

---

# **CGIAR MID-TERM MEETING 1993**

**San Juan**

**Summary of Proceedings and Decisions**



Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) held its Mid-Term Meeting from May 24-28, 1993 at the Condado Plaza Hotel, San Juan, Puerto Rico. Mr V Rajagopalan, Chairman, presided. A summary of proceedings and of the main decisions reached appears on the pages that follow. Verbatim transcripts of proceedings may be consulted at the CGIAR Secretariat.

Issued by the CGIAR Secretariat  
The World Bank  
1818 H Street, N W  
Washington DC, 20433  
Phone (1-202) 473-8951  
Fax (1-202) 334-8750

August 1993

## ***Contents***

Chairman's Opening Remarks .....	1
TAC Chairman's Report .....	2
Agenda 21 .....	2
Agroforestry/Forestry Research .....	3
Banana and Plantain Research .....	5
CIMMYT - Interim External Review .....	6
Decisionmaking Processes .....	7
Livestock - Priorities and Strategies .....	8
Medium-Term Plans .....	10
Rice Research in the CGIAR System .....	10
Other Business	
Documentation .....	12
Future Meetings .....	12
Information Document .....	12
International Nutrition Conference .....	12
Intellectual Property Rights .....	13
Root Crops .....	13
Representation on Boards .....	13
Chairman's Closing Remarks .....	13
Annex 1 - Agenda .....	15
Annex 2 - List of Participants .....	16

## ***Summary of Proceedings and Decisions***

CGIAR Chairman V. Rajagopalan inaugurated the 1993 Mid-Term Meeting of the Group on Monday, May 24 at the Condado Plaza Hotel, San Juan, Puerto Rico

### **CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS**

Opening the 1993 Mid-Term Meeting (MTM93) the Chairman said that it could not be considered "just another mid-term meeting" because decisions were required on important programmatic and institutional issues in the face of continuing funding constraints.

Since 1991 resources for international agricultural research have contracted. The share in official development assistance (ODA) flows for international agricultural research which was 0.63 percent in 1986 dropped to 0.54 percent in 1990 and 0.5 percent in 1991. Indications are that this trend will persist in 1993. As long as this trend remains unchanged, the full potential of international agricultural research as a front-line mechanism in the war on poverty will not be realized.

The victims of this situation will not be scientists and research managers, the Chairman said. Victims will be the world's poor. In human terms, this is unacceptable. In wider, strategic terms, an intensification of poverty will cause increased turbulence in the world order. Support for international agricultural research, therefore, is not a matter of charity but of wisdom and prudence in international affairs.

The Chairman acknowledged that in raising some of these issues he was addressing the converted. But, he added, "I am also speaking to the faithful and, by definition, it is a responsibility of the faithful to bring in more converts. Together, we must ensure that international agricultural research programs are truly relevant to the world's needs, and we must craft the messages about those programs that will attract adequate levels of support. For if we do not do so, who else will?"

Outlining the context in which the CGIAR works, he reminded the Group that substantial progress had been made over the past 25 years in the war on poverty. Larger numbers of people are better fed, clothed, and housed than ever before. Average life expectancy among the world's poor has risen from 51 to 63 years, and primary school enrollment rates have reached 89 percent. Nevertheless, over a billion people — more than one-fifth of the human family — today live in "acute poverty." That number will rise as the world's population pushes upward to an anticipated 10 billion by the year 2050. Science-based, modern agriculture and natural resource management have pivotal roles to play in leading these numbers of people out of poverty.

Modern agriculture is based on new technologies — such as those which triggered off the green revolution — and research is the basis of new knowledge and technology. Demonstrably, the impact of international research cuts across national

boundaries: there are numerous examples of how a single product of international research is adopted and replicated in many developing countries. Rates of return on investment in international agricultural research remain consistently high. Moreover, publicly funded programs conduct research leading to the improvement of "orphan commodities" such as banana/plantain, coconut, cassava, coarse grains, pulses, and tropical vegetables that would otherwise be ignored or neglected.

Feeding the people is, of course, an essential component of poverty alleviation. But the challenge to research is to expand food supplies to feed an increasing population without causing irreparable damage to the natural resource base on which food productivity depends. The World Development Report **1992** described the situation aptly, the Chairman pointed out, when it said that "the key is *not* to produce less but to produce differently." For international agricultural research, this is not an option. It is a compulsion.

The overwhelming challenge for the CGIAR is that of truly integrating crop improvement with natural resource management. Productivity increases achieved through crop improvement, the creation of varieties that are resistant to pests and disease, which in turn decrease dependence on pesticides, the availability of unrestricted access to genetic resources, the management of tropical forests, and research into the productive use of marginal land inhabited by the poor all need to be combined in production systems that are truly sustainable. These goals are subsumed in what we now call the ecoregional approach to research that will be further defined at a technical workshop scheduled to follow this Mid-Term Meeting.

On that basis, he said, the following questions arise. How best can we meet the challenge posed by these circumstances? If we must change the way in which we reach decisions, how best can we do so without, however, destroying the informality and the cooperative and collegial spirit associated with our meetings? How can we ensure, without prejudice to the autonomy of centers, that we will all act as a system that takes the necessary decisions in our search for change? What does it take to build an unquestionably cost-effective international research system that harmonizes food productivity with natural resource management? What incentives will increase financial support, public and private, for research? Those questions would need to be addressed with care and clarity during MTM93.

Commenting on the week's agenda, the Chairman said that it fell into six broad themes: (in alphabetical order) Agenda 21, Agroforestry/Forestry in the CGIAR, Banana and Plantain Research, Decisionmaking Processes in the CGIAR, Livestock

Research, and Rice Research. He would comment on each of these in greater detail as they were taken up for discussion. Additionally, 11 centers would present their Medium-Term Plans (MTP) for 1994-1998.

To put the MTP process in perspective, he reminded the Group that the medium term planning process is based on decisions reached at Istanbul during MTM92 when the Group accepted a recommendation from TAC that links research priorities to resource allocation. The Group endorsed a set of 1998 resource envelopes as the starting point to guide the centers as they draft five-years plans and for budget-related discussions among TAC, the centers, and the Group.

The Group urged, too, that the centers and TAC should act in tandem as they move toward final recommendations on allocations. In keeping with this approach, TAC followed an interactive relationship with the centers. In this spirit, the CGIAR Secretariat and TAC had organized a workshop, to be held at San Juan immediately after MTM93, when views would be exchanged on some of the complex issues that have emerged during discussions on MTPs.

Expressing his appreciation of the efforts made by the American hosts of MTM93, the Chairman thanked the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for welcoming the CGIAR to their picturesque country. Many representatives of the Government of Puerto Rico, of the U.S. Government, and of the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations collaborated to help the CGIAR. While extending gratitude to all of them, he said special mention must be made of Ariel Lugo and his colleagues at the U.S. National Forest Service for their help in organizing a forest visit; Negroni Associates, the local meeting planning organization; and members of the host country committee — Walter Coward, Jr., Ralph Cummings, Jr., Bob Herdt, and Frank Karel. The Chairman said that thanks were due as well to Richard Bissell, former Assistant Administrator for Science and Technology (USAID), who had first suggested San Juan as the location for a Mid-Term Meeting.

An important advantage of holding the meeting in Puerto Rico, he said, is that it enabled members of the Group to familiarize themselves at firsthand with practical aspects of some of the forestry issues that were written into the CGIAR mandate at Canberra in June 1989. Puerto Rico's El Yunque forest is a treasure house of over 240 species, and has been a useful proving ground for environmentally oriented research programs. At the various points that the Group visited in the El Verde area, there were examples of operations that deal with biodiversity, land-use management in tropical forests, and natural resource management. All three are relevant to the work the CGIAR expects to support in agroforestry and forestry. The observations of the International Institute of Tropical Forestry and of the World Wildlife Fund enhanced the Group's understanding of these issues. The previous day's program and seminar therefore formed a good prologue for the Group's review of the CGIAR's forest research agenda.

Ending his remarks on a personal note, the Chairman said that he was pleased to be with the Group at its Mid-Term Meeting and looked forward to continuing their interaction at International Centers Week in October.

## **TAC CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

TAC Chairman Alex McCalla reported that TAC60, held at Rome in March, was the busiest TAC meeting he had ever attended. Each TAC member had to read 2,000 pages in preparation for the meeting. He commended his colleagues on the committee, the TAC Secretariat, and the CGIAR Secretariat for their efforts as well as for the cooperative spirit in which they worked.

