

CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING

OCTOBER 30-31, 1975

WASHINGTON D.C.

INFORMAL SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

1. The tenth meeting of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research was held at the headquarters of the World Bank in Washington D.C. on October 30 and 31, 1975. The Chairman, Mr. Warren C. Baum, presided.

2. The meeting was attended by 24 members. Four donor members -- the Asian Development Bank, the Kellogg Foundation, Saudi Arabia and the United Nations Environment Programme -- were unable to attend. The Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development was represented as an observer. A list of participants is attached as Annex I.

Chairman's Opening Remarks (Agenda Item 1)

3. The Chairman of the Consultative Group opened the meeting by noting that the Group was entering what might prove to be one of the more interesting and significant periods in its brief history. Over the next several months, the Group would be embarking on several new ventures including the first quinquennial reviews of the scientific research programs of three centers by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the proposed review of the future growth and direction of the research network and the possible association of the Group with factor-oriented research centers.

4. On the financial front, a different kind of milestone appeared in prospect, in which the financial requirements of the international centers exceeded available funds. The Chairman indicated that there might be a financial gap of perhaps \$2 million in 1976. This should not be too alarming, especially as contributions from donors for 1976 were likely to be more than 35 percent above pledges for 1975, demonstrating the continued strong support among members for the efforts of the international centers. Even if a gap remained after the pledging session at the end of the Consultative Group meetings, arrangements were being made to bring financial requirements and availabilities into line without impairing the scientific research programs of the centers.

5. Following the Chairman's remarks, the meeting considered and approved the provisional agenda, which is attached as Annex II.

Review of CGIAR Network (Agenda Item 3)

6. The Chairman recalled that the Consultative Group at its July meeting had agreed on the desirability of a systematic review of the future growth, direction and management of the international agricultural research network. On the basis of the July discussions the Chairman had circulated a proposal on October 10 with draft outline terms of reference and suggestions on the organization, timing and approximate cost of the review. This proposal constituted the basis for discussion and is attached as Annex III.

(a) Outline Terms of Reference

7. A very strong consensus emerged from the discussion which followed that the proposed review was desirable, and that the outline terms of reference addressed the basic questions which should be investigated. Many speakers offered suggestions regarding the relative emphasis to be placed on the various aspects of the study, ranging from concentration on the processes of the CGIAR system -- i.e., the management of the network -- to the preparation of a comprehensive guide to donors on objectives and priorities for research and the place of the international centers within the worldwide agricultural effort.
8. Several common themes emerged from the discussion. First, virtually every speaker agreed that the review was designed to ensure the continued strength and vitality of a uniquely successful international effort. While the sheer size of the undertaking might require somewhat more systematic arrangements than in the past, everyone was agreed that the Consultative Group should retain its informal, de-centralized, relatively unbureaucratic character. As one speaker noted, two aspects of the system should remain inviolable: the autonomous and independent structure of the centers and the informality of the Group itself. The strength of the Group came in large measure from the informality, goodwill and flexibility of the method of operation, and these should be preserved.
9. A second common theme related to the proposed approach to the study. Most speakers cautioned against attempting to quantify with too much precision global food and nutritional requirements over the next several years, and trying to establish the contribution which the international centers' research effort would make toward meeting this requirement. Several suggested that a more qualitative approach would be preferable, working from the basic assumption that there will be a continuing need to increase food production in the developing countries, and that this must be done in large measure by increasing yields from existing cultivated land. All speakers supported the proposal's suggestion that whatever quantification effort is attempted should rely on existing data, from such sources as the FAO, World Bank, International Food Policy Research Institute and others, and should not be the subject of original research.
10. A third theme related to the ultimate objective and end use of the study. Noting that the work of the international centers and the Group is constantly evolving, several speakers suggested that the review is unlikely to be able to set goals, objectives and priorities for years to come. Rather it should consider improved processes and methods by which the network can evolve and adapt to changing circumstances. It should suggest how the Consultative Group can remain alert and responsive to the needs of research. While it may be wholly appropriate for the Review Committee to consider short-term objectives and priorities, and guidelines for such questions as the boundaries between international and national research, its major contribution might be in its recommendations on how the Group can keep itself informed, address policy questions and simplify its procedures. Other speakers, however, noted that the research programs tend to have results over a fairly long period, and it might be necessary to look at priorities over an extended time, with periodic reassessments. The problem was to strike an appropriate balance between clinging to outdated priorities and changing directions too rapidly.

11. Several speakers suggested other areas which they hoped would receive particular attention. These included the perennial question of the appropriate boundaries between the work of the international centers and national research organizations, the consideration of non-food crops within the priorities for future action and the role of the international centers on training for the development of human resources -- both research workers and managers. While some speakers suggested attention should also be given to the internal management of the network, and the interrelationship of its several constituent parts -- the CG, TAC, the Centers, the Boards, the two Secretariats -- the Chairman noted that several members at the July meeting had suggested that the Group should not tamper with the mechanism in this sensitive area, especially as the system works well despite its rather complicated administrative structure.

12. On the basis of this discussion, the Chairman noted that there was broad agreement on the objectives, approach and spirit of the study, and said that the outline terms of reference would be transmitted to those who will undertake the review, with the transcript of the meeting, for their guidance in preparing more detailed terms of reference.

(b) Proposed organization, timing and cost of the Review

13. The Chairman then turned to the arrangements for the review, as outlined in the proposal. In summary, a review committee of 9 to 12 persons, each serving in his individual capacity, would be established by the Chairman of the Group to supervise the execution of the study. Members would bring the experience of donors, both public and private, national and multi-national, the center directors and Board of Trustees, TAC, and the developing countries themselves. A study director would be nominated by the Chairman of the CG to work with the Review Committee. He would be assisted by a small study team.

14. The study director would prepare detailed terms of reference and a proposed work program, to be approved by the Review Committee. A preliminary draft might be ready for consideration by the Consultative Group at its July 1976 meeting, although the October 1976 meeting might be a more realistic target. The cost of the review was estimated at about \$350,000.

15. The members endorsed the proposed organization of the review, and asked the Chairman, Mr. Baum, to serve as Chairman of the Review Committee. They also accepted the suggested timetable and cost estimates while emphasizing the need for economy.

16. Ten members indicated a willingness to help finance the review; some of them with funds additional to their contributions to the international centers and others from within their total pledges. (A total of about \$300,000 to \$350,000 is likely to be available from indications given at the meeting and from subsequent conversations).

