From: The Secretariat

Consultative Group Meeting
June 12-14, 1985
Tokyo, Japan

MAIN CONCLUSIONS REACHED AND DECISIONS TAKEN

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) held a mid-term business meeting from June 12-14, 1985 at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Tokyo. The attached paper contains a summary of the main conclusions reached and decisions taken at the meeting.

The Secretariat will make available on request a transcript of the proceedings of the Tokyo meetings on microfiche.

Attachments

Distribution:

CGIAR Members
TAC Chairman, Secretariat, and Members
Center Board Chairs
Center Directors
Other Participants
Observers
1. A mid-term meeting of the Consultative Group was held at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Tokyo from June 12-14, 1985. The Chairman of the Group, Mr. S. Shahid Husain, presided over the meetings. A list of participants is attached in Appendix I.

2. The meeting was opened by the Parliamentary Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Mrs. Mayumi Moriyama, whose address to the Group is attached in Appendix II. The opening speech of the Chairman of the CGIAR is contained in Appendix III.

TAC Chairman’s Report - Agenda Item 4

3. The TAC Chairman, Professor Guy Camus, focused his comments on the progress made by TAC with the "Strategic Considerations Study" which has evolved into a "TAC Review of CGIAR Priorities and Future Strategies". The final product would be transmitted to the Group in mid-September for discussion at Centers Week. Professor Camus then outlined the main features of the paper, presented the conceptual framework TAC had used in the exercise, shared preliminary conclusions concerning the long term evolution of the program structure of the system, and introduced the analytical tools used in making decisions on commodity priorities. He said that the study views the CGIAR as one component of an emerging research system. It looks at priorities among existing commodities and activities as well as at possible new ones. Activities are linked to the central goals of the system, and analyzed with the aid of indicators as well as TAC's collective scientific judgement. The time horizon is dual: five to ten years, and twenty-five years. There are two financial scenarios, one assuming constant resources, and the second increased resources. TAC had adopted the following goal statement, which seems to reflect an emerging consensus: "Through international agricultural research and research-related activities, to contribute to increasing sustainable food production in developing countries in such a way that the nutritional levels and general economic well-being of low income people is improved."

4. Professor Camus then summarized the preliminary outcome of TAC's deliberations. The multi-disciplinary commodity approach has been reaffirmed as the primary research thrust, complemented by the efforts in policy research, strengthening of national capacities, and cooperative endeavors with other members of the global system. Seen from the outside, the program structure will look much the same in the long term. This should not be interpreted, however, as maintenance of the status quo. Within the structure, TAC has recommended, through its assessment of priorities for the future, several important shifts in emphasis. The objective of enhancing sustainable agriculture through resource conservation and management is strengthened. Intensification without resource degradation will be the measure of technological progress. The challenge is to increase the
productivity of rainfed agriculture and the more marginal environments which have received much less attention in research. Many of these areas are fragile ecologies which have already suffered significant environmental degradation and are under continuing pressure. Technologies are needed not only to increase productivity in the short term, but also gradually to rebuild the natural resource base. TAC's long-term recommendation for allocations to commodity productivity research, calls for a decrease from the present share of 70 percent of the budget to between 62 and 64 percent. Professor Camus explained that this apparent reduction does not imply, in fact, a weakening of commodity research, but rather a broadening to incorporate more fully the collateral concerns about the management, conservation and utilization of resources, nutritional quality, of commodities and equity. TAC recommended that research on conversion and use receive more emphasis in the future. Improved post-harvest technology helps to expand the total agricultural output directed towards human welfare by reducing waste and food losses, and by using resources and by-products more efficiently. This would also address important equity concerns. Commodity conversion and processing technologies can benefit low-income urban consumers through expanded and more regular food availability. Equity concerns are also reflected in TAC's recommendation that the CG system moderately increase its work in analysis of human nutritional linkages. TAC recommended that efforts directed towards the objective of improving the policy environment have a higher priority in the short to medium term. This is an area of high potential pay-off in terms of the central goal of the CG system because poorly defined policies are major constraints to technology generation and adoption. In the long term, TAC considers that the CG system's efforts in this area should return approximately to current levels and that reliance on collaboration with universities and specialized institutions be intensified. Efforts devoted to strengthening national institutions will remain an important thrust within the CG system. Professor Camus's concluding comments dealt with the analytical tools TAC is using in priority setting among commodities and on formulating recommendations on resource allocations.

5. A lengthy discussion followed in which various concerns were expressed: concern for the apparent reduction in resource allocation for specific commodities and suggestions that more be done for crops such as millet, sorghum, legumes and vegetables; need for special emphasis for Africa and a specific suggestion by several individuals that a coordinating unit be established for Africa so that duplication of efforts can be avoided; and concern over clarity of the terminology used to describe the target groups. Specific requests were made to TAC for it to be "courageous in its analysis". Other requests included the need for a strategy component and an executive summary that would be concise in stating recommendations.  

6. Following the discussion, Mr. Husain indicated that a day of debate at ICW 1985 would appear not to be adequate. He indicated that other possible formats for the discussion would be considered and welcomed comments and suggestions from the Group concerning these issues.

Chairman of the Board Chairs Report - Agenda Item 5

7. The Chairman of the Board Chairs, Professor John Dillon, reported on the matters discussed at the sixth formal meeting of the Chairs, which was held in Rome in March 1985 immediately preceding the 36th TAC meeting there. The
agenda had included a progress report on a profile survey of the trustees in the system which was being conducted by Dr. Reed Hertford; the final report is expected to be available in October 1985. The Board also discussed ways to brief new Board members and the procedures and requirements for Board appointments, with particular emphasis on the recruitment of competent Board members, which should include a greater number of developing country and women representatives. They had held a preliminary discussion of the potential role of the Chairperson's group in monitoring mandates, helping avoid overlaps and facilitating cooperation between centers. The Chairs also discussed the search and appointment procedures for directors general and a paper would be presented to the Chairs at the October meeting. The Chairmen have, at present, many ways of participating in system wide activities and have decided to consider opportunities for them, as a group, to contribute constructively to the work of the system; a paper to that effect will also be prepared for the Chairperson's meeting in October. The Chairpersons were in agreement about the need to delay the Third Review of the system until after there had been time to digest the Impact Study and the TAC Priorities paper.

8. The Chairs recommended that the Third Review should consist of a "think tank" report by a well selected group, who should be given the time to come up with a long-term view of the system's development possibilities. If the design of the Third Review were in fact to be different, the Chairmen still saw the desirability - indeed the necessity - of the system sponsoring a "think tank" activity about its long-term development. The Chairmen had discussed the TAC Training report and, with TAC itself, the Priorities Paper.

