January 15, 1973

TO: Members of the Consultative Group
FROM: Executive Secretary
SUBJECT: Summary of Proceedings of Consultative Group Meeting November 1-2, 1972

1. Attached is a revised Summary of Proceedings of the Consultative Group Meeting which was held in Washington on November 1 and 2, 1972. Copies of the draft Summary were circulated in November.

2. The Summary has been amended in paragraph 63 (page 13), and in the second paragraph of the "General" section of Annex 4. The table constituting Annex 3 has been revised to specify the amount of the intended Norwegian contribution to the international agricultural research centers, and to explain more fully the intended U.S. contributions. Amendments also have been made to pages 3 and 4 of Annex 1, listing the participants in the Meeting.

Attachment
1. The Third Meeting of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, sponsored jointly by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), was held on November 1 and 2, 1972, at IBRD Headquarters in Washington, D.C. Mr. Richard H. Demuth, Director, Development Services Department, IBRD, was in the Chair.

2. The Chairman announced that, since the last meeting, Australia had joined the Group as a full member.

3. The meeting was attended by 26 members and two observers; the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Kellogg Foundation (members) and the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD (observer) were unable to attend. The Chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) also attended. A list of delegates is attached as Annex I.

4. The Agenda adopted at the meeting is attached as Annex II.

Discussion of programs of existing centers and TAC's recommendations concerning them (Agenda Item 2)

5. In introducing this item, the Chairman invited the Chairman of TAC to comment on the salient points of the Committee's report about the existing centers.

6. The Chairman of TAC said that TAC supported the proposed programs and budgets as requested for 1973 with minor reservations. He stressed, however, that TAC's role was an advisory one and that decisions for support had to be taken by the Consultative Group.
a) For CIMMYT, the reservation concerned the budgetary provision of $40,000 for work on barley. Since there was no international center working on this crop at the moment, CIMMYT's work had to be recognized and its collection to be preserved. TAC felt, however, that the amount which CIMMYT had allocated to barley was inadequate to develop an effective contribution to the research on this crop. On the other hand, it believed that no decision about where to develop a major attack on barley should be made pending a thorough study of various alternative possibilities. In the meantime, CIMMYT's work should remain concentrated on wheat and maize.

b) For IRRI, TAC had emphasized that the institute should concentrate its research on rice. It encouraged IRRI to consider ways and means of expanding its work into upland, rainfed areas; but it did not recommend expenditures for this purpose in 1973. It suggested that discussions should be held between IRRI's new Director, once in office, and TAC before any decision was taken on this matter.

c) For IITA, TAC supported the division of its work into farming systems and crop improvement, and the reduction of the number of crops IITA was working on -- in particular, the concentration on yams, sweet potatoes, and cowpeas. It encouraged IITA to use its training capacity to the full, particularly in the interest of the work required in West Africa.

d) As for CIAT, TAC took the view that some clearer definition was needed of the scope of its economic work, which seemed to over-emphasize local farm management aspects and to overlap, in certain instances, with national extension activities. The discussions during Centers Week had, however, shown that the program was now more sharply focused than a year before.

e) As to CIP, TAC attached great importance to the station in the Toluca Valley in Mexico, which it hoped would be incorporated within CIP.

7. Discussion of the programs and budgets of the six centers by the members of the Group indicated general approval of the proposals as presented by the centers and endorsed by TAC. Referring to CIMMYT, the Chairman said that the budget the Group was approving included the $40,000 item for barley. In his view, confirmed by the Chairman of TAC, the inclusion of this item was not contrary to the views of TAC as long as it was clearly understood that the Group was not endorsing a major barley program at CIMMYT and that the question was left open as to whether such a program would be properly located at CIMMYT or elsewhere.

8. The representative of one FAO region said that at a recent meeting of countries of his region, reference had been made to problems which farmers in many countries were encountering in trying to
apply those international research findings which had been based on highest yield from maximum inputs. The countries of his region were now asking FAO and other international organizations to help develop ways by which farmers could use medium yield varieties requiring only medium inputs and with low risks for the farmer.

International Network of Plant Genetic Resources
(Agenda Item 3 (a))

9. In introducing this item, for which TAC had recommended consultative Group support in 1973, the Chairman of TAC pointed out that the proposal for establishing an international network of plant genetic resources had evolved out of a working group of world experts in this field, which had been convened in Beltsville, Maryland, in the spring of 1972 with the cooperation of the United States Department of Agriculture. The working group had recommended the establishment of a coordinating committee and of a trust fund which would finance the costs both of the committee itself and of the creation and operation of the proposed network. The committee would be located at FAO headquarters in Rome but would be independent of FAO. It would include in its network the germ plasm collections already existing in various institutes in the developed countries and in international centers such as IRRI, IITA and CIMMYT. In addition, the Beltsville conference had recommended the fairly immediate establishment of nine regional collection centers. TAC had modified this recommendation by proposing that the coordinating committee initially be authorized to develop only three regional centers. The financial requirements for three centers would amount to $2.2 million over a three-year period, with about $381,000 required for 1973. The two major tasks of the coordinating committee were to improve the degree of access to the germ plasm stocks and to take steps for collecting, evaluating and safeguarding appropriate stocks for which present arrangements were not adequate, which was still the case for many crops. Responding to a question, the Chairman of TAC said that the collection of genetic resources was intended to include stocks of both food and non-food crops but was not intended to include animal stocks.

