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July 30, 1982

Consultative Group Meeting
May 24-26, 1982

MAIN CONCLUSIONS REACHED AND DECISIONS TAKEN

1. The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research held a mid-term business meeting in Paris from May 24-26, 1982. The regular "annual meeting" at which the international research centers make presentations and the donor members of the Group make their pledges continues to take place for a full week in November. Beginning with the meeting in Paris this May, the Group intends from now on to meet regularly each Spring for a business session, with attendance limited essentially to the members of the Group -- continuing members and fixed-term members representing the developing countries by regions -- together with the representative of the Chairmen of the Boards and the representative of the Directors of the Centers.

2. The Paris meeting was well attended. (A list of participants is attached in Annex I). The Chairman of the Group, Mr. Warren C. Baum, presided. This paper sets out the main conclusions reached and decisions taken at the Paris meeting. An Informal Summary of Proceedings will be drafted and circulated for comment to participants who attended the meeting.
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Review by TAC Chairman on 27th Meeting of TAC

3. Dr. Cummings, the outgoing Chairman of TAC, reported on the 27th meeting of TAC which was held at IRRI from March 9-17, 1982. The agenda of that meeting included a review by TAC of the centers' 1982 programs and budgets, irrigation water management, crop protection, plant breeders' rights, plant nutrition, upland rice, the quinquennial reviews of ILCA and IRRI, and plans for future quinquennial reviews. The ILCA quinquennial review, plant nutrition and irrigation water management were discussed separately during the Paris meetings.

4. Crop Protection. At the time of considering whether to admit ICIPE to the CGIAR system, TAC had been requested to prepare a paper on this subject. Prof. Hirst had been asked by TAC to assemble information on crop protection and the extent of its inclusion in the programs of the Centers. During the meeting at IRRI, TAC agreed that most work in crop protection must be sited with multi-disciplinary crop studies, but also recognized the need to ensure the survival of some specialist services and some need for expansion or clarification of the present effort. It was decided that the working paper prepared by Prof. Hirst would be submitted to the Center Directors and a draft policy paper discussed with them at the 28th TAC Meeting in June 1982, before submission to the CGIAR in November.

5. Plant Breeders' Rights. TAC examined the report which TAC had commissioned from a group of consultants and the conclusions and recommendations of a TAC Workshop on Plant Breeders' Rights (PBR) and the IARCs. TAC generally agreed with the views expressed and actions proposed in these documents and, on this basis, prepared a draft statement of principles. This draft statement and the documents will be circulated to the Center Directors for further study and joint discussions with TAC at its 28th meeting. TAC will then submit to the CGIAR its conclusions and recommendations on PBR in relation to the work of the centers.

6. Upland Rice. A Conference on Upland Rice will take place at Bouake (Ivory Coast) in October 1982. TAC will participate in the Conference and will resume its consideration of upland rice at its November 1982 meeting in the light of the findings of the Conference and the recommendations of the Quinquennial Review of IRRI.

7. Future Quinquennial Reviews. Progress reports were presented by the TAC Secretariat on preparations for the Quinquennial Review of CIMMYT (September 6-25, 1982), CIP (February 14-26, 1983), and ICARDA (April 12 - May 2, 1983). The Committee has made progress regarding the membership of the Review Panels, the program for the respective reviews and the questions to be addressed. TAC has discussed the need for a new format and new procedures for quinquennial reviews, and plans to consider this subject jointly with the Center Directors at their June meeting.
8. **Allocation of Resources.** Several donors expressed concern at the demands on TAC's time caused by its responsibilities for recommending the allocation of resources to the international research centers. Budgets for 1982 had first been reviewed by TAC in June 1981, the outcome of which had been two recommendations by TAC for each center — one at a fully funded level and one at a reduced level. In November the Group had conditionally approved the lower recommendations which called for net funding of $163 million. But contributions by donors had not been enough to cover that amount, and so TAC had to direct much of its March 1982 meeting to a second review of 1982 budgets to bring net requirements more into line with total contributions. The Group was told that the programs and budgets of the centers for 1983 would be reviewed by TAC, assisted by the two Secretariats, at the meeting with the Center Directors in Mexico in June. It was understood that TAC would make a range of budget recommendations to cover the likely amount of funds actually made available in 1983.

**ILCA Quinquennial Review**

9. The first quinquennial review of the International Livestock Center for Africa (ILCA) was undertaken towards the end of 1981 by a panel appointed by TAC. Sir John Crawford, Chairman of the panel, introduced a critical but constructive report with a reminder of the difficulties inherent in ILCA's mandate, particularly the geographic spread of its operations with the concomitant variety of livestock systems. One of the problems that ILCA has to face is the need for an effective leadership and supportive role between headquarters and the zonal programs, the absence of which had, in the past, led to a lack of a clear sense of common purpose, of agreed research procedures and of high standards of operation. During the ensuing discussion, the Chairman of ILCA's Board, Professor McDowell, and the Center Director, Dr. Peter Brumby, indicated that the Board and Management of ILCA had accepted TAC's recommendations and were proceeding to implement them as rapidly as resources would permit. Many members of the Group congratulated Sir John and his colleagues on the quality of the report, which, together with TAC's comments on ILCA, were carefully considered.

**Plant Nutrition**

10. At the time the Group was considering whether to adopt the International Fertilizer Development Center, in May 1979, TAC had been asked to study the appropriate role of the international centers in conducting research on plant nutrition. A study, financed by UNDP, was carried out by Drs. Nicholaides and Sanchez, and the former presented the findings of the study to the Group. The Group concurred with TAC's recommendation that research on soil plant nutrition constraints by existing IARCs should be encouraged, in preference to CGIAR support for a new initiative. TAC, however, recognized the useful role that a mechanism for international coordination could play and welcomed the initiative taken
by the Australian Development Assistance Bureau to support a further study of a proposal for an International Board for Soil Resource Management (IBSRAM). TAC would keep itself informed of this development. It was agreed that the Consultants’ report on Plant Nutrition deserved to be distributed widely.

Irrigation Water Management

11. The subject of Irrigation Water Management has been under consideration by the Group since it was formed. The TAC report on the subject which was considered by the Group proposed the establishment of an International Irrigation Management Institute, located in a developing country in the immediate vicinity of a living irrigation system in which it would conduct operational research. TAC’s proposal was subject to the proviso that this new activity should be funded without detriment to support of the existing centers. The Institute would require an estimated annual operational budget of approximately US$4-$5 million when fully operational and a non-recurring capital investment of approximately US$2.5-$3 million. After extensive discussion a final decision was postponed until after the next agenda item: Future Resource Requirements and Their Funding. Following the discussion on resource requirements, the Group decided that it could not incorporate the proposed new center into the system without the risk of undermining the continued financing of the Group’s existing activities at the appropriate level. Nevertheless, there was widespread support for research in water management and it was agreed that no other new activity had higher priority for financing by the Group. A group of donors decided to meet informally to discuss means to keep the initiative alive outside the CGIAR system. The Group concluded that, if the informal group of donors could prove in the future that incremental financing could be found which would not subtract resources away from the Group’s ongoing activities, then the proposal could be brought again before the Group for its consideration.

Future Resource Requirements and Their Funding

12. The Secretariat’s paper on this subject included, as requested by the Group in November 1981, a revision of the Five-Year Plan recommended by the Second Review Committee. The discussion on the paper was extensive. The donors confirmed their acceptance of a five-year financing plan with annual pledging. This indicative, or rolling plan, would be re-examined each year and adjusted in accordance with circumstances then prevailing. Multi-year pledging was endorsed by several donors. A major policy decision taken was that as long as funding for the CGIAR system continued to be affected by slow economic growth, inflation and depreciation of non-dollar currencies, no new activities should be added to the system. This had an immediate effect on the proposed addition of a water irrigation management institution (see paragraph 11). In terms of the revised five-year plan shown below, the Group decided that the only growth that the system should absorb at present is that indicated in (a) and (b); items 5 and 6 included in (c) were not accepted.
Revision of Five-Year Plan Recommended by the Review Committee
(Constant 1982 $ Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Basic Operational Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Estimated increases to bring all existing institutions to an approved level and standard of operation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Capital Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Estimated capital requirements, excluding part of the building requirements of ICARDA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Remainder of ICARDA building requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Additional Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provision for &quot;accelerated&quot; programs as described in the Review Committee's Report</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. New activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Water Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) A Second Activity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Grand Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the annual totals accepted for indicative planning purposes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Constant 1982 $ Millions)

Their acceptance by the Group recognized the need for a substantial increase in actual contributions, particularly since the indicative plan above was calculated in real terms. An increase of about 20 percent over
1982 contributions would be required to arrive at the numbers in the plan for 1983. Since the discussions had indicated that there are limited prospects for new donors as also limited prospects of tapping other sources of funds such as charging for services, the onus of fulfilling the plan's targets would have to be shouldered essentially by existing donors.

Implementation of the Recommendations of the Second Review Committee

14. The Group had reviewed the recommendations of the Second Review Committee very thoroughly at its November 1981 meeting; its decisions are recorded in the Condensed Summary of Discussion in the Report of the CGIAR Second Review Committee dated November 1981. The Secretariat's paper prepared for the Paris meeting addressed the question of how and by whom these recommendations should be implemented. Some recommendations did not require substantive discussion. The results of the discussion on those that did are recorded below.

(i) Recommendation 2. At the November 1982 meeting TAC would present terms of reference for a study to determine the best methods for training research leaders and managers for the centers.

(ii) Recommendation 4. The Group agreed that when a center was collaborating in a research project in the same geographical region as another center, an agreement between the two parties should be established and both the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats should be advised.

(iii) Recommendation 6. The subject of the role of basic and strategic research in support of the centers' programs would as a first step be discussed at an early meeting of the center directors and TAC, following which it would be discussed by the Group.

(iv) Recommendations 7 and 8. A full discussion between TAC, the centers and the CG Secretariat about the process of assembling estimates, evaluating competing demands, and deciding on the final allocation of resources would take place at the June meeting.

(v) Recommendation 9. The Executive Secretary stated that there would be consultations with donors, Center Directors, members of the Boards and TAC about the issues relating to external management reviews of centers. The CG Secretariat expected to engage the services of an expert to help draw up an appropriate program.