9. Professor Dillon stated the views of his group on the current role of the Boards in the system. He listed the Trustees' responsibilities as covering mandates, science, personnel, finance, facilities, etc., and agreed with Mr. Husain's definition that the Group manages the system and the Boards of Trustees manage the centers. Professor Dillon urged the donors to create an environment in which the Boards would appoint the person best qualified for membership, without undue pressure upon them. He expressed his belief that the greater the extent of unrestricted core funding available to the center, the more efficient its operations would be. Professor Dillon concluded with an expression of his own concerns: the first related to the increasing development of bureaucracy in the system; secondly, he shared one donor's expressed concern that the CG system not lurch into purely developmental activities in Africa. He stated his belief that the system must stick to research and training, and, specifically, research for clearly identified commodities in Africa.

10. In the discussion that followed, members of the Group asked for more information on the criteria for selection of a director general. A speaker asked whether the centers were involved in cross center cost analyses. Professor Dillon replied that as centers developed better computerized financial recording systems, the feasibility of such comparisons increased. He cautioned about comparisons in such different cost environments, for example, as IITA in Africa and ICRISAT in India. Several donors indicated that they relied very heavily on the boards, as a substitute for establishing their own control mechanisms for the centers. Several speakers expressed their interest in having "new blood" in the system rather than "board hoppers" i.e. people who serve on several boards over time. Other
donors tended to favor the appointment of board members with previous experience on other boards in the system. Professor Dillon reported that the Chairs as a group had been attempting to obtain more names of people who would be potential board members and, with the CG secretariat, were endeavoring to establish a file of potential board members which would be available not only for selecting potential CG nominees to the boards, but also for recruitment of at-large members. There had been particular difficulty in finding suitable members from Africa and also women from Africa. Professor Dillon thought the situation had improved greatly in the last two years and that it would continue to improve. The boards were perceived to need people who had skills in the business, legal and personnel fields, as well as pure scientists. A donor requested clarification of the method of selection of board members generally and on the role of the CGIAR designated board members. The executive secretary referred the questioner to the discussion during ICW 1984 of Dr. Hardin's paper on the roles, responsibilities and, relationships of the boards of trustees. Mr. Husain asked the secretariat to review the question of the selection of CG nominees to the boards of trustees.

Chairman of Center Directors' Report - Agenda Item 6

Dr. J. Trevor Williams reported on behalf of the directors general. In response to last year's emphasis on inter-center collaboration, Dr. Williams reported that the center directors had finalized their position paper on nutrition and forwarded it to the chairman of TAC in January 1985. In April 1985, under the leadership of ISNAR, a successful workshop was conducted on the role of women. A meeting on agro-ecological zoning, organized by ICARDA was planned for early next year. A further workshop will be held on instability in crop yields, organized by IFPRI later in 1985. A steering committee met earlier this year in Delhi to organize a workshop on farming systems research which will be held early next year. At the end of January, the center directors met with the CGIAR chairman to discuss activities in Sub-Saharan Africa and the problems associated with national agricultural research systems. These discussions identified a number of constraints, including the extremely slow rate of development of seed industries, the lack of national structures for on-farm testing; and the lack of policy frameworks. The conclusions were that the international centers have a major task in producing a flow of productive, easily applicable technologies that can be realized through partnerships with national agricultural research systems and that the innovations must address the diverse ecologies of the region. Problems faced by the centers are the transfer of technology to farmers' fields and the weakness of the agricultural research systems. The directors felt that a new mechanism was necessary to free some of the aid funds from delays and constraints and that some of the money could be programmed more to support the national agricultural research systems. It was also felt that donors should move some of their bilateral support away from extension-type projects to research, in order to lay a secure base for development in the future. The key to strengthening the national agricultural research systems could be networking, particularly when countries share similar ecological zones.
Status Report on WARDA - Agenda Item 7

12. Professor Camus reported on the Scientific and Technical Council (STC) and Governing Board meetings, held in December 1984, which he attended at the request of the Group. He underlined the effectiveness and quality of the STC. He indicated that member countries of the governing council demonstrated strong interest in WARDA. The recommendations made by the external review panels had been implemented with a few minor exceptions. Dr. Leroux was removed as Executive Secretary, and Mr. Jagne, Deputy Executive Secretary, was named as Acting Executive Secretary. The STC was increased to 14 members. Departures from the recommendations, which are acceptable, included maintaining the deputy executive secretary position and replacing the STC approval of senior staff appointments by a preliminary screening and recommendations to the executive secretary. The Council also adopted a crisis budget for 1985.

13. Mr. Jagne, Acting Executive Secretary of WARDA, informed the Group that WARDA had taken several administrative decisions. In 1985, expenditures have been limited to anticipated 1985 income, by reducing staff positions by 22 percent between December 1984 and March 1985 and by reducing expenditures on the operating budget items to the minimum. In spite of numerous appeals to member states to meet their commitments, payments have not been forthcoming and as of the beginning of 1985, WARDA’s accumulated deficit amounted to $2.29 million and by March 1985 the Association was almost at the brink of total collapse. However, appeals to donors directly and through the CGIAR secretariat, resulted in contributions of $2.9 million during April and May 1985. Mr. Jagne stressed that the delays in payments by member states should not be interpreted as lack of support. He pointed out that WARDA had fared much better financially than most of the other intergovernmental organizations operating in the subregion and that in 1984 WARDA received $1.2 million in contributions, the third highest amount paid in one year in WARDA’s 14-year history. Increased responsibilities in personnel and financial management have been delegated to the station directors of the field programs. A financial controller has been engaged on a short-term basis and WARDA is proceeding with the recruitment of a controller on a permanent basis. Measures have been taken to control expenditures more tightly and an internal auditor is being recruited. Integration of the budget and finance offices will provide more timely and better financial information to management for decision-making.

14. Mr. Farrar referred to the CG document dated June 3, 1985, which had been previously distributed to the members of the Group. There had been an improvement in the quality of WARDA management and significant progress in implementing the recommendations of the external review panels. There are still a great many things remaining to be done including the process of the selection of the executive secretary. Also there is a need for a resolution of the relationship between WARDA and its host government in order to provide a context in which effective work can be done. WARDA does not have any working capital and has presently an unfunded deficit of about $1.0 million. The biggest problem is the contributions from member states. Mr. Farrar pointed out that the flexibility and responsiveness from CGIAR donors to WARDA’s problems has been very favorable and he particularly mentioned the growing interest in WARDA of the World Bank. He proposed that the following actions should be taken: assess realistically what the member states can do
and then monitor closely their performance; call upon special project donors to be willing to align their priorities and those of WARDA, so that WARDA's management is able to respond to the Group's call for an integrated program; and consider the possibility that donors might include in their bilateral support financing for WARDA, activities such as training, and, possibly, member states' contributions to WARDA. Finally, a policy for future monitoring of WARDA needs to be established.

