FROM: The Secretariat

Consultative Group Meeting
September 14-16, 1977
Washington, D.C.

Informal Summary of Proceedings

1. The thirteenth meeting of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research was held at the headquarters of the World Bank in Washington, D.C. on September 14, 15 and 16, 1977. The Chairman, Mr. Warren C. Baum, presided.

2. Enclosed with this memorandum is the Informal Summary of Proceedings, the List of Participants, Annexes consisting of Center Directors' presentations, and an informal summary of the Training Discussion.

3. The meeting was attended by representatives of 33 members. The African Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank were unable to attend--the latter being represented by the Inter-American Development Bank. Chairmen and Directors of the nine international centers, and of the IBPGR, and the Executive Secretary of WARRDA were present, as were center training officers for part of the discussions. Members of TAC participated.

4. Plenary Sessions of the Consultative Group were held on September 12, 13 and morning of the 14th. The afternoon of September 12 was devoted to a discussion on training.

5. The 18th meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held on September 9 and 10. The TAC Secretariat will be distributing a summary of that meeting separately. Other meetings held in conjunction with International Centers Week included:

   -- TAC Vegetable Subcommittee (September 7-8)
   -- Center Training Officers (September 8-9)
   -- Co-Sponsors (September 8, 13)
   -- Center Directors (September 9-10)
   -- ICARDA and CIMMYT Boards (September 14)
   -- ICARDA Program Committee (September 18)
   -- ICARDA Board (September 19-20)

Enclosures
Distribution: CG Members
Main Points from Summary of Proceedings

Agenda Item 3, The 1977 Integrative Report. Paras. 2 to 24

The Report was generally commended. The discussion focussed mainly on the complexities involved in allocating resources. There was general support for a paper on resource allocation, work on which would be initiated by TAC. There was a consensus for flexibility as to the centers doing basic research. This would be examined again in November.

Agenda Item 4, TAC Chairman's Report of 15th, 16th and 17th Meetings of TAC. Paras. 25 to 37

Dr. Cummings reviewed TAC's recent and ongoing work program, and the status of proposals on water buffalo, soybeans, vegetables, farming systems, agroforestry and water management.

Agenda Item 5, TAC Quinquennial Review of CIP. Paras. 38 to 50

The Review Panel commended the quality of CIP's program. As to Quinquennial Reviews in general, Dr. Cummings invited suggestions as to how they might be improved.

Agenda Item 6, Relationship with the International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE). Paras. 51 to 74

The scientific quality of ICIPE's work was commended. Although ICIPE did not seek membership of the CGIAR on the same basis as the centers, many members seemed anxious to support ICIPE. Collaborative programs with centers could be supported through the CGIAR system through center budgets. Donors had different preferences as to a relationship between ICIPE and the CGIAR, partly reflecting their particular funding processes. The Secretariat was authorized to help ICIPE to the extent possible. The ICIPE question raised the general issue of whether the Group should recognize certain research
institutions as enjoying some kind of "associate" status within the CG system. The Secretariats would prepare a paper on this question for the November meeting.

Agenda Item 7, TAC Chairman's Report on Center Programs. Paras. 75 to 85

Dr. Cummings summarized TAC's consideration of the programs of the nine centers, WARDA and the IDPGR.

Agenda Item 8, Discussion of Center Programs. Paras. 86 to 94

There was considerable discussion of ICARDA's mandate, and in particular, whether it should embrace irrigated agriculture. Questions were raised about the proportion of CIAT's budget being devoted to the beef program.

Agenda Item 9, Report and Discussion on CG Meeting Cycle. Paras. 95 to 99

Members generally endorsed the recommendation in the Secretariat's paper that the Group work towards completing its business in one annual meeting in October, with the possibility of another meeting in May if needed. The November 1977 meeting would decide on the program for 1978. About half the meetings should be held away from Washington, especially if two meetings per year are required.

Agenda Item 10, International Support for Technical Services to Strengthen National Research. Paras. 107 to 121

The Group agreed that some international action was needed. One specific proposal, commissioned by a number of donors, was considered. The Chairman was asked to appoint a Task Force to study the matter further.

Agenda Item 11, Matters Introduced by Centers. Paras. 100 to 106

Dr. Nickel, as current Chairman of the Directors' meeting, commented on TAC Quinquennial Reviews, staff quality, the proposal to strengthen national research, and US Title XII legislation.

Agenda Item 12, Financial Support in 1978 and Thereafter. Paras. 122 to 148

Donors stated their intentions as to total contributions to core programs for 1978, though some were unable yet to specify figures. Some gave indications beyond 1978. Given that there were still some uncertainties, it appeared that the system's total needs of some $88 million for 1978 were within $2 to $3 million of being covered.

