Consultative Group Meeting  
November 11-13, 1981

MAIN CONCLUSIONS REACHED AND DECISIONS TAKEN

1. The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research held its regular yearly meeting (International Centers Week) on November 9-13, 1981. During the first two days -- the Plenary Session -- the international agricultural research centers and other programs supported by the Group made presentations on their programs and activities. The next three days were devoted to a business meeting of the Consultative Group, the annotated agenda of which is attached as the Annex. This paper sets out the main conclusions reached and decisions taken at the Consultative Group meeting on November 11-13. An Informal Summary of Proceedings of Centers Week has been drafted and will be circulated for comment to participants in the meeting. Early in 1982 it will be issued to them in final form and will be available to others on request.

2. The Chairman noted that the Group had been in existence just over ten years. To mark this anniversary, Mr. David Bell gave members an account of the circumstances leading to the establishment of the Group.

Second Review of the CGIAR System - Discussion in Open Session

3. During 1981, there was a five-year review of the CGIAR conducted by a Study Team reporting to a special Review Committee. The Review Committee had presented its Report to the Group for consideration at this meeting. In view of the importance of the Review to the future of the Group, a large part of the meeting was devoted to it. It was discussed first in open session, when individuals associated with all parts of the system were free to participate. It was not the intention to change the Report, but for participants to express views from which the members of the Group would make decisions during the meeting later in the week as to the extent to which they endorsed the Report's recommendations.
4. Spokesmen for the Center Chairmen and the Center Directors reported their collective views, which in general tended to support the recommendations and to agree with the general philosophy of minimum essential change. The Center Directors felt that there should be a stronger involvement of donors in the decision-making process, particularly in relation to centers' programs and budgets. A number of proposals were made for improvements to existing procedures, without involving any changes in structure.

TAC Chairman's Report on the 25th and 26th Meetings of TAC

5. Dr. Cummings described the way in which TAC's role in the analysis of center programs and budgets had evolved and its effectiveness improved. The 26th meeting, at IITA, had included the most thorough budget review so far, and had provided for excellent interaction between TAC and the Center Directors.

6. Other matters touched on by Dr. Cummings included: TAC's consideration of its own role; the Quinquennial Review process, and the schedule of such reviews currently in prospect; Stripe Reviews already completed; TAC's study of plant nutrition; plant breeders' rights; TAC's study of research on pests and diseases; centers' long-range plans; progress on the proposal for an initiative on water management; cross-center study of work on upland rice.

7. At the conclusion of Dr. Cummings' remarks, the Group was informed of the procedures proposed by the Cosponsors for finding a successor on Dr. Cummings' retirement in 1982.

Progress Report on Water Management Proposal

8. The Group had repeatedly emphasized the great importance of research and training in water management. Members were given a progress report on the status of deliberations on the matter. A meeting of interested donors, chaired by Dr. Cunningham, took place in July 1981, as a result of which a study had been commissioned from consultants. TAC would consider the study at its meeting in March 1982, and the Group would consider it in May. The study was being directed by a steering committee chaired by Dr. Treitz.


9. The annual "Integrative Report", prepared by the CGIAR Secretariat, fell as usual into two distinct sections. This year the first dealt with matters of broad scientific interest -- nitrogen fixation with microorganisms, beneficial root fungi, tissue culture and genetic engineering, and the problems of marginal lands.

10. The second part of the Report dealt primarily with the financial affairs of the Group, in particular the Five-Year Indicative Financial Plan, 1983-87, which had been recommended by the Review Committee. This plan envisaged total core expenditures growing from $187 million in 1983, to
$204 million in 1987, both expressed in constant 1982 dollars. Members accepted the principles on which the plan was based but felt that the financial base of the plan should be revised in the light of the current constraints on the availability of funding. The Secretariat was requested to prepare a revision for future consideration by the Group.

Approval of 1982 Programs and Budgets

11. Despite concern from a number of members that the amounts requested would not be forthcoming, the Group conditionally approved core budgets for each center for 1982, subject to funds being available, in the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Gross Requirements ($'000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>19,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMMYT</td>
<td>23,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>10,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBPGR</td>
<td>3,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICARDA</td>
<td>17,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRISAT</td>
<td>17,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI</td>
<td>3,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>19,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILCA</td>
<td>11,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILEAD</td>
<td>10,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRI</td>
<td>22,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISNAR</td>
<td>3,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDA</td>
<td>3,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

166,842

Donor Indications of Financial Support for 1982 and Beyond

12. A number of donors were either unable to be present, or unable yet to give a firm pledge. Subject, in many cases, to approval by authorities, the following indications were given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1982 Core Contributions 1/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (provisional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Republic of Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (provisional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (approximate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ In some cases, confirmed figures differ slightly from verbal pledges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Contribution in US$ (approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>US$ 1,200,000 (equivalent in various currencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Nkr 11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>SKr 18,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>SFr 5,256,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>25% of the total to a maximum of $41,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>ECU 4,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>US$ 8,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRD</td>
<td>Up to 10% of requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD (approximate)</td>
<td>US$ 7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>US$ 5,220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>US$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC (approximate)</td>
<td>Can$ 1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>US$ 800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above information, and other estimates given to, or made by, the Secretariat, total core contributions for 1982 were expected to be in the range of $154.5 million to $157 million, depending on a number of unknown factors, including movements in exchange rates. Hence, available funds would be likely to be 5% to 6% below the total of center budgets at the reduced level recommended by TAC, and approved conditionally by the Group. This would call for another round of selective budget cuts, which would take place at the March meeting of TAC.

Second Review of the CGIAR System - Discussion by CGIAR Members

13. During its business meeting, the Group again considered the Review Report. Its decisions will be recorded in an introduction to the final version of the Review Committee's Report. The general thrust of the Report was endorsed and most recommendations were accepted. The main exception was the proposal to establish a Budget Review Committee, which the Group did not favor. It opted instead to continue the evolving process of budget review conducted by TAC and the CG Secretariat. The steps necessary to implement the agreed recommendations of the Report would be considered by the Group at its next meeting, on the basis of a paper to be prepared by the Secretariat.

Other Business

14. Members were informed of the Government of Australia's decision to set up the Australian Center for International Agricultural Research. Among other things, this new organization would foster collaboration between Australian scientists and researchers in developing countries and at the international centers.

15. The Group supported the proposal that TAC, rather than a special committee, make the selection of the center to receive the King Baudouin Award.
16. The Group unanimously expressed its deep appreciation for the outstanding service of Dr. Ralph Cummings as Chairman of TAC from January 1977 to March 1982.

Time and Place of Next Meetings

17. The CGIAR will meet next at the Paris office of the World Bank on May 24, 25 and 26, 1982. International Centers Week will be held at the headquarters of the World Bank in Washington on November 8-12, 1982. Members will be canvassed about their views on a location for International Centers Week in 1983.
FROM: The Secretariat  March 10, 1982

International Centers Week
and Consultative Group Meeting
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Washington, D. C.

Informal Summary of Proceedings

1. The tenth International Centers Week and the nineteenth meeting of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research were held at the headquarters of the World Bank in Washington, D.C. on November 9-13, 1981. The Chairman, Mr. Warren C. Baum, presided over the meeting of the Consultative Group. The plenary sessions at which Center Directors made presentations were chaired by Mr. Baum, Dr. Monyo, Mr. Mashler and Mr. Yudelman.

2. Attached are the Informal Summary of Proceedings, the List of Participants, the statement of the Chairman of the Center Board Chairmen, and the Center Directors' presentations. Drafts of the first two were circulated for comment on January 5.

Attachments

Distribution:

CG Members
TAC Chairman, Members and Secretariat
Center Board Chairmen
Center Directors
Other Participants
INFORMAL SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

PLENARY SESSION
November 9-10, 1981

1. The tenth International Centers Week of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) was held at the World Bank in Washington, D.C., November 9-13, 1981. The meeting was attended by representatives of 32 members of the Consultative Group, by Chairmen of the Boards of Trustees, Directors and staff of the international agricultural research centers and other programs supported by the Group and by a number of observers. India became a donor in 1981 and was represented as a donor member of the Group for the first time.

2. The plenary sessions of November 9-10 were given over to presentations by the international centers. The presentations were of two types, which are rotated among the centers from year to year: (a) a full-length presentation covering various aspects of a center's program and budget; and (b) a briefer mid-term report from those centers halfway through a biennial budget period. Each presentation was followed by a question and answer period. Full-length presentations were made by CIAT, CIMMYT, ICARDA, ILRAD, IRRI and ISNAR. Shorter presentations were made by CIP, IBPGR, ICRISAT, IFFRI, IITA, ILCA and WARDA. Texts of these presentations are attached as Annex II to this summary.

Opening Remarks by the Chairman of the Consultative Group

3. On the tenth anniversary of the CGIAR, the Chairman of the Consultative Group reminded the members that the vision and generosity which had produced the present system would be just as important in the next decade. Members should not allow the investment of the past ten years and the future value of the international centers to be jeopardized by short-term budgetary concerns.

Full Presentation by CIAT

4. Before introducing CIAT's Director General, Dr. Reed Hertford, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, drew the Group's attention to CIAT's new long-term plan, prepared in cooperation with national program leaders in Latin America. This was just part of CIAT's continuing effort, he pointed out, to encourage greater participation by Latin Americans, developing
country professionals and women in CIAT's activities. Dr. Hertford introduced two of CIAT's four senior managers to the Group, both Latin Americans. Dr. Hertford then called upon Dr. John Nickel, Director General of CIAT, to elaborate on CIAT's long-range plan and other aspects of the center's work. (See Annex II for full presentation.)

5. Commenting on CIAT's program, the Chairman of TAC raised several issues. He stressed the need for CIAT to keep in mind the problems of the resource-poor farmer, and it should not overemphasize minimizing the need for purchased inputs but rather place more emphasis in maximizing the returns per unit of input. He endorsed CIAT's proposal to expand its outreach activities, expressing hope that the new advances in tissue culture techniques would foster greater collaboration between IITA and CIAT on cassava. Currently, exchange of genetic material is impeded by the possibility of transferring pests and diseases. The TAC Chairman also called attention to the ratio of personnel costs to support costs, urging CIAT not to expand its personnel at the expense of support for research personnel. The need for CIAT to continue analyzing the best near-term and long-term use of land in the region, particularly in light of expanding population, transportation and other infrastructure was also raised, as was the need for CIAT to continue examining the commodities within its mandate in the context of the farming systems into which the commodities are intended to fit. Finally, the Chairman commended CIAT for its program and noted that TAC was looking forward to studying CIAT's long-term plan.

6. In reply to one speaker's question regarding CIAT's leading responsibility for work on cassava, Dr. Nickel explained that this involved taking primary responsibility for collecting germplasm, organizing international documentation, services, providing literature and information on cassava, and training on a global basis. Cassava technology development for Africa is within the mandate of IITA. He conceded that due to distance CIAT would be less likely to develop finished technology for Asia than for Latin America.

7. Another speaker asked what CIAT was doing about collecting, identifying and exploiting field grasses and legumes such as Andropogon which were from West Africa but seemed to do better than native Latin American grasses. Dr. Nickel responded that CIAT was doing some collecting itself, but drew largely on existing collections such as those coordinated by FAO and CSIRO.

8. Directing these questions more at all centers than CIAT specifically, two speakers asked how the funding limitations were in fact affecting training and the ratio between personnel costs and support costs. Dr. Nickel pointed out that CIAT's management has been particularly sensitive to these problems. CIAT had delayed filling positions in some cases to maintain maximum possible support for scientists. To avoid reducing training activities, CIAT had diverted some funds to training, found special project funding or arranged for national programs to finance courses.
9. On a question of priority, Dr. Nickel told one speaker that CIAT would not expand its regional outreach activities at the expense of its core program. CIAT is, in effect, four centers in one. It already seems presumptuous to claim international leadership with only 63 senior scientists divided among four programs. If CIAT reduced its central research staff, it would not have the right technology for the regional cooperation staff to disseminate. Interdisciplinary research in the four commodity programs would fall in such case way below the minimum critical mass needed. Therefore, if funds were short for regional activities, CIAT would try to attract special project funding rather than divert funds from CIAT's present core program of activities.

Full Presentation by CIMMYT

10. CIMMYT's presentation was introduced by Dr. Virgilio Barco, CIMMYT's Chairman of the Board, who made a strong plea to the Group to close the gap between funding and centers' budget requests. He stressed again the importance of continuity in research, pointing out that even a small cutback meant the results of previous work would be irrevocably lost. The disproportion between the savings to the developed countries and loss to the developing countries in agricultural production was tremendous. He expressed grave concern how the IARCs, the only organizations created to generate new scientific findings and technology to boost food production in the developing world, would be able to meet the challenges of the next twenty years if they operated at no growth or reduced growth levels. Following Dr. Barco, Dr. Robert Havener, the Director General of CIMMYT, made his presentation. (See Annex II.)

11. The Chairman of TAC commented briefly on CIMMYT's program, pointing out that the second Quinquennial Review (QQR) of CIMMYT was scheduled for September 1982 and that many of the issues of concern to TAC would initially be referred to the QQR panel. The Chairman endorsed CIMMYT's continued work on triticale and high protein maize. He also suggested that CIMMYT might need to consider whether it had the proper balance between work on the genetic improvement of crops to increase production and other disciplines required to support crop production.

12. Referring to Dr. Havener's statement that quality protein maize had reached the stage of commercial production one speaker asked Dr. Havener to identify countries which were prepared to adopt this type of maize. CIMMYT had received requests from 17 countries this last year for seed material. Dr. Havener noted that the distribution of quality protein maize could also stimulate increased animal production as farmers substituted quality protein maize for feeds which required protein supplements.