15. The members of the Group were pleased with the progress WARDA has made during the past months and they also agreed that some serious problems remain, such as the uncertainty of member states' contributions to WARDA. The Group agreed that the cooperative nature of the association should be preserved and this implies that member states meet their financial obligations. They voiced the need to select an executive secretary with the qualifications and calibre of a director general in the conventional CGIAR international center. WARDA's program should be based on an integrated budget, combined with the necessity that special project and restricted core donors contribute to WARDA's overhead costs. The Group indicated its support for WARDA and requested that both TAC and the CGIAR-secretariat monitor the association and keep them informed of future developments.

Financial Report - Agenda Item 8

16. Mr. Farrar referred to a paper analyzing the financial situation of the Group in 1984-1985-1986 which had been distributed earlier. In 1985, the average level of funding is at 96 percent of the bottom of the bracket figure which the Group approved (somewhat lower than was expected in November 1984). Five centers are funded below this average. Centers have lost some flexibility to adjust to lower levels of funding because in 1985 a fairly accurate adjustment for actual inflation has been made. Several donors have reacted to the shortage of funding by providing supplementary contributions to the amount they pledged in November 1984. The optimistic projection of total funding in 1986, for budgetary purposes, amounts to $190 million. Centers have been asked to base their 1986 proposals on the starting point of expected 1985 funding. It is TAC's intention to recommend a single budget level for 1986 rather than recommend a bracket of funding. The stabilization mechanism fund is operating reasonably well but cannot yet serve as a longer-term reserve for the system. The budget study has two aspects: a review of the budget system and the financial reporting, accounting systems and procedures to be followed by individual centers. The first aspect of the study will probably be sufficiently complete by October to allow implementation of a revised budget system in 1986 for the year 1987. Regarding the second aspect, the general principles which should be applied in these areas will be clear by October and additional work will be needed before the actual implementation can take place. The accumulated income of the special activities account amounted to $2.1 million compared with obligations of about $1.9 million. The annual report is expected to be available by September 1985 and will present comprehensive information about the CC system in 1984. A fund-raising unit, headed by Peter Greening, has been created and a tax exempt international fund for agricultural research has been established under U.S. law. The objectives of the unit are to make fund-raising efforts in the public sector more efficient through the sharing of information and to try to stimulate the creation of private support groups for the system. It was requested that the secretariat provide a paper on the work of the fund-raising unit at the next meeting of the Group.
TAC Training Study - Agenda Item 9

17. Dr. Hugh Bunting reported on the findings of the study that he and Professor Arajio conducted on behalf of TAC. Over 25,000 individuals participated in the various training activities of the centers; 18,000 at the centers and the balance through in-country training.

18. The TAC Chairman, in thanking Dr. Bunting for a comprehensive report, pointed out that the training study included, in addition to the main report, six country case studies. He mentioned the following three major recommendations of the report: donors should provide greater financial support for higher degree training; mechanisms should be found for the centers to utilize training components of bilaterally funded projects, related to agricultural research; and additional facilities for training should be provided to certain centers as mentioned in the report.

19. A lively, extended, and wide-ranging discussion resulted in which members of the Group made many comments and observations. In summing up, Dr. Bommer, chairman of the session, stressed the following points: (1) the thoroughness and insights of the study were recognized; (2) the beneficial effect of a joint meeting of the CGIAR centers' training officers was recognized, as was the value of a single training catalogue for the system; (3) the centers were encouraged to coordinate their activities within each country; (4) a development perspective should be introduced to a limited extent; and (5) the report should be published in some form and training should receive the attention of the Group again in the near future.

ICRISAT External Program and Management Reviews - Agenda Item 10

20. Dr. Carl Thompson, Chairman of the External Program Review panel, presented the major findings of the External Program Review for ICRISAT, stressing that the panel was unanimous in being greatly impressed by the competence and dedication of the ICRISAT staff and management, by its research results and achievements since the previous review, by its efficiency in the use of its facilities and by its success in involving research institutes of the industrialized world in research on problems of the semi-arid tropics. He highlighted a few of the recommendations, specifically those relating to germplasm enhancement, seed production, assessment of impact, strategic research, extension related activities, programs in Africa and farming systems research.

21. Mr. Luis Crouch, Chairman of the External Management Review panel, thanked ICRISAT for its excellent cooperation in the review. He indicated that the review was based on extensive interaction at all levels of the institute, including the top management. The panel held the opinion that ICRISAT's management has effectively attained the objectives assigned to the institute by the CGIAR.

22. Professor John Dillon, Chairman of ICRISAT's Board, responded on its behalf to both reviews, stressing the positive reaction of the Board to the reviews and indicated that a variety of steps had already been implemented to improve the two-way flow of communication. Consideration of various options relative to management structure, planning and personnel policies, is currently underway. As to ICRISAT's role in Africa, the Board is pleased to
note the support of the review teams and TAC for the strategy it has adopted in attempting to implement ICRISAT's Mandate in Africa. More resources, however, would be needed and any such resources would be more efficacious if they were unrestricted core. ICRISAT will hold a meeting for donors at the ICRISAT Sahelian Subcenter in Niamey, Niger during the first week of September this year.

23. Dr. Leslie Swindale thanked both teams and indicated that many of the recommendations had been found to be most helpful to the center's management and were being implemented. Some were still being carefully examined by ICRISAT for their long run management, program and financial implications. He especially thanked ICRISAT's host government for its continuing support.

24. A lively discussion, with wide participation by Group members followed. The following points were made during the course of that discussion. ICRISAT should ensure that it is devoting an appropriate amount of its core resources to research activities that are targeted at solving production problems in the semi-arid tropics of Africa. Many members believe this would require a shift in use of core resources in Africa. Dr. Swindale pointed out that in the preceding 4 years, ICRISAT had increased the core resources it used in Africa from $0.4 million to $4.0 million, and believed it would be difficult to effect further transfers without weakening the program severely. The relationship between the economics and farming systems programs should be strengthened, with economics having a greater role in evaluating potential technological options, whether developed within the farming systems program or not. A question was raised about links to private seed producers; the reply indicated that ICRISAT makes germplasm available on an equal basis to all seed producers, private and public. The recommendation of the panel regarding the need to shift out of producing finished varieties for India was noted. The point was made that the institute should take the greatest care to ensure that all potential client countries have free access to training opportunities and germplasm, regardless of political differences with ICRISAT's host country. The expressed desire of countries of the semi-arid tropics, as a whole, to have a greater influence in the institute's decisions on research priorities was commended to the management. TAC, was requested in its transmission letter, to identify more clearly the main issues arising from a review and to give their views and recommendations on what the Group should do to resolve such issues.