Agenda Item 13, Report on Implementation of Review Committee Recommendations. Paras. 149 to 155

Although progress was more rapid in some aspects than others, in general the recommendations were being satisfactorily put into effect.
Agenda Item 14, Other Business.

There was no other business.

Agenda Item 15, Time and Place of Next Meeting. Paras. 156 to 157

The next meeting of the CGIAR would be on November 16 and 17, in the offices of the World Bank in Paris.
1. The Chairman opened the Consultative Group meeting by reviewing the growth of the Group and the ideals to which it remained committed. The Group faced more difficult years ahead. On the part of the centers, there was a continuing need for strict scientific and financial discipline, together with clear future planning. They should not grow for growth's sake. Donors, on the other hand, needed to reaffirm their long-term commitment to international agricultural research which should be seen as spanning a generation or more. Mutual trust must be retained by donors promptly honoring their commitments and centers ensuring efficient and effective use of the funds. He drew the Group's attention to the items on the agenda, which was adopted.

The 1977 Integrative Report (Agenda Item 3)

2. Most of the speakers expressed their appreciation for the quality of the Integrative Report. A view was expressed that systematic analysis of priorities was needed and research should be relevant to development strategies aimed at providing the basic needs of the poorest. There was a need for more systems work and deeper study of socioeconomic factors.

3. In agreeing that the benefits of research should flow more specifically to the poorest, a speaker questioned whether this could be done only through scale neutral technology. The lot of the poorest farmer was largely determined by socioeconomic factors. He suggested there might be a need for a policy paper on the question of how research could be improved as an instrument for policymaking.

4. The complexity of determining the beneficiaries of research was stressed. Help for the resource-poor farmer was getting a great deal of study and many institutions were involved in working with LDC governments on the problem.

5. A speaker, recognizing that helping the poorest farmer posed a lot of highly complex problems, felt that provided the centers were working broadly along the right lines, they should be allowed a fair degree of flexibility. He thought the Report took a realistic view of the problems. Priorities should be reexamined before the Group took on a range of new activities.

6. While emphasis had rightly been given to training and research, there was also a need for training in research in nutrition. TAC and the centers should take note of the fact that in many areas the number of small farmers was declining and there was a trend towards somewhat larger holdings.
7. It was pointed out that research was not an end in itself but a service to the user. Just as national research programs should be based on a system of priorities within financial constraints, so should the international system determine its own priorities. Whilst much was known about biological systems, less seemed to be known about the aims and goals and aspirations of the rural populations. In Latin America particularly there was a need for economists who were deeply experienced in rural areas. Social scientists experienced in urban problems were of little value in the rural areas.

8. A speaker wished to correct the impression that small farmers needed a different kind of research from larger farmers. What was needed was socioeconomic research into the special circumstances of the smallest farmer. The centers should expand their socioeconomic research units so that the technobiologists could address the right questions.

9. Turning to Figure 3 in the Report, a speaker noted that there had been a great increase in emphasis on small farmer crops. The CGIAR could take some credit for the increasing prevalence of what was called the philosophy of minimum input.

10. Another speaker noted the importance of improving income distribution, which went far beyond the activities of the CG system. The system should concentrate on producing more food in a way that did not misallocate resources or compromise general economic development.

11. The Chairman noted a consensus in support of the period of consolidation and the concern of some donors about the maintenance of a rapid rate of growth. While maintaining the spirit and the fact of consolidation, nevertheless new initiatives could be considered.

12. The recommendation for a staff paper on resource allocation was supported, but a speaker had two qualifications. First, it should be done with true sophistication and in full recognition of all the complexities implied by multiple objectives. Secondly, a paper was needed that did not try to give all the answers but provided suggestions about the process. Whilst the Boards of the individual centers were very well representative of the developing countries, there had been repeated reference to trying to introduce farmers themselves into the process of setting priorities. Such a paper would involve quite intensive consultation and field work.

13. Another speaker noted that the figures given in the Integrative Report tended to confirm his own concerns about the allocation of resources. Now that the emphasis of the Group was no longer on expansion, internal policy issues were becoming more important. A number of measures of the relative importance of crops had been considered. One important measure might be the potential payoff on increased investment in research. Nutrition and nutritional balance should be considered as well as increase in food supply. The relative emphasis on crops as opposed to emphasis on inputs, would also have to be weighed. In focussing on the poorest people,
one should include not only producers but also consumers. There was also
the question of increasing self-reliance in food production. It was impor-
tant to be realistic about what such an exercise could achieve. He proposed
that it be undertaken by TAC as a matter of priority over the coming year
in which TAC would use whatever means it felt appropriate to accomplish the
objective. There should be a substantial document available in a year's time
which might be reviewed through some kind of seminar.