10. Some speakers expressed the view that FAO, as an international organization concerned with agriculture in all parts of the world, should deal with the aspects of the proposal having to do with coordination of collection activities and the retrieval and dissemination of information.

11. One speaker said that the funds required for germ plasm collection and conservation, as distinct from the financing of coordination activities, should be handled outside the FAO budget. The need for this kind of work would have to be defined on a crop by crop basis. Coordination might be handled by some redeployment of existing FAO staff; an alternative would be to approach other organizations that might be prepared to contribute some of their staff members' time to these functions under an FAO umbrella.
12. Asked about the scope of the activities of the coordinating committee, the Chairman of TAC said that, under the proposal, the coordinating committee would have the task of arranging for appropriate interlocking of all the existing stocks and for seeing to it that all necessary action was taken to fill any important gaps in the stocks. The TAC proposal was open to modifications with respect to the number of crops to be covered; the Chairman of TAC said that he would not object if TAC were asked to reconsider that aspect, even though this would result in delay in implementing the proposal.

13. One speaker said that since the proposal included an important training component which was designed mainly to strengthen national capacity to participate in the network, countries might apply to UNDP, for example, for support. One should also realize that the regional centers which would be used in the initial stage, according to the proposal, would form part of organizations already in existence, thus maximizing experience and minimizing capital costs. The same speaker said that thought should be given to whether this activity could not be regarded as a high priority claimant on the resources of the environment fund to be established by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

14. One speaker said that FAO should coordinate its activities especially in the field of documentation, with Unesco, which was involved in similar kinds of research.

15. At the request of several speakers, the representative of FAO stated the position of his organization toward the proposal. He said that FAO rated this as a high priority task, fundamental to maintaining momentum research in crop improvement and that FAO was already devoting resources to this work. As for FAO's involvement in the proposed network which had been strongly recommended by TAC, he agreed that the functions of the coordinating committee staff could be viewed as a regular program responsibility given the solution of FAO's budgetary problems. Despite the tight budget situation, FAO would examine the feasibility of assuming a larger responsibility for genetic resources but it was difficult for him to make a firm commitment pending this review and clearance by FAO's governing body.

16. The Secretary of TAC explained that the proposed regional centers were intended to strengthen the operations of collecting and conserving germplasm in the regions of greatest diversity of the major crops. These were all basically in developing countries, some of them quite a long way from the international centers which in any case only covered a limited number of crops. He agreed with previous speakers that the idea was not to create new institutions but to use existing establishments with appropriate strengthening facilities where necessary.

17. Summarizing this part of the discussion, the Chairman said that there appeared to be a general consensus that additional work on the collection and conservation of genetic resources was needed. The members of the Consultative Group were reluctant at this point, however, to commit themselves to the full program or to the precise pattern that TAC had proposed. A solution might be to ask FAO to consider between now and the end of January 1973, when the next meeting of TAC would be held, what part FAO might play in the coordination activities of the network proposal. In 1973, FAO would also be asked to
identify the main gaps in the genetic resources network and to recommend to TAC how these should be filled.

18. The Chairman of TAC agreed with the suggestion that FAO and TAC should consult further on the proposal. In its revised recommendation, TAC would emphasize the priorities already implicit in its recommendation to cut down the regional centers from nine to three. It would also further elaborate on the way the coordinating committee would operate in relation to the use of existing stocks and the identification of gaps.

19. The representative of FAO said that he accepted the solution proposed by the Chairman with the understanding that the proposal was of interest to the Group in principle. FAO would proceed in the expectation that, provided FAO and TAC together could bring forward an acceptable revised proposal -- perhaps with FAO's commitment to undertake the central coordination function -- the members of the Group would be prepared to consider financial support for the operational activities involved.

African Relay Stations Network related to ICRISAT
(Agenda Item 3 (b))

20. In introducing this agenda item, the Chairman of TAC said that when TAC had approved the original ICRISAT proposal it had emphasized that work in Africa would be a vital part of ICRISAT's over-all program for the semi-arid tropics; it had also foreseen the possibility of ultimate links with work in Brazil and other parts of the world. Some of the work could be carried out in the African centers without any supervision from ICRISAT; other work might, however, require ICRISAT personnel because of its specialized character. The nature of, and responsibility for, the programs in Africa should emerge from consultations between the Director of ICRISAT and the heads of the designated centers in Africa. TAC would, therefore, recommend the allocation of funds for the African relay stations only after the new Director of ICRISAT had established himself at the institute and was prepared for such discussions. This would probably not happen until sometime in 1973.