(vi) Recommendation 12. The Chairman reported that a Search Committee had been established to assist and advise him in selecting a successor to the present Executive Secretary of the CGIAR, who will soon be retiring. The person would be appointed within the
next several months. Furthermore, if the CGIAR's budget proposals, as included in the World Bank's budget for FY83 are approved, recruitment of the two additional staff members for the Secretariat will be initiated as soon as the authority exists.

(vii) Recommendation 15. The Group agreed that a discussion paper should be prepared by the CGIAR Secretariat on the methods of consultation between the Boards and the Group on important matters of policy. Boards and members of the Group would be consulted in its preparation.

(viii) Recommendation 20. Various methods of implementing the proposal to establish a small general purpose fund, to finance mainly the foreign exchange needs of representatives of developing countries who attend the CG meetings were considered. The Chairman stated that the matter would be looked into further.

Other Business

15. The UNDP representative, Mr. Mashler, recorded the debt of the CG system to one of the founders, Dr. George Harrar, who died recently.

Time and Place of Next Meeting

16. Centers Week has already been scheduled to take place in Washington, D.C. from November 8-12, 1982. The Chairman stated the Secretariat would consult with as many members of the Group as possible to establish a policy for the venue of future Centers Week meetings.
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Informal Summary of Proceedings

1. The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) held a mid-term business meeting from May 24-26, 1982 at the offices of the World Bank in Paris. The Chairman of the Group, Mr. Warren C. Baum, presided over the meetings.

2. Attached are the Informal Summary of Proceedings, the List of Participants, and the Group's proposed Five-Year Plan. Comments made on the draft by members of the Group have been incorporated into this version.
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Informal Summary of Proceedings

Opening Remarks by the Chairman of the Consultative Group

1. The Chairman reminded the Group that it was exactly eleven years since the Group first met and only the second time that the Group was meeting twice in the same year. The May meeting was a direct result of the finding of the Second Review Committee (Recommendation 10) that to allow adequate discussion of policy issues, the Group should have longer or more frequent meetings. The Group decided to do the latter. The need to meet more frequently is a reflection of the rapid growth and of the greater complexity of the business now before the Group. A reading of the Secretariat's paper on Future Resource Requirements and Their Funding indicated that the deliberations of this meeting opened on a somber note. However, the Chairman expressed the hope that the financial difficulties faced by the Group would be taken as a challenge rather than a prophecy. He reminded the meeting of the main thrust of the Review Committee's advice, which was that more substantive debates be held and more difficult decisions be taken by the Group. It was up to the Group, at this meeting, therefore, to harness its collective wisdom and to put together a strategy for the system's future over the next five years that would keep it operating as effectively as -- or preferably even more effectively than -- it had in the past. Mr. Baum expressed the Group's very real regret that it would be listening to Dr. Ralph Cummings for the last time when he presented the report by the TAC Chairman on its 27th meeting at IRRI. Dr. Cummings had played a crucial part in guiding the Group through recent years and his wisdom would be missed. The Group was fortunate, however, in his successor -- Dr. Guy Camus. Dr. Camus' knowledge of the problems and opportunities in agricultural research as well as his familiarity with the CGIAR system would be invaluable assets in his new role. The Chairman also noted, with pleasure, the presence of Sir John Crawford, who served so ably as TAC Chairman during the early years.

Report by TAC Chairman on 27th Meeting of TAC

2. The 27th meeting of TAC took place at the International Rice Research Institute, Los Banos, the Philippines, on March 8-17, 1982. Dr. Cummings announced he would postpone discussion of the ILCA quinquennial review, the study on plant nutrition, and the proposal on irrigation water management since these were the subjects of individual items on the agenda of the Paris meeting. Ten TAC members were continuing service in 1982. New members who joined for the first time at the 27th meeting were Dr. W. von Urf of the Institut fur Wirtschafts und Socialwissenschaften (Federal Republic of Germany) and Dr. C. Hanumantha
Rao of the Institute of Economic Growth, New Delhi (India), replacing Dr. G. Trant (Canada) and Dr. S. W. Sadikin (Indonesia), whose terms had expired. Dr. Camus (France), the new TAC Chairman-designate, participated in the meeting and following it had taken over full responsibilities as TAC Chairman. Dr. Cummings paid high tribute to Dr. Camus' very substantial contribution to the CGIAR in the past and extended his warmest wishes as Dr. Camus assumed his new duties.

3. As was customary, Dr. Bommer had given TAC a summary of the main highlights, conclusions and recommendation of the last FAO conference. He reported that, although the overall state of food and agriculture was considered reasonably satisfactory in 1981, mainly as a result of a larger cereal harvest in traditional grain exporting countries, food shortages were increasing in many developing countries particularly in Africa and food self-sufficiency appeared more difficult to achieve in some areas. Strong support was voiced on the need to increase resource allocation to national agricultural research systems, improve their efficiency, and to promote inter-country and international cooperation and collaboration with closer linkages to farmers. The major contribution of the CGIAR system was stressed. With reference to plant genetic resources, a request was made for work on an international convention for ensuring safe conservation and unimpeded use of global plant genetic resources with agricultural relevance for the benefit of all mankind, and toward the establishment of an international bank of plant genetic resources of agricultural interest. The conference also adopted a World Soil Charter for the rational use, management, and conservation of world soil resources.

4. Adjustments of 1982 Programs and Budgets. Due at least in part to changes in currency exchange rates and other unforeseen circumstances, it had become evident by the time of the November meeting of the CGIAR that resources which could be provided by the Group for 1982 would be less, in dollar equivalents, than had been anticipated at the time of preparation of the 1982 IARCs programs and budgets and at the 26th TAC meeting in June 1981. It also appeared that the gap would be larger than could be accommodated by technical and arbitrary adjustments, and that a new examination of at least marginal priorities within and among Centers would be required. Specifically, the budgets recommended to the CGIAR called for a gross expenditure by all thirteen Centers of approximately $167 million, with a net requirement from the CGIAR of $163 million. Against this requirement it appeared, on the basis of exchange rates prevailing as of November 1981, that only approximately $149 million could be provided. Accordingly, the IARCs were requested to prepare new 1982 budget proposals giving a prioritized listing of adjustments that would be made if they had to accommodate reductions up to 10 percent below the amounts which had, up to that time, been recommended to the CGIAR.

5. In subcommittee and in two plenary sessions, TAC, with the assistance of the CGIAR Secretariat, reviewed the submissions supplied by each Center, and the CGIAR Secretariat's individual and collective analysis of these submissions. The real growth rates experienced by each Center over the past several years and especially in 1981, including changes in
senior manyears, were reviewed, and the anticipated effects of particular
levels of rates of exchange (positive or negative) in relation to the
actual outcome of the 1981 operations were considered. Also, TAC
attempted, on the basis of evidence submitted or otherwise available, to
make some relative assessments as to the extent to which further reductions
might affect the ability of the Center in addressing its mandate.
Adjustments were made in two steps -- first with respect to technical
adjustments and second with program adjustments. Technical adjustments
reduced the net requirements for carrying out the approved program by
approximately $5.45 million. This, however, left a gap of approximately
$8.65 million which would have to be met by program adjustments. One
Center, which had voluntarily accepted a substantially reduced net
requirement, was not asked to reduce the level further at this stage.
Recommended adjustments in the net requirements of other Centers varied
between 1.8% and 10%.

6. Dr. Cummings next turned to the preliminary reviews of main
program changes in 1983 and beyond. Guidelines for preparation of 1983
program and budgets, quite similar to those utilized for 1982 budget
preparation, had already been issued by the CGIAR Secretariat in December
1981, and the IARCs were already well advanced in preparation of the 1983
program and budget submissions. Since the ceilings provided in these
guidelines were somewhat higher than present prospects for funding, it
appeared that TAC, with assistance from the CGIAR Secretariat, would find
it necessary to review the IARCs' 1983 programs and budgets as had been
done. TAC, therefore, addressed itself to the issues for 1984 and beyond,
and at the same time assigned to individual TAC members responsibility for
in-depth study of specific Centers prior to the time of the 28th TAC
meeting which would take place in June, 1982. Dr. Cummings reported that:
(a) TAC would wish to work more closely with the CGIAR Secretariat in the
future in the preparation of the program and budget guidelines. This was
an issue which would be addressed in more detail in the 28th and 29th TAC
meetings in June and November, 1982, respectively; (b) in the absence of
multi-year pledging by a major portion of the donors, and in view of the
uncertainties in future projections of fund availability, TAC saw little
use for continuation of biennial budgeting. Instead, TAC suggested
preparation of annual programs and budgets with rolling, forward
projections of perhaps three to five years. Such projections would reflect
the features of the long-range plans prepared or in preparation by each
IARC. TAC would, at the same time, welcome any moves on the part of the
donors toward multi-year pledging; (c) in preparing the 1984 program and
budget guidelines. TAC emphasized the need to arrive at a forward budgeting
system, based on a realistic estimate of available funds, and using as a
base the actual program and budget level of the current year, corrected for
technical factors. Allocation of funds over and above the current base
level would then be recommended in relation to agreed priorities. Centers
would be encouraged to submit priorities among additional items which could
not be carried out within these budget levels, giving donors a better basis
for assessment of the nature and importance of program items which might
have to be postponed. TAC proposed to devote a portion of the 28th meeting
to a consideration, in consultation with Center Directors, of strategic
issues. Two desk studies by the Secretariat were proposed for the interim, namely (a) an elaboration of the balance now existing between core and non-core funded activities of each Center on a regional as well as global basis, and (b) the activities of the various IARC in Africa or a part of it.

7. **Crop Protection.** Turning to Crop Protection, Dr. Cummings stated that he proposed to circulate the latest draft of the paper being prepared under Professor Hirst's leadership to the IARCs. The policy issues would be discussed with Center Directors at the time of the 28th TAC meeting, with a view toward submitting it to the CGIAR prior to its meeting in the fall of 1982.

8. **Plant Breeders' Rights.** Dr. Cummings reported that TAC had made very considerable progress and anticipated having a draft policy recommendation completed for consideration of the CGIAR at its next meeting. The relevant documents, reports and tentative conclusions of a workshop convened in January under the chairmanship of Dr. Bommer were being circulated to the IARCs and would be discussed further by TAC and the Center Directors at their concurrent meeting in June 1982. The documents which would come to the CGIAR at its November meeting should help very materially to clarify the issues and principles involved.