14. In supporting the proposal for such a paper, another speaker felt
that it should be built up on statements of priorities prepared by individ-
ual centers. It should also consider national capabilities in the various
commodities and the scope for inter-country collaboration.

15. The Chairman noted a consensus in favor of the preparation of a
major paper on priorities and allocation of resources. This would take time
not only to prepare, but also to digest and act upon. This was in the first
instance the concern of TAC.

16. Turning to the needs for basic research, a speaker noted that if
basic research was defined as that research conducted in order to obtain the
objectives of a center, then that center should be encouraged to do that
research which they considered essential, or if it could be better done
elsewhere be contracted out or called to the attention of other agencies.

17. Another speaker felt that the centers needed to examine the ques-
tion of basic research in greater depth, and wondered whether a paper might
not be needed, based on discussions with centers and other informed persons.
If such a paper were written, it should take a broad view, and not be limited
to the perspective of the centers. It was noted that the recent study by
the National Academy of Sciences had looked in depth at the interrelation-
ships between basic and applied research. There was now a category known as
"mission-oriented basic research."

18. A speaker thought that it would be premature to try and determine
a rigid yardstick by which centers would decide what kind of research they
should be undertaking. Recognizing that the centers needed the support of
mission-oriented basic research, another speaker added that the system
could not afford the luxury of speculative basic research; all basic research
is costly and long-term. Proposals for basic research should come from
within the system itself. Research organizations needed to devote a small
proportion, say between five and ten percent, of their resources to basic
research. However, some problems could only be solved by institutions in
the developed countries.

19. It was felt by one participant that the most limiting constraint
to the centers over the next ten to twenty years might be the lack of new
fundamental relevant knowledge. Perhaps the Group might introduce a syste-
matic process for identifying fundamental constraints on which basic research
was needed.
20. One speaker raised the question of whether the Group might wish to set up a fund for basic research which could be drawn down by the centers.

21. A director noted his center’s practice of trying to get others to conduct research on their behalf wherever possible. Where it was not possible, a combination of outside and center scientists working in cooperation had operated well.

22. Another director, noting the amount of debate that the subject had generated in the past felt that there was no need for another paper. The decision as to where a piece of research was to be done was not made on the basis of whether it was applied or basic but on the basis of who has the comparative advantage in doing it. The Boards of Trustees were the best judges of what kind of research the centers should be doing.

23. Another speaker pointed to the key importance of the younger scientists on the staff of the centers in identifying needed areas for research.

24. The Chairman concluded that the Group appeared to feel the need to know how best to handle basic research, but that more work was needed before that could be achieved.

Report of the Chairman of TAC on the 15th, 16th and 17th TAC Meetings (Agenda Item 4)

25. The Chairman welcomed Dr. Ralph Cummings in his new capacity as Chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee.

26. Dr. Cummings reviewed the situation when he took over as Chairman of TAC. The CGIAR Review Committee’s Report had been generally endorsed by the Group, though felt by some as rather conservative. A three-year period of consolidation was beginning. A number of topics were still under study and awaiting definitive recommendation. TAC was expected to continue to explore these and other topics which might have potential relevance to the overall objectives of the Group even though the Group expected that no major new initiatives would be undertaken during the next three years unless there were compelling reasons to do so. There would continue to be an emphasis on problem-oriented research to benefit the majority of farmers in low income countries and on commodities important as sources of food in the developing countries. Some of the topics under TAC review were among those previously identified as being of first priority. Other topics might be moved from lower priority to the first priority as the situation developed.

27. Four Quinquennial Reviews have already been completed: IRRI, CIMMYT, CIP and CIAT. The first two were discussed by the Group in October 1976. The review of CIP would be discussed during the present meeting, and that of CIAT at the next. The review of IITA was in progress. The draft report would be considered by TAC at its next (18th) meeting. For the future, ICRISAT and WARDA would be reviewed in 1978; the IBPGR in 1979;
and ILCA and ICARDA in 1980. Dr. Cummings invited the Group to suggest ways in which the Quinquennial Review process might be improved and more effectively serve the needs of the Group. He also asked for suggestions as to specific questions which the individual review panels should address.