21. One speaker said that, since the African centers suggested to serve as relay stations were already in operation, it should be possible for ICRISAT's Director, even at the present stage, to hold discussions on the relationship with these centers. Another speaker pointed out that the African outreach program was on the agenda of the ICRISAT Board meeting scheduled for January 1973.

22. The Chairman concluded that the Group agreed with the recommendation of TAC that a network of relay stations be established in Africa. ICRISAT's Board and Director would be informed that the question of financial support for the network would be deferred until after specific proposals had been worked out.
Completion of capital facilities for Asian Vegetable Research and Development Center (AVRDC) (Agenda Item 3 (c))

23. In introducing this agenda item, the Chairman of TAC said that TAC recommended that the Asian Vegetable Center should receive the capital support required to complete its building and equipment program for which $1.4 million were needed. In considering the Center's request for funding, TAC had originally raised some questions both about the Center attempting to deal with too many commodities and about the priority to be accorded the work of the Center. In the discussions with AVRDC's Director, assurance had, however, been received that the Center would reduce the number of commodities. As for the priority question, AVRDC's Director had convincingly stated that vegetables did form an important part of the normal diet of the people in the Far East; the Center's program was not established in the interest of exporters, but was a genuine effort to meet a problem of food supply. TAC had also felt that the location of the Center in Taiwan might perhaps have certain disadvantages since it was a little too far north to be wholly representative of the tropical problems of most of the countries of Southeast Asia. In this context, TAC strongly supported the establishment of outreach relationships with countries such as Thailand which were located in the tropical zone.

24. As for the relationship of the Asian Vegetable Center with the Consultative Group and with the other international institutes, TAC supported the idea of a loose link without equal status. No core support was sought by AVRDC at the present time; TAC might consider a closer link if a request for such support was submitted at a later time.

25. In summarizing the discussion, the Chairman said that, since TAC had not recommended core support for the Asian Vegetable Center at the present time, no issue was presented of a continuing long-term relationship between the Consultative Group and the AVRDC. He proposed, and the Group agreed, that the Asian Vegetable Center should be considered as a kind of associate member of the network of international institutes; it would be encouraged to exchange information with the other centers and vice versa. A cooperation in outreach programs and linkages in research activities would be desirable and an invitation would be extended to AVRDC to participate fully in the discussion of International Centers Week.

The representative of the United Nations Development Programme requested to be recorded as not participating in the discussion of this agenda item.

West African Rice Development Association (WARDA) (Agenda Item 3 (d))

26. In introducing this agenda item, the representative of the FAO region for Africa said that the countries of his area had been disappointed that TAC had not recommended support for WARDA. He said that WARDA would want to know whether it qualified for support from the Group and what kind of cooperation should be established with IITA and IRRI in order to prepare an acceptable program. If, on the other hand, a decision was taken that WARDA's activities were not eligible for support by the Consultative Group, this should be stated clearly.
27. The Chairman said that the reason WARDA had not been put on the agenda of this meeting was because TAC had not recommended financial support. TAC, however, had decided to retain the WARDA proposal on its agenda for further discussion of any revised program that WARDA might later submit to TAC.

28. The Chairman of TAC, while confirming TAC's position as described by the Chairman, said that during the TAC discussions, several members of TAC had expressed doubts about the principle of financing a regional institution whose primary function was not to undertake agricultural research itself, but rather to coordinate the research programs of various national institutions within the region. TAC would, however, have a further discussion of support for regional activities at its next meeting. As for the cooperation with existing institutes, TAC had specifically recommended that discussions between WARDA and the Directors of IITA, IRRI and IRAT should be held as soon as possible to develop a plan of cooperation.

29. Several speakers, referring to the terms of reference of TAC and the framework within which it was originally planned the Consultative Group should operate, expressed differing views as to whether a regional organization such as WARDA fell within this framework or not. It was agreed that a decision on this matter should be deferred until TAC had presented its recommendations.

Recommendations of the African Livestock Subcommittee regarding activities for 1973. (Agenda Item 4)

30. In introducing this agenda item, the Chairman referred to the report on the results of the recent meeting of the African Livestock Subcommittee by the Chairman of that Subcommittee. The Subcommittee had met to consider the next steps to be taken with respect to the proposed animal disease laboratory in view of the decision of the East African Community that it could not be host to this laboratory. The Subcommittee had also had some preliminary discussions of the recommendations of the Task Force on Animal Production in Tropical Africa which had been commissioned to examine the feasibility and desirability of creating an integrated organization for research into animal production and health in tropical Africa.

The Subcommittee had agreed that the Bank should make a high-level approach to the Government of Kenya to see whether that Government would be willing to cooperate in the establishment of the disease laboratory. The Subcommittee recommended that if the approach to the Government of Kenya were successful, an initial fund of $500,000 should be established for the development of the laboratory, similar to the fund established for ICRISAT. If that approach proved unsuccessful, then, in the view of the Subcommittee, the Rockefeller Foundation, as executing agency, should investigate other alternatives.