At TAC60, members considered 11 medium-term plans. They discussed the external reviews of ICRAF, IRRI, and WARDA; an intercenter rice review; and an interim review of CIMMYT. TAC members discussed a livestock strategy for the CGIAR with the livestock Working Group set up at ICW92, and reviewed banana and plantain research strategy with the Working Group covering that area. Additionally, TAC reviewed the continuing efforts by center directors to refine and unify their approaches to ecoregional research.

Activities in the pipeline, Mr. McCalla said, were the external reviews of CIAT, CIP, ICLARM, and IIMI. Also in the pipeline was TAC's completion of its priorities and strategies exercise. A major effort was being made, meanwhile, to complete the medium-term planning process so that TAC could recommend budget allocations to the Group at ICW93. This is a heavy responsibility and will be the main focus of attention at TAC's forthcoming meeting in Sri Lanka.

The Chairman congratulated the TAC Chairman and his team for the excellent work they had done in undertaking an enormous volume of work and dealing with a complex set of subjects.

## **AGENDA 21**

Mr. Stein Bie (Norway) was invited at ICW92 to interact with other members of the Group in developing ideas for an appropriate CGIAR response to Agenda 21. Calling upon Mr. Bie to present his report, the Chairman thanked him for the work he had done, and for his background paper that narrowed down a possible CGIAR response into a well-focused draft program.

Outlining the context in which he had carried out his consultations, Mr. Bie said that Agenda 21 deliberately set its face against the creation of new institutions and challenged existing national and global research structures to come up with practical proposals for their own effective involvement in the post-UNCED process. Existing institutions cannot do this

simply by packaging their practices and policies in green. They need to identify programs in Agenda 21 terms related to new tasks specifically identified in Agenda 21.

Against this background, Mr. Bie proposed that in addition to its traditional research the CGIAR should offer to undertake an Agenda 21 portfolio limited to the following three areas:

- **Soils and Water**

- (i) Utilize tropical “problem” soils;
- (ii) Improve soil fertility;
- (iii) Improve soil conservation;
- (iv) Develop methods for the rehabilitation of degraded lands;
- (v) Assess the possible effects climate change may have on soil;
- (vi) Develop principles and methods for sustainable management of fresh water resources;
- (vii) Develop methods for improved soil and water management.

- **Genetic Resources**

- (i) Conserve the genetic resource base, including *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation of useful plants and animals;
- (ii) Utilize technological developments arising from biological research;
- (iii) Establish an information base and collaborative networks;
- (iv) Assist NARS to develop coherent genetic resource policies;
- (v) Stimulate public awareness of the need to conserve and utilize plant genetic resources.

- **Human Resources and Capacity Building**

- (i) Train research scientists and technicians, particularly in cooperation with national universities ;
- (ii) Organize an international information campaign on the importance of research in support of the primary industries;
- (iii) Stimulate active local participation;
- (iv) Assist in the establishment and administration of collaborative research networks and information bases;
- (v) Incorporate a gender framework into CGIAR programs, policies, and staffing;
- (vi) Undertake policy research.

Mr. Bie further suggested that in implementing these programs, the CGIAR system should serve as a contract agency to the international community. Arrangements should be made, he said, whereby Agenda 21 donors sign contracts with the CGIAR Secretariat, and TAC selects groups of centers to carry out the programs agreed on under these contracts. This process, he said, would offer the CGIAR a unique opportunity to take on new responsibilities, originating in the Agenda 21 mandate, at a time when CGIAR centers have surplus facilities and qualified staff.

The UNEP representative drew the Group’s attention to the congruence between Mr. Bie’s approach and that of his own organization. UNEP had adopted the same priorities, but was interested as well in others such as the impact of climate change on agriculture. For all these priorities to be covered, it was necessary to develop environmental technology, and there was a move toward creating environmental technology centers, following the CGIAR center model. He suggested, instead, that the CGIAR system could provide research management capacity, for the production of environmental technology, thus eliminating the need to create new centers.

In the discussion that followed, the Group reaffirmed its commitment to the Agenda 21 process. The suggestions from Mr. Bie and from UNEP were both commended but members felt that more details were needed. For instance: how would established programs in areas such as integrated pest management be worked into the Agenda 21 process? What would be the role of national agricultural systems in some of the programs envisaged? What are the realities of funding for Agenda 21 programs?

A Working Group was established with Mr. Bie as Chairman to seek clarification of these and related questions, and to spell out further details of the initiatives proposed. Other members of the Working Group are Messrs. Iain MacGillivray, Carlos Zuberi, Hubert Zandstra, and Pedro Sanchez.

## **AGROFORESTRY/FORESTRY RESEARCH**

Agroforestry and forestry research were established as CGIAR program areas after the Group adopted a Declaration of Intent (at its 1989 Mid-Term Meeting held in Canberra) to include in its mandate, research on the utilization of renewable resources related to agriculture, and specifically to forestry. Subsequently, the Group decided at MTM91 (Paris) to admit ICRAF into the CGIAR as its agroforestry research institution, and to establish a new institution for forestry research — CIFOR, headquartered in Indonesia.

At MTM93, the current state of agroforestry and forestry research was examined through discussion of ICRAF’s external program and management review (EPMR), and the draft MTPs of both institutions.

ICRAF’s EPMR was introduced by the review panel’s Chairman Bernard Tinker. ICRAF’s response and MTP were

presented by ICRAF's Director General Pedro Sanchez. CIFOR's Board Chairman Bo Bengtsson presented the Group with a brief update on CIFOR's establishment and Director General Jeff Sayer introduced the MTP.

Initiating the discussion the Chairman said he was interested to read that ICRAF had identified widely used indigenous agroforestry technologies, and that much of the center's research agenda is directed to improving these and widening their usefulness. This was a sensible route to take, he said, given the vast diversity of potential tree and crop combinations.

The most important issue raised in the ICRAF external review report, he said, was the need to raise the quality of science while rapidly expanding ICRAF's size and geographical coverage to fulfil its new global mandate in agroforestry research.

The two MTPs, the Chairman pointed out, drew attention to a question, crucial in the current phase of budget stringency, as to whether expansion and new undertakings will come from additional funds for forestry without penalizing the CGIAR system's agricultural research portfolio.

The Group commended the review panel for its exhaustive study of ICRAF's programs, and commented on the center's responsiveness to the review process at a time of direct and fundamental change in its programs. The review had found much to commend in ICRAF's programs but also indicated some soft spots that needed to be strengthened.

Issues highlighted during the agroforestry discussion included the following:

**Quality vs. Growth.** ICRAF had taken note of the concerns expressed, but without any external pressure was deeply aware that the essential task of expansion could not be adequately undertaken unless the highest scientific quality was maintained and, in fact, increased. Several steps had already been taken to ensure this balance. These included the appointment of a scientist as Director General and the inclusion of good scientists on ICRAF's research team. This critical mass was strengthened by the presence of several scientists on the Board. Together, they could ensure efficient research management and effective research. The EPMP recommendations would guide the center as it moved forward, continuously striking the required balance between growth and excellence.

**Linkages.** The management of ICRAF's relations with different clusters of institutions — national agricultural research systems (NARS), CIFOR, other centers — was discussed in some detail. ICRAF's relations with NARS were conducted at two levels: first, research cooperation, in the expectation that program areas could eventually be transferred to NARS; and, second, training programs, which would strengthen NARS, enhance their cooperative efforts with ICRAF, and facilitate the transfer of research responsibilities to NARS over time. ICRAF is very much involved as well in establishing or expanding linkages with other CGIAR centers.

Many centers were included in ICRAF initiatives and staff from ICRAF were stationed at some centers. Thus, it was pointed out, linkages are programmatic and substantive. Collaboration between ICRAF-CIFOR included cross membership of Board chairs. The two centers were working together in several projects with ICRAF taking responsibility for agroforestry matters and managing forestry-related aspects. ICRAF was making its sites available, at the request of NARS, for CIFOR involvement.

**Special Initiatives.** Great interest was expressed in two special programs spearheaded by ICRAF, the highlands ecoregional initiative and the slash and burn initiative. The center was aware of concerns about a possible overlap of its programs with those of other centers. But as the highlands initiative evolved, and with the benefit of intercenter consultation, priorities are being sharpened. The slash and burn program is a major element of ICRAF's activities, involving other centers, and drawing international support.