9. **Upland Rice.** Several international meetings and seminars on the subject had been held during the last two years, among them one in Brazil, one in France, one at IRRI and one at WARDA. IRRI had proposed, in its 1982 budget, a post of Upland Rice Coordinator. TAC had not taken a position with reference to this proposal pending receipt of further information on the depth of interest and the willingness of relevant institutions to cooperate in upland rice research, with a coordinator located at IRRI. A conference on upland rice research was currently being planned, to be held in the Ivory Coast in October 1982. There were divergent opinions as to the relative importance and potentiality of this category of rice cultivation in different regions of the world. The term "upland rice" was used to denote rice grown in unbunded upland fields in which surface or underground water did not normally accumulate and in which natural rainfall was the only source of water supply. Very substantial amounts of land area were devoted to rice culture under such conditions in Africa, Brazil, the Philippines, Indonesia and several other countries. The terminology with respect to the ecological situations under which rice was grown, however, was not consistent among the three continental areas. It was hoped that this conference would make further progress in arriving at a better definition and classification of rice growing environments which could be recognized internationally, as well as provide more information on the state of knowledge, deficiencies, and research needs for this class of rice and their relative importance for international attention. TAC would be kept informed of the outcome of this conference.

10. **Quinquennial Reviews.** The second quinquennial review of IRRI was carried out from January 4-22, 1982 under the chairmanship of Dr. Almiro Blumenschein. The draft report was considered in a preliminary way by the
TAC at its 27th meeting. While the report was highly complimentary in tone, TAC made a number of specific suggestions for consideration by the panel chairman in finalizing the report. TAC agreed that the panel had generally covered its terms of reference, and the list of questions it had been asked to address. At the time of the 27th TAC meeting, the IRRI Board had not had an opportunity to consider the draft report and offer its comments, and the newly-designated Director General was not yet in place and had not been able to examine it. At its 28th meeting TAC expected to review the finalized draft and to have the benefit of comments from the Board and the Director General. The review report, with TAC's comments, would be placed before the CG for consideration in November 1982. Three more quinquennial reviews were now in the planning stage. The second review of CIMMYT would take place during the period September 6-25, 1982 under the chairmanship of Dr. John Dillon. The CIP review would be under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert Hugous of the University of Wisconsin and would take place from February 14-26, 1983. The ICARDA review under the chairmanship of Dr. Guy Beard would take place from April 12-May 2, 1983.

11. **Next TAC Meeting.** The 28th TAC meeting will be held concurrently with the meeting of Center Directors at CIMMYT headquarters, El Batan, Mexico from June 21-29, 1982.

12. **Ensuing Discussion.** Several speakers expressed their concern about the difficulties faced by TAC, in the task conferred upon it by the Group, in reviewing budgets under situations of insufficient funding. Both Drs. Cummings and Camus agreed that it was a burden, particularly when it had to be done twice in the fiscal year, but felt that TAC provided the only mechanism to ration funds on technical grounds. Dr. Camus expressed his conviction that TAC's task was to define the broad priorities for the whole system, that it should do so on the basis of the priority setting within each one of the Centers, and that priority setting and necessary reorientation can only be achieved on the basis of initiatives taken by the Centers themselves. He added that although budget matters were thorny issues, they could not be separated from program issues. As a means to resolve the pressures on TAC, there would be a third TAC meeting in 1982 — in November, just ahead of International Centers' Week meeting.

13. Prior to the discussion on future funding, Dr. Havener, representing the Center Directors, asked the meeting to note that many Centers were facing severe financial constraints and difficulties in 1982. Not only did several donors yet have to make their funds available for 1982, but the level of funding from various donors was still not known in 1982. Better information about the availability and value of 1982 funding levels would be extremely helpful to the Centers.

14. The representative of the US expressed his concern about the CG Secretariat's suggestion that if the funds available were slightly in excess of those planned by the TAC in 1982, they should go to the Centers that had been most severely cut, and if sums were slightly less, the Centers which had been least penalized should now receive less. Mr. Farrar considered that this bore too much resemblance to the idea of percentage
reductions, which his government had rejected in the past. Instead, in the future, it would be preferable to specify, for changes that may have to take place during the year, a priority structure reflecting the impact of budget changes on the system as a whole. The US representative also stated that his government had pledged at the last meeting a sum based on what turned out to be a very optimistic estimate of total contributions. The US provided a quarter of the total contributions raised by the Group, and with the actual result significantly under $150 million, there remained some $3-$5 million which could not be provided to Centers in 1982 if the matching formula were applied. Given particularly the changes in exchange rates during the year, the US government had been asked to provide at least part of the total amount pledged to those Centers whose programs had been reduced in ways most damaging, judged in an overall priority context. It would be a good deal easier for the US government to change its approach to funding for 1982 — on an entirely exceptional basis and without setting any precedents for the future — if it were possible for two or three donors to add to the amounts already pledged some additional pledges which could be allocated in a similar fashion, to try to make up for some of the serious damage that will otherwise occur to the system. The representative of the government of Japan informed the meeting that if the exchange rate turned favorable at the end of the financial year, the Japanese government is considering giving that portion of the exchange rate excess to the CGIAR system. That exchange rate excess would come not only from the CGIAR contribution, but from the contributions to other international organizations.

15. The representative of the UNDP referred to the issue of contribution to programs in a number of Centers which at present were classified as Special Projects. Three of those activities could reasonably be interpreted as being core programs. Mr. Mashler made particular reference to the tropical wheat program with CIMMYT, which is getting under way this year; the program with CIAT; and the research on food systems and policies with IFPRI. If TAC could classify those projects of approximately US$2 million in 1983 as core programs, they could then qualify for matching funds from the United States under the conditions outlined by its representative. On this point, the Chairman reminded the meeting that as far as the USAID and the World Bank were concerned, their contributions were proportional, but they were proportional to the core, not to special projects, which were not part of the approved budgets. Therefore, the matching funds, which were 35 percent of the total, were increased when funds were put in core; they were not increased when funds were put into special projects. That put a very heavy penalty on special projects with respect to the overall funding of the system, and one which donors should bear in mind in deciding whether they could switch some activities from special projects to core.

16. A representative of a major donor expressed the hope that more donors would participate more actively and in greater numbers at the TAC meetings. The speaker also felt that the donors should be direct participants in the decision-making process about the allocation of scarce
resources. The speaker suggested that the donors, as donors not as observers, should be present and should debate equally with TAC and the Cosponsors on matters of budget allocation, at open and closed sessions, as well as in working groups. These views were supported by other speakers.

Quinquennial Review of ILCA

17. Sir John Crawford, Chairman of the ILCA Review Panel, presented the findings of the QQR to the meeting. He stressed that the report represented the unanimous viewpoint of the Panel and acknowledged the constructive participation of all its members and of TAC, as well as the support given by the entire ILCA Organization -- Board, Management and Staff. Sir John stated that he had been Chairman of TAC when ILCA was established, and although he was presenting a critical report in many aspects, he had not changed his view that the decision to establish ILCA was a right one. While the Board had great responsibility, it could not succeed without a cooperative, open and efficient management; the Director General also had to provide research leadership. Sir John pointed out the difficulties inherent in ILCA's research mandate -- to improve animal husbandry and the quality of life of people across many political boundaries and across many climatic zones; this required not only a single large center and modest outreach programs, but several operating centers functioning in a unified framework on a continental basis. However, there are many feasible improvements in the ILCA design which can integrate the institute as a whole and its national clients more effectively than has been the case. Sir John referred especially to improved governance, more emphasis on scientific work at the central headquarters, and further emphasis on the network approach to those many problems which are common to many of the nations in its territory.

18. The key elements of Sir John's presentation concerned:

(i) **Mandate:** though basically still valid, insufficient attention had been paid to research, and development advice should not be given too freely by ILCA without the benefit of appropriate research.

(ii) **Systems Research:** it had been necessary for the Review Panel frequently to explain that systems research did not preclude component research and that, indeed, the prevailing animal husbandry system had to be understood and properly described to understand the areas where specific or component research such as animal nutrition, pasture improvement, and marketing organization was necessary. The understanding of the system was again no less necessary as a setting for testing the practicability of introducing changes suggested by component research.

(iii) **Zonal Research Program:** these were the programs in Kenya and Mali, Nigeria and Ethiopia, as distinct from headquarters activities. The general points made by the Panel were set out in
paragraph 69 of the report. Those nine points might sound more critical than they were meant to be and they did not apply to every center. One of the most gratifying features of the Panel's work in the field was meeting with comparatively young scientists able and willing to work very hard. The Panel's conclusion was that they needed the help of more experienced people, which could be better provided by having more senior scientists at headquarters capable of giving leadership of scientific quality. A further general feature was some imbalance in the research teams. Sir John faced the question as to whether all the work is equally productive. The answer, he said, was that it cannot be equally productive in the financial sense. The constraints in Mali were very much more severe than the constraints in, say, the highlands of Ethiopia. So if one were to make an investment in ILC solely measured by the amount of extra farm-produce one could produce, one would concentrate on the more favored climatic zones. But if ILC's mandate was to improve the quality of life throughout the sub-Saharan area -- as it was -- then Mali could not be excluded nor can other zones like the humid zones of Nigeria. It was not a question simply of applying an immediate investment test on the money put in, but of applying a test of whether improvement in the quality of life was possible, and the judgement of the Review Panel was that even in Mali, with all its constraints, it was possible significantly to improve the lot of the people there.

(iv) Headquarters Program: the Panel reviewed the library, cartography and computer centers, publications policy, recruitment and training, as well as relations with other national and international research institutes and with national governments. The Panel noted the encouraging and promising work of the two principal senior scientists and of the potential for using more senior scientists both for research at headquarters and as instruments for leadership, through advice and consultation in raising the scientific level of all ILC programs. The Panel also applauded at headquarters the development of the network for work in the area of trypanotolerant cattle and the obvious scope for linkage with national research efforts and of underpinning national research activity.