13. Asked to comment on the role of entomologists and plant pathologists at CIMMYT, Dr. Havener noted that they would be more directly involved in work on plant protection and insect control in the near future.
Short Presentation by IITA

14. The Chairman of the Board of IITA, Dr. Guy Vallaeys, made a brief statement before introducing IITA's Director General, Dr. E. H. Hartmans. He reminded the Group that Africa, of all tropical regions, was experiencing the greatest difficulties in accelerating agricultural production, causing grave concern among African governments and the international community. He further noted IITA's unique potential to develop technology to help Africa feed its rapidly growing population. However, accelerating inflation, high operating costs, and adverse exchange rates had cut deeply into the real value of the institute's financial resources. As a result, all of IITA's programs were seriously undermanned. Dr. Vallaeys expressed sincere gratitude to the Nigerian Government for a special grant of $1.9 million which made it possible for IITA to finish 1980 with a balanced budget. He thanked all of IITA's donors for their past support and interest but urged them to translate into action their awareness that a build up of research in Africa would be one of the most effective responses of the international community to Africa's agricultural problems. Dr. Vallaeys was followed by Dr. Hartmans. (See Annex II for his full presentation on IITA.)

15. The TAC Chairman commended IITA's management for its efforts in averting a budgetary crisis in 1980 and 1981 and expressed appreciation to the Nigerian government for its special contribution. The Chairman noted IITA's decision, because of continued financial constraints, to set up off-station testing locations in Nigeria instead of implementing a more extensive regional coordination and outreach program. He suggested that in the future it would be desirable to select some additional locations outside Nigeria in order to involve more countries in the testing network. The Chairman also fully endorsed the emphasis in IITA's program on developing technology to protect soil quality.

16. One speaker wanted to know whether IITA was collaborating with CIAT on developing stable farming systems in the humid tropics. Dr. Hartmans replied that IITA was presently working not with CIAT, but with the national research programs of Brazil and Indonesia on this question.

17. In response to another question, Dr. Hartmans stated that IITA scientists were so busy with research on the major diseases and pests of cassava in Africa there was no time for the minor, non-African diseases plaguing cassava.

18. One member was particularly interested in IITA's involvement of Africa's research community in setting objectives for the institute, as well as identifying regional or national responsibilities. He asked Dr. Hartmans to elaborate on this. IITA's Director described in greater detail three projects through which IITA was achieving greater integration in the African scientific community.

19. Another member, representing Africa, appealed to the Group to allow for more growth for IITA and WARDA. He reminded donors that 70% of Africa's
countries were less developed and suffering from severe food production problems which could only be relieved if much more emphasis was given to research.

20. Two speakers alerted Dr. Hartmans to the threat of a new pest, the maize grain weevil, spreading rapidly in Tanzania. It had come from Central America through grain shipments.

21. Dr. Hartmans reassured one speaker that IITA would be ready in a couple of years to expand its outreach activities. By then it would have developed technology appropriate for at least four different agroecological zones in Africa. IITA was doing its basic research in locations around Nigeria which were representative of these zones.

Short Presentation by IBPGR

22. Dr. Narong Chomchalow, Vice Chairman of the IBPGR, introduced the IBPGR’s presentation, which was made by Dr. J. Trevor Williams, Executive Secretary. (See Annex II for full presentation.)

23. The Chairman of TAC commended the IBPGR for the promptness with which it had adopted recommendations made by the QQR report, especially the preparation of a long-term strategy which the TAC had yet to examine. The Chairman stressed again that the function of the IBPGR was catalytic; it was the function of the international centers and national organizations to take over full responsibility for collection, conservation, evaluation and information activities. Finally the Chairman noted that the TAC felt the visibility and status of the IBPGR in the FAO structure needed to be elevated in view of its importance in the CGIAR system and had discussed this with the FAO management. The TAC has been assured that changes to rectify this would be forthcoming.

24. In answer to a question on FAO financial support to the staffing of the IBPGR, Dr. Williams replied that the Board’s Secretariat was covered by FAO and the CG in the ratio of 1 to 1 for the Headquarters staff. Field staff are wholly covered by the CG and as the IBPGR’s program expanded and input from the CG increased, the ratio would change accordingly.

25. One speaker asked Dr. Williams whether a procedure had been developed for identifying the number of accessions and nature of accessions which must be collected for any given species. Dr. Williams conceded this was a very difficult question. It was being addressed, however. It had been concluded though, that numbers alone were not the answer. What was important was representative variability.

26. In response to another question, Dr. Williams agreed that much needed to be done in improving breeders’ access to and information about gene banks. He also pointed out another obstacle. Curators of many germplasm collections did not know themselves the contents of their collections. The
IBPGR was also having to investigate this problem by stimulating curators to put their collections in order.

27. One member queried whether the IBPGR's mandate shouldn't be expanded to handle more crops. He warned that responsibility has to be taken for collecting, conserving, and storing germplasm of species not covered by the IBPGR's mandate or else valuable genetic material could be lost. Dr. Williams pointed out that within the scope of the IBPGR's mandate, the Board had already increased the number of crops it handled because of national and international pressures, and the majority of important species were covered. In this connection he noted that there was a legacy of old plantation materials from colonial days which were in jeopardy of being lost if action was not taken soon. Dr. Williams also mentioned that the IBPGR would particularly welcome guidance from the Group and TAC in formulating policy with regard to work on diverse groups of non-food crops.

Full Presentation by ILRAD

28. Dr. Guy Camus, Chairman of the ILRAD Quinquennial Review Panel, presented the Panel's report to the Group. It concluded clearly that the work of the ILRAD should continue to concentrate on trypanosomiasis and theileriosis until significant success has been achieved concerning at least one of the two mandated diseases. The panel was unanimously impressed with the quality of research at ILRAD and the progress made in the brief period during which full facilities were available. Dr. Camus noted that training, transfer of technology and dissemination of information were areas which the Panel recommended should be strengthened.

29. In his introductory remarks to the Group, the Chairman of ILRAD's Board, Dr. K. F. Wells, informed members of the administrative troubles which had been affecting ILRAD the last year and a half and the changes which had subsequently taken place in the institute's senior management. In 1981, ILRAD appointed a new Financial Comptroller, Director of Administration and Director General. Dr. Wells assured the Group that ILRAD was operating effectively despite the turnover in personnel and a new spirit of cooperation at the center augured well for continuation and improvement of productive activities. He then introduced Dr. D. Zwart, Chairman of the Program Committee of ILRAD's Board of Trustees and Acting Director of ILRAD from April to October 1981, and Dr. Ross Gray, ILRAD's new Director General, to make a joint presentation on ILRAD. (See Annex II for Dr. Zwart's and Dr. Gray's presentations.)

30. Commending the thorough presentations by Dr. Camus, Dr. Wells, Dr. Zwart, and Dr. Gray, the TAC Chairman said he had little to add. The TAC was, he remarked, particularly pleased that ILRAD had maintained the very high standards of its scientific program throughout the period of management change and noted with great satisfaction the recent major accomplishments of the institute. The TAC was also pleased that cooperation with ILCA on the problem of trypanotolerance was progressing.
31. In response to one speaker's question regarding ILRAD's mandate, Dr. Camus reiterated the Panel's recommendation that neither ILRAD's mandate nor the present course of its research should be modified.

32. Dr. Camus told another speaker that the QQR had not focussed on ILRAD's work in relation to human tropical diseases research (TDR). TDR is a major program sponsored by UNDP, World Bank, and WHO which has as one of its mandates investigation into human trypanosomiasis. Dr. Gray, the new Director General of ILRAD, proposed that a formal link be established between ILRAD and the TDR program as work going on at ILRAD was definitely relevant to the research on human trypanosomiasis. The same speaker urged this strongly as a highly cost-effective approach.

33. One speaker suggested that the QQR's of ILRAD and ILCA, the latter to be completed this year, provided an opportune time for the Group to re-examine the roles of these centers in the broader context of the animal sciences in Africa and the implications of this on the centers' mandates.

34. Another speaker endorsed the QQR's recommendation to strengthen ILRAD's training activities.

35. One donor asked what ILRAD's role was concerning trypanotolerance, citing pressure from FAO and developing countries to support work on this problem. Responding on behalf of ILRAD, Dr. Camus replied that ILRAD played a dual role of support and leadership. It provided support to ILCA, complementing ILCA's research on production with work on parasitology and entomology but took a leading role together with ILCA in coordinating the work on trypanotolerance in West Africa, specifically in the Gambia.

Full Presentation by IRRI

36. The Acting Director of IRRI, Dr. Marcos Vega, who made the presentation on behalf of IRRI, was introduced by IRRI's Board Chairman, Dr. Clarence Gray. In his introductory remarks, Dr. Gray called the Group's attention to IRRI's new long-term plan and two special features of the plan. The first was the introduction of a program for developing annual work plans with each of the major countries with which IRRI worked to bring IRRI in direct support of national objectives and plans. The second important feature regarded IRRI's management and a major review of IRRI's management systems currently underway by external consultants. Dr. Gray pointed out that in less than ten years, IRRI's budget had increased tenfold. Its employees now numbered 2000. The Board recognized the center had probably outgrown the administrative and financial procedures set up twenty years ago. Dr. Vega then made a full presentation. (See Annex II.)

37. The Chairman of TAG expressed appreciation for IRRI's long-term plan, pointing out that IRRI was one of the first centers to relate its program to the allocation of resources. He advised the Group that the second QQR of IRRI was well underway; the panel had been selected, had received
documentation from IRRI's Board and would conduct the review itself in January 1982.

38. One speaker had two observations regarding IRRI's work on the brown planthopper. He suggested that evidence linking increased use of nitrogenous fertilizers to a resurgence of the insect should be explored. He also queried the validity of IRRI's research examining how resistant varieties lose their resistance, by studying the physical structure of different types of brown planthoppers.

39. Asked about the political implications of its collaborative work with Vietnam, Dr. Vega commented that IRRI would work with any rice-producing country if such collaboration would benefit the country. Dr. Vega assured another speaker that in countries where introduction of high-yielding varieties might create initial instability in production, IRRI was working closely with the national programs to anticipate and solve any problems.

40. In response to another question, Dr. Vega confirmed that IRRI was seeking to incorporate greater genetic diversity in its breeding program.

41. One speaker raised the more general problem of language in the production of center publications. He urged the centers, particularly those with global mandates, to translate their material into French. In Africa especially many countries could not take advantage of the centers' work because of the language barrier.

42. Two speakers had questions regarding hybrid rice. Dr. Vega commented that so far only Indonesia and India had expressed an interest in experimenting with hybrid varieties.

43. Dr. Vega, asked about IRRI's involvement in constraints research, replied that a methodology had been developed to evaluate both production and policy constraints, which kept the farmer from producing total potential yields. He noted further that this was an area in which IRRI hoped to get national programs more involved so that they would conduct their own constraints studies.

Short Presentation by CIP

44. Dr. Richard Sawyer, Director General of CIP, was introduced by Dr. Joab Thomas, CIP's Chairman of the Board. (See Annex II for Dr. Sawyer's full presentation.)

45. The TAC Chairman complimented CIP on the clarity of its program presentation and projected profile for the future. He also commented on the imagination the Institute had shown in developing its regional cooperative programs. Finally, he reported that TAC fully supported the development of the new land facilities at CIP's headquarters in La Molina, and recommended
that if sufficient core funds were not available, CIP should seek a special project grant for the purpose.

46. At one member's request, Dr. Sawyer elaborated briefly on the contributions of new genetic material and improved performance of potatoes in the tropical lowlands of South America.

47. Another speaker congratulated Dr. Sawyer on his excellent presentation and asked when he anticipated true seed would be released to farmers. Dr. Sawyer explained that CIP was moving quite rapidly towards the final transfer stage of true seed technology but that its rate of adoption depended to some extent on the individual needs of each country. Currently, CIP was working closely with country programs and social scientists to identify specific problems which would have to be overcome before true seed could be used commercially.

48. One speaker, observing that many of the centers were struggling with the problem of strengthening national research, asked Dr. Sawyer to identify the major reasons for CIP's success at collaboration with national programs so that the Group could perhaps learn some lessons. Dr. Sawyer attributed CIP's success in this largely to the development of a regional network in close association with national programs from the very beginning of the center's operation. Although regional coordinators worked more as extension specialists initially, after five years, when CIP began to generate research results, the network of contacts was in place. In conjunction with this, Dr. Sawyer pointed out that in the beginning most of CIP's research contracts were with developed country institutions. Presently over half were with developing country scientists and institutions.

Short Presentation by IFPRI

49. Before introducing Dr. John Mellor, IFPRI's Director, to make the presentation, Dr. Samar Sen, IFPRI's Chairman, commented briefly on some developments at IFPRI in 1981. He noted that a shortfall of 2-1/2 percent in budgeted resources created special difficulty for a relatively small and "developing" institute like IFPRI, the margin for adjustment for which is negligible because of the non-existence of a capital budget and small size of the current budget. Notwithstanding this difficulty, IFPRI had brought out eight major publications, a number of short research papers and made important inputs into program and policy consideration of several UN agencies, international organizations and governments. Dr. Mellor then made a full presentation. (See Annex II.)

50. The TAC Chairman welcomed the preparation of a long-term plan by IFPRI and expressed the hope that IFPRI's work would continue to show a sharp focus, despite its broad mandate. He cautioned IFPRI to undertake special contracts only when they clearly tied into the central thrust of IFPRI's work. The Chairman also mentioned TAC's concern whether a sufficient proportion of IFPRI's budget was being allocated to travel. This was
essential for the staff to stay in close contact with the problems of the developing countries.

51. The representative of the United States advised the Group on the progress of legislation required to grant IFPRI international status. He reported that the legislation had been passed by the Senate and was expected to go before the House of Representatives the next week. He was hopeful it would be signed into law before the end of the year but could make no guarantee.

52. When one speaker expressed some concern about IFPRI's providing advisory staff service to governments during a time of limited funds, Dr. Mellor replied that this was necessary for IFPRI to get a sense of the realities of policy problems and to focus its research accordingly. Also through such interaction IFPRI could help governments make use of IFPRI's research.