17. On the basis of this consensus regarding the composition of the committee its chairman, the methods of appointment, the study director, the timing and cost estimates, the Chairman undertook to establish the Review Committee

promptly and to nominate the Study Director. He undertook to keep members informed regularly on the progress of the review through periodic progress reports, through the many informal occasions for contact, and through the participation of many members in providing resources for the study.

Report by Chairman of TAC on the October meeting
of TAC (Agenda Item 4)

18. The Chairman welcomed the Chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Sir John Crawford, and asked him to report on the outcome of the eleventh TAC meeting, which had been held at CIMMYT immediately prior to the Consultative Group meeting. Sir John reported on five topics - priorities of the CGIAR, national research, regional services, relations of developed country research institutes to the work of the international centers and the International Center for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE).

(a) Future Priorities

19. Sir John noted that TAC had reviewed its first paper on research priorities, which had been considered and accepted by the Consultative Group in 1973, to ensure that the priorities of the network remained valid and appropriate. While the review had confirmed the soundness of the original document, TAC felt that it should reconsider several areas and bring the paper up to date.

20. Soybean research remained the single most serious gap in crop research, and Sir John indicated that TAC intended to examine ways of intensifying research on this crop within the auspices of the Consultative Group. The needs for vegetable research were also being reviewed and a report would be available for the February meeting of TAC. As far as livestock was concerned, goats were an important part of the farming systems in some areas, and it was expected that ICARDA and ILCA would take this into account.

21. Oil seed crops, many of which were both food and industrial crops, had not been accorded high priority in the past, although groundnuts had now been included in the mandate of ICRISAT. TAC felt that this area needed re-examination, and some crops, such as sunflower, might be added to the work of existing institutions. Coconut was also an important crop, and TAC, in conjunction with FAO, would prepare some proposals for the February meeting.

22. Although cotton had been accorded lower priority than the food crops in the past, its major role in the balance of payments of many countries was vitally important. Furthermore, the Cotton Research Corporation, which had been responsible for a great deal of cotton research in the past, was being disbanded. For these reasons, TAC felt it should consider what might be done on this crop and make recommendations to the Group. While TAC would need some specialist assistance to formulate proposals, it did not intend to undertake any review of the research needs of cotton until requested to do so by the Consultative Group.

23. Sir John indicated that TAC would also wish to take another look at factor-oriented research activities such as fertilizers, water management and pests, socio-economic research, post-harvest systems research, and the role of developed country institutions to the work of the international centers.

24. Sir John emphasized that TAC's recommendations were very unlikely to necessitate any new international centers at this time.

25. As to the procedure for consideration of priorities by TAC and the Consultative Group, Sir John indicated that a draft revised priorities paper would be prepared on the basis of the TAC discussion at CIMMYT, and this paper would be circulated to members of the Consultative Group and to the Review Committee as well as to TAC members. At its February meeting, TAC would consider what recommendations to make to the Consultative Group (and the Review Committee) regarding new priorities or emphases.

26. Most of the discussion on this topic focussed on the prospect that TAC would recommend the addition of cotton research to the activities supported by the CGIAR. It was emphasized that cotton was particularly important as one of the crops within a farming system. It was confirmed that the emphasis of cotton research insofar as TAC was concerned would be on production rather than processing or marketing. The representative of the Rockefeller Foundation drew attention to a study on cotton research needs prepared under the auspices of the UNDP which would be available shortly. In reply to a question, Sir John said that although there had been a considerable effort in cotton research in the past, yields were still very low.

27. The Chairman noted that no decisions on this important question needed to be taken at the meeting. Members would have a full opportunity to consider possible support for cotton research after the TAC minutes and revised draft priorities paper had been circulated. The Review Committee would also have the opportunity to make a recommendation to the Group whether cotton might be added to the priority list of activities. At that point the Group would address the question whether to initiate further work on cotton, perhaps by TAC which would require some strengthening of TAC's resources.

(b) National Research and Regional Services

28. Sir John turned next to two related concerns, the strengthening of national research and the role of the international centers in providing "regional services."

29. Sir John noted that the strengthening of national research had been a continuing concern of TAC, for without adequate national research capabilities a good deal of the investment in international agricultural research stood to be lost. He noted that because the experience and capacity of individual countries' research effort varied so widely, it had been difficult for TAC to prescribe single or simple remedies. However, the Committee had noted a growing awareness of the problem, both by the developing countries themselves and by international donor organ-

izations. TAC had also seen indications that the situation in a number of countries was significantly improved. Nevertheless, the problem remained a very serious one and Sir John indicated that there were several organizations and activities which in TAC's judgment could serve important roles in the strengthening of national research. These include the FAO, the International Agricultural Development Service being established by the Rockefeller Foundation and possible broader-based efforts by the United States to develop linkages with American university research systems, and the international centers.

30. A particularly high priority area for improving national research capabilities was in training. TAC considered that training at all levels, including research management, was of considerable importance, and there were particularly acute gaps in the training of production specialists and extension workers. While several centers were training trainers, they could not cope with the demand. The international centers, in cooperation with such other agencies as FAO, might work out collaborative arrangements for training of trainers.

31. Turning to the question of the CIMMYT regional services, Sir John noted that the recent meeting at CIMMYT had enabled TAC to continue to grapple with the question of the limits of the responsibility of the international centers. He restated the TAC position which had been expressed at the July CG meeting that there were three appropriate areas of relationship between the international centers and national research systems:

- (i) distribution of materials for testing, evaluation and adaptation to national needs;
- (ii) scientific services directly related to a center's core research activities such as the monitoring of disease experience in different environments; and
- (iii) research aimed at identifying constraints to the adoption of the center's improved materials or techniques.

32. Many of the centers have been subject to considerable pressures to lend assistance in developing national research systems, particularly where there has been a vacuum unfilled by other organizations. While the Committee believed that the centers have a valid argument when they say that the full fruition of the center's work could not occur unless there is adequate national research capacity, TAC felt that the centers must draw the line somewhere before their managerial capacity is unduly strained. TAC felt that the centers ought not to yield to requests to take over the organization or operation of a national research system or a national extension system. Similarly, TAC could not recommend core support for the type of activities proposed in the CIMMYT East African Economic Regional Services Program, which could turn the small economic unit in CIMMYT into a principal adviser to governments on a wide range

of economic and policy matters. The relationship between the centers and national systems must be in the interest of research. The provision of staff for assistance in the organization of local extension, marketing or economic policy activities should be provided through bilateral aid, and strictly subordinated to a center's research priorities.