**Geographic Areas.** Several questions were raised about the geographic areas in which ICRAF would concentrate. Concerns were expressed that as the center grew into a truly global center it could weaken some of its activities in Africa. Conversely, strong support was expressed for expansion into Asia and for keeping ICRAF's collaboration with the Indian scientific community strong. ICRAF's position was that its growth would cover Latin America and Asia, as well as Africa. The center's proportion of outposted scientists is 67 percent in Africa, 18 percent in Asia, and 13 percent in Latin America.

**Gender Issues.** ICRAF was conscious of both aspects of gender issues — staffing and research. Some 18 percent of ICRAF's senior scientists are women. More of them are social scientists than biophysical scientists. On the research side, ICRAF's work in Africa was primarily with women in farming. ICRAF expected to be even more active in future, and was collaborating with the CGIAR Secretariat's gender program in this connection.

**Germplasm Center.** An advisory panel has been appointed for this initiative and consultations have been held with several donors about capital costs. ICRAF expects to be able to raise the funds required.

**Socioeconomic Issues.** As proposed by the EPMP, both the staff for and content of socioeconomic studies at ICRAF are being strengthened. Two social scientists have been added to the staff cadre and the range of socioeconomic studies undertaken will include strategic issues.

Moving on to forestry, with CIFOR established but not fully operational, the Group received a progress report from Board Chair Bo Bengtsson who said that a host country agreement

had been signed with Indonesia on the basis of a sponsors agreement making CIFOR a legal entity. The countries that sponsored CIFOR are Australia, Switzerland, Sweden, and the United States. Indonesia will provide CIFOR with US\$2 million for its headquarters building, and with some 100,000 hectares of forest ecosystems for research. Mr. Sayer introduced the center's draft MTP.

Support for forestry research was high among members of the Group, although some caution was expressed about undertaking too much. As with agroforestry, interest was shown as well in the linkages that CIFOR would build with other institutions, including NGOs.

The Chairman delivered concluding comments on both agroforestry and forestry. The discussion on agroforestry, he said, showed that the Group endorsed the findings and recommendations of the external review panel and approved the comments made by representatives of the center. ICRAF's development was viewed with enthusiasm. However, cautions continued to be expressed about the need to maintain scientific excellence in the center's period of adjustment and growth. The Chairman commended ICRAF on its "alternatives to slash and burn initiative" — both for the content of the program and for the mobilization of resources.

He congratulated the CIFOR Board Chair, Board, and Director General for moving ahead quickly to prepare an action program for forest resources management. He expressed the gratitude of the CGIAR to ACIAR for a job well done as the executing agency for establishing CIFOR; and he thanked Indonesia for signing the host country agreement and completing other procedures.

The Chairman noted that some members had pledged additional funding for agroforestry and forestry.

## BANANA AND PLANTAIN RESEARCH

A Task Force under the chairmanship of Henri Carsalade was appointed at ICW92 to examine the priorities for international support to banana and plantain research; to outline and assess the options for CGIAR support to banana and plantain research; and to make clear recommendations concerning priorities, programs, and institutional options.

At MTM93 the Group considered a report from the Task Force, and the draft INIBAP MTP. Outlining the major findings and recommendations of the Task Force, Mr. Carsalade noted the importance of banana/plantain throughout the developing world. It is the fourth most important food crop, in terms of gross value of production (after rice, wheat, and maize). It is also subject to some major damaging diseases, especially black leaf streak and fusarium wilt. The Task Force made six main recommendations to the group:

1. That the focus of future CGIAR support should be on *Musa* germplasm improvement and that the CGIAR

should sponsor the formation of the *Musa* germplasm consortium among research institutes within and outside the CGIAR.

2. INIBAP should focus its future research program on *Musa* germplasm-related activities and strengthening the capability of NARS in germplasm-related research through information, documentation, and training.
3. IITA should continue its plantain breeding program for Africa, in conjunction with regional and national programs in Africa.
4. IBPGR should continue its long-standing interest in *Musa* germplasm collection and conservation.
5. The INIBAP Board of Trustees should be reconstructed as a new governing body for both INIBAP and the proposed new *Musa* germplasm consortium.
6. The CGIAR should continue to support banana/plantain research at about the same level as 1992 (US\$3.3 million per annum).

INIBAP's Director General Nicolas Mateo outlined the center's draft MTP. Mr. Mateo noted that the draft MTP had been developed in response to the 1992 INIBAP External Review and a wide-ranging consultation among the partners and clients of INIBAP. Due to time constraints, the INIBAP MTP had not been revised to take account of the recommendations of the Task Force.

Mr. McCalla indicated that TAC generally was in agreement with the recommendations of the Task Force and endorsed the priority for germplasm research related to disease control. TAC felt, however, that further consideration could be given to institutional options besides those recommended by the Task Force. He noted that the Task Force had listed the option of linking INIBAP with IBPGR. Such an institutional arrangement seemed to be working well for the coconut genetic resources network now established under the auspices of IBPGR. A similar arrangement for bananas may be a more cost-effective option for the CGIAR than maintaining INIBAP as a stand-alone institute.

The Group's discussion on banana/plantain research focused on three main issues:

1. The priority problems for banana/plantain and what should be the main focus of CGIAR-supported research.
2. The most appropriate institutional mechanisms for carrying out the activities to be supported by the CGIAR.
3. The next steps required for implementation of the Group's decisions.



Several speakers stressed the importance of banana/plantain as a major food crop, and the appropriateness of continued CGIAR support; especially for *Musa* germplasm research and disease control. The need for the wider collection and conservation of naturally occurring *Musa* germplasm was also endorsed. Several speakers also noted the effectiveness of IITA's plantain breeding program in Africa, and emphasized the need for its continuing support by the CGIAR.

A lively discussion ensued as to the appropriate institutional mechanisms by which the CGIAR should support future banana/plantain research. Several speakers expressed their support for the novel institutional experiment by the CGIAR in relation to banana/plantain research. INIBAP had been included in the CGIAR in 1990 as a network model, a new approach for the CGIAR. However, several other speakers questioned the high overhead cost of INIBAP, whereby approximately 25 percent of its total budget was required for administration and staffing costs. A number of speakers suggested that the overhead costs of the network could be reduced substantially by bringing INIBAP under the governance and administration of another larger CGIAR center, such as IITA or IBPGR. After reflection overnight, the majority of the Group favored the incorporation of INIBAP as an international network under the governance and administration of IBPGR.

Harmonizing the various options considered, the Group agreed on the following points:

- High priority should be given to banana and plantain research;
- The Group should continue to support the hands-on genetic improvement work on plantains carried out by IITA;
- INIBAP's focus should be on disease-related *Musa* germplasm research and related documentation, information, and training; and
- These activities should be carried out by a consortium including INIBAP under governance and administrative structure of IBPGR, in cooperation with IITA.

The Chairman commended the Task Force for its leadership and INIBAP's Director General for a constructive attitude. He said that he would ask the Oversight Committee to formulate as a matter of urgency the next practical steps required to give effect to the Group's consensus.

#### **CIMMYT - INTERIM EXTERNAL REVIEW**

The interim external review of CIMMYT was an experiment based on a decision by the Group at MTM91, as part of

the system's continuing efforts to improve the review process. The mandate of the interim review panel was to examine major changes in strategic direction at CIMMYT since the 1988 external reviews; to highlight CIMMYT's main achievements, impact, and challenges; and to suggest issues that require a fuller examination by the center and the next "regular" external review.

A panel of two (as opposed to eight, the established norm) conducted the interim review over two weeks (as opposed to the customary seven weeks). Travel by the two-member panel consisted of a single visit to the center whereas a "full" review makes two visits to the center's field stations, and attends a Board meeting.

The panel's task was facilitated by CIMMYT's practice of holding regular "internally managed external reviews." Three or four such reviews are held every year. Each review is focused on one activity — the most recent was on the center's maize germplasm bank — and is conducted by a panel of experts including a Board member. Every major activity at CIMMYT is reviewed once in five years (or less) on the instructions of the Board.