53. One of the representatives for Africa told the Group that African research directors had identified food policy research as a key element in the process of stimulating agricultural production and welcomed very much any assistance IFPRI could provide.

54. Dr. Mellor emphasized this was just the kind of collaboration IFPRI regarded as important. He informed the representative that IFPRI had received an invitation from Kenya to participate in a conference on food policy issues.

55. In response to a query, Dr. Mellor stated that in-depth research and analysis at IFPRI demonstrated conclusively that yield variabilities increased with the adoption of modern technologies and this would have to be taken into account in the development of food policies.

Full Presentation by ICARDA

56. Dr. Andreas Papasolomontos, Chairman of the Board, introduced Dr. Mohamed Nour, ICARDA's new Director General. Dr. Nour succeeded Dr. Harry Darling who retired in 1981. In his remarks, Dr. Papasolomontos touched briefly on progress in ICARDA's collaborative research activities and building program. With regard to the latter he noted the biggest problem facing ICARDA's trustees was the lack of funds to carry out both a research program as well as a building program at satisfactory levels. While the Board had for the present decided on a very limited capital program, he told the Group this could not continue indefinitely and made a special plea for further support from the CGIAR for ICARDA's building program. A full presentation was then made by Dr. Nour. (See Annex II.)

57. On behalf of the TAC, the Chairman extended his best wishes to Dr. Nour as the new Director General of ICARDA. He also congratulated the institute for the quality and progress of its work given the instability in
the region. The Chairman advised the Group that ICARDA would be subject to a QQR in 1983 and that TAC was already working with ICARDA's Director and Board on selecting members for the review panel and drafting terms of reference. Also as part of the preparation for the QQR, ICARDA would be developing a long-term plan. The Chairman noted that the mandate, direction and activities of ICARDA would be carefully scrutinized by TAC in light of the many changes which had occurred in the region and the CGIAR since the center was established. He urged members of the Group to advise the TAC of any specific issues they wanted the TAC to address.

58. Dr. Nour told one speaker who defended the present focus of ICARDA's forage program that this was, in fact, a much debated issue in the Program Committee. Should ICARDA be devoting equal attention to both annual and perennial fodder crops, as it was currently, or giving one priority over the other?

59. In reply to another question, Dr. Nour explained that the specialist support unit ICARDA was developing to back up the work of the major research programs in disease weed and pest control microbiology and biometrics was still so small that it could not be classified yet as a separate department. The place and structuring of this complex of services would be reviewed in 1982.

60. Asked to expand a little on the future activities in Lebanon's Bekaa Valley, Dr. Nour explained that a conference was going to be sponsored in the Bekaa in December by ICARDA under the patronage of the President of Lebanon. At this time ICARDA would meet with national scientists including American University of Beirut to discuss the state and objectives of Lebanon's national research activities and how ICARDA could be of assistance.

Full Presentation by ISNAR

61. Mr. William Mathieson, Chairman of ISNAR's Board, raised two specific issues before calling upon Dr. William Gamble, Director General, to make the presentation for ISNAR. Referring to an observation in the CG Secretariat's Program and Budget Commentary, he insisted that ISNAR could only ensure continuity in appraising, implementing and supervising projects if ISNAR staff members, rather than short-term consultants, led ISNAR's review missions. Dr. Mathieson also drew the Group's attention to the general problem throughout the system of safeguarding the pensions of the centers' staff in the face of rising inflation. He strongly endorsed a recommendation in the Report on the Review of the CGIAR that the CGIAR commission a special study of social benefits in the system to address this problem. Dr. Gamble then made a full presentation on ISNAR's progress and program. (See Annex II.)

62. The TAC Chairman had no specific issues to raise concerning ISNAR.

63. Dr. Gamble told one speaker that ISNAR had a variety of criteria it used to select countries with which to work. One of the most important was
a country's ability to demonstrate political will and scientific capability. Geographical distribution and maintaining balance among countries at various levels of development were also factors ISNAR considered.

64. Asked whether ISNAR saw a role for itself in helping developing countries coordinate inputs from international donors and the CGIAR centers, Dr. Gamble replied affirmatively and gave an example of how ISNAR was already working to achieve this. However, he emphasized that the real answer to the problem was for countries to have a well-organized and well-developed national plan.

65. Regarding ISNAR's policy on distribution of country reports, Dr. Gamble agreed this was an important issue. He hoped reports would be distributed as widely as possible once the specific country had given clearance. He added that the report ISNAR had prepared on Costa Rica had just received government clearance and was now available to anyone interested. Reports on Kenya and Indonesia were in final stages and would be released following government authorization.

66. Dr. Gamble assured another speaker that even if ISNAR had to fallback to a reduced budget, it would not cancel its research into what kind of research systems work under what circumstances in developing countries. This would require internal budget shifts however.

Short Presentation by ICRISAT

67. ICRISAT's presentation by Dr. Leslie Swindale, Director General, was introduced by Dr. C. Fred Bentley, Chairman of the Board. Dr. Bentley highlighted the financial problems ICRISAT was experiencing and detailed some of the measures which would have to be taken if the situation did not improve. One alternative might be to discontinue ICRISAT's activities in Africa. Dr. Bentley urged policymakers to see that the cost of food relief resulting from inadequate research in Africa would greatly exceed the costs of investments in agricultural research by the CGIAR and related programs. Dr. Bentley also voiced disappointment with the failure of the Review Committee Report to propose mechanisms for handling the ever increasing cashflow problems of the centers. He was followed by Dr. Swindale. (See Annex II for Dr. Swindale's full presentation.)

68. The Chairman of TAC stressed that the TAC would very much regret if ICRISAT reduced its work in Africa. The QQR of ICRISAT had recommended Africa as the major area for expansion in the future. He noted with interest ICRISAT's work on the analysis of soil and climate characteristics as the basis for predicting the areas in which ICRISAT's farming systems technology could be successfully applied. Regarding the soil and crop management technology developed in ICRISAT's farming system program, the Chairman observed that a substantial degree of technical assistance might be required for it to gain widespread application.
69. Dr. Swindale advised a speaker that ICRISAT was working to develop a program of geographical and research priorities, particularly in light of reduced funding.

70. Several speakers stressed the need to accord Africa highest priority and urged ICRISAT not to reduce its activities there if at all possible.

Short Presentation by WARDA

71. Mr. Sidi Coulibaly, Executive Secretary of WARDA, spoke to the Group on behalf of the Chairman of WARDA's Governing Council, highlighting briefly WARDA's objectives and achievements. He noted that since the creation of WARDA rice production had increased markedly, making West Africa 70% self-sufficient in rice. According to WARDA's conservative projections, total self-sufficiency could be achieved by the year 2000 as long as investment in research, development and training continued. Dr. Coulibaly then called upon Dr. B.A.C. Enyi, WARDA's Director of Research, to make the presentation on WARDA's research progress. (See Annex II for Dr. Enyi's presentation.)

72. The TAC Chairman noted that closer supervision of the subregional coordinators as recommended by WARDA had improved the quality of the trial results and supported efforts by the center to impose even more effective control. He also suggested that the next QQR of WARDA in 1983 be treated by the Group as an opportunity to evaluate the results of the CGIAR's support to WARDA, particularly as it represented a deviation from the CG's support to the traditional international agricultural research centers.

73. Dr. Enyi clarified that the unusually high cost/benefit ratio questioned by a speaker applied to floating rice specifically.

Full Presentation by ILCA

74. Dr. Robert McDowell, Chairman of the Board, introduced ILCA's new Director General, Dr. Brumby, to the Group and simultaneously asked members to recognize ILCA's outgoing Director, Mr. David Pratt, for his contribution to the Institute and the CGIAR. Before yielding the floor to Mr. Pratt, he expressed the Board's wholehearted support for greater collaboration between ILCA and other CG centers. Similarly, he reported the Board was taking action to encourage greater liaison with national programs. (See Annex II for Mr. Pratt's full presentation.)

75. On behalf of the TAC, the Chairman extended his best wishes to ILCA's new Director and Board Chairman and his appreciation to Mr. Pratt for his years of dedicated service. The Chairman reminded the Group that the QQR of ILCA was currently in progress under the leadership of Sir John Crawford. The results of the review would undoubtedly have important significance for the future direction of the center.

76. No comments or questions were raised by members of the Group.
Item 1 - Chairman's Opening Remarks

1. The Chairman of the Consultative Group, Mr. Warren C. Baum, opened the 19th meeting by welcoming members, particularly the representative of India, which had recently become a donor to the system. The CGIAR met for the first time in May 1971 and was therefore just over ten years old. The next ten years would be materially affected by decisions the Group would be taking at its current meeting. The Chairman expected the CGIAR's next decade to be one of much less rapid growth than the first, but marked by steady increase in the production of valuable technology by the centers.

2. Looking ahead, one could not see what opportunities or problems new advances in technology might create. However, the food problem in one form or another would persist. Means must be found for ensuring long-term financial stability to enable scientists to achieve their full potential. It was hoped that the current preoccupation with short-term funding problems would in time become a thing of the past. Crucial to the future success of both the CGIAR system and national programs was the effort to ensure an adequate supply of well qualified and highly motivated scientists operating under favorable conditions. The CGIAR had become an established and significant part of the international development community. However, it must continue to retain its ability to take chances and dare to go where others could not.

3. To mark the occasion of the Group's tenth anniversary, the Chairman invited Mr. David Bell to say a few words about the early years. Mr. Bell reminded the Group of the pessimistic outlook for world food during the late 60s and early 70s. The grim philosophy of "triage" was much in vogue, and there were many predictions of worldwide famine. At the same time, some agricultural research programs had begun to show spectacular results, notably those of IRRI and CIMMYT. Contrary to the conventional wisdom of the time, farmers in developing countries often showed that they could move very quickly to grow new varieties and adopt new practices if prices and risks were acceptable. Political leaders were quick to see the potential.

4. The Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, meanwhile, were supporting the four existing centers, which were running effectively for a total operating budget of about $6 million. Clearly, they needed to grow if they were to fulfill their missions, and new centers would be desirable. At the same time, the end of the boom in the US capital markets was about to bring a drastic decline in the two Foundations' resources. Hence, additional sources of funding were sought and, indeed, found, from Canada, (both CIDA and IDRC), from USAID, the UK, Germany, the Netherlands and elsewhere. Then there was a meeting on general agricultural questions, convened at the initiative of the then Director General of FAO, Dr. Boerma, and hosted by the Rockefeller Foundation at Bellagio in 1970. Dr. F. F. ("Frosty") Hill's account of the effectiveness of agricultural research and its impact on places like the Punjab fired the imagination of the delegates, who became generally convinced of the high returns to such research, and the
value of international support for it. The idea of a Consultative Group for the purpose was born, and donor support secured.

5. Within the next few months, the basic structure of the system, which was still in place, was designed — the concept of the international, independent research centers, the supporting Consultative Group of donors and representatives of developing countries, the Technical Advisory Committee to the Group, the basic pattern of financing, and so on. This led to the founding meeting on May 19, 1971, from which the Group had steadily evolved. Its success stemmed from the confluence of two brilliant streams of thought — the International Center concept invented by Frosty Hill and George Harrar, and the institutional support system devised by Robert McNamara and Paul Hoffman.

Item 2 - Adoption of Agenda

6. There was some discussion of the logic behind the proposal in the draft agenda to approve programs and budgets before the pledging session had indicated the amount of resources likely to be available. It was pointed out that both items were very closely intertwined and, moreover, even after the pledging session, there would be considerable uncertainties as to the actual dollar value of the funds received. On balance therefore, it was felt appropriate to retain the order as in the draft agenda which was adopted after the Chairman had noted that there would be a status report on the appointment of a new chairman of TAC immediately following the report of the current chairman.

Item 3 - Second Review of the CGIAR System - Discussion in Open Session

7. The Chairman outlined the procedures for the Second Review which broadly followed those adopted for the first one completed in 1976. The work had been done by a Review Committee, members of which had been selected on the basis of their personal qualifications and who mostly had an inside knowledge of the workings of the system. The Committee had met three times — in January, May and July of 1981 — and had been assisted by a Study Team drawn from outside the Group consisting of four consultants working more or less full time during much of 1981 and four other consultants engaged for shorter periods. The Committee and the Team between them therefore provided for some balance between the views of insiders and the views of those seeing the system from the outside. In expressing the Group's thanks to the Committee and the Team the Chairman also recorded its appreciation for the very great help that the Review process had been given by large numbers of scientists and administrators all over the world.

8. Special efforts had been made during this Review to secure the views of the developing countries to the fullest extent possible. Two special seminars had been organized and participation had been arranged in a third, embracing respectively Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Chairman thanked Mr. Muturi of the Kenyan National Council for Science and Technology for the expert organization of the African seminar, and he paid tribute to the memory of the late Dr. Jose Drilon whose organization SEARCA had run the Asian seminar. He noted especially the contribution of the Study Team that had worked most effectively under extreme pressure of
time. The Group would be concentrating mainly on the recommendations included in the summary of the Review Committee’s Report. Some of these recommendations raised operational questions which had yet to be fully answered. In deciding which of the recommendations were to be accepted and put into effect, the Group would need to consider how this would best be done and moreover, how any additional costs could be met. While the Report itself was the collective responsibility of the Review Committee, the decisions to be taken as a consequence were the responsibility of the Group. The first session, devoted to a discussion of the Review Report would, in the terminology of the Report itself, be a discussion by the system as a whole. The second session later in the week would be a discussion confined to members of the Group, again as defined in the Report. The decisions taken by the Group would be recorded in a brief supplementary report which would be included as a preface to the final version of the Review Committee Report as ultimately distributed.