33. Sir John indicated that he hoped the full minutes of the TAC meeting would enable members to gain a more complete understanding of TAC's views on this important question. He also expressed the expectation that TAC and the center directors would try to work out next May the respective roles of the centers and other bodies, such as FAO, in support of national research organizations.

(c) The Relationship between Research Capacity in Developed Countries and the Centers

34. The TAC meeting had discussed how scientific research establishments in the developed countries might help achieve the objectives of the Consultative Group, both through relations with the international centers and with appropriate institutions in the developing countries. The discussion had focused on the relationship with the international centers because there appeared to be adequate machinery already available for effective relationships between research institutions in the developing and developed countries.

35. Several participants in the TAC meeting had felt that the collaboration of advanced scientific institutions in the developed countries in the work of the centers could be useful particularly on the more difficult and fundamental problems. To avoid a flood of proposals to the international centers, TAC had recommended that donors advise their scientific communities that specific research proposals would be formulated and submitted to donors by the centers themselves. This did not imply that there should be no individual scientist-to-scientist contacts, only that ad hoc unorganized initiatives from individual scientists were becoming an administrative burden on the centers and should be discouraged.

36. TAC had also felt that a more efficient information system on current research projects in developed countries of direct interest to the centers would be very valuable. The TAC Secretariat intended to see whether the information system being developed by one donor, the United Kingdom, would be compatible with the FAO CARIS system. If so, all donors would be asked to formulate their information on this subject in a way which would also be compatible. This would enable the TAC Secretariat to bring out a register. On a related topic, two centers, IRRI and CIMMYT, had found it useful to have individual scientists designated by donors as correspondents or liaison men with the international centers. TAC felt that such linkages had proved worthwhile and recommended consideration of such an arrangement by other centers.

37. Several speakers noted how the scientific establishments in their countries were supporting the work of the international centers and the general problem of food needs for the food deficit countries. A number of speakers felt the question was sufficiently important that more time might be devoted, perhaps during Centers Week, to consideration of how the scholarship, experience and

technical skills of advanced research institutions might be brought to the research programs of the international centers.

38. The Chairman indicated that the matter could be placed on the agenda for International Centers Week, and that on the basis of the TAC recommendations members might develop a consensus on how the centers, TAC, FAO and bilateral donors could work together in this field. In the meantime, it may be useful to develop some procedure for having a more full-dressed debate of this question next July.

(d) International Center for Insect Physiology & Ecology (ICIPE)

39. Sir John reminded members that TAC at its July meeting had considered whether there might be appropriate activities of ICIPE which deserved the support of the Consultative Group. TAC had noted that ICIPE was an institution of high quality, whose research activity could be relevant to the research effort of several international centers.

40. A mission from the TAC and Executive Secretariats had visited ICIPE in September 1975 to assess whether and how the center's activities might warrant the support of the Group. Their report had been considered by TAC at its October meeting. The Committee had decided that certain areas of research could be of direct interest and value to several centers which did not themselves have the capacity or the facilities to carry out such research.

41. Four centers, IITA, ICRISAT, ILRAD and IRRI, had indicated that they would wish to make use of ICIPE's services. To enable the Center to carry out the work requested, the Secretariat mission report had suggested that additional facilities at ICIPE would be needed, the cost of which would be about \$1.1 million. TAC had agreed to recommend this for funding by the Consultative Group. If accepted by the Group, ICIPE would have a unique relationship within the CGIAR, in that only a portion of its program would be supported, and ICIPE itself would not be a full member of the Group. Furthermore TAC's recommendation to the Group would be conditional on ICIPE having drawn up firm agreements with the other centers on the nature of their interest and collaboration. It was also to be understood that TAC would monitor ICIPE's activities through TAC's reviews of the research programs of the other centers, and not directly, although informal contacts would be maintained.

42. Sir John said that TAC did not expect the Consultative Group to make a decision at that point, but he hoped that on the basis of the report of the Secretariat mission and the minutes of the TAC meeting, both of which would be circulated to members, the question of support for ICIPE could be agreed at International Centers Week. As TAC was not recommending any financial support before 1977, the question could be resolved in July, although it would be useful if donors could informally express their views regarding ICIPE's association with the CG before that time, to enable the centers to begin preparing agreements if the response is favorable.

43. The Chairman said that after members had had an opportunity to study the TAC recommendations on ICIPE, informal contacts would be made to deter-

mine whether there was sufficient support to enable centers to firm-up their arrangements with ICIPE, subject to a formal decision by the Group next July.

Ongoing Business (Agenda Item 5)

44. The meeting next turned to several topics which had been discussed at the July meeting and had been agreed at that time should be considered in October. These items included progress on the establishment of the International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas (ICARDA), activities of the Post Harvest Technology Working Group and the relationship of the International Fertilizer Development Center (IFDC) to the Consultative Group.

(a) International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas (ICARDA)

45. Mr. Harold Graves, Chairman of the ICARDA Subcommittee, reported on the results of the Subcommittee meeting on October 29 which had considered progress in the selection of sites, negotiation of legal agreements and nomination of the Board of Trustees of ICARDA.

46. Mr. Graves reported that despite the difficulties in the area, the project to establish ICARDA was moving ahead and that the preparatory phase was approaching a conclusion. He reported that the Executing Agency responsible for the creation of ICARDA, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), had advised the Subcommittee that suitable sites had been found in all three of the prospective host countries, Lebanon, Syria and Iran. In each case the authorities had expressed a willingness to acquire the land in question and make it available for the purposes of ICARDA.

47. The Executing Agency had also reported that negotiation of the necessary legal documents had been carried to an advanced stage. The proposed Charter of ICARDA had been accepted in principle by the three host governments and was ready for signature. Mr. Graves asked for, and subsequently received, the agreement of the members of the Consultative Group that the Charter should be signed on behalf of the Group by the three Co-sponsors -- FAO, UNDP and the World Bank and by IDRC, the Executing Agency.

48. The country agreements were also approaching readiness for signature and would be signed in each case by the host government and the Executing Agency. The ICARDA Subcommittee had agreed that the Executing Agency could sign these agreements in each country as soon as it was apparent that the necessary constitutional requirements could, or had, been met. In Iran, the Executing Agency indicated that this condition had already been reached, although some time might be required for the execution of the necessary procedures. In Lebanon the situation was, to say the least, less determinate. The authorities were willing to proceed but the procedure required parliamentary consent and it was difficult to say when parliament in the Lebanon would be in session. In Syria, the matter of ICARDA was yet to reach the agenda of the Council of Ministers, where the necessary policy decision would be made, and consequently it was not possible to say when this decision may be reached.