19. Sir John reported that the Panel had made some 54 recommendations together with many other suggestions less formally stated, but hopefully, to be taken just as seriously. Sir John congratulated the Board and the new Management on facing up to the realities of the changes the Panel suggested and on undertaking a very considerable restructuring. In many countries improvement in livestock was still a major key to the success of rural development programs and to improved human welfare. The postscript to the report underlined that ILC's continental thrust was vital and great pressure for expansion of its activities would come: it strongly suggested that ILC could meet the challenges through its own efforts and through those conducted in cooperation with national research systems.
20. The Chairman in thanking Sir John for his presentation described the ILCA QQR as a model of what the donors look for: frank criticism but a constructive attitude towards the institution under study.

21. Dr. Cummings as Chairman of TAC reported TAC's comments on the Review Panel's findings. TAC reaffirmed its appreciation of the quality and the format of the report, and of the thoroughness and the perception of the diagnosis made of ILCA by the Review Panel. It was recognized that the Panel had done an extremely good job, and that the frank analysis of the present state of development of ILCA had generated very constructive and positive recommendations. In its general endorsement of these recommendations, TAC expressed its conviction that major changes in the structure, the mode of operation and the programs of ILCA were absolutely necessary. In particular, the research capacity of ILCA had to be strengthened so as to arrive at a better balance between systems and related component research, and at increased concentration of efforts in removing the major constraints to better livestock production. TAC regretted that some of that would have to be done in the face of more serious budget constraints than TAC would wish. TAC was not convinced that for the immediate future ILCA's activities should continue to be dispersed as widely as at present, nor as widely as might be inferred from the reaffirmation by the Panel of the continental mandate of ILCA. That comment was made in the context of scarcity of resources for all the centers. TAC felt that concentration of talent and resources at a few locations to achieve program excellence and relevance deserved priority attention. The future need for additional funding to make ILCA equal to its task was recognized, but TAC felt that it could consider recommendations for additional funding levels only after the patterns of restructuring and redirection had emerged. The Institute and its Board had addressed this problem very promptly and forthrightly, and a copy of a draft of recommendations had already been prepared by the Board. Dr. Cummings congratulated the Board and Management on the fact that they themselves had endorsed the report, drastic as it may have been in its recommendations, and had been able constructively to address the issues in an attempt to proceed along the lines suggested.

22. Dr. McDowell, Chairman of ILCA's Board, stated that the Board and Management, and especially the Board at the early stage, took the views of the quinquennial team very seriously, even to the point of making a change in the Director General post, five months ahead of time. Some 30 of the 54 recommendations were operational; another 20 were under serious consideration and the Board would be moving to implement them as resources permitted. ILCA was attempting to shift emphasis to strengthen component research and to do this largely through the leadership of outstanding scientists. The 1982 revised figures reflected a reduction of approximately 25 percent in field operations for 1982, and 35 percent in administration and general operations, in order to move resources towards the implementation of the QQR recommendations. However, increased emphasis on component research would require substantial capital funds if ILCA were to attract the kind of people appropriate to conduct the work.
Plant Nutrition

23. Two background documents had been circulated: a report by Dr. Nicholaides and Dr. Sanchez, i.e. the Consultant's report on plant nutrition which had been financed by the UNDP, and a transmittal letter from Dr. Cummings giving TAC's recommendations on the subject. In his summary of the report, Dr. Nicholaides stated that food production in the developing countries would be more heavily dependent on improved plant nutrition through added fertilizer inputs over the next 20 years than during the past two decades. However, plant nutrition constraints in practice could not be separated from other soil related constraints. Consequently, consultation with the steering committee led the Consultants to broaden the original terms of reference of this study to include soil related constraints. The Consultants concluded that, with certain exceptions, soil plant nutrition research was not a neglected area, but many of these efforts were not conducted in a sufficiently coordinated manner to produce maximum benefits and adequate interchange of information. The Consultants then examined their findings in relation to the 1979 TAC priorities paper and its objectives, and concluded that the present efforts and their geographical distribution were insufficient to ensure that technology for alleviating the soil plant nutrition constraints would be adequately developed and transferred, in order to permit continuing increases of sufficient magnitude in food production. They felt that an international effort was needed to overcome this gap. The Consultants also considered the issue of location specificity, and felt that it should be brought into focus in terms of the soil plant nutrition study. They then suggested that TAC initiate actions to better coordinate and strengthen international research on soil plant nutrition in order to: increase the efficiency of plant nutrient inputs; increase and stabilize food production in the marginal areas of the developing countries, with special emphasis on rain-fed areas; and conserve the land resource base, particularly in the priority agro-ecological zones. Three institutional approaches were also presented for TAC's consideration: (1) strengthen the soil plant nutrition research efforts in the existing international agroresearch centers, and establish a network among those conducting such research; (2) develop a coordinating and catalytic center for soil plant nutrition research, with particular emphasis on national and international institutes; and (3) create a fully fledged international institute on soil and plant nutrition research, with emphasis on the rain-fed agricultural systems. The pros and cons of these institutional approaches were examined, and it was suggested to TAC that the second alternative -- the development of a coordinating and catalytic center to foster soil plant nutrition research -- would be perhaps the most appropriate.

24. Dr. Cummings reported that at its 27th meeting, TAC endorsed the report's concern that plant nutrition research should include related soil constraints in the various agro-ecological regions. The IARCs and several institutions, international and national, were active in this field. TAC supported the continuation of such activities, and would be ready to consider the need for accelerated programs as part of its overall consideration of the program and budget proposals of the centers in the
context of the report and in relation to the other priorities and demands of the system. Furthermore, TAC supported the cooperation which several IARCs had with the IFDC and other plant nutrition research institutions. TAC had been informed of the proposal under study by an independent group for the establishment of an International Board for Soil Resource Management and welcomed the prospect of support from the Australian Development Assistance Bureau (ADAB). TAC was convinced that further research in plant nutrition would play an important role in improved agricultural productivity in the less favorable environments of the developing world but, at the same time, accorded higher priority, in the CGIAR context, to research in this field by the existing IARCs over support by the CGIAR for a new and separate initiative in the field. While TAC could not recommend a new initiative by the CGIAR in this field, it commended the report to the CGIAR for careful study and consideration. In addition TAC proposed to reproduce the report, probably with the deletion of the portions on alternative action recommendations which were addressed primarily to the CGIAR, for distribution to a wider public audience.

25. The representative of Australia informed the meeting that his government had decided to put a small amount of money this year into a study to establish an international board for soil resources management. The purpose of the consultancy study was to develop work plans and a budget for the operation of the proposed board, and to identify some specific examples of the type of collaborative research that such a board might foster. This collaboration would be among the international centers, the national research systems and the institutions concerned with soil research in the developed countries. The study was being conducted this year by Dr. Bruce Miller, the present Director of the New Zealand Bureau of Soils Research. He had been assisted by the IBSRM steering committee chaired by Dr. D. J. Greenland, Deputy Director General of IRRI, and the consultant had been based at IRRI. The government of Australia anticipates that the consultant's report would be ready by the end of 1982 and it would be made available to all interested donors.

Irrigation Water Management

26. In introducing the subject of Irrigation Water Management, the Chairman stated the subject was on the TAC agenda at its first meeting, and had been a recurrent theme of TAC and of Group meetings over the years since then. At a 1980 meeting in Manila, TAC presented a proposal for discussion by the Group. At that time, some members of the Group had doubts as to whether the factor-oriented research properly belonged in the Consultative Group. However, a majority expressed a definite interest in pursuing the matter further, but there remained an unresolved problem -- whether the idea of an international center or a series of satellite centers was necessarily the right approach, or whether an approach through the strengthening of existing Centers was more appropriate. No decision was reached at the Manila meeting and the Group referred the matter back to TAC for further consideration.
27. TAC did review it once more at the following meeting, and subsequently by agreement between the Chairman of TAC and the Chairman of the Group, an ad hoc meeting of donors was held in July 1981 in Washington. At that meeting, which was chaired at Mr. Baum's request by Dr. Cunningham, it was decided that a team of four consultants would be engaged to examine the subject in more detail and report to a steering group of donors and other interested parties. The steering group met in 1981 in October in Rome under the chairmanship of Dr. Treitz and again in Rome in February 1982 to review the consultants' report. TAC considered the report at its 27th meeting last March. The subject was complex and there remained some differences of opinion as to how water management issues should be handled by the Group. The Chairman recommended that this subject had by now been studied as thoroughly as it was possible for the Group to do, and every effort should be made to reach a decision, one way or another, at the Paris meeting.

28. Dr. Cummings introduced the study team leader, Dr. Schultze, and noted that Dr. Cunningham and Dr. Treitz, who had both steered committee meetings on this subject, were present. Dr. Cummings stated that TAC reiterated its full and strong conviction, previously expressed and fully supported by the study team's report, that irrigation water management was a subject of highest importance and priority, justifying international attention through the CGIAR. TAC gave its very high commendation to the work of the study team, reinforced by the advice of the steering committee, which had assisted greatly in advancing TAC's thinking on the particular role which an international initiative in this field, supported by the CGIAR, should fulfill. TAC wished to recognize the very substantial contributions in funds, personnel, and other support which several members of the Group had made toward the recent work of the study team and its steering committee, particularly the Ford Foundation, the World Bank, the USAID, the United Nations Development Programme, the Netherlands Government and the Federal Republic of Germany. The earlier study by the team under Sir Charles Pereira, supported by the International Development Research Center, as well as contributions and suggestions too numerous to mention individually, were acknowledged with sincere appreciation.

29. The major feature of the proposal concerned the establishment of an international irrigation management institute. This would have a headquarters' multidisciplinary staff of approximately 15 to 20 full-time professionals supplemented, where necessary, by shorter-term consultants and professionals under contract. It would be located in a developing country in close or immediate vicinity to a living irrigation system in which it would conduct operational research. A modest installation of buildings to house staff offices, diagnostic laboratories, shops, warehouses and necessary support facilities would be needed. The interdisciplinary team at headquarters would be involved in actual operational research in nearby living irrigation systems, as well as providing coordination and support to a network of cooperating operational research and training units based in national systems. Small teams of professional staff would be outposted in selected national irrigation operational research units which would participate in the network.
had developed something of a prototype for a field cooperative operational unit. TAC tentatively estimated that an operational budget, after three to four years, of approximately US$4 to $5 million would be needed. An amount of approximately $2.5 to $3 million would be required for capital investment, depending on the extent of cooperation with other institutions.