9. Suggesting that the Report be discussed in sections, the Chairman asked the Study Director, Dr. Michael Arnold, to introduce the first four chapters. Dr. Arnold stressed that the Report was concerned with principles rather than with details and with mechanisms rather than solutions. The Report tried to suggest such mechanisms for solving problems far into the future rather than concentrating narrowly on specific solutions to problems of the moment. The Report recognized both the need for change and the value of continuity and many of the Report’s conclusions reflected a balance between the two.

10. Chapter 1 of the Report set the scene by reviewing the background to the world food problem and described some of the contributions that the CGIAR institutions had made.

11. Chapter 2 looked at the effect of the previous Review and the extent to which its recommendations had been put into effect. This analysis had concluded that the Group had to have a strong sense of common purpose derived from clearly defined and generally accepted policies.

12. Chapter 3 addressed the evolution of the system and its underlying philosophy. Much effort had gone into examining the original objectives of the Group but it was concluded that they could continue to stand as they were, recognizing that there would in future be changes in emphasis without any fundamental change in the Group’s original purpose.

13. Next the Report examined the structure of the Group and its informal procedures and examined a wide range of alternatives. This had led to the conclusion that it was best to rationalize and strengthen the present structure rather than design a new one.

14. Chapter 4 considered the place of the system in the world pattern of related activities. Its focus should continue to be on the development of improved technology and close collaboration on adaptive research with national programs both in developing and developed countries. None of the first four chapters of the Report led to any specific recommendations.

15. The Chairman invited Dr. Bentley, Chairman of ICRISAT and current Chairman of the group of chairmen, to summarize his colleagues’ comments on the first four chapters.
16. Dr. Bentley appreciated the effort that had gone into the Review and was pleased that it did not suggest any fundamental changes to the system. The chairmen had no particular points to raise in connection with Chapter 1. They agreed with the conclusion of Chapter 2 that the system should continue to operate on the basis of consensus, also with the view expressed in Chapter 3 that the system would need to continue for at least the next 20 years. They also concurred that the system should avoid providing technical assistance to the extent this was possible, but should rather enter into collaborative programs where necessary and feasible.

17. Speaking on behalf of the Center Directors, Dr. Hartmans felt the Report addressed itself to all major issues and provided a well balanced presentation of both problems and possible solutions. They were pleased that the Committee recognized the value of the existing semi-informal and non-political structure and with the existing degree of freedom for Directors General and Boards of Trustees. Directors agreed with the Committee's view that the centers should continue to exert research leadership and to act in a catalytic capacity. The Report rightly stressed the importance of research as a precondition for development, but the Directors noted that this was not always appreciated by policymakers. The resources likely to be available to the system appeared always to be much less than the needs required and that the high returns would justify it. While the Directors felt that the Report was probably correct in not suggesting any major innovations in the structure of the system, they did feel that there was a need for greater involvement of donors in the policy and decision-making process, particularly in broad strategic questions of priorities and the prospects for success and in resource allocation.

17. Noting that TAC as a whole had not yet had the opportunity to review the final version of the Committee's Report, the Chairman nevertheless asked Dr. Cummings to summarize such comments from TAC members as he had received. Dr. Cummings felt it right that the Group should wish to build on the procedures which had worked well so far and to avoid change for change's sake.

18. TAC felt itself generally able to endorse a major part of the recommendations. He felt that there should have been greater elaboration of the specific role of TAC as seen by the Consultative Group. This seemed somewhat out of balance compared to the somewhat extensive discussion of the role of the Consultative Group Secretariat. In general TAC could endorse the presentation made in Chapters 1 through 4. However, he noted some possible inconsistency between the opportunities confronting the system and the somewhat pessimistic outlook contained in the Report's final chapter.

19. Another speaker found difficulty with references to the Group's nonpolitical character. He felt that technical assistance activities, such as those of ISNAR and indeed the decisions of donors, might well have a political element.

20. A speaker felt strongly that the time available for discussion of the implications of the Report was inadequate for the purpose. To take one topic as a straightforward example, the relationship between the centers and the work of advanced institutions in developed countries raised a lot of issues which clearly could not be fully examined in the time available.
He went on to sketch some of the issues involved, and the Chairman agreed that this one example made it clear that the current meeting could not possibly address every topic in the degree of detail that the Group would like. Matters would remain for consideration at future meetings.

21. Another speaker emphasized the importance of the Report's statement that technology "is determined to a far greater extent by the institutional framework within which the productive processes take place". Such frameworks were seldom optimal. He and other subsequent speakers felt the need for more indicative data on the results of the work of the international agricultural research centers. The Report gave only general statements on this topic.

22. Joining with others in commending the quality of the Report, another speaker nevertheless felt it somewhat "polite". He queried whether the centers were not becoming more responsive to the attitudes of donors than to the needs of developing countries. This in turn was related to the question of the relationship between the centers and bilateral agencies of the governments represented in the Group. Perhaps there should be further examination of the bilateral activities of donors. He suggested there might usefully be a review of donors' priorities for their bilateral research activities and how these might better integrated with those of the centers. He was greatly disturbed by the evidence presented for the reduction in training. He drew members' attention to new funds created both by Australia and by Canada for enhancing collaboration between their national scientists and those in the developing countries. He also drew the Group's attention to the International Commission on the Application of Science to Agriculture set up recently by the International Council of Scientific Unions. Finally, he stressed his concern for better development of research managers from within the system so that they could develop their careers to the point where they were appointed as Directors General.

23. Agreeing with others on the need for more data on the impact of the system, a speaker suggested that this might be an appropriate topic for a future Integrative Report. He reiterated the importance his delegation attached to the involvement of developing countries in the formulation of the Review's recommendations. Agreeing that the system should probably continue until at least the end of the century, it should be prepared to change as the needs of the developing countries changed. Some current activities might be replaced by others of higher priority in the future.

24. Turning to Chapters 5 and 6, Dr. Arnold pointed out that Chapter 5 addressed principles for including new activities in the system. Readers should refer where necessary to the TAC priorities paper.

25. Recommendation 1 supported multidisciplinary approach to research with a focus on specific commodities. However, it did not support the building of additional international centers to work on single common factors of production unless there was no feasible alternative. Work on factors of production should be built up within the multidisciplinary approach.

26. Recommendation 2 emphasized the overriding importance of training both of research leaders and of research managers. TAC might well examine the system's capacity in this respect.
27. In Chapter 6, Recommendation 3 supported the trend towards the development of collaborative networks.

28. Recommendation 4 pointed to the need for more effective methods of coordinating the work of two or more centers active in the same geographical region.

29. Recommendation 5 supported the development by the CGIAR institutions of appropriate lines of strategic research.

30. Recommendation 6 pointed to the desirability of wider publicity for the research interests and needs of the centers.

31. Speaking for the Board Chairmen, Dr. Hertford emphasized the need clearly to understand criteria for bringing in new activities into the system and equally importantly deciding which activities might be phased out. This seemed to require what he called an "ultra-long-run" view of the state of world agriculture for which IFPRI might be expected to provide assistance. The Center Chairmen had some reservations about the proposal that research and training on water and irrigation management be included within the system. This was not for any lack of importance but because it seemed likely that alternative sources of support would be readily forthcoming. The Chairmen strongly supported the conclusions on training and concurred with the observation that traditional sources of funding for this purpose had largely dried up. He suggested the system might wish to make a careful study of manpower needs and of training opportunities. The Chairmen had found themselves somewhat confused by Recommendation 4 and cautioned against setting up additional regional mechanisms for coordinating and administering center activities. This responsibility should lie with the government.

32. Dr. Arnold clarified that the point of the recommendation was to initiate a study on coordinating activities and reminded members that the Report was suggesting mechanisms rather than specific solutions.

33. However, another speaker noted that African research directors meeting at the African seminar had suggested some form of regional organization in East Africa whereby the various countries could deal with the different centers through some form of common service unit. The Review Committee had not attempted to design such a specific arrangement.

34. Speaking for the Center Directors Dr. Gamble supported the importance that should be given to training, particularly in Africa. They commended the emphasis on the training of trainers and the training of research leaders and managers and agreed that TAC should study the system's current capacity in that regard. However, he cautioned that research and training were to some extent competitive and one should not suffer at the expense of the other. The fundamental purpose of the centers was research. With respect to Recommendation 4 it was pointed out that many specific arrangements were already in operation, possibly to a much greater extent than was generally apparent. All of the centers would file such agreements with the Secretariat. The centers would continue to seek ways in which they could cooperate better among themselves and with the developed and developing country research institutions.
35. Noting that the subject of water management would come before the Group later in the meeting, Dr. Cummings urged a pragmatic approach. In reference to Recommendation 2, Dr. Cummings doubted whether TAC had any special contribution to make to the desirable objective of making more effective use of the special talents of women. He strongly commended the section on networks which he felt deserved careful study. With respect to Recommendation 6 his own experience as a director of an international agricultural research center suggested that it was extremely difficult to draw up long in advance a list of topics on which outside collaboration should be sought.

36. Mr. Muturi said that he had welcomed the opportunity to organize the African seminar and hoped that similar arrangements could continue in the future. He also hoped that African research directors could meet with the Center Directors. He emphasized the special training needs of Africa, noting that African trainees of the centers tended to have less academic qualifications than those from Asia or Latin America. He noted the general lack of awareness among his African colleagues of the training and other facilities available at the centers. He raised the possibility of holding a Centers Week in Africa. He felt that more attention should be given to developing networks throughout Africa.

37. Reminding the Group of a previous speaker's mention of the International Council of Scientific Unions, a speaker suggested that the Secretariat should look into the question of closer contacts with it.

38. Agreeing with the emphasis to be given to training, another speaker urged that bilateral funding be sought to the extent possible. Referring to cooperation between the centers, it was emphasized that there should be better appreciation of the role of the international agricultural research centers in Africa in the area of livestock development not only with regard to ILCA, ICIPE and ILRAD, but in connection with the whole effort by national and regional centers.

39. On behalf of a regional development bank, a speaker urged caution in expanding the system with new centers. He too was much concerned with training. He felt that it should be studied in the context of priorities. He agreed with Recommendations 3 and 4 that more careful study should be made on coordination and interrelationships between different centers. He noted that his own bank would shortly receive a study which would provide ideas on how it could improve support for the international agricultural research system and the relationships between international centers and national systems.

40. Sharing the concern of others, a speaker felt it unacceptable that centers should have to reduce their training efforts in order to meet budget shortfalls. He regretted the apparent lack of opportunities for women scientists within the system. He urged that an analysis of the situation be presented to the next Group meeting.

41. A number of other speakers emphasized the importance of training and the need to provide better opportunities for women within the system.

42. Emphasizing with others the importance of water management, a speaker felt that more attention should be paid to the relationship between water use and production. In many developing countries water was a very expensive input.
43. A number of speakers questioned whether the impression that bilateral efforts in training were declining was correct. In the case of a number of agencies, the reverse was true.

44. Introducing Chapter 7, Dr. Arnold noted that it was the longest chapter and reflected the great interest shown by all concerned in organization and management. The Group's informality, freedom from bureaucratic control and its ability to respond rapidly to changing circumstances were attractive features. However, more complex circumstances had brought a need for better mechanisms for formulating and implementing sharply focused policies involving all components of the system. Secondly, there was a set of problems to do with securing adequate levels of funding and allocating them equitably.

45. Recommendations 8 and 9 related to planning and budgeting. The Review Committee could not possibly get into the intricacies of these questions and it was suggested that they be studied further by the CGIAR Secretariat, assisted if necessary by consultants. The Review was responding to the need for greater accountability by recommending management audits built into the procedures for external review. As for relevance, it was recommended that commodity or activity reviews be introduced focusing especially on relevance.

46. Recommendation 10 tried to meet the general feeling that there be greater involvement in the affairs of the system by each of its components. As part of this, Group meetings needed to be longer and/or more frequent.

47. Recommendation 11 addressed the specific problems of shortfalls and funding and the annual allocation of resources and after very lengthy discussion had proposed a Budget Review Committee as something of a compromise between the varying views expressed. It was proposed for an experimental three-year period.

48. Recommendations 12 and 13 related to strengthening the CGIAR Secretariat and strengthening the functions of TAC.

49. Recommendation 14 proposed more work in the general area of public relations and communications, and Recommendations 15, 16 and 17 referred to issues affecting to Boards of Trustees, bearing in mind the need to maintain balance between the autonomy of the institutions and their ultimate dependence on the members of the Group.

50. Recommendation 18 referred to the need to investigate the benefits of the career staff of the institutions with a view to maintaining long-term security.

51. Recommendation 19 drew attention to the role of women in agriculture in the developing countries and its implications for the work of the system.

52. Chapter 8 considered the participation of developing countries in the system's affairs. The Study Team, in its extensive discussions in developing countries, had noted the relative lack of importance which they attach to representation at meetings of the Group, feeling it more important to be involved at the level of program formulation and on Boards
of Trustees. Concern for participation by developing countries at Group meetings seem to be coming primarily from the donors.

53. Recommendation 20 spelled out some suggestions for strengthening the present system of participation.

54. Recommendation 21 involved the involvement of scientists from developing countries in the work of the centers, while Recommendation 20 concerned procedures that centers should adopt in developing their off-campus activities.

55. Dr. Bentley, on behalf of the Center Chairmen, was the first of many speakers to express reservations about the proposed Budget Review Committee. As an alternative he proposed a secret ballot whereby each of the 13 centers should be rated by various other components of the system in respect to the effectiveness of their performance and their expected potential to therefore increasing food production. The tabulated results of such an exercise would provide non-binding guidance to the Budget Review Committee. Noting the suggestion that Directors General be involved in the interactive process of setting annual budgets, Dr. Bentley felt that in such cases they should be accompanied either by their Chairman or by some other Board member. The Chairmen were not impressed by the proposal to add a senior management specialist to the CGIAR Secretariat. Rather, the centers should engage a firm or firms of specialist consultants to provide such services as were needed from time to time.