31. One member of the Group described the activities of the Near East Regional Animal Production and Health Commission and said that it was hoped that a close collaboration could be established between that Commission and the integrated livestock institute to be set up in Africa.
32. Several speakers emphasized the importance of integrating the research on animal production and on animal health. Efforts should be made to proceed with the disease laboratory, but it should be made clear that the laboratory would operate on an interim basis until a decision was made regarding the over-all livestock research center. The letter which was to go to the Government of Kenya should mention that it was envisaged that the laboratory would, at a later stage, become part of the integrated center, if and when created, and that the integrated center might well be established elsewhere in Africa.

33. The Chairman quoted the letter President Kenyatta had sent in June 1971 to Mr. McNamara when he first had offered the facilities of Kenya for an animal disease laboratory. In it, President Kenyatta had clearly stated that the offer was for an immunology sub-unit of an integrated center which might be established elsewhere in tropical Africa. Thus, the Government of Kenya had already agreed that the institute to be established in Kenya might be part of a larger organization.

34. One speaker said it was necessary that the negotiators for the animal disease laboratory be reassured that the Consultative Group was prepared to move ahead with it irrespective of the ultimate outcome of deliberations with respect to the African Livestock Research Center.

35. In summarizing the discussion, the Chairman said that the consensus of the Group favored approaching the Government of Kenya with a view to trying to establish in Kenya an immunology laboratory concentrating on East Coast Fever and Trypanosomiasis. It should, however, be made clear that this institute was not being established at the present time as a continuing separate international institution or center, but as a potential sub-unit of an integrated African Livestock Research Organization, if and when established. It should also be stated that if the integrated organization could not be established, consideration would then have to be given to how the laboratory could be put on a continuing basis if that was desired.

36. The Group agreed that the African Livestock Subcommittee should meet shortly after TAC had had a chance to consider the proposal for the integrated organization. It requested TAC to discuss the integrated organization as soon as possible, in view of the interim character envisaged for the disease laboratory.

37. The consensus of the Group, the Chairman noted, carried with it the implication that an initial fund for the disease laboratory would be established if the approach to the Kenya Government was favorably received. It would have to be understood that additional funds subsequently would be required to finance buildings and equipment for the laboratory, regardless of the progress being made in connection with the establishment of the integrated African Livestock Research Center.
Statements of intention regarding financing of existing international centers (Agenda Item 5 (a))

38. A number of members made statements of intention, subject to legislative and other approvals, regarding the total amounts of funds to be made available for the existing centers for 1973 and, where possible, also for subsequent years. Those statements, with slight modifications to reflect subsequent developments, are presented in tabular form as Annex 3.

39. Some members also indicated the intended extent of their support for the existing centers in 1974. These indications are summarized in Annex 4.

40. In connection with the statements of intention a number of representatives made some general remarks about the purposes intended to be served by the research they were supporting. One speaker said the kind of research the Group was sponsoring should be designed not only to increase and improve yields, but also to meet nutritional needs. More generally, in designing research programs it was important to take relevant socio-economic factors into consideration, such as the effects of the technology and programs being developed upon the large mass of small farmers, on income distribution and employment, and on nutrition and health. The research undertaken at the institutes should also take ecological and environmental factors carefully into account.

41. Several representatives spoke about the importance of strengthening national research programs. International research centers depended for their effectiveness upon the delivery of their research results to the farmers, which could be only done through national programs. National programs therefore had to be regarded as an integral part of the global agricultural research and training system.

42. Other speakers urged on the Centers the importance of developing outreach programs. Such programs should include training in research personnel from developing countries, provision of advisory services of those countries, the carrying out of joint research with centers in the developing countries, and similar activities.

43. Referring to the forthcoming meeting of the Directors of the international institutes, a speaker noted that this kind of meeting was an important step towards relating the research programs of the institutes to each other, including studies of socio-economic questions of significance to the peoples of the developing world.

44. The representative of one of the FAO regions stressed the fact that developing countries should have the possibility of contributing, in however small a manner, to the activities of the Group. Unfortunately, the present structure of the Group seemed to be very restrictive.
45. In introducing this agenda item, the Chairman observed that ICRISAT was the first center to be established under the sponsorship of the Consultative Group. Since ICRISAT was starting from the ground up, it would take at least until some time in 1976 to construct its buildings and install its equipment. Although most members of the Group could only appropriate funds from one year to the next, ICRISAT had to be in a position to sign long-term contracts for construction and to have funds in sight to purchase the necessary scientific and capital equipment.