Sir Ralph Riley who headed the interim external review panel said that he found that CIMMYT continued to be an efficient and effective research organization. He drew the Group's attention to the following major points:

- The panel's recommendation that CIMMYT's applied molecular biology laboratory should be given the status of a program;
- The panel's agreement, after initial hesitation, that CIMMYT should engage in natural resources research;
- The international impact of CIMMYT's breeding work in both wheat and maize;
- CIMMYT's successful devolution of several training programs to national systems; and
- The major challenge posed by funding constraints.

Commenting further on the financial issue, Sir Ralph cautioned that while CIMMYT is a bright star in the CGIAR constellation, further budget cuts could turn it into a black hole.

Responding on behalf of the center, CIMMYT Director General Don Winkelmann drew attention both to the strength of continuing programs and the potential of new activities. Investment in biotechnology, he said, would result in new scientific insights and new genes for deployment. This activity would, therefore, be intensified, but not as a separate program. CIMMYT's natural resource management research, meanwhile, would be joined with economics in a single program.

Turning to the effect of funding constraints on staffing, he said that tough decisions had been made by CIMMYT and

more might be needed. If the Group wanted the work of the system to have a strong impact on poverty alleviation and environmental protection, it should favor CIMMYT.

The ensuing discussion dealt both with the interim review process, and with the reach and impact of CIMMYT's research programs. Summarizing the discussion, the Chairman said that the Group had endorsed the practice of holding interim reviews under specific circumstances and had commended CIMMYT's response to the review. The Group commended the evolution of CIMMYT's research agenda, the deepening of its scientific program, its collaboration with other centers, and its response to the challenge of funding constraints. The Group agreed that a continuing decline of resources could jeopardize CIMMYT's future effectiveness.

The Chairman shared with the Group the assessment of World Bank President Lewis T. Preston who had visited CIMMYT and been "very impressed with the center's research program, its staff, and management."

## DECISIONMAKING PROCESSES

The Group considered the final report of a Working Group established at MTM92 (Istanbul) under the chairmanship of Mr. Robert Herdt, to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the CGIAR's deliberation and decisionmaking processes, and to develop options for improving these processes<sup>1</sup>. A preliminary report was presented at ICW92.

The Working Group's final report confirmed the following 10 recommendations:

1. That the CGIAR continue its "two meetings a year" format, but provide separate foci to the ICW and the MTM, such as devoting the ICW to more systemwide issues and the MTM to center-specific issues.
2. That parallel sessions be used at future ICWs as appropriate, and that the designers of the future parallel sessions take full account of the criticisms of previous parallel sessions as documented in a survey of CGIAR members carried out by the Working Group.
3. That mid-term meetings be held in countries where CGIAR centers are located, to the extent that the national agricultural research authorities and center authorities can manage such events in a practical way.

4. That discussion procedures at the ICW and MTM be streamlined.
5. That the donor members of the CGIAR establish a standing committee on finance from their own membership, with terms of reference as specified in the body of the Working Group's report.
6. That a five-person CGIAR standing committee on system-level evaluation be established, with terms of reference as specified by the Working Group, and that the CGIAR Chairman appoint *ad hoc* working groups made up of CGIAR members on each review scheduled for consideration by the CGIAR.
7. That when significant shifts in strategy and priorities are envisioned, the CGIAR Chairman establish an *ad hoc* working group to consider TAC's recommendations.
8. That the Directors General, the Public Awareness Association, the Secretariat, and key national support groups jointly decide on a single mechanism for CGIAR public awareness work, to ensure leadership, coordination, and efficient use of public awareness resources.
9. That appointment of *ad hoc* working groups follow an approach that systematically aims at the type of objectives specified in the Working Group's report.
10. That the CGIAR and the centers explore the possibility of using a regional round-table format more systematically for reflecting views of developing country agricultural researchers within the CGIAR.

Introducing the agenda item, the Chairman traced the history of the Working Group's activity and stressed the need for decisions on the recommendations from the Working Group.

The principal issues raised, he said, concerned the existence of a strong sentiment and willingness to change within the Group. The Working Group felt that such feelings existed. The Chairman sought confirmation or rejection of that assumption. If the Group felt that change was required but that the recommendations were not acceptable, he would expect members to come up with a new set of options. If they wanted change, they would also have to indicate to what extent they are willing to delegate to fellow members the responsibility for handling parts of CGIAR business on their behalf. Dedicated time would also be required for participation in the work of the proposed committees.

<sup>1</sup> Other members of the working group were Messrs. Manoel Malheiros-Tourinho, Wilhelm Suden, Eugene Terry, and Klaus Winkel.

Mr. Herdt described the process of consultation — within the Working Group and throughout the system — on which the recommendations were based. From those consultations, there was evidence that 80 percent of the CGIAR stakeholders were dissatisfied with current deliberation and decisionmaking processes. There were concerns, too, about the lack of financial commitment to back some of the decisions reached by the Group. This anomaly resulted in many *ad hoc* decisions and affected center programs adversely. The proposed committees — finance and evaluation — would sharpen the deliberative process. They would provide mechanisms for focused discussion and decisions.

He emphasized that the basic philosophy of the recommendations is consistent with the defining characteristics of the CGIAR, that is, independent centers, autonomous donors, independent technical advice, and final decisions by consensus. These characteristics would not change.

Support for change was indicated by all participants in the discussion. However, several speakers sought more operational detail, voiced concerns, or offered modifications. The main points included the following:

- The new committees could introduce a new layer of bureaucracy, rather than simplify decisionmaking. This danger should be avoided.
- Clear terms of reference are required to avoid conflicts between the committees and existing bodies such as TAC.
- The role of the CGIAR and TAC Secretariats in relation to the committees had not been spelled out. This could cause practical difficulties.
- The name “evaluation committee” is not acceptable. It could be changed to “operations” or “oversight.”
- The committees should be charged with working out their own detailed terms of reference, which could be reviewed by the Group at ICW93.
- The formation of two committees should be viewed as an experiment to be evaluated and continued or dropped after a reasonable period.

Summing up the discussion, the Chairman said that there was overwhelming support for change if it did not result in an increase of bureaucratic layering. The Group wanted the committees appointed soon, but as an experiment. They also wanted more attention paid to working details that had not been fully covered in the report presented to them.

Following a series of consultations on and off the floor, the Chairman announced the appointment of two committees — finance and oversight. The Finance Committee will consist of

donor representatives and the Oversight Committee of individual donors. Two members of the Oversight Committee will serve for one year, another two for two years, and the remaining two for three years.

After consultations among members of the Group, and an informal process of nominations, the Chairman announced that the Finance Committee will consist of representatives from Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, the World Bank, and two developing country donors. The World Bank was unanimously invited to serve as chair. The Oversight Committee will consist of Messrs. Ralph W. Cummings, Jr., Paul Egger (Chair), John F. Holmberg, V. L. Chopra, Henri Carsalade, and Robert W. Herdt.

## LIVESTOCK — PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES

The Group resumed its consideration of priorities and strategies for livestock research from the point that was reached when the subject was discussed at ICW92. Discussion at ICW92 was based primarily on a preliminary report from TAC. The sense of the Group was that TAC should continue its exploration of the subject in the light of points raised by the Group. This would involve the elaboration of strategic proposals as well as the formulation of options for the future work of ILCA, ILRAD, and other centers.

To facilitate TAC’s efforts, a CGIAR Working Group was set up under the chairmanship of John “Taff” Davies to clarify strategic issues and re-examine institutional options. The Working Group was expected to consult widely before preparing a report for presentation to the Group as a whole.

At MTM93 livestock issues were discussed as a single theme. Discussion was based on draft MTPs from ILCA and ILRAD, a progress report from the Working Group, and a revised statement on livestock priorities and strategies from TAC.

Inaugurating the discussion, the Chairman said that the CGIAR was in an evolutionary process to derive a long-term livestock research strategy. From the documentation available in advance of the meeting it was clear that answers were required from the Group to some basic questions, such as:

- Should the CGIAR have a unified strategy to guide future research?
- What is the appropriate balance between global and continental investment in livestock research?
- What is likely to be the most effective institutional arrangement for future research?
- If new institutional arrangements are required, what is the pace at which changes should be made from existing arrangements?

The MTPs of the two livestock centers were presented by their Board Chairs and Directors General (ILCA - Dieter Bommer, Board Chair, John Walsh, Director General; ILRAD - Niels Ole Nielsen, Board Chair, Ross Gray, Director General) who were commended for the work at the centers, for their willingness to make necessary changes for the future, and for the transparency of their presentations. Final recommendations on the MTPs will be made by TAC at ICW93.