49. In the meantime the Subcommittee agreed to proceed with the general program approved by the Consultative Group last July. They instructed the Executing Agency to continue to press forward toward the realization of this general plan, recognizing the difficulties that exist in parts of the region to be served by ICARDA. The Executing Agency was authorized to begin moving from the preparatory to the establishment phase, including arrangements to engage the services of such initial staff and consultants as may be desirable and to procure such equipment as may prudently be ordered or acquired at the present time. Among other things, this action by the Subcommittee would make it unnecessary to disrupt the relevant activities now being carried out in the Arid Lands Development Program (ALAD) in the collection, testing and exchange of plant genetic materials in cooperation with national and regional programs of the area.

50. The previous day, the ICARDA Subcommittee had also elected a majority of the members of the Board of Trustees for ICARDA. According to the Charter, the Board will consist of 15 members, three to be designated by the host governments and one to serve ex officio as Director General. The remaining 11 members were to be chosen by the Subcommittee. On October 29, the Subcommittee had elected eight members, leaving three others to be chosen by the Consultative Group at a later time in consultation with the Board itself. The 8 Board members selected came from 8 different countries, of which 4 are developing countries of the region. The Board-designate would meet at the earliest opportunity to acquaint itself with the procedures of the Group, to identify the tasks to be performed in the permanent organization of a new center and to begin the task of choosing a Director General. These things would be done informally and in advance of a final transfer of responsibility for ICARDA's affairs from the Subcommittee to ICARDA's own trustees.

51. For the time being, the Subcommittee would continue to guide the course of ICARDA and would probably meet again in late January or early February to review the situation which then exists and determine whether new conclusions need to be reached by the Subcommittee and by the Group, or whether the new center could at that time begin the process of transferring responsibility into the hands of the Board of Trustees.

(b) Post Harvest Systems Research

52. The Chairman next called upon Mr. Hulse from IDRC for a report on the meeting of the informal working group which was considering the question of post harvest systems research. Mr. Hulse reviewed the genesis of the group of interested members who were concerned that comparatively little attention had been addressed to this question in the past, and felt the need to explore ways in which bilateral programs and funds might be directed to support and complement the activities of the international agricultural research centers.

53. A meeting of the interested donors had been held the previous day, attended by 11 members of the CGIAR and an observer from the Arab Fund. The group had reaffirmed the belief that much more attention must be add-

ressed to this question and particularly to post harvest systems research as it affects the crops which fall within the mandate of the international centers. In the working group's view, inefficient post harvest systems were a deterrent to increased production, both from direct wastage due to poor storage and processing and from production foregone where farmers will not grow more than their own immediate needs for lack of adequate storage.

54. The post harvest meeting had reiterated its request for more formal recognition from the CGIAR, and asked that it might report on its activities to the Consultative Group from time to time. Formal recognition would enable members to give fuller support to the necessary programs and activities related to post harvest systems, permit sponsorship of special studies and specialist working groups, and report results to TAC and the full Group. The meeting also requested the proposed CG Review Committee to consider the appropriate relationship of post harvest research and the working group to the international network.

55. Mr. Hulse also advised that the meeting had agreed to sponsor an expert study group meeting early in 1976 to work out a global strategy for post harvest systems research and development. The provision of staff and financing for this study group would be made by the members of the working group. Finally, the meeting had also agreed to establish a relationship with the Consultative Group on Food Production and Investment at an early date in the expectation that the post harvest group's efforts could be of direct benefit to CGFPI's program in this area.

56. In response to questions, it was confirmed that the post harvest group was not recommending the establishment of a new international center, nor calling for funds from the CGIAR.

57. The Chairman noted that the Review Committee would look into the appropriate institutional format for the relationship of the post harvest group to the full Consultative Group and that if the Review Committee had not completed its report by next July, the post harvest group will be welcome to make a report at Centers Week next year.

(c) International Fertilizer Development Center (IFDC)

58. The Chairman referred to a paper from the Consultative Group Secretariat on October 13, regarding the appropriate relationship of the IFDC to the CG. The Secretariat had canvassed member views and had concluded that there was some reluctance about adopting IFDC as a full member at this stage, and that it would be premature to apply the standard review procedures to IFDC. While it would be entirely appropriate for IFDC to serve as a contractual agent with international centers and as such to be funded indirectly through the CGIAR, no direct financing should be considered at this stage. Representatives of IFDC would be welcome to make a written and oral report of the Center's program to the Consultative Group at the time of Centers Week.

59. The representative of one of IFDC's sponsors, the United States, (Mr. Farrar) gave a report on the status of IFDC's development. IFDC formally initiated its activities in May 1975. Its research program has already begun and cooperative relationships had been established with IITA and IRRI, with prospects of cooperation also in view with CIAT. A substantial program of outreach activities had also been initiated with several countries in Asia and Latin America.

60. The staff and Board of the Center had also been internationalized with four professionals on the staff from outside the United States and representatives from Asia, Africa and Latin America invited to serve on the Board.

61. In response to the question whether an institution located in a developed country could respond to developing country needs, Mr. Farrar noted that the location of IFDC in the United States related to the availability of the integrated laboratory at the Tennessee Valley Authority which would be very expensive to duplicate elsewhere. The work to be undertaken in the United States would be that which required such laboratory facilities -- mainly industrial engineering and laboratory work. Most of the work on agronomic testing, feedback on fertilizer requirements and socio-economic analysis would be done through the international research centers, national research institutions and through commercial testing by fertilizer companies.

62. In response to a further question, it was agreed that the work which FAO was undertaking on applied fertilizer research and development does not duplicate the work to be done at IFDC on formulating new fertilizers specifically responsive to the conditions of the developing countries.

63. A third question related to patents, and how materials developed by the center would be made available. IFDC had determined that its results would be patented in order to protect the discoveries, but that the patents would be available on payment of a modest fee. This was the same practice which had been followed at TVA since its inception.

64. Discussion followed regarding the practices of other centers on this question. It was suggested that the staff of the Secretariats might make an enquiry of the centers and similar institutions in the agricultural field, to ensure that the policies regarding patents which are beginning to be established by the different centers are in fact satisfactory from all points of view. The Chairman agreed that this review would be undertaken by the Secretariats.