25. In summing up the discussion, the Chairman made the following points. The Group generally favored a transfer of core resources from the headquarters in India to Africa. There was need for greater administrative autonomy for the Sahelian Center, but it should be achieved without losing close contacts between program staff at the Sahelian Center and headquarters. The need for a sorghum research location in West Africa should be considered. ICRISAT needs to continue producing finished varieties for those countries in Africa which are not yet able to do so, but it should gradually, on a planned schedule, pull back from delivering final varieties in India and other countries that can do so for themselves. Research in the farming systems and economics programs should be more closely interrelated, especially in the assessment of technologies produced by the crop improvement program. The boards and directors general are the keys to effective management of the centers and the TAC and CGIAR must continue to hold those
bodies responsible for performance and implementation of the Group's recommendations. It was agreed that centers should report on their implementation of review recommendations when making presentations to the Group.

IBPGR External Review - Agenda Item 11

26. Dr. Maxwell Day introduced the report of the external review panel, covering the main points:

- While molecular biology may in time reduce the importance of collecting and preserving genetic materials, that is far in the future. For the present the work of the IBPGR in preserving the genetic variability of plant resources is critical for plant breeding and food production in the years to come;

- The mandate of IBPGR as modified by the panel and again by TAC gives IBPGR a wide responsibility, but one focussed on the essential features necessary to ensure that tomorrow's plant breeders will still have available the genetic material they need;

- The main policy recommendation is that the IBPGR should give a more scientific basis to its work. It needs a mission oriented tactical research capacity, and a sufficient knowledge base on the staff to manage an expanded contract and grant research program;

- The IBPGR has done valuable work since its inception ten years previously. The statistics of cultivars collected and stored may be misleading, however, when the unsatisfactory conditions in many gene banks are considered;

- Its accomplishments notwithstanding, the IBPGR does face a number of management problems. Its Board should act more like a board of trustees rather than a program committee, and the panel recommended a number of steps in this direction;

- The principal problem was that the executive secretary was asked to serve two masters, one a large and powerful organization, and the other a small organization specifically designed to avoid the problems of a bureaucracy;

- The IBPGR staff were all FAO employees and subject to its regulations, with the result, for example, that merit promotion within the IBPGR secretariat was impossible;

- The panel recommended the appointment by the CGIAR of a task force to go more deeply into the management issues and how they could be resolved. The task force should explore the extent to which the FAO could provide more appropriate conditions within which the management problems identified by the panel could be overcome. If conditions could not be changed to permit the IBPGR to operate as an autonomous unit, the panel suggested that it be moved outside of the FAO.
27. The chairman of TAC, Professor Camus, said that TAC had not been able to reach final conclusions on the basis of the panel's report. Instead, TAC had appointed a subcommittee of three members who had been charged to define the types of contribution that IBPGR should make in research, analyze ways in which that effort could be conducted efficiently and integrated with other IBPGR activities so as to enhance those aspects of collaboration with FAO that have been fruitful in the past, and to explore possibilities for overcoming the current constraints under which IBPGR is operating. The TAC would receive the report of the subcommittee at its meeting in June and report further to the Group at International Centers Week.

28. The chairman of the IBPGR, Dr. Kahre, expressed agreement with the recommendations of the panel and the intention of the IBPGR to implement them. A program committee had been established and was beginning to define research activities. The Board agreed that first class scientific staff was needed, but proposed to achieve its research objectives mainly by contracts with centers of excellence. He called attention to the inability of the IBPGR under present circumstances to exercise its full responsibilities as a board. The Board supported the idea that its staff should be established in a scientific environment. As an autonomous center, the IBPGR would continue to cooperate with the FAO and other organizations involved in genetic resource work. The board urged formation of a task force as proposed by the review panel, and promised its full cooperation. The executive secretary of the IBPGR, Trevor Williams who was recently appointed as an honorary professor, distributed diagrams showing the integrated program of the IBPGR. He said that in 1985 about 45 percent of the budget was allocated for field operations, and up to 30 percent for strategic research. The proposed changes would require eight to ten senior scientists in appropriate disciplines, most of whom would be recruited from outside, but the Board felt that phasing over a number of years would enable this to be done without markedly increasing the total number of professional staff. Costs would rise because of marginal increases in salaries for senior staff and the need to pay for accommodation and services.

29. Dr. Bommer then presented a full statement of FAO's views of the panel report. Since this material, (Pages 216 to 220 of the verbatim of the Tokyo meeting), unlike the views of TAC, the panel and the IBPGR, is not elsewhere available, it is attached in full as Appendix IV. Dr. Bommer reviewed in detail the history of the relationship between the two entities, to illustrate that the Board was established on the ground prepared by FAO and has made full use of FAO programs, facilities and name. Even though it is an autonomous body, the IBPGR de facto implements a part of the FAO's program. The model chosen initially was not for a body to do research, but rather to promote action. FAO considers this concept still applicable, and advises against making the IBPGR a full fledged center on conceptual and practical grounds. As conveyed earlier to the TAC, the FAO disagreed with the panel on two major recommendations, namely the involvement in research, and the IBPGR role in evaluation of plant genetic resources. These would mean drastic change, with many implications financial and otherwise. In its management recommendations, the FAO thought the panel was too much influenced by the center model, and was unable to see the value of a CGIAR activity differently conceived. On the specific management issues, the FAO saw no possibility of making additional office space available in the near future. Every effort
had been made to provide wide flexibility in the operation of the secretariat. Nevertheless it should be understood that the FAO could not grant exceptional privileges to part of its staff for which the director general has overall responsibility. Dr. Bommer welcomed the approach taken by the panel to the role of the commission recently created within FAO. The commission had referred favorably several times in its first report to the IBPGR and had recommended that the relationship between the FAO and the IBPGR should be reviewed, with particular attention to the formal and working relationships and the avoidance of duplication and overlap. He concluded that the FAO was prepared to give full support to the IBPGR under the present cooperative arrangements and would regret a unilateral move by the CGIAR to change the functions of the IBPGR from a promotional/catalytic role to that of an international research center.