Mr. Davies, presenting a progress report from the Working Group, reviewed a number of issues including the livestock species on which CGIAR centers should concentrate on (cattle, sheep, and goats); products (meat, milk, traction, and manure); geographic areas for research; ecoregions (subhumid tropics, higher rainfall areas of the semiarid tropics, and the highland cool tropics); activities (management of sustainable crop/livestock systems, constraints on health, genotype, and feed supply); levels of research (strategic); and institutional options.

The Working Group recognized that livestock research is holistic, and would benefit from interaction between and among programs. A more visionary CGIAR approach would help to make livestock research more effective, to reduce overlaps, and mobilize more resources. The Working Group felt that a future research strategy should include the following elements:

- (i) A single livestock research strategy, incorporating appropriate programs from ILCA and ILRAD as well as from other CGIAR centers, e.g. ISNAR, IFPRI, CIAT, ICARDA, ICRISAT, and ICRAF;
- (ii) A joint Livestock Board using elements of the existing ILCA and ILRAD Boards;
- (iii) The creation of a single international livestock center in three to five years;
- (iv) Designation of priority problem areas, and core areas that are core-funded;
- (v) Decisions on funding mechanisms for other essential components of the global livestock research scene; and
- (vi) An implementing mechanism to manage transition and change.

Highlighting the revisions in TAC's paper on livestock, Mr. McCalla drew the Group's attention to a new section on opportunities for intercenter collaboration in each of seven priority areas — health, nutrition, genetics, feed resources, production systems, natural resource management, and policy.

On the question of funding, Mr. McCalla said that the revised paper attempted to clarify the existing distribution of CGIAR resources to livestock research: 18 percent of total resources and 23 percent of commodity resource research. The paper expands on research needs at global and ecoregional

levels, and emphasizes the fact that strategic research is not limited to global activities.

Mr. McCalla pointed out, as well, that livestock research should be based on a unified strategy and vision, as well as on an integrated institutional arrangement. In this connection, he presented the following institutional options:

- (i) *Status quo*, which was unacceptable;
- (ii) An intercenter collaborative mechanism;
- (iii) A simple merger of ILCA and ILRAD; and
- (iv) TAC's preferred option; the establishment of a new global mechanism or center for livestock research with global responsibilities for strategic research in genetics, physiology, nutrition, and health. This work would be supported by and would interact with research of an ecoregional nature in mechanisms to be developed.

Thematic discussion of livestock issues by members of the Group saw the emergence of a consensus that livestock research in the CGIAR should be entrusted to a single entity. Other major points brought up during the discussion included the following:

- ILCA and ILRAD were commended for their positive reaction to the views expressed and were assured that they would continue to be vital components of livestock research in the CGIAR system.
- The work already done by both centers and the linkages they had established should be preserved and integrated with future programs. Similarly, institutional changes should be undertaken with minimum discomfort to existing staff.
- Livestock research should be guided by a single vision. This requires a combination of effort by several centers. At the same time, further examination of species, products, activities, and so on would be helpful.
- National research systems, with whom some linkages have already been established, are an essential component of a holistic approach. Their contributions should be fostered under the proposed new institutional arrangement.
- The arguments for and against maintaining resource allocations were debated, with a final view that no change is called for at present.
- Institutional and programmatic changes based on the Group's decisions should be introduced with as little delay as possible. This would provide for an effective

transition period, maintain continuity of effort, and reflect the positive nature of the discussion. The need for a knowledgeable steering group to suggest and monitor transitional arrangements was strongly endorsed.

Summing up the discussion, the Chairman pointed out that the Group had decided that the system required a single vision and a unified institutional structure that builds on the strengths of both existing livestock centers. This is expected to maximize the impact of CGIAR supported research.

The Group appreciated the constructive attitude of the livestock centers, the broad endorsement from the ILCA Board of the Group's approach, and the anticipated endorsement from the ILRAD Board.

The Group acknowledged by acclamation the contribution to the work of the CGIAR system by ILRAD Director General John Walsh who will be leaving the center shortly to take up new responsibilities in Ireland.

The Chairman announced the formation of an implementing Steering Committee chaired by Lucia de Vaccaro. Other members of the committee are Niels Ole Nielsen and Dieter Bommer, the Board chairs of ILRAD and ILCA respectively; John "Taff" Davies, Deputy Chief Natural Resources Adviser at ODA, United Kingdom, who chaired the Livestock Working Group, which reported to MTM93; Cyrus Ndiritu, Director General of the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute; John McIntire, a World Bank agricultural economist; and John Vercoe, from CSIRO, Australia.

## MEDIUM-TERM PLANS

A phase of medium-term planning for the period 1994-1998 was brought to a close when the Group heard presentations on the medium-term plans (MTPs), as currently envisaged, of 11 centers. Seven centers presented their MTPs at ICW92.

Medium-term planning is based on a decision reached at MTM92 (Istanbul) when the Group accepted a proposal from TAC linking resource allocation to research priorities. The Group endorsed a set of 1998 resource envelopes to guide the centers and to establish the context for budget-related discussions involving first TAC and the centers, and then the Group.

Centers were asked to draft MTPs based on the core resource envelopes recommended by TAC, but were given the flexibility to present proposals that were plus or minus 10 percent of the resource envelope figure. The resource envelope guidelines worked out to a base notional level of US\$270 million, including funds for external reviews and a reserve for future allocation.

CIAT, CIMMYT, CIP, ICRISAT, IIMI, IITA, and ISNAR presented their MTPs at ICW92. At MTM93, the following seven MTPs were presented in the context of the themes considered by the Group — Agroforestry/Forestry (ICRAF,

CIFOR), Banana and Plantains (INIBAP), Livestock (ILCA, ILRAD), and Rice (IRRI, WARDA). Individual presentations as separate agenda items were made by IBPGR, ICARDA, ICLARM, and IFPRI.

Of the 18 centers, six pegged their MTPs to the base budget level, seven came in at the plus 10 percent level and five at over the plus 10 percent level, requiring total funding of some US\$284 million. The Group generally commended the program thrusts outlined by centers but expressed concerns over the mismatch between plans and the estimated availability of funds (approximately US\$231 million in 1993).

Several options for reconciling supply with demand were considered at a system-level workshop on MTPs held after the business sessions of MTM93 were completed. These options included a phasing out of programs, "across the board" proportional cuts, and a freeze on growth at centers whose proposed allocations require growth in excess of current funding levels.

Further discussions were scheduled for the next TAC meeting to be held in June at Colombo, Sri Lanka. Final recommendations for resource allocations will be formulated thereafter. Decisions on allocations for center MTPs will be required at ICW93.

## RICE RESEARCH IN THE CGIAR SYSTEM

Issues concerning rice research in the CGIAR system were examined in relation to the External Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs) of IRRI and WARDA, the two centers' MTPs, an intercenter rice review, and TAC's draft Strategy Statement on Rice Research.

The agenda was structured in such a way that members of the Group could comment on matters specific to the two centers as well as on broad strategic issues including intercenter responsibilities and resource allocations.

The EPMRs were introduced by the chairmen of the review panels — David Bell (IRRI) and Declan Walton (WARDA). The centers were represented by Board Chairs and Directors General — Walter Falcon and Klaus Lampe (IRRI); Henri Carsalade and Eugene Terry (WARDA). Grant Scobie, chairman of the panel, introduced the intercenter rice review.

Inaugurating discussion of the agenda item as part of a unified theme, the Chairman reminded the Group that consideration of individual center programs and plans could lead to the emergence of major issues that relate to rice research generally, to the niche of CGIAR centers in global rice research activities, and to continental rice research responsibilities. He suggested that the Group should consider center-specific discussions as entry points for consideration of broader issues.

Some major questions that he felt the CGIAR system should address were the need to double rice production in 30 years, the need for higher yields, concern about declining

yields, and the need to balance productivity with sustainability.

Setting the context for a consideration of rice research issues, TAC's draft strategy statement pointed out that rice is the most important food crop in the world and is the major staple for 2.7 billion people in Asia alone. Over 90 percent of the world's rice production is both produced and consumed in Asia. Global demand for rice is projected to grow at a rate at least equal to population growth rates and by the year 2030 the amount of rice needed will be more than double present output. Of the extra output of rice to be produced, 91.3 percent will be needed in Asia, 3.8 percent in Sub-Saharan Africa, 3.8 percent in Latin America, and 1.1 percent in West Asia/North Africa (WANA).