46. The estimated capital budget requirements through 1976 were $13.4 million. If donors were in a position to indicate their intention of providing long-term support on this scale, then the management of the World Bank Group would be prepared to consider the feasibility of entering into an underwriting arrangement, which, if approved by the Bank's Executive Directors, would enable ICRISAT to enter into long-term contracts with the assurance that it could meet the financial requirements as they came due. The Chairman also suggested that one way of approaching this matter might be for some members to indicate that they were willing to bear a certain percentage of the budget of ICRISAT, a procedure already being followed by one member with respect to all its contributions to the international centers.

47. Nine members of the Group indicated that their intentions were to continue to support ICRISAT during its formative period, although most of them were not able to give specific commitments as far ahead as 1976; six of these members were able to contribute funds for capital expenditures.

48. One member roughly estimated that these intentions implied that at least $10 million was in sight for the ICRISAT capital budget over a period of three years, with additional contributions likely during the construction period. Other speakers concurred in the judgment that ICRISAT's capital needs would in all probability be met. The Chairman agreed to pursue the matter further, from the standpoint of the World Bank Group, by getting in touch with prospective donors to learn more about their long-term projections of support for ICRISAT.

49. The Group then turned to the question of financing for new initiatives. It appeared that neither the proposed genetic resources network nor the linkage between ICRISAT and African relay stations would be ready for funding in 1973. That left for consideration the question of an initial fund for African livestock research.
50. Some members indicated that they would support the establishment of a development fund for the animal disease laboratory. Others indicated that they would contribute to an initial fund if it were intended for the development of an organization for comprehensive research on animal production and health, of which the laboratory would be a sub-unit; some would be unwilling, or at the least would find it difficult, to contribute to a fund for the laboratory alone. One member pointed out that it would be hard to negotiate an agreement with the Kenya Government without the prospect of a start-up fund for the disease laboratory.

51. No consensus appeared on the kind of initial fund which would attract the support of members. In any case, the Chairman pointed out, the Group had before it neither any recommendation from TAC concerning an integrated African livestock research center nor any proposal for an initial fund to support such a center. The Group concurred in the suggestion that the subject be referred to the African Livestock Subcommittee, to be considered by the Subcommittee soon after the next TAC meeting in the light both of the reaction of the Kenya Government on the animal disease laboratory and the recommendations of TAC on the proposed integrated livestock research center.

52. With respect to the ICRISAT network in Africa, one speaker said that his organization already was supporting some of the African institutes that might serve as relay stations.

53. With respect to the Asian Vegetable Center, two speakers said that they believed the Center would be carrying out important work, and were supporting it on that account. No new contributions to the Center were announced.

Selection Procedures for Consultative Group representation on Center boards of trustees and nominations to the Board of Trustees of CIP (Agenda Item 6)

54. The Chairman said that this Agenda Item related to the procedure for responding to requests from international centers or organizations for the Consultative Group to nominate candidates for election to their governing boards. The usual pattern was for each board to be composed of trustees of three kinds -- first, trustees representing the host country; second, trustees drawn from developing countries lying within the ecological zone with which the particular center was concerned; and third, trustees from developed countries able to offer the center financial assistance or technical knowledge. In the case of ICRISAT, for the first time, the charter of an international institute stipulated that three members of the institute's governing board should be selected by the Consultative Group.
A request had been received by the International Potato Center (CIP) for the Consultative Group to make three nominations to its Board, in accordance with the recently amended statutes of the Center. The Group, at its informal meeting during International Centers Week, had agreed to accede to this request. Thereafter, the Secretariat had tabled a paper suggesting a procedure for handling this request and any other similar ones which might be made to the Group. The proposed procedure contemplated that all members of the Consultative Group should be entitled to submit nominations to a board in which Group representation was sought, but that the nominees should be selected in each case by an ad hoc committee consisting of those members interested in providing financial support to the center or having a special relationship to the center.

55. In response to a question, the Chairman said that the proposal only referred to requests for nominations by the Group received from institutes and that it did not imply that institutes that did not ask for Consultative Group representation on its board should be persuaded to do so.

56. One speaker suggested that nominees recommended to centers' boards should not be considered as being representatives of the Consultative Group but rather be deemed to be members of the board appointed on the recommendation of the Consultative Group. This was agreed.

57. The proposal tabled by the Secretariat was approved by the Group and thereafter an ad hoc subcommittee met and selected three nominees to be recommended for appointment to the Board of the Potato Center. They are: Dr. I. C. de Bakker, The Netherlands; Dr. Borge Jacobsen, Denmark; and Professor E. R. Keller, Switzerland.

Socio-economic aspects of international agricultural research
(Agenda Item 7)

58. In introducing this item, the Chairman referred to a proposal made by the representative of the United States during International Centers Week. The first part of the proposal called for a seminar on the progress and prospects of socio-economic work by the international research centers which might be held in the Washington area at the end of next International Centers Week. This seminar would bring together personnel of the international centers, outside experts, and any members of TAC or the Consultative Group who wished to attend. The second part of the proposal suggested that consideration be given to means for strengthening the capacity of developing countries to formulate programs for the development of their agricultural sectors, perhaps by giving support to an international institution of some kind that would work toward this objective.