30. The chairman invited comment, after observing that this was a sensitive issue, that attention should be paid to the substantive role of the organization we wished to support. He suggested that since TAC had not completed its work, this discussion might be considered guidance to TAC in its further deliberations. The discussion that followed reflected agreement on the complexity and sensitivity of the issue of plant genes. Several delegates said they did not have enough time to absorb the report and obtain expert advice on it. The Group should regard this first discussion as preliminary and consider the matter finally at centers week. Several commented that the commission will handle political and policy issues, and promote awareness of the question. It was generally welcomed in this role, and its relationships with the IBPGR were viewed positively throughout the discussion.

31. There was a broad consensus among those who spoke that the technical basis for genetic conservation programs was weak, and that more research was needed. The IBPGR work in this field, however, should be done through a grant and contract program, perhaps on the model of the tropical disease research activities of the WHO, and not by direct participation of IBPGR staff in research. A strong scientific staff would be required, but there was no agreement on its size. The IBPGR should become a technical center in this area, which it is not at present. Several delegates called for flexibility, particularly by the FAO, to make it possible for the present relationship to continue on an improved basis. Some made a flat statement that they did not agree that IBPGR should leave FAO. Others believed that it was critical for the IBPGR to be organised with the full range of authorities and capacities of a research center like the others, even though this would mean independent status. Among the points stressed were control over scientific policy, finances, appointment, promotion and compensation of staff and clear responsibility to the Group and no one else. It seemed possible that cooperation with the FAO would be strengthened by a clearly independent status. Others feared that competition and overlapping functions would result from having the IBPGR become independent. One donor suggested that consideration be given to finding another home for some of the research functions proposed, leaving other policy or action oriented work at the FAO under improved management conditions.

32. While some delegates spoke in favor of taking no action until after the TAC report was considered at centers week, a much larger number spoke in favor of the creation of a task force or committee so that the matter could be moved forward more quickly. There was considerable concern that TAC
might otherwise get into political and organizational areas beyond its usual role. At the same time, several speakers called upon TAC to respond clearly on the technical aspects of the panel report, which had significant organizational implications. Concern was expressed by one speaker over administrative measures taken by the FAO with regard to the contracts of IBPGR staff, who were all now on a very short-term basis. Dr. Bommer said that this was a normal procedure given the uncertainty about the future. He assured the Group that there was a flexible attitude on the part of FAO management, and that adjustments would be made in accordance with the needs of the work, as these could be foreseen. Financial issues were discussed rather lightly. One donor said it was prepared to assume its share of increased costs if the IBPGR became independent.

33. In summarizing the discussion, the chairman said there was great appreciation for the work done by the panel and the accomplishments of the IBPGR. The TAC should consider the best means of the IBPGR conducting increased research. There was unease about the problems of an autonomous organization actually located within a larger organization. It was probably set up this way to enable the IBPGR to benefit from the broader mandate, facilities and political context of the FAO. He would appoint a committee to make detailed recommendations to the Group at centers week, based on an objective analysis of the complex issues involved, and on the recommendations of TAC. The committee would be small, to make it efficient, but also representative of the opinions expressed in the Group on this issue. This committee, announced at a later session, consists of the following individuals: Dr. Amir Muhammad, Dr. N. C. Brady, M. Louis Caudron, Dr. J. Hardon, and Mr. R. C. Hills, with Mr. Husain serving as chairman.

Other Business - Agenda Item 12

34. The Chairman proposed that the Group approve a recommendation of the Cosponsors that TAC be expanded by two members — a decision that could be reversed if the Group decided at any time that the workload so warranted. The Group approved.

Future Meetings - Agenda Item 13

35. The Group approved the dates of meetings in 1985, 1986 and 1987 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>ICW</td>
<td>October 28-November 1, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Mid-year ICW</td>
<td>May 21-23, Ottawa, Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November 3-7, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Mid-Year ICW</td>
<td>May 20-22, Paris, France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October 26-30, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mid-Year ICW</td>
<td>May 23-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October 24-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ These are the dates of the business meeting of the Group only; the mid-term meeting will, in fact, begin on May 19 with a scientific presentation by the Government of Canada.
36. A member of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany mentioned the possibility of holding the 1988 Mid-Year meeting in either Bonn or Berlin.

37. The Group discussed the format of both the Impact Study and the Priorities Paper and the need to postpone the presentation of the usual plenary session by the international centers because of the very full agenda. The donors agreed that they would plan for a follow-up discussion on the strategic issues study at Ottawa and that there should not be a total absence of presentations by the centers at ICW 1985.
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The Parliamentary Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan
Opening Remarks (verbatim)

MRS. MAYUMI MORIYAMA: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary General, ladies and gentlemen: It is a great pleasure for me to express a cordial welcome on behalf of the Government of Japan to all the delegates of the CGIAR donors meeting. We are highly honored to hold this meeting in Japan following the Paris meeting in 1983 and the Rome meeting in 1984.

First of all I would like to thank Mr. Husain, Chairman of the CGIAR, and all the staff of its Secretariat for their efforts in the preparation of this important meeting.

The important role which has been played by the CGIAR is now being recognized and highly appreciated in the international community, and a great expectation is being entertained of the group in Japan, as well.

The Agriculture Research Institutes under the CGIAR, cooperating and coordinating with each other in their research activities, have been enlarging the fields of their activities and enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of their research. While it started with four member Institutes and financial resources of $20 million, the CGIAR has now become a large and significant group joined by the 13 member Institutes and financed by the amount of $170 million. Such a remarkable development of the Group has been realized through great efforts by Mr. Husain and his staff, as well as the consistent support from the donor countries and organizations concerned.

Japan had been making a contribution only to IRRI until 1975, but now its contribution is being extended to 10 Research Institutes with a total amount of more than $10 million a year.

In view of the high priority of agricultural development in the economic and social development of the developing countries, and the crucial role of agriculture research in agricultural development, the significance of the CGIAR activities will be further increased in the future.

I wish to reaffirm on behalf of my Government that the Government of Japan will continue to make best efforts to expand its assistance to the CGIAR. I would like to point out, however, that the CGIAR is strongly required to further enhance their efficiency and effectiveness of activities, especially under the current budgetary constraints faced by the donor countries.
In this regard it would seem to be significant to have a review of the activities of CGIAR Institutes, which is scheduled to be carried out at today's meeting. I sincerely hope that in this review coordinated ways and means will be sought for efficient and effective research activities through close contact and cooperation among the Institutes.