Currently, the TAC statement said, the CGIAR allocates 65.6 percent of core expenditures for rice improvement to Asia, 21.4 percent to Sub-Saharan Africa (17.1 percent to West Africa), 10.7 percent to Latin America and the Caribbean, and 2.3 percent to WANA.

TAC observed, as well, that there are four major themes in international rice research to which the CGIAR must make a major contribution:

- Raise the yield ceiling, which has not increased significantly since IR8 was released in 1966;
- Close the gaps between potential yields and those achieved in farmers' fields;
- Sustain current yields — sustainability issues in this connection include the problems of the less favorable rainfed environments as well as those of yield decline in irrigated systems; and
- Build or strengthen national research capacity.

In the course of the discussion, the chairmen of all three review panels emphasized the importance of rice research in the CGIAR system. Mr. Scobie said that research is an essential component of the increased productivity that will be required to meet the world's growing food requirements. Mr. Bell said that major strategic problems such as the yield ceiling and the decline in factor productivity were not likely to be overcome unless IRRI takes the lead in mobilizing scientific and financial resources to deal with them. Mr. Walton, who described rice as "a star crop" in West Africa — on account of the high rate at which the demand for rice is increasing — argued the need for a major rice research program in the region.

Mr. Bell presented a highly positive assessment of IRRI. The central finding of the review panel, he said, is that IRRI has emerged successfully from a period of change and is ready to settle down to a period of solid, productive work.

On the program side, he said, the review panel found the

center to be well into a major transformation, with more emphasis on strategic research, more attention to less favorable rice growing environments, more concern with equity, sustainability, and resource management, all carried out without diverting the center's attention from germplasm improvement and production in more favorable environments.

In the area of management, he said, IRRI has made major changes in scientific organization, management systems, financial administration, and Board functions. Under a new organizational pattern, research at IRRI is organized by ecosystem, irrigated, rainfed, lowland, upland, deep water; plus a cross-ecosystems program to attend to subject matter that does not fall neatly into the ecosystem categories.

Other developments drawing positive comment from the review panel included staff changes with a consequent transfusion of new ideas; a range of improvements in the management of center affairs; and relations with national agricultural research systems that were creative as well as productive.

Mr. Walton commended WARDA for having responded to the challenge posed by the CGIAR in 1986 when the Group urged that the center should undergo a substantial transformation. In 1993, Mr. Walton said, WARDA is depoliticized and well managed with a soundly designed program that holds out the prospect of a significant impact within a reasonable time.

WARDA successfully reconciles its dual personality as an instrument of 17 member states in the region and as an autonomous international research center within the CGIAR system, Mr. Walton added. WARDA's Council of Ministers had proved to be an asset, providing the center with policy level access in all member states.

He commended WARDA's model of collaboration with national research systems, which is based on joint task forces that share out research tasks among WARDA and individual national systems on the basis of comparative advantage.

Noting that there is a strong need for rice research in West Africa, Mr. Walton said the review panel had examined various alternatives by which this research could be carried out — including a merger of WARDA with IITA — and concluded that WARDA remains the best option. WARDA must have a reasonably assured future, he said.

Mr. Scobie summarized the conclusions of the intercenter rice review within a framework of major issues such as population, equity, technological change, equity, sustainability, and resource allocation.

The crux of the review panel's approach was that rice research in the CGIAR system should concentrate on global needs, both in its elaboration of research programs and in its allocation of resources. The current regional balance of funding is not aligned with the future needs for increasing rice production. Dealing specifically with the two rice centers, whose work was being discussed, the review argued that:

- IRRI, the center responsible for global commodity leadership and for Asia must have funding commensurate with its task, and
- WARDA cannot continue to operate as an independent commodity-based center for a relatively small region with reduced funding.

Mr. McCalla suggested that discussion of rice research issues should not focus solely on regional perspectives, a single region, or a single institution. The major issue was how best the CGIAR system could respond to the needs of developing countries. The system's response would involve not only IRRI and WARDA but also CIAT, IITA, IFPRI, IBPGR, IIMI, and ISNAR.

Commenting on resource allocation for rice research in West Africa, Mr. McCalla noted that WARDA as an institution needs to be sustained but that it is at or below critical mass level. There was a need for research to be done, he added, on the sustainability of rice-based cropping systems in West Africa, and both WARDA and IITA have important roles to play.

The Group commended review chairmen and center representatives for frank and transparent presentations. There was general agreement on the need for rice research to continue within the system at a high level of intensity and intercenter collaboration. IRRI and WARDA were both commended for having managed a series of changes and for their willingness to continue undertaking other changes that might be necessary. IRRI's role as a flagship center of the system was recognized and the center was urged to "serve the whole world" with its efforts. IRRI's program emphases were considered to be consistent with the development needs it seeks to satisfy.

Some reservations were expressed about the case for a single center rice program in West Africa, and about the critical mass of scientists at WARDA. Overall, there was a consensus that the Group should continue to support WARDA.

Summing up the discussion, the Chairman said that the Group had reaffirmed the importance of rice as a crop that is the most used staple in developing countries. The external reviews of both centers were endorsed. TAC's recommendations on their MTPs would come up at ICW93 for decisionmaking by the Group. The Group wished that the CGIAR system should intensify and consolidate its rice research programs so as to continue its contribution toward increasing the productivity of rice and promoting the sustainability of production. The Group agreed that many centers should be involved in different aspects of this activity.

The Chairman said IRRI's role as a mature center that has made many innovations and is engaged in programs that are relevant to current production or environmental problems was widely acknowledged. IRRI was commended for its relations

with national systems and for its development of creative partnership arrangements.

The Chairman noted a strong sentiment for the Group to continue supporting WARDA and encouraging its innovative mechanisms for collaboration with national systems. The Group felt that for WARDA to fulfil its role it should be funded at or about the current level. While WARDA was urged to continue its own research programs, it also was advised to undertake research partnerships with IITA on rice-based farming systems in the inland valleys of West Africa. WARDA's role in ecoregional research was viewed as requiring further elaboration.

## OTHER BUSINESS

### • Documentation

Responding to a suggestion from the floor, the Secretariat said it would continue with its efforts to attach to all MTM and ICW documents a summary that would indicate the most important issues for discussion and decision.

### • Future Meetings

The following dates and places were confirmed.

ICW93: October 25-29, Washington, D.C.

MTM94: May 23-37, New Delhi

ICW94: October 24-28, Washington, D.C.

MTM95: May 22-26. Location to be fixed.

ICW95: October 30 - November 3, Washington, D.C.

Members were requested to suggest locations for future meetings.

### • Information Document

Mr. Jim Ryan, Director General, ICRISAT, presented the Group with a draft information document on the vision and strategy of the CGIAR system. Crafting the document was a project jointly supported by Board Chairs, Directors General, and TAC. The final version of the document will take into account the various comments and suggestions made at the Mid-Term Meeting.

### • International Nutrition Conference

IFPRI Director General Per Pinstrup-Andersen reported on the International Nutrition Conference, organized by FAO and WHO, at which IFPRI represented the CGIAR system. He described the process of preparation for the conference, and IFPRI's contribution to the substance of those preparations as well as to the conference itself.

As a result of IFPRI's efforts and of a program organized by FAO, the role of agriculture in general and of the CGIAR in particular in achieving nutritional goals was understood and reflected in conference documents. Following the conference, IFPRI was engaged in follow-up action in collaboration with other centers. In particular opportunities were being explored for alleviating Vitamin A and iron deficiencies through breeding and other areas of agricultural research.

The FAO representative placed on record his organization's appreciation of IFPRI's work. The Group added its endorsement and agreed that IFPRI should represent the CGIAR system at the International Conference on Population and Development scheduled to be held in Cairo next year. The Rockefeller Foundation will cosponsor with IFPRI a round table meeting on food, agriculture, and population in preparation for the Cairo conference.

- **Intellectual Property Rights**

At the request of several members, Mr. Lukas Brader (Director General, IITA), Chairman of the Center Directors Committee on Intellectual Property Rights, presented the meeting with a report on activities that had taken place since the adoption at MTM92 (Istanbul) of a working document on intellectual property rights (IPR).