59. The Group agreed that a seminar on the socio-economic aspects of agricultural research should be held following International Centers Week in the summer of 1973. The seminar should include the Directors and economists of the international centers, members of TAC and of the Consultative Group, and a selected number of outside experts. The representative of the United States agreed to assume responsibility for assembling a planning group, which would work out an agenda, and of commissioning some preliminary working papers for this seminar.
60. During the discussion, the following suggestions, among others, were made for items that might be included in the agenda:

- the transmission of research results to the population of developing countries;
- implications of new technologies for farm-management practices;
- social or structural implications of these technologies (e.g., whether the technologies being developed by the centers were a function of large size, or were neutral as to size);
- research relationships between the centers and national governments, universities and research stations;
- appropriate training functions for the centers (it was recognized that it was impossible for the centers to take on the task of training the entire extension service in any one country);
- the problem of keeping people in rural areas;
- employment and income distribution (the possibility of using social science and biological innovations as a means of achieving goals of stimulating growth and creating employment);
- the issue of how to add a social science dimension to essentially biological and agronomic research.

61. Representatives of several members said that they were willing to provide the seminar and the planning group with material from research activities already under way in their countries or organizations.

62. As for the second part of the proposal, the Chairman of TAC said that this issue would be on the agenda for TAC's next meeting. He did not believe, however, that it would be desirable to create a single center to perform the functions envisaged by the representative of the United States. He said he was hopeful that the January meeting of TAC and the summer seminar would lead to further progress on this question of how to marshal available experience in agricultural sector analysis and planning for the benefit of developing countries.

63. One speaker speculated that, with new production technologies having been developed at the Centers, there might now be a need for another kind of technical advance: the development of improved methodologies for analyzing the effects of alternative national policies and programs affecting agriculture on the multiple goals sought by developing countries, such as increased production, more employment, better income distribution, improved health, improved trade balance, and so forth. The goal would be to build developing countries' own capabilities to do such analysis in support of their policy makers, thereby improving policy choices and reducing dependence on the advice of experts from the developed countries. This methodology might be developed by bringing together experts in this field and enabling them to work closely with those departments in developing countries which were trying to do this kind of work. It would have to be seen whether a centralized effort in this direction was the right approach. If the answer were affirmative, it might be that a center established for this purpose would be very different in structure from the existing biological centers. The answer might also be that no unified approach to this question was desirable. It was therefore suggested that TAC select international experts to look into the issues involved.
64. The Chairman of the Group concluded that it was the consensus that TAC be asked to take careful note of the discussion and to give its advice on whether continuing institutional arrangements would be desirable in connection with the set of problems encompassed within the second part of the proposal of the representative of the United States and, if so, what kind of arrangements there should be.

Discussion of the UNCTAD Resolution on Competitiveness of Natural Products, Synthetics and Substitutes (Agenda Item 8)

65. The Chairman, in introducing this item, cited the UNCTAD resolution which requested that the Consultative Group give urgent consideration to the need for assistance to research designed to improve the competitiveness of natural raw materials including processing and end use research as well as production research.

66. Several speakers expressed the fear that extending the Group's concerns to non-food crops and to research on commercial and industrial uses of these products might have the undesirable effect of diffusing the Group's financial resources and diverting the priority area of food crops. A representative of a developing region, on the other hand, said that there was pressure from all over the developing world for research that would enhance exports of non-food agricultural products from the developing countries, and urged the Group to take serious account of the UNCTAD resolution.

67. Most speakers suggested that it would be desirable for TAC to weigh the issues raised by the resolution, and the Chairman of TAC confirmed that non-food crops would be included in TAC's forthcoming consideration of research priorities. There was agreement that the Consultative Group would take no final decision on the UNCTAD resolution until it had received the advice of TAC.

Review Procedures (Agenda Item 9)

68. The Chairman said that the paper on review procedures which the Secretariat had prepared for the Group's consideration sought, for the most part, to express in the form of recommendations the consensus which seemed to have emerged from the discussion during the informal meeting of the Group in August 1972. The paper dealt with procedures for making an annual review of programs and budgets and with the external scientific reviews which occurred at different intervals at different centers and took a number of different forms.

The paper reflected the consensus that the initiative for designing and scheduling the latter kind of review should be left in the hands of the Centers and their Boards of Trustees. In addition, however, a number of suggestions had been made to meet the wishes of members of the Group who wanted to have some influence over the content and the scheduling of external reviews. One way of having members of the Group participate would be to ask the Centers to prepare a five-year schedule for reviews, indicating which of those reviews would be open to observers, and giving members a chance to
comment on timing and substance. Centers might also give the Group an opportunity to participate in the selection of members of external review panels: the Chairman of TAC, in consultation with the Chairman of the Group, could confirm the selection of experts nominated by the centers, and could appoint additional experts to review panels in cases where that appeared desirable. Should these suggestions be followed, then TAC would have less need than formerly to look into the execution of approved programs by on-going centers and it would have correspondingly more time to consider proposed program changes in those centers, other new research initiatives and how best to fill existing research gaps.