I think it is also important that the CGIAR play an important role in the current need to solve the agricultural problems of the developing countries. It can be said that the development of agriculture in Africa is one of the primary concerns of the international community. You may recall that this problem was discussed at the last Economic Summit Meeting in Bonn and in the Bonn Economic Declaration. In Japan, too, this issue has become a matter of deep concern for the people.

The CGIAR has a glorious history showing a great number of significant achievements such as the "Green Revolution" in Asia promoted by IRRI and CIMMYT to change the food situation in Asia. I think it is now time for the CGIAR to contribute further to the solution of the agricultural development program in Africa by applying its accumulated know-how and experience. It is my sincere hope that the CGIAR Institutes, together with other research institutes, will further promote and develop their research activities with a view to contributing to agricultural development in Africa.

In closing I would like to express my sincere hope that there will be fruitful discussions and an exchange of views at this meeting, and that the CGIAR and its member Institutes will further contribute to the development of agricultural research activities in the world.

Thank you.
Chairman's Opening Remarks (verbatim)

THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

The Parliamentary Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mrs. Moriyama will be arriving in about half an hour to address this meeting on behalf of the Government of Japan. Mrs. Moriyama is unable to be here now because of a prior commitment at the Japanese Parliament. We have agreed, therefore, that, given our rather full agenda, I shall open the meeting prior to her arrival.

I could not be more grateful to the Japanese Government for hosting this meeting in Tokyo and I particularly want to thank the Government of Japan for making it possible for us to hold the Biotechnology Seminar and for organizing a visit to Tsukuba yesterday. We in the CGIAR have been privileged in the last two days to have a compressed, but extensive and in-depth, view of the latest advances in agricultural science in Japan. We are immensely grateful and have learnt a great deal from this exchange. I am hopeful that this will simply be the beginning of a more intensive dialogue on matters of common interest with a country from which the CG system has a lot to learn.

As I mentioned last November, I intend to see that the issues of science and technology are brought before the Group at its meeting as a matter of course. The Biotechnology Seminar falls into that category and I hope will be an accepted pattern for the system. At the International Centers Week later this year we shall be holding the first Sir John Crawford Memorial Lecture. We shall be advising you later in the year of the details but I do now want to thank the Government of Australia for helping to make the lecture a reality.

At this meeting we shall see further evidence of the financial constraints under which the system is currently operating. Therefore, we must establish clear priorities for our activities so as to make the best possible use of the funds available to us. This does not mean that we should not urge the donor community to continue to contribute and to increase its contribution to the system, but to do that we must convince them that we are
making the best possible use of their funds. During this meeting Professor Camus will be providing us with a detailed overview of the priority of study. Professor Camus's presentation at this meeting is only a precursor to a full day's presentation and discussion of the Group at the International Centers Week and I am hopeful that the TAC priority study will provide the Group with an opportunity to take stock of the past, cast a visionary glance at the future, and guide us towards a change in course when our technical advisers find the cause to do so.

When we discuss priorities we are dealing with the essential role of the CG system in fulfilling its mandate of increasing food production in the developing countries. In reviewing the role of the CG system we must also assess the capacity of the national research systems of developing countries to complement the work of our system. At International Centers Week in November we shall have some measure of the system's influence on potential beneficiaries when we discuss the impact study. However, there is an issue that could fall between the terms of reference of both the priorities and impact studies and that is the demarcation line between the work of the centers and the work of the national research institutes. It would be a natural tendency for the international centers to take on activities simply because they are beyond the capacity of the institutions to which they must transfer the reserves of their research. The negative effect of such tendencies is to overburden the international centers with downstream activities to the possible detriment of the upstream activities and to provide the national systems with disincentives to undertake essential tasks that they should be doing.

In this context I want to urge the boards of trustees of the international centers to shoulder the ongoing responsibilities of monitoring the mandates of their centers. A profusion of activities seldom leads to the significant advances that can be achieved on a clearly defined front. Once the priorities and impact studies are available the boards will play an effective role in keeping the centers on a carefully defined course. Obviously the success of the system depends on its ability to change course where necessary, to recognize the need to absorb new technologies and to take account of new needs. We are, and must continue to be, a dynamic evolutionary system. In this context I believe we could all be impressed at the degree to which many of the centers have absorbed selected applications of biotechnology in their regular work programs. However, we must also learn to prune our activities down to those for which the centers have a clear comparative advantage. Given our financial and management constraints and the challenges of maintaining levels of excellence in the activities undertaken by the international centers, it is essential that whenever we undertake a new task we ask ourselves what activity we can drop and what activity we can train others to do.
Most of you will already know that ISNAR now has a new Director General, someone who is well-known to everybody here, Alexander von der Osten. I would like to congratulate him on behalf of all of us. I would also ask him in the context of the comments I have just made to begin to think carefully about ways in which ISNAR can help to strengthen national institutions, particularly in Africa, so that they become full partners with the international centers in helping to increase food production in their own countries. For complex and often very understandable reasons, national institutions are at their weakest in Africa. In an attempt to focus the attention of the CG centers on this problem, I met with the Center Directors in January to discuss a strategy for the CG systems in Africa. Partly as a result of that meeting, but also in the context of the World Bank's ongoing efforts to create a favorable climate for development in Africa, I have organized, as a Vice President of the Bank, a meeting of traditional donors to agricultural research activities in Africa on the afternoon of June 14, that is following our CG meeting here. I have deliberately restricted the numbers to traditional donors since the prime subject of discussion will be coordination of assistance to agricultural research. As you see, I am not only urging the international centers to rationalize their activities but I am simultaneously exploring with the donor community ways in which priorities can be established and overlap avoided.

At the CG meeting proper we shall also be concentrating on Africa, when we consider both WARDA and the reviews of ICRISAT. You will all recall that, with immense regret, we decided at International Centers Week to suspend approval of WARDA's 1985 budget. Subsequently, I am happy to report that certain improvements have taken place and to a sufficient degree to warrant our recommending that the donors release funds for WARDA's 1985 operations. Despite its acceptance of a reduced budget, the Governing Council of WARDA, however, has been forced to request donors to provide emergency assistance because the center is running out of funds to finance its ongoing operations. The Group will be reviewing a series of documents that analyze WARDA's current situation. However, it is essential that we find a way to help WARDA establish itself on a sound financial footing and with a carefully defined program of operations for the future. At a time when we are focusing on national programs in Africa and on more effective donor aid to these institutions, it is unacceptable that one of our own centers be unable to contribute effectively to African research. WARDA's difficulties have already absorbed a considerable amount of our time. I sincerely hope that at this meeting we can be assured that WARDA's problems are temporary and that, if the short-term financial crisis is resolved, WARDA will be as effective a member of the CGIAR as any of the other centers.