The committee had amended some of the guidelines and sought reactions from a number of partners including CGIAR centers, NGOs, and national agricultural research centers. Reactions in general were positive.

The committee planned to evaluate developments such as the new international Biodiversity Convention and the importance of IPR at GATT negotiations before developing a new policy statement. The legal status of center collections and the integration of CGIAR efforts with those of the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources were other important issues to be clarified.

At the request of several donors, the Group agreed that IPR issues will be on the agenda at ICW93.

- **Root Crops**

An Asia-Pacific regional representative proposed that a small Task Force should determine whether an international agricultural research entity for aroids could be established in the Pacific. It was agreed that the Australian delegate would follow-up the possibility of the coconut genetic resources network (established under the auspices of IBPGR) assessing the scope for work on aroids.

- **Representation on Boards**

A member questioned the appropriateness of "ex officio" representation on CGIAR Boards by members of international organizations. The question was referred to the Oversight Committee.

## **CHAIRMAN'S CLOSING REMARKS**

In his closing remarks, the Chairman congratulated the Group on having made a number of decisions that are meant to retain the vitality of the system over the long term. Some of these decisions will transform the CGIAR system's research agenda over time, he said, while others will decisively change the way in which the CGIAR conducts business.

By making those decisions, he continued, the Group had destroyed the myth that the CGIAR cannot or will not make decisions.

To guide the Group's future deliberations, the Chairman summarized the main conclusions reached.

**Decisionmaking Process.** The Group decided to establish two committees — Finance and Oversight. These committees will work with other components of the CGIAR system between meetings of the Group to help define issues sharply and speed up their resolution.

**Livestock.** The Group sifted through a number of options and concluded that to fulfill a global vision for livestock research within the limits of available resources, the CGIAR should support a unified strategy, program, and institution. This is to be done with a minimal transition period and with the least possible uncertainty among center staff. The programs at ILCA, ILRAD, and other centers must be integrated in the new strategy. A CGIAR steering committee will work out the next steps.

**Rice.** The Group took note of the fact that rice is the most important staple for developing countries, and showed strong support for both rice centers in the CGIAR system — IRRI and WARDA — and decided that both should continue their rice programs, seeking innovative and cost-effective ways to reach their goals. The WARDA management was urged to seek stronger partnership arrangements with IITA and other centers.

**Banana and Plantain.** Based on consideration of a report from a Task Force the Group supported the establishment of a disease-related germplasm improvement consortium. The activities recommended for INIBAP by the Task Force will be carried out under the governance and administrative structure of IBPGR. The hands-on genetic improvement work at IITA should be continued. The CGIAR Oversight Committee will facilitate the implementation of these decisions.

**Agenda 21.** Two significant initiatives came up as part of the possible CGIAR response to Agenda 21: that the CGIAR system should serve as a contracting mechanism to implement programs in three areas — soils and water, biodiversity, and human resource development — and that an environmental technology dimension should be added to CGIAR centers. These and other possible initiatives will be examined by a



Working Group chaired by Stein Bie and specific proposals placed before the Group at ICW93.

***CIMMYT Interim Review.*** Thematic issues were examined through the consideration of several external reviews but the interim review of CIMMYT was considered as a separate agenda item. This interim review is part of a continuing effort by TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat to improve the external review process, both in terms of quality and cost effectiveness. The interim review confirmed CIMMYT's achievements and relevance in several areas of research including natural resources management and biotechnology. The sense of the Group was that the interim review process should continue.

***Medium-Term Plans.*** Following acceptance at MTM92 (Istanbul) of a TAC formulation which links research priorities to resource envelopes, the centers began a medium-term planning (MTP) process covering the period 1994-1998. Seven centers presented their MTPs at ICW92 and 11 made their

presentations at MTM93. TAC's recommendations on all 18 MTPs will come to the Group for decisions at ICW93.

The Chairman thanked all those who helped to bring the meeting to a successful conclusion: cosponsors for their leadership, consultants who helped with external reviews, members of Working Groups and Task Forces, center managements and staff, the TAC Chair and his colleagues, the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR and the Secretariat staff, the administrative staff from the Fund, the interpreters, the technical staff, and all other local organizers. Most of all, he thanked members of the Group who reaffirmed their vision of the CGIAR, and took important steps to ensure that their vision can be matched with implementation.

Finally, the Chairman said goodbye and thanks to two CGIAR stalwarts, Don Plucknett and John Spears, who will be retiring from the CGIAR Secretariat before ICW93. On behalf of the Group, he wished them the very best in the future.

## ***Annex 1***

### ***Agenda***

<i>Agenda Number*</i>	<i>Item</i>
1	Opening remarks
2	Adoption of the agenda
3	TAC Chairman's report
4	Interim external review of CIMMYT
5	ICRAF external program and management review
6	IRRI external program and management review
7	WARDA external program and management review
8	Intercenter review of rice
9	Medium-term programs — CIFOR, IBPGR, ICARDA, ICLARM, ICRAF, IFPRI, ILCA, ILRAD, INIBAP, IRRI, WARDA
10	Status report on the work of the working group on CGIAR deliberation and decision processes
11	Progress report by the task force to examine the priorities for international support to banana and plantain research
12	Progress report by the livestock strategy working group
13	Progress report on possible follow-up action on UNCED Agenda 21
14	Other business

---

\* Not necessarily in order of discussion

## ***Annex 2***

### ***List of Participants***

#### **Chairman**

V. Rajagopalan  
Vice President and Special Adviser  
The World Bank Group  
Washington, DC

#### **DELEGATIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP**

#### **African Development Bank (AfDB)**

Isaiah B. C. John  
Director of Agriculture  
African Development Bank  
  
Birama Boubacar Sidibe  
Deputy Director, Agriculture Department

#### **Australia**

George H.L. Rothschild  
Director, Australian Centre for International Agricultural  
Research (ACIAR)  
  
Eric T. Craswell  
Research Programme Coordinator, ACIAR  
  
Derek E. Tribe  
Executive Director, Crawford Fund

#### **Austria**

Ralph Gretzmacher  
University of Agriculture  
  
Alfred Just  
Official in Charge of CGIAR  
Ministry of Finance

#### **Belgium**

Luc Sas  
CGIAR Officer/Senior Agricultural Advisor  
Belgian Administration for Development  
Cooperation (BADC)

#### **Brazil**

Mario Alves Seixas  
Head of Foreign Affairs  
Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuaria  
(EMBRAPA)

#### **Canada**

Iain C. MacGillivray  
Senior Programme Manager  
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)  
  
Richard Baerg  
Senior Forestry Advisor, CIDA  
  
Trevor Sykes  
Agricultural Specialist, CIDA

#### **Denmark**

Ebbe Schioler  
Consultant  
Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)  
  
Ole Olsen  
Director of Research  
Ministry of Agriculture

#### **Commission of the European Communities (CEC)**

Jean-Louis Chiltz  
Principal Administrator

#### **Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)**

Philippe J. Mahler  
Special Adviser to the Director General/ADG for  
Environment and Sustainable Development  
  
Mohamed S. Zehni  
Director, Research and Technology  
Development Division

#### **Ford Foundation**

E. Walter Coward, Jr.  
Director, Rural Poverty and Resources Program (RPRP)

Deborah Merrill-Sands  
Consultant

**France**

Genevieve Chedeville-Murray  
Head, Multilateral Division  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Odile Pomarede  
Chargé de Mission  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**Germany**

Wilhelm Suden  
Head of Division  
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and  
Development

Jurgen Friedrichsen  
Division Head  
German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ)

Ekkehard Kurschner  
Coordinator, International Agricultural Research  
German Council for Tropical and Subtropical  
Agricultural Research (ATSAR)

**Indonesia**

Soedjadi Hartono  
Head, Agency of Research and Development  
Department of Forestry

Ombo Satjapradja  
Secretary, Agency for Research and Development  
Department of Forestry

Nelson Hutabarat  
Agricultural Attache, Embassy of the Republic  
of Indonesia

**International Bank for Reconstruction and Development  
(IBRD)**

Michel J. Petit  
Director, Agriculture and Rural Development  
Department (AGR)

Douglas A. Forno  
Division Chief, Technology and Services, AGR

Anthony J. Pritchard  
Agricultural Research Adviser, AGR

Gabrielle Persley  
Biotechnology Manager, AGR

**International Development Research Centre (IDRC)**  
Joachim Voss  
Program Director, Sustainable Production Systems

**International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)**  
Abbas Kesseba  
Director, Technical Advisory Division