56. Dr. Sen, speaking primarily as an individual chairman, addressed a number of points under discussion. While endorsing a number of the recommendations in these two chapters, he had serious difficulties with numbers 9, 11, 12 and 15 and the underlying philosophy behind them. He detected an attempt to limit significantly the autonomy currently enjoyed by the centers and their Boards and he feared the emergence of a highly bureaucratic system. He felt the Board of Trustees' system had served the Group well, and suspected the effect of the recommendations would be to make the 186 people serving on Boards of Trustees essentially subservient to decisions made by a very small number of people in key positions in the Secretariat or in TAC. If a management review was felt necessary for any center, it should be commissioned by the Board of Trustees concerned either on its own or following a specific resolution passed by the CGIAR as a whole. It should be done by independent consultants. While supporting the concept of a Budget Review Committee, Dr. Sen felt that three members would be enough and that they should be nominated by the Chairman of the CGIAR in consultation with the Cosponsors and with the Chairman of the Committee of Board Chairmen. Each of these three persons should be independent and TAC should not play any part in the process. As for Recommendation 12, he supported most of it but felt that it would be unwise to add a management specialist to the staff of the CGIAR Secretariat, thereby creating some kind of inspector general function. As regards Recommendation 15, he suggested substitution of the words "collective resources" for "collective will" in the first sentence and the word "function" for the word "behave" in the second sentence. He also suggested deletion of the entire third sentence from "to ignore ... central authority" and of all the words after "important matters of policy" in the fourth sentence. He felt that these amendments would help remove a number of misunderstandings and controversial points.
57. Speaking for the Center Directors, Dr. Swindale said that they concurred with the need to preserve the informality of the system, its lack of bureaucratic control and its ability to respond quickly. Generally speaking, the Center Directors supported most of the recommendations in Chapters 7 and 8, particularly those with regard to participation of developing countries. In respect with Recommendation 7 it was felt that while the system retained biennial budgeting, five-year projections should be made only every other year rather than annually. Within Recommendation 9 his colleagues felt that the term "management review" should be more clearly defined. Judgements as to the quality of management of the centers were the prerogative of the Boards of Trustees. Centers were subject to independent external audit and audit by some donors whether it was accepted that the Group did have the right to make special investigations whenever there was a clearly felt need, and the centers would fully cooperate in any such activity. They were concerned by the large number of reviews already taking place and doubted whether more central reviews would in practice reduce the number mounted by individual donors. He noted that the proposed Budget Review Committee would not enhance the involvement of donors in the process of resource allocation, but if the Group wished to experiment with this the centers would fully cooperate. However, he hoped this would not be an additional activity but would in fact take over some of the functions currently being given to TAC. TAC should devote more of its time to long-term technical issues of agricultural research and training and centers would welcome the opportunity for a better dialogue between themselves and TAC on such matters.

58. He felt that the proposal in Recommendation 12, essentially to maintain the existing structure, was evidence of the success with which it was currently functioning. Centers would support the proposal for a study of terms and conditions of employment and staff benefits required to retain high quality staff, provided always that such a study did not interfere with the autonomy of each center. Finally, he offered the cooperation of the centers in providing assistance to the public relations effort of the Secretariat.

59. Regarding Recommendation 11, Dr. Cummings emphasized that programs and budgets could not be seen in isolation from each other. TAC, as a technical advisory body, had a duty to maintain a continuing review of program priorities. Hence the introduction of a Budget Review Committee would not relieve TAC as a whole of that responsibility. He noted that the suggested process would add to overhead administrative costs. Agreeing with the need to maintain the highest level of expertise within the TAC Secretariat, Dr. Cummings paid tribute to the skill and devotion of the current staff. If they were to have enough time for preparing more analytical studies, then their capacity would probably need to be strengthened. While Dr. Cummings agreed that in future the post of TAC Chairman would be close to a full-time job, it was nevertheless important that the incumbent maintained his intellectual independence. He endorsed the proposal to allow individual TAC members a longer term of service.

60. For Japan, Minister Hatano confirmed the great importance attached by his government to agricultural research and particularly that carried out under the aegis of the CGIAR. His goverment had established a new medium-term target for increasing its official development assistance, and he hoped this would have a favorable impact on Japanese contributions to the CGIAR centers. He felt the current Review was particularly
appropriate given the difficult economic circumstances currently facing the world. His authorities appreciated the work of the Committee and found the Report generally satisfactory and most of the recommendations could be supported. However, he doubted whether the proposed Budget Review Committee was appropriate and would prefer to see some strengthening of the existing mechanisms and the production of a set of guidelines to guide budgetary decisions. The proposed strengthening of the CGIAR Secretariat should extend not only to its staff but also to its mandate. He found merit in the earlier proposal for a management advisory committee and would welcome more detailed information on the pros and cons of various alternative mechanisms. He felt that each CGIAR center should adopt clear and equitable procedures for the selection of Directors General and other senior staff. This would help create better understanding of the value of the system, both among the public and the treasuries in donor countries. This matter was important for his own country's efforts to strengthen their support for the CGIAR. Hence he urged that the centers, perhaps assisted by the Secretariat, should draw up for themselves criteria and procedures to be followed for the selection of senior staff, recognizing that it was important to maintain the autonomy of each institution.

61. Another speaker, regretting that the Report had not found it possible to consider alternatives in most cases, would have preferred to have seen mention of some suggestions of a more radical or innovative nature. An annual budget of some $170 million implied a very major operation which in other cases called for clearly defined management processes on the part of governments and other components. While the current system had served well in the past, he doubted whether the modest changes proposed would leave in place a strong enough system to support the very large-scale expenditures planned for the coming decade. He suggested the possibility of establishing, as one possible alternative, a governing board for the international agricultural research activities with its own secretariat functioning independently from the Cosponsors. He had difficulty in fully accepting the concept of the autonomy of Boards of Trustees since they did not take fundamental responsibility for raising resources and hence could not realistically expect to remain fully autonomous. Those providing the resources must be held accountable for them and in turn hold accountable the organizations to which those resources were provided. He felt that there should be some input from donors in preparing budget guidelines now prepared mainly by the CGIAR Secretariat. In his opinion the proposed Budget Review Committee did not do much to solve the problem of getting more direct donor involvement in setting priorities and taking policy decisions. If some kind of multiyear funding mechanism were to be pursued, then it would require careful examination of the current processes within the CGIAR system.

62. Another speaker also felt that with a budget in excess of $150 million a year, some centralized governance became inescapable, one in which the Consultative Group itself should have a key role. He felt the Report was in general overly bland and lacked critical evaluation of the current system, for example in the structure and conduct of its meetings which had now in his opinion become quite inadequate for the work in hand.

63. A number of other speakers felt that the strengthening of the Group's central services had now become inescapable.

64. A speaker queried the validity of the figures on special projects as compared to core expenditures. He felt there were serious problems of definition and possibly some obfuscation.
65. With respect to Boards of Trustees a speaker questioned whether it was realistic to try and exclude donor representation from Boards.

66. A speaker saw the evaluation process in terms of the management of resources in order to achieve development objectives. In listening to the discussions so far, he feared that the Group would demonstrate that it was not currently structured in such a way as to be able to make hard decisions for itself. As one who had originally supported the proposal for a Budget Review Committee and who still supported it, he felt it had two important virtues. One was that it would limit the danger of bureaucratisation which he felt was a real one if more responsibility were given to employees of the system. Secondly, the Budget Review Committee, if there were one, would consist of people not personally involved in the operation of the system but nevertheless knowledgeable about it. Such a Committee would create the opportunity to use the services of very highly qualified people who might not be available in other capacities. He warned against the danger of increasing direct relationships between donors and centers in which each donor would make its own independent judgements which would make it difficult to keep the Group together.

67. Another speaker questioned whether it was necessary for donors to pledge to individual institutes provided there were other ways in which they could express their views on priorities. Perhaps a financial meeting of interested donors could discuss policy matters and set general guidelines for overall allocations.

68. A speaker noted the constructive interaction of developing countries with the Review process. This prompted him to raise a number of problems in connection with the participation of developing countries in the Group’s affairs. Their voices were seldom heard at meetings of the Consultative Group. They tended to be heavily outnumbered. There was a psychological problem in that delegates from developing countries tended to feel isolated and on the fringe of things. When they raised their own concerns, there was the feeling that they were being somehow overly subjective. All the Group’s papers were written in English which made them largely inaccessible to Francophone Africa. The term of services of delegates from developing countries was too short to enable them to get to know the operations of the system. It was difficult or impossible for delegates to get to know the views of the region they represented or to report back to their constituents. The delegate himself would be in a difficult position if he wished to express a personal opinion. There could also be difficulties connected with the cost of attendance. Finally there was a great need for a thorough study of the real impact of the international centers on the development of national research capacity in developing countries.

69. The Chairman confirmed that the question of resource allocation in general and the proposal for a Budget Review Committee in particular had generated great debate in the Review Committee and had given rise to a number of second thoughts. Nevertheless, the Review Committee had collectively arrived at this recommendation. However, the Group in the course of the current meeting clearly had to make some decisions urgently with respect to 1982 and 1983. He summarized the range of options currently before the Group. One was to continue evolving the process for
resource allocation which had begun with the TAC meeting in Lima in 1979 which would call for the strengthening of the existing central services. The second alternative was for the proposed Budget Review Committee, and if that were supported there were a number of details which would still have to be worked out. There were other options, as for example some kind of management advisory committee or the proposal from the floor for an independent board with its own secretariat and separate from the three Cosponsors.

70. Turning to Chapters 9 and 10 Dr. Arnold briefly reviewed the statistical information included in Chapter 9 on the development of the Group’s funding. Chapter 10 discussed future strategy and included a five-year financial plan. He emphasized that this plan was only as good as the information upon which it was based in which there still remained considerable uncertainties. Hence Recommendation 23 proposed the progressive refinement of such plans until they became a realistic reflection both of financial requirements and the likely availability of funds.

71. Speaking for the Board Chairmen Mr. Mathieson emphasized their dismay at the negative growth in some center budgets. They were strongly in support of the view that a serious effort must be made to increase predictability of future funding in order to give the center managements a greater sense of financial security. He also drew attention to the serious cash flow problems and had hoped that the Review might have had some suggestions in that regard. To the extent that legislative procedures permitted, the Chairmen hoped that commitments could be made much further in advance than at present. The Chairmen felt that Directors General should continue to maintain direct access with individual donors. He urged that the heads of the three cosponsoring agencies be invited to bring the interests of the CGIAR before their contacts in member governments, stressing the very high rates of return that agricultural research could achieve. The Chairmen supported the view that Boards should arrange for the production and approval by them of five-year rolling plans for their centers. Any growth built into these plans should not be automatic but should reflect specific lines of action approved by the Board. It was desirable that donors be persuaded to reassess their priorities in order to channel relatively more funds into international agricultural research through the CGIAR system. Tightly constrained budgets led to inertia, lack of flexibility, declining staff morale and the inability to respond positively to the needs of the developing countries.

72. Speaking for the Center Directors, Dr. Nour supported the views expressed by Mr. Mathieson. While the Center Directors supported the concept of rolling five-year financial plans, they could not fail to be concerned at the levels of real growth proposed, zero in some cases. Center Directors felt that for established centers growth of the order of 3% per annum and for the still growing centers between 10 and 15% per annum would be appropriate. He noted the concerns expressed at the summit conference at Cancun about the world food situation and the importance of the role of agricultural research. Centers felt the need for greater influence on national agricultural research and greater interaction with them. He would like to see extension activities being made available to the centers so that the new technologies would reach their targets. While appreciating the support that the centers had received in the past, the Directors felt that the difficult financial situation encouraged them to
look for new initiatives and innovations and the pressure of the food crisis in the developing world should stimulate centers in their quest for further funding and additional support. They felt that the voice of the developing countries should be much more heard.

73. Dr. Cummings noted that TAC endorsed the concept of five-year plans and that good progress was being made to prepare them. TAC would be in close consultation with the centers on this matter. Referring to the suggestion that financial plans be prepared only very other year, Dr. Cummings felt that the present biennial budgeting system was something of a fiction in view of the tight financial constraints year by year. In practice the Group was considering annual budgets with, however, five-year forward projections. He felt that in his judgement the financial plan summarized in Recommendation 24 was too pessimistic and conservative. The text, however, was much more imaginative and forward-looking.

74. A speaker who had been involved in the very early days of the creation of the system, emphasized the moral commitment that the donors collectively had to the CGIAR system and to the long-term support of the centers. He felt the Group would defeat its own purposes if it concentrated only on internal management without paying proper regard to securing an adequate level of funding for the future.

75. Another speaker pointed out that the CGIAR system was now in serious competition for funds with other agricultural and development activities. The work of the centers were sometimes criticized on the grounds that it diverted support from national programs or that it only benefited the more prosperous farmers. While it was probably justifiable that emphasis should be given to the remarkable success of wheat from CIMMYT and rice from IRRI, nevertheless an assessment of the impact of the centers' programs on national programs in general as suggested by another speaker would be extremely useful. From his own experience he knew of many dramatic examples. He felt the need for some more lively publicity of such successes. He felt some well-made films might be useful in this respect.

76. Another speaker pointed to the dilemma inherent in financial plans. On the one hand they should provide incentive and an optimistic picture to the Group as a whole, but on the other hand Center Boards and management should be presented with realistic figures. The discrepancy between the two could lead to ad hoc measures which were inconsistent with the Group's own guidelines.

77. The Chairman noted that the assumptions on the levels of funding built into the current version of the financial plan may turn out somewhat unrealistic and the plan might have to be scaled down. What was important was to focus on the assumptions underlying the planned rate of growth over the five-year period and whether or not these were acceptable to the Group. They were on the whole extremely modest, but the resulting financial total was not inconsiderable.