65. The Chairman of TAC felt it was important for the international centers and for TAC to have a continuous relationship with IFDC to ensure that it achieved the kind of objectives which the center itself and the centers associated with the Group had in mind for it. He indicated that the director of IFDC would be invited to meet with TAC at its May meeting with the other center directors.

66. Regarding the financial support for the center, Mr. Farrar confirmed

that the United States was making available funds to IFDC sufficient for the center to operate on a minimal basis for three years and to make its initial capital investments. He indicated that there was a requirement for additional funding from other sources, not of core expenses but of outreach and special projects of various kinds. After three years the center would expect to be in full operation and the United States hoped that it would have substantial international financial support at that time. In short, through the successful internationalization of IFDC and the appropriateness of its work to the activities of the CGIAR sponsored network, it was hoped that there would be a very close association between the center as it develops and the CGIAR.

67. In summary, the Chairman noted that the feeling of the Group was that the association of IFDC for the time being would be that it provide the Group annually, at the time of Centers Week, a written report on its program and that its representative be present at Centers Week to speak to this report and respond to questions. He also noted the TAC believed it was important for the effective work of the existing centers in relation to IFDC that TAC should maintain close informal relationships with the work of IFDC. He also asked the Group to take note of the comment by the United States' representative that the development of IFDC as an international institution is evolving and that the center can achieve its objectives only if it succeeds in becoming a body that has truly international standing and financial support.

Financial Support for 1976 (Agenda Item 6)

68. The Chairman asked members to declare their intended financial support of Consultative Group-sponsored international agricultural research in 1976 and thereafter. He noted that net requirements put forward by the centers in July totalled about \$68 million. Since then, the Consultative Group Secretariat has been in discussion with ILCA, IITA and CIMMYT about possible reductions in their requirements for core budget support with the result that the current requirements were about \$66 million. On the basis of informal contacts with donors prior to the meeting, an increase of more than 35% from the contributions made in 1975 could be expected for 1976; nevertheless, a small gap of perhaps \$2 million was likely to remain. The Chairman proposed to make some suggestions to meet such a situation if the pledges to be made fell short of requirements.

69. Donors subsequently stated their intentions, subject to parliamentary action, for financial support to the international centers for 1976. On the basis of these declarations, and Secretariat estimates where pledges were not made and where the four donor agencies were not represented at the meeting, total availabilities for 1976 were estimated to be about \$64 million. A table on the initial financial position for 1976 by donor and center is attached as Annex IV. It has been updated to reflect the position as of January 31, 1976.

70. The Chairman noted that there were a number of possible sources for additional finance for 1976, and the actual amount of carryover from 1975 may also affect net financial requirements. He noted that the sums involved in the possible shortfall in any event were not very large at any one center.

71. The Executive Secretary described a procedure by which the international centers would be advised of the funds available initially and asked to adapt their programs to meet this level of funding. In suggesting allocations among centers to those donors who had some flexibility in the use of their funds, decisions on the amount of the shortfall would be based on estimates of priority items for deferral within each center budget which had been worked out by the CG and TAC Secretariats. Certain items in a center's capital program, such as guest and staff accommodations, might be deferred or reduced in size, and some equipment purchases might also be delayed. In addition, most centers should be able to accommodate modest reductions in core operating budgets for such items as supplies, stores and possibly travel. Although these items had been identified by the Secretariats, in the final analysis each center would be free to revise its budget in the manner it felt would be most appropriate.

Other Business (Agenda Item 7)

72. The Chairman said that there were several other matters which he would like to raise under this heading. First, he noted that the Consultative Group Secretariat had circulated a supplementary program and budget paper for 1976 on the International Livestock Center for Africa. The Secretariat had suggested that funds for ILCA in 1976 be provided in two installments, with the second contribution being subject to approval of several cooperative research projects by the ILCA Board of Trustees and further subject to availability of funds. While no members had comments regarding this proposal, the question was raised when ILCA would be in a position to manage its own funds. In response, the representative of the World Bank announced that the Bank was ending its role as fiscal agent and executing agency for the initial phase of ILCA's development effective as of October 31, 1975, and funds remaining in the special trust account would be transferred to ILCA's own account on November 3, 1975.

73. On a second matter, the Chairman asked the Executive Secretary of the TAC Secretariat to report on progress in preparation of a report on bilateral support for agricultural research. Mr. Oram, the TAC Executive Secretary, indicated that 13 members had responded to an earlier request for information on activities being sponsored by donors in support of agricultural research in developing countries. A like number of members had not yet replied and the TAC Secretariat intended to be in touch with all donors regarding the provision of information in a form which could be used for development of a register compatible with the CARIS system. The TAC Secretariat was running a trial on 20 existing projects to see whether information could be organized in such a way as to make it compatible. If it proved successful all such information would be fed into the CARIS system to be produced either as part of the CARIS directory or, as is currently intended, to produce a separate directory of Consultative Group members' research support in developing countries.

74. Finally, under this Agenda item, the Chairman circulated a draft press release. After modification on the basis of comments from members, the press release was issued and is attached as Annex V.

Time and Place of Next Meeting (Agenda Item 8)

75. The Chairman proposed, and the meeting agreed, that International Centers Week would be held in Washington from Monday, July 26 through Friday, July 30, 1976.

Retirements of Mr. W. A. C. Mathieson and
Mr. A. R. Melville

76. Mr. Mashler of the UNDP noted that this would be the last CG meeting for two of the founding members of the Group, Mr. W. A. C. Mathieson and Mr. A. R. Melville of the United Kingdom. On behalf of the members, he expressed appreciation for their contributions to the Group. Not only had the contribution been one of substance but of humor and spirit, which have characterized the Consultative Group itself from the very beginning. The Chairman added that there was a happy tradition in the Group that retiring members do not disappear but re-associate themselves in some new capacity. In wishing Messrs. Mathieson and Melville well he said that they were not saying goodbye, only offering best wishes in their new assignments and the hope for a continuing association with them.

The meeting adjourned at 12 noon.

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING

(October 30 and 31, 1975)

Chairman

Mr. Warren C. Baum
Vice President, Projects Staff
World Bank

Chairman, Technical Advisory Committee

Sir John Crawford
Canberra, A.C.T. 2600
Australia

DELEGATIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE CONSULTATIVE GROUPAustralia

Mr. Bruce M. Cheek
Alternate Executive Director
for Australia
World Bank
Washington, D. C.