**Ireland**

A. Austin Mescal  
Chief Inspector, Department of Agriculture, Food  
and Forestry

**Italy**

Marina Romualdi Vaccari  
Director of Administration  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**Japan**

Shinzo Adachi  
Assistant Director, Multilateral Cooperation Division  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Kazunori Sakata  
Deputy Director  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

Masashi Kobayashi  
Director General  
Tropical Agricultural Research Center (TARC)

**Netherlands**

Rob D. Van den Berg  
Head, Research Programme  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Willem van Vuure  
Senior Scientific Officer for International Relations  
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management  
and Fisheries

Hans Slot  
Research Programme

D. M. Ooft  
Project Officer, Environmental Programme  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**Norway**

Inge Nordang, Senior Executive Officer  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Stein W. Bie  
Director, NORAGRIC

**Rockefeller Foundation**

Robert W. Herdt  
Director, Agricultural Sciences

Frank Karel  
Vice President, Communications

**Spain**

F. Javier Garcia-Ramos  
Head of External Relations Service  
Instituto Nacional de Investigacion y Tecnologia  
Agraria y Alimentaria (INIA)

**Sweden**

Carl-Gustaf Thornstroem  
Senior Research Officer, Swedish Agency for Research  
Cooperation with Developing Countries (SAREC)

Johan F. Holmberg  
Director of Programmes, SAREC

Per Brinck  
Board Vice Chairman, SAREC

**Switzerland**

Paul Egger  
Head, Agricultural Service  
Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC)

Jurg S. Benz  
Scientific Advisor, SDC

**United Kingdom**

John C. Davies  
Deputy Chief, Natural Resources Adviser  
Natural Resources and Environment Department  
Overseas Development Administration (ODA)

Malcolm Iles  
Natural Resources Institute

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

Timothy S. Rothermel  
Director, Division for Global and Interregional Projects

Alva A. App  
Senior Scientific Adviser

Nyle C. Brady  
Senior Consultant on International Development

Chinwe Diké  
Senior Project Officer

**United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)**

Carlos A. Zulberti  
Deputy Chief, Clearinghouse for Technical Cooperation

**United States**

Ralph W. Cummings, Jr.  
Coordinator, IARC Staff  
United States Agency for International Development  
(USAID)

Dana G. Dalrymple  
Research Advisor, IARC Staff, USAID

Robert B. Bertram  
Science Advisor, IARC Staff, USAID

David C. Gibson  
Forestry and Natural Resources Adviser, LAC, USAID

**Representing Africa (Ghana and Morocco)**

K. A. Haizel  
CSIR  
Ghana

M. Faraj Hocein  
Director, Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique  
Rabat, Morocco

**Representing Asia and the Pacific (India and Western Samoa)**

V. L. Chopra  
Secretary  
Ministry of Agriculture  
New Delhi, India

Seve Imo  
Deputy Director, Agriculture  
Western Samoa

**Representing Latin America and the Caribbean (Chile and Trinidad and Tobago)**

Claudio Wernli  
Director General, INIA  
Chile

Thomas Carr  
Director of Research, CARONI (1975) Ltd.  
Trinidad and Tobago

**Representing Europe (Czech Republic and Israel)**

Josef Vlk  
Research Projects Coordinator  
Ministry of Agriculture  
The Czech Republic

Joseph Shalhevet  
Senior Scientist, Agricultural Research Organization  
Israel

## **INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTERS**

### **Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)**

Lucia Vaccaro  
Chairperson

Gustavo A. Nores  
Director General

### **Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)**

Bo M. I. Bengtsson  
Chairman

Jeffrey A. Sayer  
Director General

### **Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT)**

Donald L. Winkelmann  
Director General

Tiff Harris  
Head, Information Services

### **Centro Internacional de la Papa (CIP)**

N. Lindsay Innes  
Chairman

Hubert G. Zandstra  
Director General

### **International Board for Plant Genetic Resources (IBPGR)**

Lauritz B. Holm-Nielsen  
Chairman

Geoffrey C. Hawtin  
Director

Dick H. van Sloten  
Deputy Director

Ruth Raymond  
Public Awareness Officer

### **International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas (ICARDA)**

Enrico Porceddu  
Chairman

Nasrat R. Fadda  
Director General

Aart van Schoonhoven  
Deputy Director General for Research

Ben Wedeman  
Communications Specialist

### **International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management (ICLARM)**

Barry K. Filshie  
Acting Chairman

John L. Munro  
Director, Coastal and Coral Reef  
Resources Systems Programs

Roger S. V. Pullin  
Director, Inland Aquatic Resource Systems Program

Sten Sverdrup-Jensen  
MTP Coordinator

### **International Center for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF)**

George D. Holmes  
Chairman

Pedro A. Sanchez  
Director General

Robert Bruce Scott  
Deputy Director General

Ester N. Zulberti  
Director, Training and Information

### **International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)**

Eric H. Roberts  
Chairman

James G. Ryan  
Director General

Karl Harmsen  
Director, Resource Management Program

H. K. Jain  
Consultant

### **International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)**

Gerald K. Helleiner  
Chairman

Per Pinstруп-Andersen  
Director General

Curtis Farrar  
Director, Administration and Finance

Peter Hazell  
Division Director

Barbara Rose  
Director of Information

**International Irrigation Management Institute (IIMI)**

Roberto L. Lenton  
Director General

Khalid Mohtadullah  
Deputy Director General

Marian Fuchs-Carsch  
Project Development Officer

**International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)**

Lukas Brader  
Director General

**International Livestock Centre for Africa (ILCA)**

Dieter F. R. Bommer  
Chairman

John Walsh  
Director General

Hank Fitzhugh  
Director General Designate

Ralph von Kaufmann  
Director, Donor/Board Secretariat

**International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases (ILRAD)**

Niels Ole Nielsen  
Chairman

A. Ross Gray  
Director General

J. J. Doyle  
Deputy Director General

Koen Geerts  
Director of Administration

**International Network for the Improvement of Banana and Plantain (INIBAP)**

Coenraad H. H. ter Kuile  
Chairman

Nicolas Mateo  
Director

Ramiro Jaramillo  
Regional Coordinator

David Jones  
Crop Protection Research Coordinator

**International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)**

Walter P. Falcon  
Chairman

Klaus Lampe  
Director General

Fernando Apelo Bernardo  
Deputy Director General

Kenneth S. Fischer  
Deputy Director General (Research)

Edward Sayegh  
Director of Finance

Kwanchai Gomez  
Head, LCPU

**International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR)**

John L. Dillon  
Chairman

Christian H. Bonte-Friedheim  
Director General

**West Africa Rice Development Association (WARDA)**

Henri Carsalade  
Chairman

Eugene R. Terry  
Director General

Peter J. Matlon  
Director of Research

## **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)**

Alexander F. McCalla  
Chairman

Hans M. Gregersen

Richard S. Musangi

Sir Ralph Riley

Maria Jose de O. Zimmerman

John S. Spears  
Science Adviser

Monica M. Stillwell  
Executive Assistant

Ravindra Tadvalkar  
Senior Financial Officer

Heinrich von Loesch  
Information Adviser

## **TAC SECRETARIAT**

John H. Monyo  
Executive Secretary

Guido Gryseels  
Deputy Executive Secretary

## **CGIAR SECRETARIAT**

Alexander von der Osten  
Executive Secretary

E. J. Capbert  
Conference Officer

Michael P. Collinson  
Science Adviser

Ernest Corea  
Senior Information Officer

Frona G. Hall  
Conference Officer

Jean-Pierre Jacqmotte  
Senior Finance Officer

Selcuk Ozgediz  
Management Adviser

Donald L. Plucknett  
Science Adviser

## **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

Jock R. Anderson  
Principal Economist, AGR, IBRD

Michael H. Arnold  
Consultant

David E. Bell  
Consultant

Richard E. Bissell  
Overseas Development Council

Robert Buschbacher  
World Wildlife Fund

Grant Scobie  
Consultant

Laurence Stifel  
Visiting Fellow, CIIFAD

P. Bernard Tinker  
Consultant

Moctar Touré  
Executive Secretary, SPAAR

Declan Walton  
Consultant



Printed on recycled paper.