30. Dr. Cummings stated that TAC was convinced that a new international initiative in the field of irrigation management research and training along the above lines was urgently needed. This would require mobilization of sufficient additional funds over and above those necessary for the efficient functioning of the institutions already financed by the CGIAR. Furthermore, while not able to recommend the funding of such a new initiative at the expense of activities of the existing system -- some of which were already seriously underfunded -- TAC would also advise against a reduced level of funding for the new initiative if that would lead to its fragmentation, the postponement of important and essential elements, and/or their ineffective execution.

31. At the Chairman's suggestion the debate concentrated first on the issue of the merits of the proposal as such and then on the thorny problem of its financing. A long discussion took place in which almost all the representatives present participated. Among the many technical issues discussed were: whether health factors and health hazards of the proposal had been considered; the balance between research and training; whether the proposed institute was appropriate given that the need for work on irrigation water management was very different in different agroecological areas and zones and that existing Centers had different tasks to fulfill within this area of water management; the consideration that research may solve some water management problems, but some were not technical but social and political; the belief that this type of research, being highly location specific, should take place within the framework of large irrigation projects supported by national governments and in many cases major donors; and the question of whether ongoing work in Centers such as IRRI, ICRISAT and ICARDA, which were already involved in irrigation or dryland water management, could not be strengthened. Another speaker suggested that if the CG started creating "discipline" centers, it would establish precedents for the creation of many more and felt that these should be the responsibility of the national systems and that the CG should concentrate on the commodity centers. A representative from northern Europe referred to Recommendation I of the Second Review Committee and in particular to the statement: "We consider that the CGIAR should be cautious in giving direct support to additional international centers that focus on a single factor of productivity unless there is no other way of doing the work." Since work on water management is very different in different agroecological areas and zones, and existing centers have different tasks to fulfill within this area of water management, the representative considered that increased activity in the water management area should come within the present framework of the mandates of the existing centers as an activity to be coordinated. The representative was not convinced that the TAC proposal was the right one even if the overriding objection of lack of new sources of funding could be overcome.
32. The representative of a major donor stated that his agency had been engaged in research on water management for the last fourteen years, starting with some fairly large projects that would not have fitted within the mandate of any of the existing IARCs. One of those projects, in particular the one in Pakistan, achieved some results which led to a major reversal in thinking about the efficiency of the use of water from irrigation systems. The research showed that only one-third of available water was used and that the loss took place very largely beyond the end of the distribution system on the farm. The agency was now attempting to translate that finding into on-farm water management systems that would be location specific. The agency had started with a relatively small project and recently embarked on a somewhat larger venture, for which approximately $4 million a year over the next five years had been set aside, focussing but not confined to work in Asia, for an activity that bore a striking similarity to that which was proposed to the Group by the study team. It involved extensive training, particularly the design of training courses, which could then be applied in specific locations; a great deal of technical assistance, mostly short-term expertise, to assist in the design and management of projects and assessments of irrigation sector problems; special studies, as requested by particular countries, on physical, biological and social interactions in irrigated agriculture; and in a system of collecting information and transferring technology on water management. The project manager for this activity in the donor's Government had found that the CG proposals were quite similar to the above activities. The donor representative stated that after consideration of the report of the study team and the proposals of TAC, his agency rather preferred the report of the study team. The principal differences related to the size of staff at headquarters and to whether the headquarters was to be constructed or rented. Given that water management activities were highly location-specific, it seemed to him that the work of an international institute would need to be concentrated very heavily in particular irrigation systems, but not committed to them for periods longer than four or five years.

33. Since a number of speakers had suggested it might be preferable to use existing Centers or national programs rather than begin a new international initiative, the Chairman asked Dr. Cummings and Dr. Schultze to explain why this alternative had been discarded. Dr. Cummings stated that the overriding consideration was that a small unit added to an institute that had something else as its principal focus, would not give the visibility, the importance, or the concentration of effort that was needed for making a real impact on the kind of principles that were replicable into different environmental situations. Dr. Schultze also said that the subject had been discussed extensively in the study team; it had also been discussed by the steering committee and by TAC. There were three reasons why the study team had concluded that it would prefer a recognizable governance for this kind of exercise. It was not a center but an institute that was being proposed, and that institute would try to fill the gaps that remained between different disciplines. It would address itself mainly to management problems, interdisciplinary cooperation between agronomists, agriculturists, engineers, social scientists, economists, environmentalists and health experts. The interdisciplinary gap was central in this activi-
ty, and if one attached such a program to IRRI, ICRISAT or IITA, the focus of effort would be different from that required of the institute. Furthermore, the results of the research that would be carried out by the institute, apart from its additional role in supporting national activities, would address itself mainly to irrigation managers — those in charge of running irrigation projects — so the clientele would basically be those who were in charge of the irrigation management systems, and such people should in one way or another be represented in the governance of the exercise.

34. A donor representative stated that he had come to Paris prepared to support the recommendation adopted by TAC, thinking that at this time the Group might decide in principle to establish the new institution, leaving the question of timing or the establishment of the institution at a later stage. The speaker agreed with the recommendation that the institute be located in a developing country in the close or immediate vicinity to a living irrigation system in which it would conduct operational research, but proposed that economic factors should be taken into consideration. If a new institution were established in a country where minimum infrastructure was not in existence, the cost of running such an institution would be very high; furthermore, the availability of supporting staff from that country should also be taken into consideration. Another major donor stated that his Government supported most strongly the concept that water management should occupy the highest possible priority in tropical agriculture. However, he doubted whether any additional funds to support the new activity could be found within the CG system. The possibility of finding ODA funds from other sources would have to wait to see what form the new organization took, at which point the appropriate geographic regions could be approached to find out if there were such funds available. A representative of one of the Foundations stated that it had been active, through agricultural and rural development programs, for a number of years in giving the highest priority to the development of national capacities, working with irrigation groups and with water management groups of various sorts, in various country settings. Precisely because of this experience he believed that an effort along the lines developed by TAC was crucial to the development of large areas of the world. The delegate from a Development Bank reported that his organization had been providing technical assistance for irrigation water management in many of its member countries. He emphasized the importance his organization attached to the proposal, but was aware of the critical financial constraints. The speaker suggested that all the alternatives that had been proposed be collated and studied by the Group for further discussion in November. The delegate from a major donor stated that the cost of this institute or service would be only minimal compared with the investments that were made at present and would be made in future irrigation. However, his Government had only one fund available for the CGIAR system, so that funds for such a new initiative would be at the expense of existing Centers.

35. Dr. Havener, representing the Center Directors, stated that they recognized that in those areas where water was a scarce resource, it took on pre-eminent importance in increasing and stabilizing agricultural productivity. Therefore, no one could be against an initiative that
attempted to bring to bear science and technology on making better use of available water and distributing it more equitably for agricultural purposes. The Center Directors, therefore, supported any initiative to increase the availability of irrigation water for agricultural productivity around the world. Having said that, however, they also believed very strongly that funds for this purpose should be additional. The question had been raised as to whether or not the Centers would be willing to do more in the area of irrigation if additional funds were available. The answer to that was affirmative if those funds were clearly designated for irrigation purposes.

36. The representative of another Foundation believed that management advice was likely to make a more important contribution than irrigation research, which raised the issue as to whether a water management institute or a water irrigation research institute should be created. Furthermore, irrigation management was so site specific due both to social and physical factors as well as political ones at times, that it was doubtful that what was learned in one location would be relevant in other locations. IRRI's irrigation program worked because IRRI had a large multidisciplinary team of scientists and had great influence in the location where it worked; it was questionable whether this situation would prevail in all other locations. A handful of countries dominated the irrigation acreage. The speaker suggested that national programs focused on those few countries might be more effective than an international institute. In the coming years a greater investment would be made in irrigation than in any other aspect of agricultural development. Even most improvements in the efficiency of irrigation systems could provide for significant returns. He suggested that an institution that was more in the nature of an experimental model might be indicated, but it should have sufficient support for it to have a chance of success. The Foundation would be prepared to collaborate with those who might wish to undertake that kind of an initiative. A donor representative suggested that the model that was being used in promoting exchange of germplasm, the International Board for Plant Genetic Resource, could be a model to be followed in promoting activities in water management. Many countries recognized the importance of water management and had their own funds set aside for this, so it was possible that with a proper coordinating mechanism, some initiatives could be started immediately, although these might be small.

37. After several hours of debate, the Chairman suggested that since the question of additionality was becoming critical to a decision as to how the Group wished to proceed, the Group should move on to the discussion of Item 7 dealing with the overall funding position of the Group. Only after that discussion would the discussion on the water irrigation proposal be resumed. On the following day, after further debate, the Chairman interpreted for the Group the decision that had been taken. The proposed new water irrigation management institute could not be incorporated into the system without the risk of undermining the continued financing of the Group's existing activities at the appropriate level. Nevertheless, there was widespread support for research in water management and it was agreed that no other new activity had higher priority for financing by the Group. A group of donors decided to meet informally to discuss means to keep the
initiative alive outside the CGIAR system. If the informal group of donors could prove in the future that incremental financing could be found which would not subtract resources away from the Group's ongoing activities, then the proposal could be brought again before the Group for its consideration.