28. The Stripe Review on farming systems was underway and was looking at these problems in CIAT, IITA, ICRISAT and IRRI.

29. TAC was considering the criteria which would govern its consideration of possible new initiatives which might be referred to it, within the previously established priorities. Whilst these criteria were still subject to review, it was suggested, first, that the commodity or activity should be of present or potential importance to a large part of the agriculture and populations of many developing countries. Secondly, the activity should have the potential for major improvement. Thirdly, there should be good reason to believe that such improvement is at present limited by gaps in technological knowledge. New initiatives submitted to TAC should be clearly formulated and directly addressed to the solution of critical problems. Furthermore, they should be of the type that needed international effort. It was not appropriate for the Consultative Group directly to fund individual national programs. Contracting work could be considered only if directed to well-defined activities essential to the core objectives of the international effort and if the work would be most efficiently done by a contract arrangement.

30. (a) Water Buffalo. Proposals for water buffalo research had been before TAC for a long time. A proposed international network had been tentatively endorsed by TAC in May of 1976. It was subsequently decided to study the matter in phases, the first to be undertaken directly under TAC auspices. A report had been prepared by a consultant, Dr. Mahadevan. TAC believed this report to be of extremely high quality and it would be circulated to the Group for information. Although TAC was not able to recommend Consultative Group support for an international effort on water buffalo research, it did commend Dr. Mahadevan's report and it was hoped that bilateral donors would be able to support some phases of the recommended program. It was understood that some eight nations in the Asian region had recently agreed to pledge some $3 million of their own resources over the next two years in support of water buffalo research. However, more resources were likely to be needed.

31. (b) Soybeans. Soybeans hold considerable potential for developing an important source of edible oil, high quality protein and cash income and therefore retained their ranking by the TAC in the first priority. Much of present soybean production is processed by large scale industrial facilities, but the seed can well be processed at the village or home level. TAC has been exploring various possibilities for soybean work, including a consortium of resource bases, or a Board rather similar to the IBPGR, but was not yet ready to make a firm recommendation.
32. (c) Vegetables. The AVRDC has had a kind of associate relationship with the CGIAR from its beginning, although not receiving direct financial support. TAC had mounted three missions on vegetables in order to determine what further work on these crops might be supported by the Group. Following recommendations of the latest mission, TAC had established a vegetable sub-committee which was still deliberating. TAC now considers vegetables in its first priority group, but does not yet have a specific recommendation for the Consultative Group.

33. (d) Farming Systems. TAC had initiated a Stripe Review of farming systems. A preliminary report should be available for TAC's 18th meeting, and it was planned to hold a workshop probably in June 1978. TAC would hope to present a report by the autumn of 1978 and at that time would anticipate developing suggestion on possible follow-up action.

34. (e) Agro-forestry. IDRC had commissioned a study which TAC had reviewed in consultation with its author. A number of interested parties had subsequently reached preliminary agreement on setting up an international council for research on agro-forestry which had its temporary headquarters at the Royal Tropical Institute in the Netherlands. In due course a Secretariat would be set up and the location probably moved to a developing country. The council would provide consultation and coordination but would not itself conduct research. This council might in due course seek some kind of associate status with the CGIAR, but as yet associate status was not defined nor were the obligations that it implied.

35. (f) Forest Genetic Resources. The IBPGR had asked for TAC's guidance on the extent to which it should consider forest genetic resources for its program for 1978. Although TAC felt that forest genetic resources conservation was of concern to the IBPGR, it did not feel able to make a definite recommendation until the Board had a comprehensive proposal including the financial implications and the method of implementation.

36. (g) Water Management. TAC's previous view had been that existing centers should incorporate water management research into their program and that there was no case for a separate center to address this problem. However, TAC is again attempting to reassess its position on this subject. IDRC is assisting in developing the necessary background information. A definitive recommendation from TAC will require considerably more time and study.

37. In answer to a question, Dr. Cummings stated that vegetables were likely to have a higher priority than the other topics. A speaker pointed out that there were very many vegetables and asked whether TAC had ranked them in order of priority. For example, were mung beans and cowpeas included? Dr. Cummings agreed that some crops regarded as vegetables were already within the mandate of some of the centers, as for example mung beans, dry beans, cowpeas, chick peas, pigeon peas, cassava, yams, sweet potatoes, etc. He thought that leafy vegetables would probably have a high priority for any new initiative. Another high priority would be solanaceous vegetables such as tomatoes and peppers.
Report on the Quinquennial Review of the International Potato Center (CIP)  
(Agenda Item 5)

38. In introducing this item the Chairman reminded the Group that it should be alive to any steps which should be taken to improve the review process itself. He noted Dr. Cummings' request for comments based on the experience of members.