The ICRISAT Program and Management reviews deal quite extensively with the center's involvement in Africa, and I look forward to listening to the Group's reactions to the recommendations.
The other center where we will be considering external reviews is IBPGR. Here we are dealing with a matter of extraordinary importance to the system and the world at large - the conservation of the germplasm resources of Third World countries. We shall also be required to involve ourselves in the complexities of the institutional framework in which the IBPGR can most efficiently carry out its mandate.

We have allocated some two hours of our agenda to a discussion of training in the system based on a comprehensive study carried out by Dr. Bunting and his associates. Training represents one of the system's obligations to its clients in the developing world.

While we should be looking at our obligations to the developing countries, I also believe that several of these countries should assume the obligations of membership of the CGIAR. Particularly in East Asia, the distinction between developed and developing countries is becoming less sharp. I would like very soon to see a number of countries like Korea, Thailand and Indonesia amongst our membership.

In all our deliberations we should bear in mind that however successful the CG system has been in the past, serious challenges still remain for the future. It is true that agricultural productivity has been increased for a number of crops, but the challenge still remains for the CG system to institutionalize those increases in productivity. After all, the increased levels of food supply is still only able to sustain large masses of the population at relatively low levels of nutrition. A major challenge for the system also is to increase food production in the more difficult ecological zones of the world.

We shall not be discussing the Third Review of the system here in Tokyo. We shall discuss the need for this review after our deliberations on the Impact and Priority studies.

In conclusion, I want to encourage all of you to participate in our discussions. I hope that these meetings will stimulate all of us to express our opinions on the subjects before us. The health of the system depends on the interaction of its members and on the free and frank expression of views between the several components of the system.

Thank you.
MR DIETER F. BOMMER (FAO):

1. FAO has recognized for many years the importance of conserving plant genetic resources. It organized a first International Technical Meeting on Plant Exploration and Introduction in Rome in July 1961. One of the recommendations of this meeting was to constitute a Panel of Experts to assist and advise the Director-General on new lines of action to deal with the problem, and to expand the exchange of information, and of plant material, between countries and scientific institutions. The FAO Panel of Experts on Plant Exploration and Introduction was officially established in 1965. Later, decisions led to the establishment of a Panel of Experts on Forest Gene Resources in 1968.

2. Two further international technical Conferences on Crop Genetic Resources, held in Rome in 1967 and 1973, led inter alia to a recommendation that a global network of crop genetic centres be established. Although both funds and manpower restricted the extent to which the recommendations of the Conferences and of the FAO Panel of Experts on Plant Exploration and Introduction could be implemented, the initiative of FAO had several valuable results.

3. When FAO established a Crop Ecology and Genetic Resources Unit in 1968, a plan of action was formulated to collect, conserve and document genetic resources. This plan was submitted to UNDP but it failed to receive full support because it was considered to be too ambitious and of a too long duration. However, FAO continued to emphasize the urgent need to collect and conserve major crop genetic resources which were threatened with extinction. This was also reflected in one of the recommendations of the UN Conference on the Human Environment held at Stockholm in 1972, which — among others — gave FAO full responsibility to assist in the establishment of an International Genetic Resources Programme.

4. Consequently, FAO submitted a proposal to establish a network of genetic resources centres to the 2nd meeting of the TAC of the CGIAR in October 1971. TAC decided to convene an ad hoc Working Party of leading scientists to prepare an Action Programme for the collection, evaluation and conservation of genetic resources for future use. This Working Party met at Beltsville, Maryland, USA. The Beltsville Group proposed the creation, for a period of five years, of a network of genetic resources centres. These plans were further reviewed by the TAC and CGIAR and led, at the end, to the establishment of the IBPGR.

5. Before this, various organizational issues required solving, in particular the question whether the Board should be charged with overall supervision of the genetic resources programme and be an integral part of FAO, reporting to the FAO Governing Bodies, or be an independent entity within the CGIAR frame, but with very close links with FAO. There was a general agreement on the following approach:
(1) IBPGR should be created as an independent entity, reporting to the CGIAR through TAC, and receiving funds through the CGIAR System;

(ii) The Headquarters of the Board should be at FAO HQs with FAO providing the Secretariat, and having a permanent non-voting seat on the Board;

(iii) A central fund should be created to finance the expenses of the Board, this to be administered by FAO as a Trust Fund without charge, at least for the first 5 years.

6. The first meeting of the Board took place in June 1974. In order to ensure consistency between the Board's programme and FAO's own genetic resources work, the Chief of the FAO Crop Ecology and Genetic Resources Unit was designated to serve, concurrently, as Secretary of the IBPGR.

7. By Letter of Agreement between FAO and the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the U.K., the donors concerned agreed to make funds available "for the purpose of creating a Central Fund to finance the activities of the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources".

8. The purpose of the Fund is described as: "...to finance activities in plant genetic resources, including exploration, conservation, classification and documentation, utilization and training; and to provide secretarial services to the Board".

9. It was also noted that: "The Agreement shall remain in effect for a period of one year unless terminated sooner by FAO or the International Board notice in writing given to the other, of not less than 30 days in advance of the effective date of termination. Upon mutual agreement of both FAO and the International Board, the effective period of the Agreement may be extended". Such an extension has not been agreed upon formally.

10. For the benefit of the effective functioning of the Board, the FAO Panel of Experts on Plant Exploration and Introduction was discontinued.

11. My emphasis on the background is to better illustrate the very specific relationship between IBPGR and FAO. It is much more than an arrangement of convenience and provision of various facilities and services. The Board, in fact, was established on the solid ground prepared by FAO and continued to discharge its duties making full use of FAO programmes, facilities and name.

12. The IBPGR de facto implements a part of FAO's programme even though it is an autonomous scientific body supported by the CGIAR. Therefore, FAO's support to IBPGR's programme appears in FAO's Programme of Work and Budget under Sub-Programme 2.1.2.1. - Plant
Genetic Resources - and in the Reviews of the Regular Programme presented to the FAO Conference. Similarly, IBPGR's activities undertaken in various countries come under the aegis of FAO. In consequence, criticism against the IBPGR also affects FAO.

13. During the last decade the IBPGR, in association with FAO, furthered the cause of plant genetic resources and their conservation. The success of the Board is a source of satisfaction to FAO. The operational model chosen for the work of the IBPGR was deliberately different from that of the IARC model. The need was perceived not for a centre to conduct research but rather for a body to promote actions, create awareness and catalyze efforts in all aspects of plant genetic resources. The benefits of associating such a body with an organization with wide responsibilities, activities and authority became immediately obvious.