Future Resource Requirements and Their Funding

38. The Chairman introduced Agenda Item 7 by referring to his introductory remarks in which he had said that the question of the CG's future funding was the most important item on the agenda. To facilitate the discussion, the Chairman reviewed the points raised in the paper in the order in which they were presented. The paper started with a general overview of the reasons for the declining growth of the system -- since 1977 approximately -- both in terms of expenditures and of contributions. Undoubtedly, a major factor in this tapering off of growth had been worldwide inflation and economic recession, which in combination had imposed serious economic strains on a number of donor nations. The report then studied in Section III the implications of these trends for the system and found that unless there was a significant change, the Group faced a static or shrinking research system. The issues here were whether these trends could be reversed by any or a mix of savings through increased efficiency, funds from new sources, and measures to counteract inflation. In Section IV the paper considered what the Group's policies should be as to the system's future growth. In November 1981 the Group considered the five-year plan recommended by the Review Committee. It accepted the principles underlying the plan but not its financial level. Instead, the Secretariat was asked to revise the plan in keeping with the prospects for contributions in 1982. That original five-year plan recommended an increase in total gross expenditure of 2.2 percent in constant terms, over the period 1983-87. However, the Committee's assumption of a level of expenditure of $167 million in 1982 had to be revised downwards sharply when donors' pledges for 1982 became known. The revised plan as presented basically reflected several elements: a "no-growth" policy for established Centers; an average annual growth in total requirements of 3.4 percent in real terms over the next five years to bring the Centers up to a common standard; acceleration of a limited number of programs; and the addition of one or two new activities such as water management research and training, if the Group should decide to do so. New activities and innovations in the programs of the Centers were to be funded largely by reducing existing activities. The provision for accelerated programs amounted to only 1.6 percent of total expenditures up to 1986, when it would level out and then decline thereafter. For 1983 and 1984, based on estimates of inflation in the developing countries and the assumptions with respect to the prospects for currency devaluations, the 3.4 percent annual rate of real growth implies an annual decrease in total expenditures on core programs of about 20 percent in current terms. The implication was that except as new sources of funds could be found, a 20 percent increase in contributions from existing donors would be needed in 1983 and in 1984 to cover the Centers' requirements as set forth in the plan. In Section V the paper gave the justifications for the need to augment resources. Section VI sketched a grim picture of the consequences for the system if the minimum funding required to sustain modest growth during the next five years was
not obtained. However unpalatable the choice between evils, the Group would have to consider such a choice if increased contributions were not forthcoming. The last section drew attention to the CG's future timetable. TAG would meet in June to make a detailed review of the Centers' proposals and make a recommendation to the Group on the Centers' budgets. For that meeting the Secretariat should provide a tentative estimate of the likely level of donors' contributions in 1983. Therefore, by the end of the discussion those present would have arrived at a consensus on the future requirements of the system and a financial plan for funding them.

39. The Executive Secretary of the CG Secretariat, Mr. Michael Lejeune, summarized the trends indicated in the paper. There had been a decline in system growth in real terms from an average of 15.4 percent over the period 1977 to 1982, to 9.2 percent from 1979 to 1980; between 1980 and 1981 it was negative; between 1981 and 1982, making some assumptions about the total amount to be contributed in 1982, it had risen by only 2.3 percent. There had also been a decline in growth in contributions, down from something like 20 percent per year in real terms in the early years to barely 5 percent in more recent years. In this connection it was important to note the declining role of new donors as compared with the early years new donors. Inflation in developing countries rather than inflation in the countries which provided the resources had been the major factor in eroding contributions -- in recent times approximately nine-tenths of the incremental increases from the Group have had to go to compensating for increases in prices where the Centers operate.

40. The representative of the Chairmen of the Boards made a statement that concentrated mainly on means to raise funds for the CG system, in a situation where the problems facing the system could be divided into two broad categories of inadequate funding and unexpected erosion of sanctioned funds. A donor representative stated that last year the Cancun summit emphasized the importance of agricultural development, including agricultural research, and this had greatly assisted fund-raising for the CGIAR system. It was important that the CGIAR system as a whole prepare some kind of material or publicity data, that could be used to persuade the financial authorities that the system was very effective.

41. Dr. Havener, representing the Center Directors, pointed out that the paper provided the first recognition of an official nature that some of the mature Centers were being disinvested. It was an important conceptual step forward that at least donors recognized that some of the more established Centers were in fact operating at lower levels in real terms than they did in the past, or levels lower than the donors had intended them to operate. Dr. Havener expressed concern about two points that were not very well addressed in the paper. The paper talked about aggregate growth in the system, but in 1982 not all funds had been received that would allow the growth rate that was projected in the paper to be attained. Secondly, Dr. Havener said that the paper still tended to cover up the problem of the optimum size of the system. When funding began to level off, basically in 1979 or thereabouts, the established Centers suddenly became the mature Centers, without any definition of what a mature Center was. Dr. Havener believed it was imperative, before talking about stable funding situations,
to talk about optimum size for individual Centers and return on investment for individual Centers.

42. One of the Cosponsors suggested that perhaps a paper should be prepared, possibly every few years, which would give the CG the ammunition to prove that with every dollar invested so much had been produced, and the benefits derived from this investment had yielded actual results for the developing countries, in terms of production increases and income increases. This should ensure that legislative bodies provide larger allocations for the CG system and should ultimately help to bring the more affluent of the developing countries, and particularly those who had been the main beneficiaries, gradually into the system and convince them that they themselves must help finance the CG effort more substantially.

43. The representative from Australia, Dr. Manning, stated that Australia's contribution rate of 20 percent had recently been increased and the introduction of the Australian Center for International Agricultural Research represented a quantum leap in commitment. The question had been raised of multi-year commitments. Dr. Manning said he was somewhat skeptical of being able to formalize anything that was better than an undertaking to maintain the value of commitments in domestic real terms. Australia had rather hoped there would be ways in which, for instance, the resources of the Australian Center for International Agricultural Research and other donors' funds could be made available to participate in the accelerated programs, and this would present an opportunity for firm commitment from the CG and other funding agencies towards components of the accelerated program.

44. In his summary of the discussion on the past trends in the system, the Chairman stated that it had been one of the most interesting and rich discussions which the Group had had on any subject, and one of the few in which virtually every participant in the Group had taken part and made a significant contribution. Some points were very clear. First, the climate for aid had changed over the years and a number of principal donors faced very difficult economic circumstances. The multilateral aid agencies, without exception, had experienced the impact of these difficult economic conditions on their principal supporters, and the CGIAR was not immune to that process, even though it had been relatively privileged within it. The fact that the CGIAR system had matured had also made the task somewhat more difficult, and the Group was not in a position to make the same claims for novelty and innovation that it did in the early days. The Group would need to do a great deal more in the future to make the nature of the CG's contribution better known to those who in the end made the decisions about providing funds. No one had questioned the fact that, even if aid funds were limited, a system which was helping to promote food production, namely, research, which had a very high cost:benefit ratio, deserved a high priority within whatever amount of funds was available. Mr. Baum believed that the Group might not, individually or collectively, have done as thorough a job as it could in making the benefits of the system known to the decision-makers. A number of Centers were, year by year, producing results that were being transmitted through national
programs to farmers in the field, and that information should be collected and must be made more immediately available to the Group's audience. Donors should be told about the negative impact of the cuts which had taken place in the programs and the negative benefits and costs of insufficient funding. Finally, the developing countries should be more actively involved in this process. Those present at the meeting had been heartened by the very strong support for the benefits of the system which the recipients had mentioned, and the Group should harness that support and make it better known. It was to be hoped that these countries would themselves take some of the initiatives that had been suggested.

45. The next part of the paper on financial prospects dealt essentially with the possibility of raising greater resources through savings, through new donors or through the sale of services. The implication of the trends discussed above was that, unless they changed, the Group was facing the prospect of a static or shrinking system, which gave rise to the question of whether some changes in the trends could be introduced. The conclusion of this discussion, however, was that, with the possible minor exceptions with respect to training and sale of research publications, there was very little prospect for selling the services of the Centers, there were limited prospects for new donors, and therefore the decision about the ultimate level of expenditure of the CG system rested essentially with the existing donors present in Paris.

46. Mr. Lejeune introduced that part of the paper dealing with growth. As a result of a meeting in 1979 in Paris, the question of growth became a fundamental one and the Secretariat was invited to produce a five-year plan for the consideration of the Group the following November. The principle at that time was that all Centers would be allowed some degree of real growth, but those which were already essentially established would be limited collectively to something of the order of 3 percent per year in real terms, whereas others could develop as required to come up to an approved level over a reasonable period of time. This was modified the following year, but the question of growth was addressed afresh by the Second Review Committee. The principal innovation was that the Review Committee broke down the causes of growth into certain elements and built its five-year program based on those specific elements. The Group approved this plan in November 1981 with the important exception that it felt the base number on which it was founded, namely, the estimated operational expenditure in 1982, was too high given what appeared to be a considerable shortfall when the pledging session took place in November. Therefore, the Secretariat was asked to revise this plan for consideration at this Paris meeting. The main elements had not been changed, since the assumption was that the Group approved the elements of the plan. Apart from some minor modifications, all that had been changed, basically, was that the number for operational expenditure in 1982 had been brought down to a level more consistent with current expectations. The plan was based on certain principles which essentially reflect virtually a no-growth policy, except for the intention to allow the developing Centers to reach a higher level of expenditure. The only other growth was the provision for accelerated programs, which was really very small, and the provision for new activities
which were subject, of course, to approval by the Group from time to time. If new activities were excluded, this allowed for growth over the period 1983-87 for the existing 13 Centers of something like 2.4 %, or if operations only were considered, 3.5%.

47. For want of viable alternatives, the Secretariat proposed that existing donors collectively provide enough additional resources each year to cover price increases experienced in the developing countries, plus a minimum of three or four percent in current terms to provide for the minimal amount of growth in net requirements in the plan. Finally, the paper contained some discussion on the consequences of failure to get these necessary funds, not the least of which was that the morale of the Centers would deteriorate and that it would be not only difficult to retain good people but certainly difficult to recruit good people, and the cutting edge of what the Group was doing would be dulled. However, if funds were not available, the Group should begin to take strategic measures to decide what was to be dropped. It was essential for the Centers and TAC to know what the Group intended, because already planning for 1983 was reaching a critical stage. Centers had been pressed to make five-year plans, and unless they had a good idea of what the Group intended for the future, it was very difficult for them to draw up sensible plans.