39. Dr. ten Houten, who had led the CIP Review Panel, introduced the findings of the review. He commended this young center's dynamic and practical approach. It had some special features as, for example, its use of contract research. CIP had a systematic five-year planning process making use of planning conferences of outside experts and CIP's staff. The Review Panel had been asked to pay special attention to these aspects. The three main tasks of a Quinquennial Review were, first, to evaluate scientific quality of current programs; secondly, to comment on their scope and balance; and thirdly, to evaluate future plans. CIP saw its mandate as rapidly to develop, adapt and expand the research necessary to solve priority problems limiting the production of potatoes in developing countries. The Panel had reviewed each of CIP's nine research thrusts carefully and concluded that in general the scientific work had made excellent progress. Breeding, selection and pathology were especially commended. The Panel considered that priority support should be given to expanded work on meristem culture and seed production, including virus testing and related entomological work. Transferring potatoes around the world was attended by great risk of spreading disease. CIP was paying great attention to the multiplication of true seed. CIP had taken several important measures with regard to phytosanitary precautions. The Panel commended CIP's intention to integrate its regional research and training activities with the nine headquarter thrusts. The Panel found merit in CIP's concept of the "third dimension," in which CIP would provide technical backstopping for programs managed by others. It considered that contract research was a highly efficient use of CIP's resources. Such work seemed to be of high standard and also provided CIP with a desirable degree of flexibility. CIP might well reconsider the distribution of the training work load.

40. In summing up, Dr. ten Houten commended the standard of CIP's work and the energy of its Director General. He noted with approval that a Deputy Director General had been appointed. He noted the excellent spirit of cooperation between the Panel and CIP's management and staff, as well as the great contribution made by the Panel's Secretary, Mr. Brian Webster.

41. Dr. Cummings pointed out that TAC had reviewed the draft reports on CIP at its 15th meeting, at which stage it had made quite a number of comments and suggestions. These had been incorporated in the final report which TAC therefore endorsed.

42. A speaker congratulated Dr. ten Houten and his Panel for an excellent report. He asked for clarification of CIP's distinction between research and extension, and secondly, whether CIP experienced any difficulties in
negotiating research contracts due to the imposition of donor preferences. Dr. ten Houten said that it was an exception for CIP's core activities to include extension work though he felt this might tend to be the case more often in special projects. Dr. Sawyer emphasized that CIP had not experienced any situation where CIP had unwillingly accepted a contract under pressure from a donor. He agreed that in CIP's early years, some regional staff had tended to get involved in activities that bordered on extension work. But as the program settled down, they were reverting to their primary task of the transfer of technology.

43. Speaking about Quinquennial Reviews in general, a speaker questioned whether they should continue to concentrate primarily on scientific competence of the centers. The reviews should continue to look at the scientific ability of centers, but this was seldom in doubt. Should they not concentrate more on allocation of resources among programs and between center programs and outreach programs and between research and training? Reviews should look more closely at the forward planning of centers.

44. The Group was reminded by another speaker that when the Quinquennial Review process was established, it was precisely aimed at the scientific quality of the centers' work. What was now being proposed was some kind of policy review, which might be broader than the responsibilities of TAC as presently understood. There were a number of issues coming forward which were broader than scientific issues, and which the present system could not satisfactorily address without having to create special task forces or special reviews on an ad hoc basis.

45. In answer to a question, the Chairman pointed out that CIP was only five years old, and it was probably too early to be able to assess the impact of CIP's work in the developing countries.

46. A speaker felt that there was a need to tackle more fundamental issues than had been dealt with in Quinquennial Reviews so far. Further definition of the criteria for the allocation of resources was needed. Although CIP was a one-crop center, the questions could be asked as to the appropriate balance and priority between different research thrusts. He noted the panel approval of CIP's contract research and thought that CIP's experience of contract research was relevant to the Group's consideration of basic research.

47. Another speaker emphasized the importance of the centers' Boards of Trustees. He felt more consideration was needed, including the role of Board of Trustees, before the mandate of TAC Quinquennial Reviews was expanded.

48. The Chairman of CIP added that the CIP Board thought the independent review functions to be most desirable and CIP had benefitted from the work of the panel. However, members of the CIP Program Committee would be analyzing the review and comments would be made available to the Secretariat for distribution. If reviews were to get into policy matters, then clearly Boards of Trustees would have to be involved in the review process.
49. A speaker warned the Group that there appeared to be an assumption that scientific assessment was not needed. He certainly did not share that view. He thought it would be wrong to change the nature of Quinquennial Reviews to make them address policies and priorities. He hoped the Group would consider some other means of doing that.