78. Another speaker while believing that the financial plan in Recommendation 24 was sensible and prudent, nevertheless it should remain an internal planning document and should not be widely distributed to people outside the system. As a planning exercise, it did not imply any commitment.
79. The representative of a major donor, while supporting a previous speaker's plea for an optimistic and imaginative approach to the long-term future, drew attention to the serious cutbacks that his own agency was experiencing and hence the need for realism. He hoped the meeting could come up with definitive projections particularly for 1983. As far as contacts between the centers and donors were concerned, he had been surprised by the extent to which people in donor agencies working mainly on bilateral programs were ignorant of the work of the centers. Every effort should be made to educate them and encourage them to visit the centers.

Item 4 - TAC Chairman's Report on 25th and 26th Meetings of TAC

80. Dr. Cummings confined his remarks to subjects that were not covered elsewhere in the meeting's agenda. Dr. Cummings felt that TAC had had an excellent interaction this year with the Center Directors and the CGIAR Secretariat in the annual program and budget review process. It was not TAC's role to consider details of budgeting and budget allocation, but it did have to keep abreast of developments in each program and advise on priorities. He reiterated that programs and budgets were inseparable. TAC's role in this regard had evolved substantially over the last three years, partly due to the emergence of severe financial constraints. Efforts were being made continuously to improve the process whereby budget guidelines were evolved in the light of general priorities. The internal priorities of each center could be identified in terms of activities at the margin which could be supported or otherwise depending on the actual availability of funds. Hence, TAC was prepared at its last meeting at IITA with a much better analysis of the programs of the different centers in relation to their own priorities. Prior to that meeting each member of TAC had been assigned one or more center to identify the items which were important for consideration at the TAC meeting. Most members of TAC had been able to visit at least one of the centers prior to the meeting. At IITA TAC had divided itself into three subcommittees, each of which met individually with about a third of the Center Directors. TAC then met in closed session to get an overview of the issues center by center, and then discussed them with the Center Directors in open session. TAC then divided itself into two subcommittees which prepared recommendations on priorities within and across centers and as to the programs which could be implemented at two levels of budget. The resulting recommendations were then referred back to the full TAC. Dr. Cummings stressed TAC's intention to introduce as many improvements as were feasible in the system of program and budget review so that the system's resources could be used to the best effect and have the most effective impact on improving the food supply of the developing world.

81. Secondly, Dr. Cummings referred to TAC's consideration of its own role. It had before it a number of papers on this question which the Group had received. These confirmed that TAC saw its role as primarily a technical one which required a continuing and close understanding of the goals and programs of the individual centers and the planning that underpinned them. TAC's advice on program matters became translated into budgetary terms which then became the responsibility of others. One of TAC's main functions was the system of Quinquennial Reviews and now two or three of such reviews were undertaken each year. These were now operated under revised set of guidelines introduced some three years ago. Perhaps
the most useful part of the quinquennial process was the self-examination which the center itself took in preparation. While it was entirely appropriate for Boards of Trustees to have some difference of view about various recommendations of TAC arising from Quinquennial Reviews, nevertheless TAC attempted, wherever possible, to follow up and see the degree to which all its recommendations had been put into effect and where they had not, to consider the reasons therefore. As for Quinquennial Reviews currently in view, the current meeting had received a report on the Quinquennial Review of ILRAD. The ILCA Review was under way, being conducted into two phases, the first of which was completed. The second Quinquennial Review of IRRI was scheduled for January 1982 and the Chairman of the Review Panel, Dr. Ralph Riley, had already met with the Board at its meeting last October. Plans were well advanced for the second Quinquennial Review of CIMMYT to be conducted under the Chairmanship of Dr. John Dillon in September 1982. The review of CIP was scheduled for December 1982 through January 1983, and that of ICARDA in March of 1983. Reviews of WARDA and CIAT and the first one for IFPRI were not yet scheduled, but would be planned in the near future.

82. Turning to Stripe Reviews Dr. Cummings mentioned that the system had so far commissioned two -- one on farming systems and the second one of off-campus activities. Both of these were done by groups of consultants. As for the review of off-campus activities, Dr. Cummings urged members to consider the reports that had been produced and to provide comments and suggestions about this important and rapidly growing area of the Group’s activities. TAC had taken note of the Review Committee’s recommendations on commodity and activity reviews which seemed to him to be synonymous with stripe reviews.

83. Dr. Cummings reminded the Group that TAC had been requested to undertake a broad and comprehensive study of the whole subject of plant nutrition, partly in response to the outcome of the application of IFDC to join the system. A paper on the subject had been considered in draft at the 25th meeting of TAC and this had subsequently been reviewed by an independent panel. A final draft would be available for consideration at the 27th meeting of TAC in March 1982.

84. Dr. Cummings mentioned that TAC had been asked to make a study of the question of plant breeders’ rights, particularly in relation to the work of the international centers. It soon appeared that a number of quite different issues had become confused in the public mind under this general heading. A form of questionnaire had been sent to the international centers and a number of responses had been received and were being analyzed. In the meantime the IBPGR had commissioned a paper on the related subject of the conservation of genetic resources and this had been considered by TAC. In addition a paper had been prepared by a group of experts from the Netherlands addressing the major issues involved. This would be the basis for a workshop to be held in FAO in the early part of 1982. TAC hoped at its March meeting to be able to formulate a general statement of policy on the subject which might seem applicable to the work of the international centers. Dr. Cummings noted that one outcome of the application of ICIPE for membership in the Consultative Group was a request for TAC to study pests and disease research at the international centers. Preliminary inquiries had developed a wide array of questions and a working
paper was being developed by a member of TAC on this subject in consultation with the centers. A revised paper would be before TAC in either March or June 1982. In view of the range of topics that Dr. Cummings had mentioned, he felt that to do them justice more time would be needed than the typical meeting allowed, which suggested the need for more forum discussions.

85. Dr. Cummings noted that the centers had been strongly urged to develop long-range plans in consultation with their staff and their Boards. These were part of the standard instructions for preparation for a Quinquennial Review. Most centers now either had plans or had them in draft and TAC would be reviewing them in the near future. While the forward plans of the system would not simply be an aggregate of the plans of the centers, the latter would be important inputs into TAC’s consideration of a long-term plan for the system as a whole. This was a matter to which TAC attached considerable importance.

86. TAC had been considering alternative strategies for implementing the Group’s objectives. Every time a new initiative was suggested, alternatives to the traditional international center model were considered, for example the team looking into water management had before it several alternative models. Dr. Cummings mentioned TAC’s examination of the work on upland rice which would be the subject of a symposium in Africa in 1982. More details would be provided in due course. TAC had been paying some special attention to the development of ISNAR and was very pleased to note the progress which had so far been made.

87. Concluding his last presentation before the Group in his capacity as Chairman of TAC, Dr. Cummings ended on a personal note by expressing his appreciation for the support he had received during his term of office.

88. A speaker asked Dr. Cummings about TAC’s priorities for factor oriented research, noting that TAC was currently considering a proposal for an international board for soil resources management as well as the question of irrigation water management.

89. Dr. Cummings noted that factor oriented research was already being carried out within the system and TAC would take a pragmatic view of any further developments in that direction which might be desirable.

Item 4a - Process for Selection of the Next TAC Chairman

90. At the request of the Cosponsors Dr. Cummings had agreed to remain in office as Chairman of TAC until after its next meeting in March 1982. The process of finding his successor was already under way. The Cosponsors had solicited and received a large number of recommendations for potential chairmen. From this they were in the process of preparing a shortlist. The composition of this list depended to some extent on the nature of the TAC Chairman’s job and the amount of time he would have to devote to it, both matters still under consideration as part of the Review. After the current meeting the Cosponsors would circulate a shortlist to all of the members of the Group in writing together with a job description as the Cosponsors understood it. Members would be asked to state their preferences among the candidates on the shortlist and give any comments that they wished. Based on these comments the Cosponsors would propose a single candidate for the ratification of the Group. It was hoped
that the new Chairman would be designated in time to attend the March meeting which would be chaired by Dr. Cummings. One speaker asked that the shortlist be made available in the course of the current meeting, and another felt that the job description need not await further consideration of the Review.

91. In answer to a question the Chairman reaffirmed that the new Chairman of TAC would be physically independent of all the Cosponsors and that he would not be a member of any of their staffs.

**Item 5 - Progress Report on Water Management Proposal**

92. The Chairman noted strong consensus that, should the Group's activities expand, research and training in irrigation water management would be among the highest priorities and had indeed been before the Group since the very beginning. He and the Chairman of TAC had convened a special meeting of interested donors in Washington in July 1981 which had been well attended and had been chaired by Dr. Cunningham, who gave a brief report on it.

93. Dr. Cunningham reminded members of TAC's long consideration of water management which had been the subject of a number of papers. At its last meeting the Group had considered a paper by TAC entitled "Proposal for the Creation of an International Institute for Research and Training on Irrigation Water Management". This was clearly a subject of the greatest possible importance and the Group's reluctance to get directly involved in it stemmed rather from a diversity of view about the best approach. TAC had felt that they had studied the question enough and before proceeding any further needed to have a clear signal as to the Group's wishes. Hence the July meeting of interested donors had been convened and attended by some 30 participants.

94. There was general agreement that water management should have the highest priority if and when the Group had resources to expand into something new. The meeting had also concluded that if there were a new activity in water management, it should not take the form of a traditional international center with heavy capital investment. An alternative might be some kind of network arrangement or an organization on the same general pattern as ISNAR. In terms of budget the meeting felt that something of the order of $3-5 million a year might be enough to start with. The meeting had recognized that water management embraced a very wide range of topics and some kind of study group would need to be set up to decide what any new organization should concentrate on. This group would be established under the auspices of TAC. TAC had moved fast on this and the Study Team was already at work. It was expected that it would present its final report in time for consideration at the March meeting of TAC and the conclusions would come before the Group at its next meeting.

95. Dr. Cummings confirmed that a team of four consultants had been engaged to study the subject further under preliminary terms of reference as set forth in the annex to the report of the July meeting. They were working under the direction of a steering group chaired by Dr. Treitz which had met in mid-October, consisting of 16 members. The team was currently undertaking field work and would meet again with the steering group in Rome in mid-February. Dr. Cummings thanked a number of members of the Group for supporting this study through providing either funds or experts.
96. Dr. Treitz reported on the first meeting of the steering group. This group recognized that expensive delays and mistakes in large irrigation schemes arose through a lack of communication between engineers, agronomists and other experts. The group urged a multidisciplinary approach that would look at irrigation schemes as a whole system. All the alternatives listed in the terms of reference should be studied and although the budget envisaged seemed about right, this too should be considered flexibly.

97. In answer to a question Dr. Treitz confirmed that the health aspects of irrigation schemes were one example of subjects which tended to be overlooked and would certainly be included in the current study.

98. In response to a request Dr. Cummings listed the members of the team as Dr. Schulze, Dr. Chambers, Dr. Kirpich and Dr. Dagg.

99. A speaker raised the question of finding resources to support a new activity in water management. His own agency could probably find funds additional to those it provided to the CGIAR, but it would be necessary to know whether other donors could do likewise. He questioned whether such an activity should properly be included in the CGIAR system.

100. Dr. Amir Muhammed reported on the expert consultation he had chaired under FAO auspices in Islamabad. This had concluded that water would become a limiting factor regardless of other advancements in technology, biological or otherwise. He recommended that urgent action be taken to collect scientific views on water constraints on food production. Contrary to popular belief, there were still serious gaps in knowledge about water management, for example little was known about farmers' organizations, systems of water distribution and other socioeconomic aspects. In order to get such knowledge assembled and acted upon, it was necessary to have the kind of international prestige which would command attention from policymakers.

101. In answer to a question Dr. Cummings confirmed that the current study had not yet examined whether ICARDA had any particular role in water management, but the study team had it in its terms of reference to look at possible activities in this field of the existing institutions. If a network approach were favored, then some of the centers might well form part of it.


102. The Chairman noted that as usual the Report had two distinct sections, the first dealing with matters of general scientific interest and the second dealing with matters connected with the Group's business. The first part this year covered four main topics -- nitrogen fixation with micro-organisms, beneficial root fungi, tissue culture and genetic engineering, and the problems of marginal lands.

103. A speaker, noting the difficulty of writing a report which was intelligible to the layman while at the same time presenting a fully balanced view, warned that in his view some of the claims for biological nitrogen fixation had been exaggerated. The potential for other techniques discussed in the Report lay, in his view, well into the future. He agreed
with the Report's conclusion that new advances in technology had profound implications for the work of the centers but he queried at what stage the centers should take advantage of them. While the centers would move into more basic research as national programs became stronger in applied research, more speculative lines of research should only be taken up when there was some confidence that they could be successfully applied. His own agency was increasingly providing funds for contract research in support of the work of the centers.

104. A speaker sought information on how much of the Group's current resources were being used for the fields discussed in the Integrative Report. He wondered whether some kind of stripe analysis of the techniques being used at the centers should be undertaken.

105. Dr. Plucknett conceded that it was very difficult to get hard figures on the amount of resources going into these fields. He would guess something of the order of 10%. However, the centers were increasingly beginning to move in these directions and as an example he cited IITA's tissue culture laboratory. There was already a high degree of coordination in nitrogen fixation work. The centers were applying new techniques largely in the interests of saving time.

106. A speaker noted that the Report's discussion of marginal lands made no mention of trees. He reminded the Group that the International Council for Research on Agro-forestry was now in existence in recognition of the great importance of trees in land resource utilization.

107. A representative of Australia referred to the establishment of the Australian Center for International Agricultural Research. This would have substantial resources available to it, but he would welcome guidance from the Integrative Report on how far one should go in the direction of basic research.

108. Another speaker proposed that there be a workshop on the contributions that basic science could make to agriculture and food production. He also suggested that a new center be established dedicated to basic science in agriculture. At present many good scientists in the developing countries were not getting the attention they deserved.