48. A donor representative made a statement that was the subject of considerable comment. He said he would like to endorse the need for the long-term funding of international agricultural research. His government would certainly be prepared, together with other donors, to discuss adapting a new pledging procedure for the CG to arrive at some kind of multi-year financing procedure, on the understanding that the five-year plan was accepted as a guide for the future. The objective should be to maintain at least the existing activities of the Centers. The size and the role of the system and of the Centers should be discussed in the context of agricultural research in general and, in particular, the way in which the system interacts with national research activities in developing countries. This role should be discussed on the assumption of increased national capabilities in research and extension services in developing countries. It was obvious that the role of most of the institutions and most of the Centers in, say, ten or fifteen years, would not be the same as it was today. It was also clear that at the national level, research institutes would assume increased responsibilities. That was the assumption when the CG looked towards the future. What was needed for such a discussion about future priorities and the proper role of the CG system was an overview of what had been done in the field of agricultural research and a paper on the impact of research so far. That should be provided by TAC. A more difficult need was for an analysis of what should be done and what should be strengthened at international centers of excellence and what should be done at the national level in the future, looking ten or fifteen years ahead. The speaker believed that the individual Centers should be asked to take a hard look at their priorities in this perspective and report to the Group through the TAC. Finally, it would be very valuable to have an analysis of the linkages established between the international Centers and the national research activities established today and those
which may be established in the future. His Government could not discuss the future funding levels on the basis of past trends and projected aggregate financial trends. The preparation of documents for a long-term commitment to the system would be demanding on the Secretariat and might also require funding; together with other donors, Sweden would be able to make a small contribution towards that effort, if it were necessary. The speaker ended by reiterating his government's strong preference for full contributions rather than special projects, both in the CG and in a number of other organizations.

49. Another donor representative stated that for ten years now the Group had operated on what was clearly a demand-oriented system. Had not the time been reached where the Group should revert, certainly while funds were short, to a supply-oriented system, in which the Center Directors and the Boards of Trustees would have a much clearer guideline on planning. If base lines were provided which were much more realistic and therefore very much lower, the Centers could also present at the same time projects in increasing order of priority which would be adopted if more funds came along. Dr. Cunningham believed that decisions should be left to the Centers themselves and their Boards, rather than that greater controls be exercised by the Group, TAC or the Secretariat.

50. The representative of a multilateral agency expressed her organization's support for the idea that there should be not only just indicative planning but a clearer sort of strategy whereby it would be easier for all donors to be able to convince the policymakers, whether multilateral institutions or bilateral institutions, of the benefits of the CG system, whether from the point of view of the international community or of developing countries. A donor representative supported the idea of lowering forward predictions. His Government would be prepared to discuss the possibility of forward pledging also in that connection. The speaker made a plea for more realistic planning. It seemed to his Government that the analysis of the report itself did not easily lead to the conclusion that the plan that had been put on paper was a feasible one. The outlook as explained was not very bright for new donors, so it was a question of present membership being willing and able to live up to whatever plans were put forward now. His Government had already committed its funds for 1983 and would not reach anywhere near a 20 percent increase for 1983. It was a little more flexible for 1984 onwards, but would still not surpass a 20 percent increase. The speaker urged that there be prepared a base line for the Centers that corresponded to realistic funding expectations, which in the case of additional funds becoming available, could then be moved upwards. His Government very much supported the need to have strategic revisions in the Centers' programs rather than across-the-board cuts. Although this created an arduous task for TAC at its next meeting, there seemed to be no alternative.

51. Dr. Havener asked for clarification on sub-paragraph (a), item 2, referring to estimated increases to bring all Centers and existing institutions to an approved level and standard of operation. Some people interpreted that to mean that the established Centers would have zero growth and
some not-yet-established Centers would have some growth. Others had interpreted paragraph 27 to imply that the Committee did not favor the concept of a predetermined optimum size for any particular Center, but suggested that Centers should expand, contract or change their method of operation according to need and resource availability. Mr. Lejeune replied that the plan was not designed to be specific to any Center, but rather was designed for general planning purposes. Each Center's budget was arrived at by an iterative process of proposals put forward and reviewed by TAC, ending up with a specific recommendation with respect to each Center which would go to the Group in November. Obviously, however, some assumptions had been made about what increases might be necessary to bring Centers up to a common standard of operations, but even these were for discussion year by year.

52. The representative of a Development Bank stated that unless additional funds were available, his organization believed no growth was possible for the system. The Bank also favored not only improved efficiency within each of the Centers but an improved financial system and would be prepared to consider multi-year pledging in order to assure a continuity in financial planning.

53. The Chairman summed up the discussion "with some trepidation" because of the variety of views expressed. The majority of the donors in all senses of that word accepted items (a) and (b) of the plan on page 13 of the Report (see Annex III). It was accepted as an indicative plan, a rolling plan, which would be re-examined and adjusted each year in the light of the circumstances then prevailing. The donors recognized that this acceptance implied a substantial increase in actual contributions, the more so that Table 13 was calculated in real terms. A later table in current terms indicated that the increase in contributions required to meet next year's planning figure was about 20 percent. Acceptance of these elements of the plan implied a collective commitment on the part of the Group as a whole to use its best efforts to arrive at these numbers, and that applied to each of the donors. Some donors had indicated that they did not believe themselves to be in a position to reach this figure. This was on record, and it was understood. Some had indicated they expected to be able to do better, and it was partly on that basis that reasonable grounds existed for believing that the plan as a whole could be achieved. Group discussion had indicated that there were limited prospects for new donors and limited prospects, however desirable they might otherwise be, of tapping other types of sources of funds such as charging for services. Therefore, a collective commitment on the part of the Group and an individual commitment on the part of each donor to use its best efforts to arrive at the target which had been set, was needed. Because the most recent figures suggested that inflation, at least in the major developed countries, might be moderating, the assumptions in the plan might be more stringent than necessary. This was just a possible offset to what otherwise might appear to be a somewhat optimistic figure which the Group had set for itself. TAC should develop a plan that was sufficiently flexible to deal with the full range of possible outcomes of financing in 1983 without having to do the exercise a second time. Therefore, TAC would
not only have to have a number but a range of numbers which realistically covered the gamut of possibilities it could face in 1983. The share of the CGIAR in the aid budgets, even in the agricultural elements of aid budgets of the donors, was still very small. Group members were fully convinced of the importance and the priority of this activity, but they should make sure that their masters were equally convinced. The CG should collect and disseminate more information than in the past on the actual results of the work of the centers as they were translated through national programs to increase production in the farmers field. More information was also needed on the implications of the cuts that had been made, so donors were aware of the consequences of reducing funds and what impact they would have. It had also been suggested that the developing countries themselves needed to be involved more actively in this prospect. Stability of funding was more important than optimism or unrealistic expectations of larger amounts which, in fact, did not always materialize. Multi-year pledging which had been endorsed by several donors would be one way of closing that uncertainty gap.

Implementation of the Recommendations of the Second Review

54. The Chairman opened the discussion by stating that the report and recommendations of the Review Committee were very thoroughly considered by the Group in November, and decisions were reached with respect to each of them. At that meeting it was agreed that the Secretariat should prepare a follow-up paper to review progress to date, and to consider how and by whom each of the Committee's recommendations should be implemented.1/ He stressed that the purpose of the current discussion was not to reopen the discussion of the substance of the Committee's recommendations but to discuss the means of implementing those decisions -- how they will be implemented and by whom they will be implemented, and not whether they should be implemented. The Chairman suggested that they be taken one by one, in the order in which they were presented by the Committee. Not all of them needed to be discussed as some were fairly straightforward.

Recommendation 2

55. The specific implementation proposal was that TAC should be asked to inform the Group, preferably at the November meeting, of its plans with respect to how training should be dealt with in the manner indicated. Dr. Camus stated that TAC was fully conscious of the problems it had to deal with. It had to sort out the priorities at each one of the Centers in close cooperation with Center Directors and Center Boards. It also had to reassess the overall priorities of the Group. The two exercises really went together in parallel, but it would not be realistic at all to expect TAC to come with a clear-cut solution at the November meeting of the CG.

Dr. Camus drew the Group's attention to the difficulty with which TAC was faced. As far as the program and budget was concerned, the year 1983 would be a very difficult one, but 1984 would probably be much easier, especially if strategic issues had been discussed and TAC's proposals on policy issues were endorsed by the Group. At present, Dr. Camus said, he could not be optimistic about any kind of a timetable by TAC to provide the answers that were required on training. Training had been considered by TAC and by the Centers a few years ago, in 1978. The study was undertaken by a forum which was organized by the Center Directors. In view of the importance of training and in view of the reactions the Group had made clear about training so far, TAC intended to tackle that subject again in a more detailed way than it had previously; but by November TAC would only be able to indicate how it intended to handle the matter. The representative of a major donor said that several donors had been concerned about the tendency for training to be one of the items pushed aside in order to adjust the budget cuts year by year. Hence it was, in a sense, a strategic issue that needed, apart from the overall study referred to, to be addressed in the review of budgets as part of the whole. The speaker also expressed the hope that a beginning could be made in looking at the special needs for training of women as soon as possible, since that had been a subject up till now relatively neglected in the Group. A representative of a Foundation suggested that if the task of making a study was currently beyond the scope of TAC, consideration might be given to contracting it either to another agency under the supervision of TAC or in collaboration with another agency, because the question was rather urgent. Some of the Group's efforts in training could be better linked to overall strategy if those needs and demands were known. Dr. Camus agreed that the study would have to be carried out in close cooperation, for instance, with ISNAR, but TAC would look at ways and means of speeding it up, and a year from now some policy proposals could be made to the Group.

Recommendation 3

56. A representative of the developing countries pointed out that it was indicated that TAC and the Center Directors were the ones to determine the kind of mechanism of collaboration between the Centers and national programs, but it omitted the participation of directors of research or program leaders in the national Governments. They should participate in the formulation of the proposed research program itself and assess the implications of such a collaboration on the national budget. They would also be in a better position to establish close cooperation and interaction between the national programs and the Centers' work in that particular field.

Recommendation 4

57. This recommendation suggested that the Group ensure that appropriate collaboration among Centers working in the same geographic region be the responsibility of the Centers and TAC, and that the mechanism of quinquennial and other external reviews be the one which is used to make sure that this took place effectively. This should be under discussion
between the TAC Secretariat and Center Directors at one of their forthcoming meetings to make sure the process was understood. Dr. Camus stated that the problem of collaborative activities was touched upon by TAC in 1979 when there was a review of off-campus activities. It would be discussed at a joint meeting with the Center Directors in June in Mexico, and would probably be a major item in the African study which TAC was intending to undertake as soon as possible. One of the Cosponsors stated that written agreements between Centers should be posted in both Secretariats of TAC and the CGIAR so that they had a full record of what was agreed on in various Centers. It was clear in the review that this had not always been done, so there was some uncertainty as to what existed and what did not exist.