50. The Chairman noted that a broad set of issues had been opened up. He proposed that the two Secretariats jointly prepare a paper on the Quinquennial Review Process which would be presented to the Group at its November meeting. It would review the objectives, content and method of approach of such reviews.

Report and Discussion on Relationship with International Center for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) (Agenda Item 6)

51. The Chairman referred to the Secretariat's memorandum of August 8, 1977 summarizing ICIPE's present stage of development and outlining possible options for the Group. He asked Mr. Mashler to introduce the subject.

52. Mr. Mashler noted that UNDP had supported ICIPE for more than five years. This was because it was a unique institution set up under African initiative mainly through the efforts of Professor Odhiambo to conduct basic research on insect physiology to develop environmentally acceptable methods of pest control. The Stockholm Conference had emphasized this particular problem. There were major opportunities for collaboration between ICIPE and the work of the centers. A policy advisory body had been built up comprising the UNDP together with FAO, WHO and IEA, together with scientists from the centers. A new program was being initiated under UNEP and WHO auspices for research on tropical diseases on which ICIPE would play a major role in the area of trypanosomiasis research. UNDP, who at one time contributed nearly 60% of ICIPE's budget, thought that its financial base should be broadened in order to secure a firmer basis for the future. In its first five years, ICIPE had demonstrated its scientific ability and had achieved wide recognition. Despite many discussions, the TAC and the Group had not reached any definitive conclusion as to an appropriate relationship with ICIPE. An interagency conference had been convened in July at which many of the present participants had been present. This conference had had positive results and it was recognized that ICIPE deserved long-term support. However, the conference did not have before it any clear indication of the attitude of the CGIAR. Therefore, the ad hoc interagency group that met in July would remain in existence for the time being to provide at least some kind of support base for ICIPE should the CGIAR not find it possible to do so. It had been agreed that ICIPE's Scientific Advisory Committee would be broadened to include representatives of developed and developing countries and a representative of TAC. Firm pledges amounted roughly to $1 million in addition to the present limited funds available and it was expected that about another $750,000 might become available before the end of 1977 subject to confirmation by donors.
53. Dr. Cummings noted that the quality of ICIPE's work had long been recognized. However, only a portion of ICIPE's program would be likely to be relevant to the Group's activities and some reorientation had been needed in order for ICIPE to address itself more directly to the Group's concerns. There had been a need to increase the continuity of resident leadership in a number of programs. ICIPE had made considerable progress in both these directions. About half or perhaps 60% of ICIPE's programs now had reasonably direct relevance to the Group's concerns. TAC had welcomed the formation on an interagency group of ICIPE donors which might assure better continuity of support.

54. Provided that all the necessary conditions could be met, TAC was prepared to recommend that ICIPE be given some support through the CGIAR for those portions of its program which would be relevant. If the CGIAR provided financial support, this implied a direct organic relationship and therefore some obligations, including review of ICIPE's program and budget and the preparation of a program and budget commentary. It was not clear whether this proposal would be acceptable to ICIPE. TAC had noted that ICIPE had immediate problems particularly on the funding of its capital program. The CG contribution should be directly related to activities relevant to the international centers and TAC suggested that the contribution be for the most part tied to an amount put into projects worked out jointly between the international center concerned and ICIPE and which would perhaps be channelled through the center as an earmarked item in its budget. It was recognized that much of the support work, as for example in physiology, fine structure, basis for insect resistance, etc., could not be closely identified to the interest of an individual center. A contribution for these kinds of support operations might be desirable on a continuing basis again tied to the amounts of contributions coming through the centers. TAC could endorse interim measures such as a one-time contribution to capital and interim support to the operating budget.

55. The Chairman noted that this was the first proposal involving new funding since the Group had entered a period of consolidation. It was also a different kind of activity from those supported in the past. Previous concerns about scientific quality had been put to rest. ICIPE sought financial support, but not along the lines of the existing centers.

56. In answer to a question, Dr. Cummings noted that associate status had never been clearly defined. There were some institutes which already had some kind of informal associate status involving endorsement but not direct financial support. TAC had in mind a closer form of association which would bring relevant programs under regular review, somewhat analogous to the position of WARDA. TAC had assumed that funds pledged by the interagency group would be additional to those pledged by the same donors to CGIAR activities. These funds could be reported as contributions through the CGIAR, but they would add to the net total resources.

57. Another speaker thought that long-term support should get very sympathetic consideration. As far as his agency was concerned, it would
not be an advantage to channel funds to ICIPE through the CGIAR. His government was willing significantly to increase its contribution to the CGIAR system. Its contribution to the funding of ICIPE, however, was provided under other authorizations. Some form of associate membership with the CGIAR but with separate funding would be preferable.