Belgium

Mme. S. Vervalcke
Director, Multilateral Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Brussels, Belgium

Canada

Dr. R. Poirier
Vice President
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
Ottawa, Canada

Mr. Paul Ladouceur
(CIDA)
Ottawa, Canada

Mr. Franc Mes
CIDA
Ottawa, Canada

Mr. George Dion
Agricultural Advisor
CIDA

Denmark

Mr. Nils Bernstein
Financial Secretary
Danish Embassy
Washington, D. C.

Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations

Mr. J. F. Yriart
Assistant Director General
Development Department
Rome, Italy

Mr. T. S. Baribisala
Director, Agricultural Services
Division

Ford Foundation

Mr. David Bell
Vice President
New York, N. Y.

Dr. Lowell Hardin
Program Officer, Agriculture
New York, N. Y.

France

Mr. Henri Vernede
Commissaire du Gouvernement auprès des
Instituts de recherche specialises outre-mer
Ministere de la Cooperation
20 Rue Monsieur
75700 Paris, France

Mr. René Paul Rigaud
Alternate Executive Director
World Bank

Germany

Dr. Werner Treitz
Ministry of Economic Cooperation
Bonn, Germany

Dr. Rohner
Meckenheim, Germany

Inter-American Development Bank

Mr. Clarence M. Pierce
Senior Consultant

Mr. Victor M. Horcasitas
Consultant, Technical Assistance
Division

Mr. José Soto Angli
Advisor, Technical Cooperation

Mr. Ferruccio Accame
Chief, Training Division

Mr. Cesar Cainelli
Division of Agricultural Development Projects

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)

Mr. James Fransen
Agricultural Research Advisor

International Development Research Centre (IDRC)

Mr. J. H. Hulse
Program Director
Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences
Ottawa, Canada

Mr. Douglas Daniels
Research Officer
Agriculture, Food and
Nutrition Sciences
Ottawa, Canada

Iran

Dr. Hussein Mirheydar
Deputy Minister
Ministry of Agricultural and Natural Resources
Tehran, Iran

Italy

Dr. G. T. Scarascia-Mugnozza
Professor of Plant Breeding
Faculty of Agriculture, University of Bari
Bari, Italy

Japan

Mr. Akio Suzuki
Deputy Director-General
Council Secretariat
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

Mr. Morihisa Aoki
First Secretary, Embassy of Japan
Washington, D. C.

The Netherlands

Dr. G. de Bakker
General Director of Agricultural Research
Ministry of Agriculture
The Hague, Netherlands

Mr. K. Soels
Research Program Officer
The Hague, Netherlands

New Zealand

Mr. W. A. E. Green
Executive Director, World Bank

Nigeria

Mr. Barnabas S. Oloruntoba
Permanent Secretary
Federal Ministry of Agriculture
Lagos, Nigeria

Dr. B. O. E. Amon
Secretary
Agricultural Research Council
Ibadan, Nigeria

Norway

Mr. Per M. Oelberg
Counsellor
Embassy of Norway
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Einar Risa
First Secretary of Embassy
Washington, D. C.

Rockefeller Foundation

Dr. John A. Pino
Director for Agricultural Sciences
New York

Sweden

Professor Ewert Åberg^o
Agricultural College
of Sweden
Uppsala, Sweden

Mr. Per Ryden
Programme Officer
SIDA, Stockholm

Switzerland

Mr. Guy Hentsch
1st Secretary of the Embassy of Switzerland
Washington, D. C.

United Kingdom

Mr. W.A.C. Mathieson
Deputy Secretary, Ministry of
Overseas Development
London, United Kingdom

Mr. A. R. Melville
Chief, Natural Resources Adviser
Ministry of Overseas Development

Mr. W. D. Maniece
Assistant Secretary
Ministry of Overseas Development

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Mr. William T. Mashler
Senior Director, Division for Global and
Inter-regional Projects
New York, N.Y.

United States

Mr. Curtis Farrar
Assistant Administrator
Technical Assistance Bureau, USAID

Mr. C. R. Benjamin
Assistant Director
International Programs Division
ARS - USDA

Dr. Guy B. Baird
Associate Director (Research)
Office of Agriculture, TAB/USAID

Dr. Dana Dalrymple
Agricultural Economist
USAID - Dept. of Agriculture

Representing Latin America - Argentina

Mr. Jorge Cazenave
Agricultural Counselor
Embassy of Argentina
Washington, D.C.

The Consultative Group Secretariat

Mr. Michael L. Lejeune
Executive Secretary

Mrs. Gene Audifferen

Mr. Daniel Ritchie
Deputy Executive Secretary

Mrs. Monica Stillwell

Dr. John K. Coulter
Scientific Adviser

Mrs. Audrey Mitchell

Mr. Carlos Gavino
Research Assistant

TAC Secretariat

Mr. Peter A. Oram
Executive Secretary
Technical Advisory Committee
Rome

Mr. Brian N. Webster
Deputy Executive Secretary
Technical Advisory Committee
Rome

O B S E R V E R

Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development

Dr. Nasarat R. Fadda
Agriculture Officer
Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development
Kuwait

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

CGIAR - October Meeting

Provisional Agenda

October 30-31, 1975

1. Opening Remarks by Chairman
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Proposal for Review of CGIAR System
4. Report by Chairman of TAC on its
October Meeting
 - (a) ICIPE
 - (b) Consideration of priorities
 - (c) Other matters
5. Other Ongoing Activities
 - (a) ICARDA - Progress Report
 - (b) Coordination of support for post-harvest systems
research
 - (c) IFDC - relationship to CGIAR
6. Financial Support for 1976 and thereafter
 - (a) Indications by Donors of Level and Allocation of Funds
 - (b) Plans for Handling Shortfall (if necessary)
7. Other Business
 - (a) Press Release
8. Time and Place of Next Meeting
9. Chairman's Closing Remarks

CGIAR Secretariat
October 9, 1975

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

1818 H St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20433 U.S.A.
Telephone (Area Code 202) 477-3592
Cable Address - INTBAFRAD

October 10, 1975

TO: Members of the Consultative Group

FROM: Warren C. Baum, Chairman

SUBJECT: Proposal for the Review of the CGIAR System

1. At the July meeting of the Consultative Group, we agreed on the need to review systematically the future growth, direction and management of the international agricultural research network which is supported by the CGIAR. As noted in the "Integrative Report" provided to the meeting, since the Consultative Group's creation in 1971, the individual centers, the network and the Group itself have changed considerably. Financing of the centers has increased sevenfold, the number of donors has quadrupled since the days before the Group was formed and the number of operational centers and programs in the system has tripled. The system has matured to the point that most of the ecological zones and essential food crops of the developing world are encompassed in the research programs of the international centers. The character of the centers themselves has been evolving from pure crop research to an agricultural development orientation. Members felt that the Group represents an unusually successful international effort addressed to supporting a key activity required to help the poorer countries to develop their agricultural potential. They also felt that the Group had done very well in accommodating itself to the rapid growth of the CGIAR system. At the same time they recognized that it was still evolving and we would have to contemplate further adjustments in both the scope of the program supported and the level of finance, and would have to consider whether it was desirable and feasible for the past rate of growth to be sustained. The consensus was that these questions needed review.