14. FAO feels that this concept is still valid and is prepared to continue its support to IBPGR on the basis of the prevailing arrangements and as long as its work and programmes are compatible with those of the Organization. The Consultative Group obviously has to decide for itself whether such concept and arrangements are valid ones or an alternative is needed. The main premise in the Review Panel's Report, if one reads it carefully, is the need to convert the IBPGR into a fully fledged centre modelled on other CC centres. FAO as co-sponsor of the system will advise against this move, not only on the grounds that this is going to add to the cost of running the system, but mainly on conceptual and practical considerations.

15. In fact, we would have liked to see the Panel examine the possibility of phasing out some of the Board's activities so as to free resources for new ones. This could possibly lead to a leaner IBPGR with greater flexibility in pursuing its goals. The area of information, for example, is likely to receive much attention from FAO and its Commission on Plant Genetic Resources. Therefore, the Board could possibly shift resources towards other areas. Likewise, some of the work on major crops could be handled directly by certain IARCs.

16. New and important developments took place in 1983 resulting in the adoption of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources and the establishment of the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources. Increased emphasis is being placed by the international community on the important role of national authorities in the conservation of plant genetic resources and their proper use in crop improvement programmes.

17. We find the Panel's views on these developments both thoughtful and very constructive. We are particularly pleased that the Panel saw both the Undertaking and the Commission as a means of strengthening the commitment to the cause of plant genetic resources and their free exchange and that the IBPGR and its cause stand to benefit from all this. This, indeed, is the very point which the Director-General of FAO conveyed on several occasions when assuring that the integrity and the work of the IBPGR will be further enhanced as a result of the Undertaking and of the Commission.
18. In its first session, the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources has already identified major areas of work for the years to come. This undoubtedly will require increased efforts and additional resources. There is much to be done in enhancing the developing countries' capabilities in the area of genetic resources and plant breeding. In this respect, we are looking forward to fruitful cooperation between FAO and IBPGR.

19. Turning now specifically to the Programme and Management Review of IBPGR in front of us, we would have liked to discuss the report in its entirety and after TAC had concluded its deliberations on the subject. TAC is still to look into the main recommendation of the Panel dealing with the issues of research and a Sub-Committee was established to deal with this matter.

20. FAO's preliminary comments on the Report of the Second External Programme and Management Review of the IBPGR were conveyed to TAC at its 36th Meeting held in Rome from 11 to 18 March 1985. These need not be repeated here except to emphasize that FAO's views were at variance with those of the Panel concerning two major recommendations. These relate to the IBPGR involvement in research and its role in plant genetic resources evaluation. The implementation of these recommendations would lead, in FAO's views, to a drastic change in the nature and character of the "Board" with many implications, financial and otherwise, for the Board and the CGIAR as a whole.

21. In the section dealing with management issues, the Panel dealt with the advantages, and in much greater detail, with the disadvantages of the IBPGR being associated with FAO. While some of the difficulties are real, they have not, in our view, affected to any serious extent the work and the performance of the IBPGR. The achievements of the Board were rated by the Panel itself as being outstanding. The Panel finds the IBPGR to be a "very industrious, productive organization that has grown rapidly over the past decade." It further adds that the IBPGR has "accomplished a great deal in its various programmes and has much cause for pride in its achievements."

22. It must be frankly stated that the Panel looked rather narrowly at the management issues and in isolation from the wider issues and implications. It was very much influenced by the "Centre" model and could not see an activity of the CGIAR without all the trappings of a fully fledged centre with all titles and privileges.

23. The Secretariat of IBPGR has grown over the last 10 years from a group of 4 Professionals and 3 General Service staff to 8 Professionals and 7 General Service staff located at FAO Headquarters and an outposted staffing of 17 Professionals and 9 General Service staff. FAO is operating under severe limitations in accommodation at FAO Headquarters, a matter which is since long under consideration by its host Government and FAO's Governing Bodies. As there is no easy solution in view, it will not be possible to make additional office space available for the IBPGR in the near future.
24. The Review Panel emphasized the restrictions placed upon staff working in the IBPGR as a result of FAO's rules and regulations, as all staff members are FAO employees. It would not be necessary here to discuss each issue raised individually. However, we would like to emphasize that every effort has been made to provide wide flexibility to the operation of the Secretariat. The Secretariat conducts its routine, day-to-day business with no interference by FAO, and there are no restrictions on its reporting to the Board on all the IBPGR's operational and policy matters. Nevertheless, it must be understood that FAO cannot grant exceptional privileges to part of its staff for which the Director-General has overall responsibility.

25. The Sub-Committee of the TAC was briefed on FAO's views on some of the issues related to management and these will no doubt be conveyed to the Group by TAC in the context of its further deliberations in October, particularly as it relates to the Committee's views on the research component of the work of the IBPGR.

26. The Inter-Governmental Commission on Plant Genetic Resources has clearly defined the various activities to be undertaken in the near future and we are convinced of the complementarity of the work of both FAO and IBPGR in carrying out this programme of work. In its deliberations the Commission has referred several times favourably to the IBPGR.

27. The Commission agreed that "the special relationship of FAO and the IBPGR provided a basis for the Commission to consider the activities of IBPGR in relation to FAO's responsibilities and activities. In this regard, the Commission noted that the relationship between FAO and the IBPGR has been established in a letter of agreement signed in 1974 and implicitly renewed since then. The Commission recommended that the agreement be reviewed by the parties concerned and, if necessary, appropriate changes be incorporated to take fully into account the implementation of the Undertaking and the establishment of the Commission. In this process, the Commission urged that FAO and the bodies involved give particular attention to the formal and working relationships between FAO and IBPGR and the role which IBPGR could play in implementing the Undertaking and the manner in which any duplication and overlap with FAO's activities could be avoided."

28. In conclusion, I would like to reiterate here that FAO views positively the long association with the IBPGR. It is our belief that the IBPGR has benefitted greatly from this relationship. FAO is ready to give its full support to the IBPGR and its cause under the present cooperative arrangements which have enabled the Board to successfully operate for 10 years. Should the Board want to change its basic functions from a promotional/catalytic role into that of an international research centre, and thus decide that it requires other facilities than those offered by FAO, this unilateral move will be very much regretted by the Organization. We are convinced that the activities which were launched by FAO in the 60s and strengthened in an association of FAO with IBPGR over the last ten years should continue to prosper in the close cooperative relationship which has been established between the Board and FAO.