58. Its representative noted that the World Bank took the view that the programs developed between the centers and ICIPE were an excellent use of resources. They offered essential flexibility. If such joint projects were to be supported, the Bank would need to be assured that they were of high priority. The Bank recognized that ICIPE needed long-term support, nevertheless the nature of its mandate and objectives was such that it could not be integrated into the CGIAR system. The scientific work was of international standard. The CGIAR and TAC Secretariats should be available to assist ICIPE.

59. A speaker distinguished ICIPE from the centers supported by the CGIAR. The latter had been established to develop new production technology applicable in developing countries. ICIPE was a serious and potentially most valuable effort to build scientific capacity in the developing world. Although ICIPE was a good institute, it could not yet fully compete with basic research available in developed countries. ICIPE was not devoted primarily to development of production technology but was an important element in the development of scientific capacity particularly in Africa. Full membership in the CGIAR would not be appropriate, but donors should support it directly.

60. Another speaker emphasized that ICIPE was no longer exclusively occupied in basic research and its activities now included considerable applied research. An example was the specific problem on which ICIPE and IRRI were cooperating. ICIPE was an international center and its charter was in the process of being modified with the government of Kenya.

61. Another speaker felt that ICIPE would not fit easily in the present CG system. It appeared able to attract significant bilateral support. His own government would have difficulty in funding an activity in its entirety both through the CG and bilaterally. A satisfactory compromise would be for the CGIAR to fund that portion of ICIPE's activities which related directly to the work of the centers. If necessary, a one-time capital contribution could be made. The alternative by which individual centers contracted out research to ICIPE seemed less satisfactory as it would not give TAC and the CG Secretariat an opportunity for program and budget review.

62. The Executive Secretary pointed out that if the CGIAR were to adopt ICIPE on the same basis as other centers, it would get the full treatment of review by TAC and by the Secretariat. In the case of WARDA where the Group financed only a part of its activities, that part is reviewed against the background of WARDA's total program. However, only that part funded by the Group was reviewed in detail. Similar arrangements could
be made in the case of ICIPE. If ICIPE's services were provided under contract to the centers, then these contracts would form part of the core programs and budgets of the centers and would therefore be reviewed by TAC and the Secretariat. This part of each center's program could be given special attention to ensure that ICIPE's services were reviewed and evaluated properly.

63. A speaker had reservations about bringing ICIPE within the framework of the Group. ICIPE had a role in supporting activities of the system. However, there was a problem in earmarking funds in the center's budget for ICIPE since he feared this could impinge on the responsibilities of the Boards of Trustees. It was up to the individual centers to determine how they could best fulfill their mandates. He queried why TAC should be involved in the review of ICIPE since it was not involved in every organization that at present undertook contract work for the centers.

64. A speaker noted that ICIPE's Chairman had made a formal statement that ICIPE did not wish to become a member of the CGIAR, but it did seek a firmer financial base for those activities which relate to the work of the international centers. There were technical problems which arose from the financing mechanisms of the donor members of the Group. Some donors are free to give directly to ICIPE, but others prefer to see support channelled through the CGIAR as this is the only channel open to them.

65. Another speaker expressed concern about the possibility of receiving a new institution into the Group. This question should be carefully examined though he personally had no opposition to it. International centers were assuming responsibilities for scientific research which for many years had been carried out in developed countries. How did the quality of the work compare? There had been criticism in developing countries about the proliferation of international institutions. He felt it would be more efficient to attach individual specialists to existing centers. He quoted the remark that "institutions do not grow on the basis of their importance but on the basis of their existence." He warned against increasing international and national bureaucracies.

66. The point was made that there was some difficulty with the concept of CGIAR being a partial funder of institutions. To provide individual grant funding would be a different role from that assumed in the past. There was merit in the arrangement whereby specific contracts could be supported.

67. Another speaker noted that the question of ICIPE had been before the Group for three years. ICIPE had introduced major changes at the behest of the CGIAR. He recommended that there now be a clear decision. He felt that ICIPE would have no difficulty in meeting the requirements of the Group. He noted the possibility of a grant for capital development on the grounds that this was necessary to support the cooperative contracts.

68. Dr. Cummings said that in speaking of "earmarking" an item in a center's budget for ICIPE he did not imply imposing directives on that
center. The center would not be constrained to put an item in its budget, but if it did so, it would ensure that that program was relevant to the mandate of the center.