109. Another speaker cautioned against the centers becoming too involved in basic research which when added together could amount to a large scale activity, resources for which might be better used for applied work. Another speaker felt that the more basic work was better left to bilateral programs rather than being included within the CGIAR system. A number of speakers found difficulty in distinguishing clearly between basic and applied research, both of which formed part of a continuum.

110. Turning to the second part of the Integrative Report, the Chairman drew members' attention to the levels of recommended funding. The figures for each center had been derived according to a process described in Annex IV of the Report. Each center had two figures, one based on the total agreed for planning purposes at the last meeting of the Group, and the second based on a figure some $10 million lower in total.
111. In answer to a question, Dr. Cummings confirmed that TAC had considered the operational budget requests for each center and had examined those items which the centers themselves identified as things that could be eliminated or deferred if funds were shorter than expected. At the time of its meeting in Ibadan some centers were still uncertain as to the receipts they would actually get during 1981.

112. A representative of Sweden underlined the need for long-term funding for international agricultural research and stated that his government would be prepared, together with other donors, to discuss a new pledging procedure for the CGIAR to provide multi-year funding. Regarding the five-year plan in the Integrative Report, his delegation was somewhat skeptical as to whether the proposed funding levels would be achieved. He queried whether the figures provided on collaborative research reflected the true picture. Another speaker stated that from his own experience the figure of $450,000 was a statistical construct and very much underestimated the extent of collaborative work.

113. Dr. Cummings pointed out that the figures in any case did not include expenditures made on collaborative research by collaborators outside the CGIAR system. It was recognized that the tabular data was built up from information provided by the centers and there was need for considerable improvement and standardization of such reporting.

114. A speaker, while commending the process which had been developed at Ibadan for reconciling resources and requirements and accepting the financial projections as a prudent internal planning exercise, nevertheless stressed that this did not in any way commit his agency to any particular level of funding. He emphasized the importance of information on the actual financial outturn for 1981, which was essential when negotiating with treasuries. Mr. Lejeune stated that the best estimate for total core funding for 1981 would be about $131 million, as compared to a total pledges of $139 million, the difference being largely due to changes in exchange rates.

**Item 7 - Approval of 1982 Programs and Budgets**

115. The Chairman reminded members of the procedure whereby an explicit figure was approved for the budget of each center without guaranteeing that this amount would be fully forthcoming or that any individual donor was committed to a particular amount. For 1982 there were two recommendations for each center, one based on the overall planning figure agreed by the Group, the other on the assumption that total contributions would be about $10 million less. Mr. Lejeune reminded members of the procedure which was outlined in Annex IV of the Integrative Report.

116. In response to the Group's wish for a limit to be imposed on the growth of the system, the Secretariat had from 1979 been preparing five-year indicative financial plans. These plans allowed for a modest degree of real growth. It had become clear that it would be unlikely that funding would exceed the total of the fallback positions for 1982 and the recommendations currently before the Group amounted to net funding of $163 million. Allowing for a certain degree of shortfunding, the system could live with total contributions for 1982 of around $160 million.
117. A speaker drew attention to the widely differing growth rates in center budgets between the revised 1981 figures and those recommended for 1982. If actual receipts turned out to be some 10% below the fallback position in 1982, then many of the centers would experience negative growth. Recognizing the many uncertainties in the system, due in part to fluctuations in exchange rates, the Chairman felt that the Group had little alternative than to plan on the figure derived from the programs and budgets as reviewed by TAC. There remained the question of how to deal with any additional shortfall in funding.

118. A representative of Canada noted that his own government was devoting an increasing share of GNP to official development assistance. However, there were many demands on this assistance and increased emphasis was likely to be given to bilateral programs, multilateral activities having grown very fast during the 1970s. Recognizing the need for a moral commitment to provide the resources recommended, this commitment became somewhat diluted when there was significant disagreement about the admission of new activities. He drew attention to the fact that the system had nothing in the way of reserves, a problem made more serious by the lack of dependability of some donors.

119. Mr. Lejeune agreed with the seriousness of this problem though noting that centers typically had 30 days' operating expenditure as working capital. Some short-term funding was also available in the first part of the year from the World Bank. This raised the question of whether there should be a contingency pool available centrally for helping out centers that found themselves in short-term difficulties.

120. A representative of the United Kingdom emphasized that as far as his authorities were concerned, the CGIAR was in competition with funds with other multilateral activities such as FAO, UNDP, and the World Bank. Treasuries would point to the fact that it appeared that the CGIAR would be requesting considerable degree of growth in 1982 over the outcome for 1981 at a time when other programs were being subjected to a policy of zero real growth. The Chairman confirmed that while there were many uncertainties in the figures, it was not the policy of the Group to have zero or negative real growth. Some new donors were expected to join the Group and there were others who could look for substantial real increases in their contributions. He confirmed the consensus of the Group that for planning purposes the figures given in Table 1A of the Secretariat's document of November 4 be approved as the center budgets for 1982.

Item 8 - Donor Indications of Financial Support for 1982 and Beyond

121. Members in a position to do so made the following pledges for 1982 and in some cases beyond.

122. UNDP pledged $5,220,000 to restricted core and an additional $3,704,800 for special projects in 1982. These amounts had already been approved.

1/ In some cases, figures stated verbally differed slightly from figures subsequently confirmed in writing. The latter are used in this Summary.
123. Australia would contribute Aus$3.53 million in 1982, an increase of 21% over 1981. Contributions through the new Australian Center for International Agricultural Research would be additional.

124. The United Kingdom could not yet give a firm figure, which was still under consideration, but the amount for 1982 would probably be no less than the amount for 1981 expressed in sterling. The intention was that the amount for 1982 would include allowances for inflation, also for any loss derived from the depreciation of sterling against the dollar and might also allow for some real increase.

125. Norway would contribute 11 million Norwegian krona in 1982, an increase of 10% over 1981.

126. Switzerland was considering a contribution in 1982 of 5.26 million Swiss francs, approximately equal at the current rate of exchange to some US$2.9 million. In Swiss franc terms this was an increase of 20%, compared to an overall increase in Swiss foreign aid of only 6%.

127. The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany said that for indicative purposes the Group should plan on receiving from its authorities funds equivalent to 22.5 million Deutsche Mark, 1.5 million Deutsche Mark more than in 1981.

128. In 1982 the United States was prepared to grant up to 25% of the total contributions, limited to one-quarter of $167 million as a maximum, and subject to the provision by Congress of adequate funds. The actual amount provided by USAID would be reduced to the extent that total contributions fell short of $167 million. The experience of the past whereby the US contribution had exceeded 25% due to fluctuations in exchange rates could not be repeated.

129. Subject to government approval, Sweden would provide 18.2 million Swedish krona in 1982, an increase of 16% over 1981.

130. The World Bank would continue its role as donor of last resort and would contribute its customary 10%.

131. Denmark would contribute 7.5 million Danish krona in 1982, an increase of 500,000 krona over 1981, subject to Parliamentary approval.

132. Again subject to Parliamentary approval, Canada planned to contribute 10.2 million Canadian dollars in 1982, an increase in Canadian dollar terms of approximately 12.5% over 1981. Contributions to ICRAF would be additional.

133. The representative of France noted that his government was reassessing its policy with regard to collaboration with developing countries and with respect to scientific research. For both of these, planned increase in terms of share of GNP was in view. The balance between multilateral and bilateral activities was still under consideration and therefore no firm figure could be given at the present time. For internal planning purposes, the Secretariat could assume that the 1982 contribution would amount to 6.2 million francs. The amount might possibly be higher, particularly for 1983.
134. Subject to final approval, the Commission of the European Communities would continue to support four centers and planned to contribute 4.9 million ECU, an increase of 25% over 1981 in ECU terms. A decision might be taken in March 1982 to provide an additional amount for CIMMYT.

135. The representative of Japan noted that his financial year began in April and the process of negotiating contributions for 1982 was still underway. However, it was the intention to contribute 10.35 million US dollars in US dollars, hence the amount would not be affected by changes in the value of the yen against the dollar. In Japan, the CGIAR was now in direct competition with major international organizations in the UN family.

136. The Netherlands was prepared to contribute 3.433 million US dollars in 1982, compared to 3.07 million in 1981. Together with an additional amount for special projects, the Dutch financial contribution to the system would increase by about 15% in 1982, compared to an overall growth rate in the development budget of only 5.5%.

137. The Ford Foundation had undertaken a careful review of its support to the CGIAR system and its representative confirmed that the Foundation would contribute US$1 million in 1982, with the possibility of an additional amount if there was a positive recommendation on an activity connected with water management.

138. IDRC recorded its difficulty in distinguishing between core and special projects and planned to contribute roughly 1.5 million Canadian dollars to restricted core and about 1.6 million dollars to special projects to about five centers in 1982.

139. IFAD's proposed budget for 1982 included funding for the CGIAR at a level of about $7 million subject to confirmation at its Board meeting in December. Owing to the timing of the budget process, IFAD's funds would not be disbursed until after the next Board meeting in April.

140. Subject to approval of its Board, the Rockefeller Foundation planned to contribute $800,000 to selected centers in 1982. While this represented a reduced contribution in financial terms, the staff and Board of the Foundation retained strong interest in the future of the activities of the Consultative Group.

141. The Inter-American Development Bank planned to contribute $8.1 million in 1982 for unrestricted core support to the three centers in Latin America, $3.65 million to CIMMYT, $3.5 million to CIAT, and $0.95 million to CIP. The representative of the Bank noted increasing difficulty in convincing the Board of Executive Directors representing 43 member countries of the need to increase contribution to the CGIAR in the face of many competing claims. Convincing evidence was needed that the funds were being used in the best possible way. The Bank had approved loans and financed technical cooperation for agricultural research purposes to an amount exceeding $200 million in the course of its normal operations. The Bank wondered whether the present system of management by a small group of cosponsors was still appropriate and felt the need for a more sophisticated management approach. The Bank urged the establishment of firm criteria for the inclusion of new activities or the phasing out of
existing ones. Latin America was felt to be underrepresented in the policymaking bodies of the system. The Bank attached particular importance to the interrelation between international and national agricultural research and was watching the progress of ISNAR with great interest. It felt that highest priority should be given to training at the centers. Financial management should be strengthened with a view to leaner budgeting and greater cost effectiveness and further outreach activities of the centers should strengthen their financial base. Each center should try to measure the impact of its programs and look for opportunities for generating additional income. The Group's activities might be more sharply focused on crop oriented research in those areas in which developing countries had the potential for self-sufficiency in food production. The Inter-American Development Bank's future position on funding would be strongly influenced by the outcome of the current review process.

142. Subject to Parliamentary approval, Nigeria planned to increase its contribution in 1982 by about 50% to the equivalent of about 1.2 million US dollars, of which IITA would get the equivalent of .75 million in local currency, ILCA .225 of which 150,000 would be in US dollars and the remainder in local currency, ICRISAT would get 150,000 US dollars and WARDA 75,000 US dollars. Nigeria shared the concern of other donors for cost effectiveness in the system and would make available to members the proceedings of a two-week workshop on research management held recently in Nigeria and in which the Director General of IITA participated.

143. Without being able to give a firm figure, the representative of Ireland said his authorities were considering a substantial real increase in their contribution to the CGIAR.

144. The representative of India hoped that it would be possible that its contribution would be maintained at the same level as 1981 subject to government approval. The amount had been included in the budget of the Department of Agricultural Research and Education and the Chairman noted that the amount in question was one-half million US dollars.

145. Subject to government approval, Mexico's contribution for 1982 would be equal to that in 1981 in Mexican pesos.

146. The Chairman noted that while individual donors were in widely differing positions, many of them were at least maintaining their contributions in real terms and were clearly giving priority to the CGIAR within their own programs. Some were able to make significant increases for 1982 and possibly for 1983.

147. Subsequently, Mr. Lejeune summarized the results of the pledging session. He noted that a number of important donors were not present and others had been unable to give firm commitments. Moreover, exchange rates were unpredictable and could vary widely. At the current exchange rates, pledges for 1982 were estimated by the Secretariat to lie within the range of $154.5 million up to $157 million. Hence, the total of the budgets at the fallback level could be 5% or 6% above the likely supply of funds. Therefore, the funding position looked substantially worse than it had at the time of the TAC meeting at Ibadan when each center budget was reviewed.
148. In answer to a question, Dr. Arnold confirmed that the question of exchange rate fluctuations was one topic which would be included in the proposed review of funding procedures. Dr. Cummings confirmed that TAC had not yet adopted a zero based approach to budgeting but was moving somewhat in that direction.

Item 9 - Second Review of CGIAR System - Discussion by CGIAR Members

149. The Chairman reopened consideration of the Review by reminding members of the procedure that had been adopted. The Group as a whole was too large to conduct the Review in what might be called a committee of the whole as had been borne out by the experience of the earlier discussion.

150. A Review Committee had been constituted made up of persons serving in an individual capacity but representing the interest of large and small donors, new donors, old donors, developing countries, center directors and board chairmen, assisted by a study team of four regular consultants and four additional part-time consultants.

151. The earlier discussion had shown that a number of members had reservations about the Report as indeed had some of the members of the Review Committee. The Group now had to consider whether the Report met the basic objective of helping the Group chart its course over the next five or ten years. However, it was not the intention to redraft the Report.

152. In answer to a question, the Chairman suggested that the recommendations be taken seriatim but they would not be voted upon as the Group had no voting procedure. In each case he would attempt to identify whether or not there was a consensus.

153. The following summary outlines the consensus that was reached on each recommendation:

154. The Group endorsed the general approach taken by the Review Committee, and approved its recommendations with exception noted below. It observed that the Committee's Report was concerned with fundamentals, and with the design of mechanisms rather than with specific answers to operational questions. The Group decided that the Report's recommendations as modified below, should be put into effect as rapidly as possible. Steps towards such full implementation would be an important concern of the Group sat its next and future meetings.