69. The Secretary of TAC made the following comments on behalf of the Chairman of TAC:

- TAC itself did not pretend to examine the budgets of the international centers in detail;
- TAC was anxious that any appearance of interference with approved center programs should be avoided;
- If review panels should be established, their reports would be particularly valuable to TAC;
- TAC would welcome being invited to designate one or more of its members to join in review panels, provided members did not come from the particular region where the center was located;
- TAC recognized the need to clarify review procedures and to improve the content of the Centers' annual reports;
- TAC's concerns should be limited to the difficulties encountered by the centers in carrying out their programs and any program changes which might be proposed.

70. During the discussion of this item, the following principal points were made:

- Several speakers said that they believed it would be better if members of TAC were not themselves members of review panels;
- Members of review panels should be selected in consultation between the institutes and TAC;
- In the case of those centers which had annual external reviews, the visit of the Consultative Group Secretariat's review staff should be concurrent with the center's own external review;
- The review procedure suggested should be tried for the first year on an experimental basis.

71. In summarizing the discussion, the Chairman said that it was the consensus of the Group that the review procedures as proposed should be tried on an experimental basis for one year or so. It should be assured
that, whenever possible, the visits of the Consultative Group reviewing staff should be coordinated with the centers' own reviews. The whole matter would, from time to time, be put on the agenda of Consultative Group meetings for reexamination. Responding to several questions, the Chairman said that the proposal had been sent to the centers for their comments.

**Other Business (Agenda Item 10)**

72. The Secretary of TAC reported on the FAO regional conferences which had met during the preceding weeks. This statement will be circulated separately.

73. One speaker referred to a resolution passed by one FAO regional conference which provided that research priorities established by the conference should be regarded as guidelines for choosing regional projects to be financed by the Consultative Group; the resolution stated that those guidelines were the more essential because of inadequate representation of the developing countries on the Consultative Group. The speaker said that, in his view, this resolution was based on a misconception of the purpose of the Consultative Group. Research priorities had to be determined in the first instance by TAC which would certainly welcome the advice of the regional conferences. As for a resolution stating the conference's dissent from the position taken by the Consultative Group in regard to the participation of the developing countries, the speaker said that the Consultative Group was a consulting body rather than an organization where decisions had to be reached collectively or by vote.

74. The representative of the FAO region for the Near East said that a mission organized by TAC was scheduled to visit the Middle East and North Africa in early 1973 to study the research problems of that area. During their recent conference, representatives of the region had discussed major research priorities in the area to facilitate the work of the mission. Among the problems discussed were those of dry farming, water use and irrigation techniques, animal food and new varieties of legumes and forage.

75. Of special interest for this region, he said, were the possibilities of aquaculture. For this reason, funds had been raised to finance a feasibility study of this problem in the Near East region. The study might, he suggested, be undertaken by a team appointed by TAC.

76. The point was also stressed that, in its program of conferences and of assistance to the developing countries, FAO should include more information about the research results of the centers.

77. Responding to a question by the Chairman, the Secretary of TAC observed that aquaculture was on the agenda of TAC's next meeting. The terms of reference for a proposed working group had already been drawn up
which would meet in May 1973. It would study the state of the art and advise whether additional research in aquaculture was likely to have significant results, primarily in terms of widespread production of high-protein food for the lower income groups.

78. Referring to the question of fuller participation of developing countries in the Consultative Group, one speaker said that, as had been pointed out at the first planning meeting of the Group, the primary business of the Group was consultation among a body of donors in an attempt to mobilize and coordinate financing for the international centers. TAC, on the other hand, had been set up as the body to advise the Group on research priorities. In doing so, it had been agreed that TAC should increasingly rely on selected panels of experts to advise it on particular matters. TAC might want to rely more heavily on experts from developing countries serving on these panels.

79. In response to this suggestion, the Secretary of TAC said that TAC had already convened such panels or working groups but that TAC's rather tight budget of $150,000 did not allow a sizable increase in the number of these panels.

Date of next meeting (Agenda Item 11)

80. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Consultative Group would be held during International Centers Week which was scheduled for the week of July 30, 1973.

Press Communique (Agenda Item 12)

81. The Chairman was authorized to issue a press release on the meeting. The text of the release is attached as Annex 5.
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### Indications of Financing of Existing Centers for 1973
(Equivalent of $’000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>CIAT</th>
<th>CIMMYT</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>ICRISAT</th>
<th>IITA</th>
<th>IRRI</th>
<th>To Be Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>350 b/</td>
<td>450 c/</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>220 a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>d/</td>
<td>d/</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>d/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>1,400 e/</td>
<td>870 f/</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>700 g/</td>
<td>500 h/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.</td>
<td>5,390</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>745 i/ 1,200 j/ 725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Group</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of which part may be devoted to special projects.