2. At the July meeting I undertook to prepare for the Consultative Group a proposal for the review to be carried out, including outline terms of reference, a proposed work program and timetable and tentative cost estimates. Accordingly, I am providing in this note some preliminary suggestions regarding the scope and execution of the proposed review. Consideration of this proposal will constitute one of the principal items on the agenda of the October 30 and 31 meeting of the Consultative Group.

Purpose of the Review

3. The basic purpose of the review would be to provide an overall perspective on the growth and development of the CG network over the next several years, in the light of five years of very successful experience and in the context of the long term aims which brought the members together in the founding of the CGIAR. It would seek to recommend objectives and priorities of international agricultural research related to food requirements of the less developed countries and, taking into account the general concern of donors to help small farmers, would suggest the appropriate scope of activities of the international centers in the light of the financial support which can realistically be expected to be available from the CGIAR until 1980. The review would also consider means of ensuring the most efficient use of resources available to the system.

4. More specifically the review would seek:

- (a) to suggest overall objectives over the next decade of CGIAR-sponsored international agricultural research related to the estimated food and nutritional requirements of the less developed countries;
- (b) within these objectives, to suggest the basic priorities for CGIAR-sponsored research over the next five years, both for ongoing activities and potential new ones;
- (c) to consider the appropriate role of the international centers in achieving these objectives, particularly the limits of a center's responsibility for the transfer of technology to beneficiary countries and farmers, in the light of the necessary levels of national research;
- (d) to determine the level of financial resources required by the international network over the next five years, and after assessing its likely availability to assess what measures may be needed to bring research targets and resources into line, including setting of priorities at alternative levels of funding;
- (e) to recommend means of ensuring the most effective use of the financial and staff resources available to the network, including consideration of means of measuring the efficiency of investment in research; and
- (f) to consider improvements in the programming and budgeting procedures of the CGIAR system.

Terms of Reference

5. Outline terms of reference for the review are attached as Annex A. They are intended to identify the major areas of investigation for the study or studies which would constitute the major input for the review. More detailed terms of reference would be prepared by the review committee (see paragraph 6 below) once the general outline has been agreed.

Structure for Implementation of the Review

6. The Consultative Group at its July meeting agreed to the formation of a special committee which would be responsible for directing and supervising the requisite studies and making recommendations to the full Group. Members of the Review Committee (who would be appointed by the Chairman of the Group) would represent a broad spectrum of interest within the CGIAR system, including bilateral and multilateral donors, the beneficiary countries and centers. While members would be selected in their personal capacity, they may have served in more than one capacity within the system, and thus be able to represent more than one point of view. This, in turn, may enable the Committee to be limited in size, perhaps to between nine and twelve members.

7. It has been suggested that the Chairman of the Consultative Group serve ex officio as Chairman of the Review Committee. It is for the Group to decide whether this is appropriate.

8. Responsibility for the conduct of studies and drafting of papers would be vested in a Study Director, to be selected by the Committee on the recommendation of its chairman. He would take his instructions from the Committee and be responsible to it. He would prepare the detailed terms of reference, organize studies and investigations, invite papers and suggestions from appropriate sources, recommend engagement of staff to assist in the preparation of the review, supervise research and be responsible for drafting a report for the Committee's consideration.

9. The Study Director would be assisted by perhaps two other staff who would devote most of their time over specified periods to the review work. Short-term consultants and the services of selected staff from CG member agencies, international centers, TAC and CG Secretariats and other sources might be requested as needed. To cover the essential types of issues to be addressed by the review, the qualifications of the review staff should include scientific, economic and management expertise.

Program

10. In July we agreed to consider the outline terms of reference, program, timetable and tentative costs of the review at the October meeting. Assuming that the Consultative Group agrees to move ahead with the review at that time with agreed terms of reference, I would plan to establish the Review Committee promptly, which in turn would appoint the Study Director.

11. Before the end of 1975 the Study Director would be expected to put before the Committee detailed terms of reference for the review, a work program and a timetable for its preparation. He would also prepare a list of supporting papers and other assistance which would be solicited from CG members, center personnel and others.

12. The assistance and advice of TAC would be particularly important in consideration of a number of topics, especially priorities and objectives of the system. Other participation might include the FAO and the IBRD regarding longer-term global food requirements, the CG Secretariat in assessing financial availabilities, the international centers on the appropriate boundaries of their activities and selected individual organizations with interest in specific topics.

13. It would be desirable to have a first draft of its report for consideration by the Committee in April or May 1976, and a revised draft ready for consideration by the Consultative Group at International Centers Week in late July 1976. However, this is a very tight schedule in light of the breadth of the review and the time required to assemble staff and the draft may in fact have to be submitted to the Group at its October 1976 meeting, with work continuing as necessary thereafter until completion.

Cost

14. The cost of the review would be in the order of \$350,000. This would include the cost of the services of a full-time Study Director and two support staff, 12 man-months of short-term consultant services, travel by review staff, secretarial and office expenses, reproduction and printing costs, and contingencies. A nominal sum has been included to cover the travel and subsistence costs of Review Committee members in the exceptional cases where their organizations might be unable to bear such costs. A tentative cost estimate is attached as Annex B.

15. Contributions from members of the Group would be needed to finance the study, as the cost would be beyond the resources of the co-sponsors or other sources. A number of members have already indicated their willingness

to contribute. The rest are invited to do so, and it is hoped that enough members will pledge sums for this purpose at the October meeting (preferably in addition to their support for the regular operations of the CGIAR) to enable the study to proceed. The World Bank could serve as administrator of these funds, if desired, along the lines of the ICARDA and ILCA trust accounts. Office space and support facilities could also be provided by the World Bank.

16. The emoluments and travel expenses of staff of members asked to undertake specific assignments of limited duration would be met by their organizations. If staff were to be assigned to a longer-term assignment or undertake costly travel exclusively for the review, then such costs might reasonably be expected to be borne from the review budget.