155. The Review Committee and the Study Team had carefully considered wide range of alternative approaches in arriving at their recommendations. In reviewing the Report, the Group felt in general that the unique structure of the CGIAR system which had evolved had served well, and changes should be made only where essential. On the other hand, a number of members of the Group stressed that its activities had now reached such a scale as to make necessary both stronger management controls and greater involvement of members in policy issues. Hence, in the course of discussion, the Group's approach was to support recommendations for maintaining the Group's fundamental goals and for rationalizing and substantially strengthening the existing structure, rather than to propose radical change.
156. The following summary records the main features of the consensus on each recommendation. It should be read in conjunction with the Summary on pages vii-xx of the Review Committee Report, in which the recommendations are given in full. Where little or no comment is made on a particular recommendation, this is because the Group essentially endorsed it as written.

157. Chapters 1-4 contained no specific recommendations. Recognizing the value of these chapters as background to what follows, some members felt the need for more extensive examination of the impact of the CGIAR System on the production of food commodities in developing countries.

158. Chapter 5 dealt with principles for inclusion of activities in the system, and, by implication, principles for phasing out existing activities. The Group endorsed Recommendation 1, that the system should continue to concentrate mainly on food commodities, with the exceptions noted in the Report. The Group also supported the other parts of this Recommendation, for example on the importance of genetic resources, water management, and the value of the multi-disciplinary approach. The high priority for training in Recommendation 2 was strongly endorsed, including training and career development within centers. With respect to training women, it was noted that while a special effort was required to recruit women into the System, the recommendation should not be taken to mean that the training needs of women were any different from those of men.

159. Chapter 6 had four recommendations on modes of operation within the System. Recommendation 3, urging scrutiny of new expansions, and wider consideration of networks was endorsed. The Group supported the proposals in Recommendation 4 for better coordination among centers operating in the same region, although some felt that this was already in fact better than the Report seemed to imply. There was little dissent from Recommendations 5 and 6, dealing with strategic research, though some difficulty was noted in foreseeing centers’ needs for this kind of work much in advance, and the practicality of lists of such topics was questioned. Possibilities for cooperation with the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU) were noted.

160. Chapter 7, dealing with Organization and Management, absorbed by far the greatest part of the Group’s attention, since it included 13 recommendations. Supporting Recommendation 7, the Group stressed the importance of forward planning and the preparation of long-term plans and rolling five-year estimates by centers. In line with Recommendation 8, the CGIAR Secretariat was instructed to embark on the suggested study of budgets, cost-effectiveness and funding. Recommendation 9, concerned with reviews within the System, introduced the concept of “Commodity and Activity Reviews”, which was accepted. Members noted the dangers of over-reviewing, although good central reviews could reduce the need for reviews by individual donors. Recommendation 10, on representation and participation in Centers Week, was supported. There was general agreement that the Group would probably need to meet more than once a year for the foreseeable future.

161. Following extensive discussion in which several alternatives were considered, the Group did not arrive at a consensus in support of Recommendation 11, proposing the establishment of a Budget Review Committee. Instead, the Group decided to continue to strengthen the procedures which had evolved. These comprise the development of multi-year plans by all centers,
adoption by the Group of a rolling five-year indicative plan for the System as a whole, provision to centers annually of budget guidelines based on the five-year plan and estimates of future available funding, preparation by the centers annually (or biennially) of programs and budgets for review by the Technical Advisory Committee and the Secretariat and, after adjustments made as a result of that review, putting them to the Group for approval. The Group expressed interest in monitoring closely the further development of these procedures, which would be reconsidered after a reasonable time period.

162. In an intervention bearing on a number of recommendations, a speaker felt there were a number of anomalies in the system. First, he noted that the CGIAR had a permanent chairman, who represented both a cosponsor and a major donor, and who controlled the Secretariat. Secondly, it was somewhat anomalous that the technical services of the Group were supported by a Secretariat provided by another cosponsor, one moreover with which the Group had in the past had some measure of disagreement. Thirdly, the CGIAR Secretariat was funded entirely by one agency and its costs were not shared equally among the members of the Group. Fourthly, no other system operating on a comparable scale could conclude its business in one three-day meeting a year with the possibility of an additional two-day meeting if required. The Secretariats should be directly responsible to the Group, which had funding implications and involved the creation of yet another institution. Also, it might be dangerous to talk about subgroups of the Consultative Group although the concept might have some merit. He felt that the Executive Secretary should report directly to the Group and that the Group should have a chairman elected or appointed. The Executive Secretary should also be responsible for the TAC Secretariat. The Secretariat should also be responsible for submitting to the Group clear and concise papers addressing policy issues. Finance and management and technical issues could be addressed in coordination through a combined Secretariat. Finally, access to the Group must be retained for the Directors and Chairmen of the Boards.

163. In replying to the speaker, the Chairman noted that the first review had considered whether the Secretariats reported to the Group or the cosponsoring agencies and it had been agreed that the Secretariats had, in fact, reported to the Group and not to the heads of the agencies. In the case of the TAC Secretariat, it reported through the Chairman of TAC to the Group and not to the Director General of FAO. In the case of the CGIAR Secretariat, the Bank had in no way intervened in the relationship between the Secretariat, the Chairman and the Group, except with respect to its administrative budget.

164. The Group concurred with Recommendation 12, agreeing that the proposed management specialist in the CGIAR Secretariat might be complemented by consultants where required. The proposed additional scientific adviser could be a social scientist. Members supported Recommendation 13, providing for more input from TAC, and longer terms of service for its members. The duties of the Chairman of TAC were expected to occupy him almost full-time. There was also support for Recommendation 14, proposing a stronger public relations effort. Publication and materials for meetings were needed in languages other than English. Publications should emphasize actual and potential impact, and should serve to assist in fund raising.

165. Regarding Recommendation 15, while recognizing sensitivity of Center Boards respecting their independence, the Group noted that there was a
consensus on the accountability of Boards to the donors and the need for consultation. There was general agreement on the need for better communication between Boards and the other components of the CGIAR System. Recommendations 16 and 17 dealt with related matters, and were endorsed. Members supported the principles of the independence and objectivity of Board members outlined in Recommendation 16. Recognizing that the level of funding for an individual center was a policy question for the Group collectively, donor members reaffirmed the importance of not seeking individually to influence the policies of a center on recruitment or other matters through unexpected changes in their level of contribution.

166. Members shared the Committee's concern for the erosion of staff pensions and other benefits, reflected in Recommendation 18. There was consensus in support of a study of this question, with the details of how to proceed yet to be determined.

167. The Group supported the emphasis in Recommendation 19 on strengthening the role of women throughout its System, a policy consistent with that of most major international agencies.

168. Chapter 8 dealt with participation by developing countries in the Group's affairs, which most members agreed should be strengthened. The Review process, itself, had gone to great lengths to take account of the views of developing countries. Members selected by the FAO regional conferences as representatives of their regions stressed the difficulty of making that representation effective. FAO indicated its intention to increase efforts to assist them. A proposal was made for regional meetings of national research directors, with participation by international center directors. The difficulty of financing the costs of attendance by developing country representatives was noted, and it was recognized that means to overcome it should be explored.

169. Members supported Recommendation 21, to provide greater opportunities for scientists from developing countries, though the problems of reentry to national programs had to be recognized.

170. Chapter 9 was concerned with funding the system, and did not contain any explicit recommendations.

171. Chapter 10 covered future strategy and a Five-Year Indicative Plan. The assumptions behind the Plan were accepted for planning purposes, but the figures were felt to need some revision in light of the current availability of funds. Such a revision within the general framework of Recommendations 23 and 24 would be an important item of business for another meeting of the Group.

172. A representative of Japan took the opportunity of the discussion of the Review to bring members' attention to the Asian Vegetable Research Development Center (AVRDC). He felt that political factors that had previously inhibited wide support for AVRDC no longer existed and he urged favorable consideration by donor members, leading perhaps to financial support even if this were at a token level.
Items 10 and 11 - Report of Center Directors and Report of Center Board Chairmen

173. Since the directors and chairmen had already made their views known earlier in the meeting, they had nothing further to report under these items.

Item 12 - Draft Press Release

174. Members considered a draft press release in the course of which they questioned some of the figures used to demonstrate the value of production increases. A number of changes in wording were proposed. More than one speaker felt that there should be more reflection of the achievements of the system.

Item 13 - Other Business

175. Dr. Persley reported on the establishment of the new Australian Center for International Agricultural Research. This had been set up with an initial budget of 25 million Australian dollars for the first four years, and it was expected that its budget would be in the range of 20 to 25 million Australian dollars a year when it was fully operational. The intention was to foster collaboration among Australian and developing country institutions and international agricultural-research centers. The main emphasis to begin with would be on collaborative strategic research programs in a wide range of disciplines on problems of tropical agriculture. Policy guidance would be provided by a high-level committee chaired by Sir John Crawford. Australia looked forward to strong support for the CGIAR and for closer collaboration between Australian institutions and the international agricultural-research centers.

176. As a second item of other business, Mr. Lejeune proposed a modification in the arrangements for selecting the winner of the first King Baudouin Award. It had previously been envisaged that the selection would be made by a small committee established especially for the purpose. On reflection, it was proposed that it would be more appropriate to ask TAC to make this judgement since it was a larger body embracing more of the disciplines concerned, and it would avoid the establishment of an extra ad hoc committee. The Chairman of TAC and the Center Directors had been consulted and were in agreement. There being no objection from the floor, this proposal was adopted.

177. Dr. Mellor drew the attention of the participants to a new publication "Resource Allocations to National Agricultural Research: Trends in the 1970s". Copies would be mailed to any participant wanting one. It had been prepared jointly by ISNAR and IFPRI.

178. As the final item of other business, Mr. Mashler, speaking on behalf of all the members of the Group, paid tribute to the outstanding service of Dr. Ralph Cummings as Chairman of TAC. The Group adopted by acclamation the following resolution: "The members of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research wish to record their gratitude to Dr. Ralph W. Cummings for his outstanding service as Chairman of the Group's Technical Advisory Committee from January 1977 to March 1982 and their appreciation of the wide knowledge, deep understanding and tireless devotion with which he has served."
Item 14 - Time and Place of Next Meeting

179. The Group had agreed that it would be necessary to have two meetings during 1982 and considered the various constraints on the timing. In view of possible conflicts with other international meetings no firm decision was reached at the meeting, but it was subsequently confirmed that the next CGIAR meeting would be held at the offices of the World Bank in Paris on May 24, 25, and 26, 1982. Following this, the World Bank would organize a meeting of donors interested in national agricultural research at the same place on May 27 and 28. It was agreed that International Centers Week would be held in Washington on November 8 through 12, 1982. The Secretariat would, in the meantime, seek the views of members on what should be the Group's policy on holding future Centers Weeks outside of Washington.
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Presentations by Centers - CIAT
                CIMMYT
                CIP
                IITA
                IRRI
                ICRISAT
                ILRAD
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                IBPGR
                ISNAR
                IFPRI
Mr. Chairman: Ladies and Gentlemen of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research: The Chairman representing the Boards of Trustees of the 13 institutes have already voiced their views and major concerns which may be summarized as follows:

1. We share with the staff of the institutes, the donors, the co-sponsors and others the conviction that the System is not only unique but one of the most important and effective ways to improve the level and stability of world food production.

2. There is abundant evidence that investments in the System give exceedingly high returns which are inadequately publicized and are, therefore, in urgent need of documentation and advertising in easy-to-comprehend form.

3. We recognize that donors are rightly concerned that all aspects of financial and administrative management of the institutes be highly effective and that there be clear and full accountability.

4. We are deeply concerned that funding shortfalls necessitate reductions in budgets that have been recommended for acceptance by TAC and approved by the Group. We propose that representatives of the Boards of Trustees as well as the Directors General should be involved in the interactive process when downward adjustments in budgets are necessary.

5. We do not like pro-rata reductions applied across all institutes. If there is to be a Budget Review Committee or some similar mechanism, we believe there should be a provision for the views of donors, members of TAC, Directors General, Chairmen of Boards and perhaps others to have an input, and we have suggested one way that might be achieved.

6. We are of the opinion that the extent and seriousness of cash flow problems are inadequately known and appreciated. Institutes cannot perform efficiently when, through events over which they have no control, they must obtain huge overdrafts at prime interest rates. Some less harrowing and less costly way of dealing with cash flow problems must be found.

7. We recommend that all institutes and the CGIAR prepare simple informative descriptions of their origins, structures, procedures, mandates, sources of funding and responsibilities which can be provided to new Board members and others so that they will be properly informed about the System.

8. We desire to have persons of excellent qualifications, availability and dedication as Board members. We solicit assistance and suggestions from all sources so that we may identify suitable persons. We especially seek assistance to identify citizens of our client countries who may be able to serve effectively on our Boards.

9. We solicit continuous assistance and suggestions in the constant search for scientific and administrative staff for the institutes but we question the practicality and value of protracting the work of search committees by having them submit their short lists for review before final decisions are taken.
Exchange rate fluctuations have increased the funding of some institutes and decreased the funding of other institutes to extents not intended by donors when pledges were made. We believe some mechanism is needed to eliminate or substantially reduce such unintended differences in de facto funding of institutes.

We urge early action on the problem of indexing pensions of employees of the institutes and request the Secretariat to do so.

We concur in the suggestion in the Review Report that if funding problems continue, it is likely to be preferable to discontinue some activities rather than to apply progressively debilitating reductions across the System.

We suggest development of criteria for including or excluding additional programs merits attention, as does study of ultra long-run aspects of world food.

We question the wisdom of bringing water management into the System both because of funding shortfalls and the availability of alternative solutions.

We concur in the desirability of further studies of manpower needs and training programs in developing countries.

We request that for each institute an improved method of evaluating the effects of local and international inflation on its costs of operation be developed and employed in the budget development process.

Dr. S.R. Sen of the IFPRI Board has been elected Chairman of the Committee of Chairmen for 1982.

Respectfully submitted,

C. F. Bentley