Core support for cassava and swine programs.
Core support for triticale program.
Amount to be determined.
Including $718,000 to complete CIAT's basic capital facilities.
Including $120,000 for the Puebla project.
Core support for high-lysine maize program; this amount adjustable in the light of cash needs.
Core support for sorghum and millet programs; this amount adjustable in the light of cash needs.
U.S. confirmed availability up to one-fourth of core and capital costs, subject to need, appropriation and satisfactory outcome of required review of ICRISAT planning for capital expenditures.
Estimated at $300,000 for core costs plus uncertain amount capital costs to be established. Amount shown a provisional estimate of total.
Provisional subject to establishment of total core plus capital budget for 1972 and 1973 and adjustment of U.S. contribution for the two years to one-fourth of total up to amount indicated.
Indications of Financing of 
Existing Centers for 1974

During the Consultative Group meeting, various donors gave indications of their intentions concerning financial support for international agricultural research centers in 1974. In most cases, the amounts mentioned were subject to legislative or other approvals. The indications are summarized below.

**General**

The representatives of the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations indicated that the support of their organizations for the international agricultural research centers, and especially for the four original centers (CIAT, CIMMYT, IITA and IRRI), would continue; the representative of the Rockefeller Foundation also specifically mentioned a continuing interest in CIP. Both indicated that their organizations wished to be flexible with respect to individual grants, determining the amounts in the light of over-all needs and availabilities within the Consultative Group framework. The Ford representative said that it would continue to be the policy of his Foundation to make individual grants up to a total of $3 million; the Rockefeller representative said that this also had been the policy of his Foundation.

Without specifying amounts for particular centers, the representative of the United States referred to the general formula for its participation stated at the Consultative Group Meeting of December, 1971. He indicated that in 1974, subject to legislative approval and availability of funds, his Government would continue its support of international agricultural research activities, up to 25 per cent of requirements, so long as that 25 per cent did not exceed $7 million. If the total of operations endorsed by the Consultative Group were to exceed four times that amount, his Government would re-study the situation in the light of the requirements then existing.

Certain other donors were not in a position to give specific indications of intentions with respect to individual centers in 1974. These included Germany and Japan.

**CIAT**

The representative of Canada said that his Government would have approximately $550,000 available in 1974 for CIAT's work in cassava and swine. The representative of the Netherlands said that his Government would continue its support of CIAT at not less than the level for 1973 ($125,000). With respect to the Kellogg Foundation, it had been indicated during International Centers Week that the Foundation's support would be given at a level of from $250,000 to $300,000.

**CIMMYT**

The representative of Canada said that approximately $550,000 would be available for the triticale program in 1974. The representative of UNDF
indicated that his organization's support for the high-lysine corn program in 1974 would amount to approximately one-third of his organization's 3-year commitment of $2,340,000 for this program.

**CIP**

The United Kingdom representative said that the British grant to CIP in 1974 would at least equal the £21,000 (about $50,000) to be made available in 1973. The Danish representative indicated that a recommendation would be made within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that support for CIP be continued at a sum not less than the 1973 level (between $150,000 and $175,000). The Swedish representative said that his Government intended to continue its support of CIP on a scale not less than that of 1973. The Netherlands representative said that it was the intention of his authorities to support CIP on at least the same scale as 1973 ($180,000). The representative of Switzerland reported that his Government would contribute 250,000 Swiss francs (about $65,000) to CIP in 1974. The representative of Canada said that he would expect the grant of his Government to CIP in 1974 to be at least as large as the $200,000 grant recommended for 1973.

**ICRISAT**

The representative of UNDP said that his organization's contribution in 1974 would be roughly one-fifth of the $3,585,000 his organization was committing to ICRISAT over a 5-year period. The United Kingdom, said its representative, was prepared to make a contribution in 1974 which would be "substantially increased" over the £95,000 (roughly $225,000) intended for 1973. The Swedish representative said that while he could not commit his Government to specific figures, it was not the intention to diminish the support being given to ICRISAT ($1,000,000 for 1972/73). The Swiss representative reported that his Government would make a grant of 500,000 Swiss francs (roughly $130,000). The representative of Canada said that his Government intended to have $2,100,000 available for ICRISAT in 1974, of which $800,000 could be drawn down before April 1 of that year.

**IITA**

The United Kingdom representative said that his Government's support would at least equal its 1973 contribution (£230,000, or about $540,000). The Netherlands representative indicated that his Government's grant would be maintained on at least the 1973 level. The Belgian representative expressed the hope that his Government's support would increase beyond the 10 million Belgian francs being considered for 1973. The representative of Canada said that his authorities would seek approval for a grant of at least $750,000.

**IRRI**

The United Kingdom representative indicated that the British grant to IRRI in 1974 would be at least as much as the £140,250 (about $330,000) to be granted for 1973. The representative of the International Development Research Centre of Canada said that up to $280,000 would be available for IRRI's multiple-cropping program in 1974.