Recommendations 5 and 6

58. A member of the Second Review Committee stated that both the Study Team and the Review Committee supported these two recommendations, specifically directed at basic and strategic research.

Recommendation 7

59. The Chairman, Mr. Baum, stated that the early decision relating to Future Resources (Agenda Item 7) was interlinked with the recommendation. He stated that the decision taken that morning had two elements: first, there was the question of accelerated programs which appear in the later years of the five-year plan; and secondly, that "no growth" applied to the system in the aggregate. It did not apply to a particular Center, and each Center would be free and indeed obliged to put forward its own program, and TAC would be reviewing increases and decreases in the programs of individual Centers. The relevance of these five-year plans per Center was by no means reduced. In fact, a plan which was not only a total but a composite plan and which indicated the priority nature of each activity became even more important at a time of stringent financing than it did when funds were abundantly available.

Recommendations 8 and 9

60. The Chairman invited one of the donors to introduce his comments on the QQRs. The speaker highlighted the importance of the quinquennial reviews. Basically donors needed all the help they could get in dealing with the various reports produced about the Centers and the system. The options and implications needed to be identified, and only TAC and its Secretariat could do that. Clearly, as a current non-contributor, for example, to ILCA, such an analysis was critical for an eventual reordering of his Government's priorities in determining funding for these various Centers. A statement was needed from TAC itself on the place of the institution under review in the overall system. Apparently the discussion on the case of ILCA was one of the best that had ever been undertaken in respect of the quinquennial reviews, and the reason for that clearly was that time was given for it. It was placed on the agenda in a position where it would not be dropped at the end or rushed through, so obviously all future reviews should be put foremost on the agenda so that they may
receive the attention they deserve. Dr. Camus replied that quinquennial reviews were also considered by TAC to be very important. TAC had put this on its June agenda and would return at the November meeting to the way the quinquennial review process could be improved, compared to what had been done so far. Possibly the question raised about the place of the particular Center in the whole system would have to receive greater attention that it did before. However, the recommendation very rightly stressed that quinquennial reviews were not the only way of getting at the strategic and policy issues which were a must for the system. TAC had also been concerned in the past about the problem of following up the implementation of the reviews. Happily enough, many recommendations so far had been implemented by the Centers, but there might be cases where there would be resistance. The annual program and budget examination would help to solve the problem.

61. Dr. Sen expressed his reservations about both Recommendations 9 and 12. He thought that there would be a tendency for a management specialist to become an inspector-general. The thirteen different institutions had thirteen different kinds of problems and to think that one person would be good enough for all these institutions was perhaps asking for a superman. Since the management review is by law the responsibility of the Boards of Trustees, the Boards must be consulted and must also help determine who should be the right person to undertake the management review. Dr. Sen stated that the Board Chairmen also had reservations about Recommendations 11, 15 and 16 of the Report and that further consultations were needed before the Boards of Trustees could consider changing present practices.

62. Dr. Havener associated himself with comments made by other speakers about the problems of over-review of the system. The Group should evolve towards a process whereby the quinquennial review became the linchpin of the review process. There ought to be time to reflect and debate on the issues raised by that quinquennial review panel, and the Center Management and Center Board of Trustees should express their reaction to the recommendations of the panel. On the management issue, no one could be against the more prudent management or more rational budgeting of resources nor the more open disclosure of how those resources were used. The Center Directors themselves would participate in the process of trying to rationalize the budgeting and accounting procedures within Centers and across Centers. However, not much was to be gained in the tightening of fiscal management within individual Centers, unless problems that affected the efficiency of the system as a whole and that cost money, were to be addressed, such as cash flow problems; donor default problems; exchange rate problems; core-restrictive funding warping Center programs; and interest costs on borrowed money.

Recommendation 10

63. The Group was in fact implementing this recommendation in the way in which Centers Week was organized in November 1981, while the meeting in Paris in May was an implementation of the recommendation to meet more frequently.
Recommendation 11

64. The recommendation was being implemented as the Group agreed.

Recommendation 12

65. The Chairman reported that a Search Committee had been appointed by him, and that the process was under way and would come to a conclusion in the next several months. Mr. Lejeune explained that the authority for the Secretariat to engage two more people rested in the approval of the World Bank budget. As soon as that authority existed, the Secretariat would be in a position to recruit.

Recommendation 13

66. The selection of the members of TAC was made by the Cosponsors on the basis of a request for recommendations from the Group for appropriate candidates. That was the procedure that was reviewed by the Review Committee, and no changes in it were suggested by that Committee. Mr. Mahler of TAC reported that the Cosponsors had made a major effort to provide TAC and the TAC Secretariat with the necessary means to implement this recommendation, and he took this opportunity to acknowledge with gratitude the major effort which had been made by the three Cosponsors in this regard.

Recommendation 14

67. A representative of an African country noted that the African Regional Group Meeting had demanded a Centers Week for Africa. That would serve to explain the activities of the international research centers and at the same time seek areas of collaboration both at regional and national levels. He believed that the question of financing the bringing of these people together should rest with the Secretariat. Last time it was SAREC that funded the African Region Seminar. Should it be acceptable to Dr. Havener and his colleagues, Nairobi would offer itself as a guinea-pig for this particular experiment for the Centers Week, provided of course the funding aspect was resolved. The Speaker stated that last year in Washington his colleague from Senegal complained about the lack of documentation from the CG system and from the Centers themselves, that could be understood by French-speaking Africa. That should be part of the public relations work discussed by the Group. There should also be a wider distribution of publications by the Centers, so that everyone would be aware of what the IARCs had to offer, and also what collaborative effort was going on around the world to solve the questions that arose in agricultural research.

Recommendation 15

68. The representative of an Asian donor country stated that his delegation considered this recommendation, that the Boards of Trustees should conduct their affairs as if they were accountable to the Group even
though their legal status makes no provision for such a relationship, to be one of the most important. His country would find it very difficult to remain in the Group as a member if this recommendation were not faithfully carried out. If there was any kind of autonomy within the Centers and Boards of Trustees, there must be some kind of autonomy in financing, but that was not the case. One hundred percent of the financing, practically speaking, was undertaken by the members of the Group.

Recommendation 16

69. Mr. Lejeune reported that the selection process for the three members of certain Boards who were selected by members of the Group comprised first: circulating to all members of the Group a request for suggestions for filling vacancies as they occurred; secondly, the communication of the yield of that to the Board concerned; thirdly, consultation between the Board and the Secretariat; and lastly, a recommendation by the Secretariat to the Group for its final approval.

Recommendation 17

70. No comments were made.

Recommendation 18

71. The Chairman noted that the commentary and the recommendation suggested that the pension issue was a highly complex subject, and one which could have important financial ramifications for the funding of the system. It suggested a process whereby a small steering committee be put together for the process, but it also pointed out that, if a fully-funded pension scheme were to be established, that would substantially increase the operating costs of the system, and donors should be aware of that before such a group was formed.

Recommendation 19

72. The representative of a major donor inquired whether the Secretariat had been able to make any progress in collecting data about how or where the Group should begin to try to increase participation by women in the system. In his view that was a function that could only be performed by the Secretariat and it was important that the Group had some idea of the present degree of participation by women, so that it could judge, after some time, whether any progress had been made or not. He had noted that of some 120 people on the list of potential members of the TAC recently circulated, there was not a single woman. The Chairman stated that if it was the wish of the meeting, there would be a discussion with the Centers about establishing a reporting mechanism which would inform the Group of the extent to which the objectives which they had set for the Centers were being realized. However, it was an onerous task; it was one more piece of reporting information. Mr. Lejeune stated that the Secretariat would pursue the matter with the Centers.
Recommendation 20

73. Dr. Bommer of FAO reported that the program committee of FAO which had met the previous week recommended that regional conferences give full recognition to research development in their deliberations, including those of the CGIAR system. He had written to all the Center Directors requesting that the regional representatives of the developing countries be regularly invited by the Centers to their major meetings. Dr. Bommer also reported that FAO had been approached by a number of representatives asking if FAO would be in a position to assist in funding their travel, or referring to the proposed Common Fund -- asking if this fund was available. They had been informed that this fund had not been established so far. The Chairman concluded the debate by stating that the funding question would be further pursued.

Recommendation 21

74. Dr. Havener stated that there was a trend in the system for more of senior management staff to come from developing countries. Those who were familiar with the system would recall that the last two directors general who were appointed were from developing countries.

Recommendation 22

75. Dr. Havener stated that the Recommendation would be discussed with the Center's Boards of Trustees and he would report back to the Group.

Recommendation 23

76. The annual preparation of a rolling five-year plan for the system as a whole will be an iterative process between the Centers, TAC, the donors and the Secretariat. The Secretariat, after consultations as appropriate, should be responsible for putting before the Group each year a revised plan for its approval, as was done at the May meeting in Paris for the period 1983 to 1987. It should be noted that it would be very desirable that long-term commitments from donors go hand in hand with long-term plans for the Centers individually and the Group as a whole.

Recommendation 24

77. A speaker pointed out a misprint in the 4th line: US$204 million in 1984 should read in 1987.

Other Business

78. The UNDP representative, Mr. Mashler, recorded the debt of the CG system to one of the founders, Dr. George Harrar, who died recently.

Time and Place of Next Meeting

79. Centers Week had already been scheduled to take place in Washington, D.C. from November 8-12. The Chairman stated that the Secretariat would consult with as many members of the Group as possible to establish a policy for the venue of future Centers Week meetings.
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### A. Revision of Five-Year Plan Recommended by the Second Review Committee

*Constant 1982 $ Millions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Basic Operational Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Estimated increases to bring all existing institutions to an approved level and standard of operation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Capital Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Estimated capital requirements, excluding part of the building requirements of ICARDA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Remainder of ICARDA building requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c) Additional Elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provision for &quot;accelerated&quot; programs as described in the Review Committee's Report</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. New activities: (i) Water Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) A Second Activity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d) Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. The annual totals accepted for indicative planning purposes at the Paris Meeting of the Group in May 1982 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(constant 1982 $ millions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>