Attachments

OUTLINE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Review of CGIAR System

Introduction

1. The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) intends to review the future growth, direction and administration of the network of international agricultural research centers and programs which it supports. It plans to consider the appropriate objectives and priorities for research over the next ten years and the appropriate level of activity over the next five years in the light of the financial support which is likely to be available through the CGIAR during this period.
2. The review is designed to provide a general perspective of the role of the international agricultural research network sponsored by the CG in dealing with food and nutritional requirements of the developing countries. It will serve as a strategy for the development of the network to 1985 and as a guide for determining the most efficient use of the resources available to the system.
3. The review will include an examination of what improvements in the administration of the CGIAR system may be needed to ensure efficiency, particularly the efficient use of the resources provided to the system.

Review Committee

4. The review will be based on the work and report of a Review Committee constituted for the purpose. The necessary study or studies will be carried out by a Study Director under the guidance of the Committee.

Terms of Reference

5. The Committee and the Study Director will be guided by the following general terms of reference.

- (a) Based on the best information available on the needs of the LDCs for the principal food crops until the end of the century and the potential of the areas most severely pressed, the Committee will make a judgement of the rate of increase in yield of these crops required to meet the needs.
- (b) Taking into account the research already in progress and the likelihood of adding significant increases in yield through research, the Committee will examine the need for expanded research on these crops and related farming systems and suggest the priorities of research work, noting areas where break-throughs appear most promising and neglected areas of research and taking into account the cost of various types of research in relation to potential results.
- (c) The Committee will estimate the research input, including trained people, that is likely to be necessary to achieve the feasible yield increases, and suggest a balance between "basic" and "applied" research.
- (d) It will suggest how the work might most appropriately be divided between the international system, research programs in the developed countries and the national programs of the

LDCs; it will particularly consider the appropriate boundaries of the international centers' responsibility for facilitating the effective transfer of technology to the beneficiary countries and the farmers in them.

- (c) The Committee will estimate the likely level of financing required by the international system over the next five years and, after assessing the likely availability of funds, consider whether a serious shortfall impends and recommend measures to bring resources and research targets into line and research priorities at given levels of funding.
- (f) Finally, the Committee will consider the need for improvements in the programming and budgeting procedures of the CGIAR system to ensure that the manpower and money devoted to international agricultural research are efficiently used.

6. Under these general terms of reference, the Committee may wish to develop more specific guidelines for the work to be carried out under the direction of the Study Director.

ESTIMATED COST OF THE REVIEW

\$ US

I. Personnel Costs(i) Study Director

18 man-months @ \$5,000 90,000

(ii) 2 Study Staff

24 man-months @ \$4,000 96,000

(iii) Short-term Consultants

12 man-months @ \$4,000 48,000

(iv) Secretarial Staff

24 person-months @ \$1,200 29,000

Sub-total 263,000

II Travel and Subsistence Costs(i) Director

2x\$2,500 (maximum distance)	5,000
3x\$1,500 (medium distance)	4,500
subsistence - (60 days @\$100)	6,000

15,500

(ii) Study Staff

5x\$1,500 (medium distance) 7,500

subsistence (60 days @\$100) 6,000

13,500

(iii) Review Committee

(3 meetings of 3 days each,
including travel)
- 2 intercontinental members
(2 x 3 x \$2,500 plus subsistence)

17,000

Sub-total 46,000

III Other CostsOffice Supplies, Reproduction and Printing 4,000Communications 3,000

Contingencies (about 10 percent) 34,000

Sub-total 41,000

Total 350,000

ANNEX IV

CGIAR Allocations, 1976 (US\$ million)

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>CIAT</u>	<u>CIMMYT</u>	<u>CIP</u>	<u>ICRISAT</u>	<u>IITA</u>	<u>IRRI</u>	<u>ILCA</u>	<u>ILRAD</u>	<u>GENES</u>	<u>WARDA</u>	<u>ICARDA</u>	<u>CARIS</u>	<u>UNALLOCATED</u>
Australia	1.775	.125			.400		.500	.375				.250		.125
Belgium	1.750	.125	.050		.025	.750		.300		.050	.100	.150	.050	.150
Canada	5.560	.835	.835	.510	.880	.930	.590		.390	.100	.195	.295		
Denmark	.455		.170	.245				.040						
Ford	2.000	.400	.465			.500	.565					.070		
France	.520							.245			.125	.110	.040	
Germany	4.595	.460	.325	.135	.500	1.145	.095	.460	.460	.040		.115		.860
IDB	5.000	2.100	2.300	.600										
IDRC	1.810		.060	.075	.585		.550					.540		
Iran	1.975		.725			.250	.250	.250				.500		
Italy	.100											.100		
Japan	1.200				.200		1.000							
Kellogg	.300	.300												
Netherlands	1.500	.200		.220	.100	.275		.125	.175	.125	.100	.130	.050	
New Zealand	.105						.080					.025		
Nigeria	.640					.400		.160			.080			
Norway	1.075				.715			.110	.180	.070				
Rockefeller	2.150	.500	.500	.050		.400	.500		.200					
Saudi Arabia	1.000		.150	.050	.125		.125	.020	.020	.010		.500		
Sweden	2.190			.340	1.295			.340		.090	.070	.055		
Switzerland	.855	.140		.140	.275			.150	.150					
U.K.	3.235	.120	.220	.140	.920	.810	.535	.100	.230	.060		.100		
U.N.D.P.	2.360		1.460		.900									
U.N.E.P.	.600	.070	.070		.120	.170	.070			.100				
U.S.	15.100	1.700	2.550	1.000	1.900	2.500	2.150	1.200	1.500	.200	.090	.200	.110	
World Bank	6.800	.250	.110	.400		1.520	1.580	.980	1.420			.075	.100	.365
AVAILABLE	64.650	7.325	9.990	3.905	8.940	9.650	8.590	4.855	4.725	.845	.760	3.215	.350	1.500
REQUIRED	64.955	7.535	10.275	4.185	8.600	10.025	8.865	4.850	4.870	.960	.850	3.300	.640	
NET POSITION	- 1.805*	-.210	-.285	-.280	.340	-.375	-.275	.005	-.145	-.115	-.090	-.085	-.290	

* Includes \$1.500 Million Unallocated amount

Note: Conversions to US dollars based on exchange rates prevailing on December 31, 1975.

January 31, 1976