69. The Chairman, in summing up, admitted to some difficulty in detecting a clear consensus. However, the majority view seemed to be as follows. First, the importance, high quality, and utility of ICIPE's work in the developing countries were fully recognized by many present. That was no longer an issue. ICIPE had made some marked improvements in its programs over the years, partly in response to CGIAR deliberations. Secondly, ICIPE had not been asking for "full" membership in the Group and did not ask for full support of all its programs on the same basis as the existing international centers. In view of ICIPE's mandate, this would not be an appropriate role. However, other forms of association should be considered. Thirdly, a group of donors was in existence prepared to support ICIPE on a sustained basis. It appeared that some donors might require the CGIAR to provide a basis for their contributions. However, this had not been explicitly raised by any donors present at the current meeting. A number of participants would be glad to see the centers contract with ICIPE for services that ICIPE could provide. Such arrangements would bring ICIPE's activities within the review process of the Group as a whole. ICIPE had a Policy Advisory Committee and a member of TAC had been invited to participate.

70. There appeared to be strong support for the idea that Group contributions to ICIPE should be through the decisions of the individual centers to enter into contracts which would then be financed by the Group through the budgets of the individual centers and would be subject to some appropriate form of review. This left the question of whether there would still be a gap of ICIPE's funding and capital investments might be needed in order for ICIPE to carry out its contract work with the centers. If there were such a gap, it could be asked whether the Group would wish to consider a one-time capital contribution to ICIPE.

71. The Chairman, in pointing to a number of activities which already enjoyed a loose form of association with the Group and which took the opportunity of Group meetings to organize meetings of their own, suggested that the Secretariat might help ICIPE by organizing meetings of donors for it in connection with Centers Week.

72. The Chairman noted that the Group had concluded that it did not wish for a formal relationship with ICIPE though it welcomed the institution and would be prepared to finance contract programs with the centers. Should ICIPE wish, the Secretariat would be prepared to help it in obtaining further donor support. He hoped bilateral donors would do their best to meet ICIPE's remaining needs.

73. In responding to a suggestion that ICIPE be officially given the title of associate status the Chairman pointed out that associate status was not well defined. The Group would consider having ICIPE present its program during Centers Week. The conclusions that had been reached should
not be interpreted as any lack of support for the important function which
ICIPE is carrying out and the Group would certainly encourage donors to
maintain or increase their support. He detected the agreement of the Group
to the Secretariat assisting ICIPE in any way that it could.

74. A speaker pointed out that his agency would in principle be pre-
pared to provide funds for ICIPE, but his regulations required that it would
be necessary to do so under some kind of CGIAR umbrella.

TAC Chairman's Report on Center Programs (Agenda Item 7)

CIAT

75. The Quinquennial Review of CIAT was conducted in April, 1977. The
report had been discussed in two sessions of TAC with the Director of CIAT
and the Chairman of the Panel present. The final report would be available
for the next CG meeting. It was particularly important to coordinate some of
CIAT's programs with those of IITA, particularly the cassava program, where
there was an important disease problem. CIAT had been asked to prepare a
strategy paper with forward projections which had been extremely helpful to
the review. Other centers would be asked to do the same. It was noted that
CIAT had undergone a large number of internal and external reviews, and had
made a major shift in the program and had had a number of significant changes
in staff and management. CIAT's program was well conceived and it now needed
time to settle down. TAC had noticed many improvements in management and
planning, and in general highly commended CIAT's program.

CIP

76. The Quinquennial Review of CIP had already been discussed. The
quarantine problems of vegetatively propagated materials such as potatoes
were serious. In the case of true seed, there was the problem of genetic
heterogeneity, whereas in using maristem tissue, the small quantities used
needed propagation and multiplication, which took time. TAC felt that CIP's
third dimension approach was basically sensible in that it did not attempt
to manage programs in every country but worked with those that did and pro-
vided the necessary technical backstopping. CIP was taking steps to improve
its budgetting and accounting procedures.

WARDA

77. An important change had been WAKWA's acting on a recommendation to
subregionalize its test supervision which should improve the quality of the
regional and national testing program. Definite progress had been made in
filling out its technical staffing. The quality of the trials was better
in paddy flooded rice than in upland rice. WARDA would be reviewed by TAC
during 1978.
ICRISAT

78. ICRISAT was still developing in very close accord with the original plan approved in 1978. Capital development should be completed in 1978 and staffing should come up to full strength in the same year. TAC will make a Quinquennial Review of ICRISAT in the autumn of 1978. Of particular concern will be the examination of special projects. Another question concerned the cold tolerant sorghum program taken over from CIMMYT recently on a special project basis by ICRISAT. The Integrative Paper had called attention to the modest allocation of resources to sorghum and millet. ICRISAT had identified technologies which were considered scale negative in that they worked more in favor of the small farmer.

ILRAD

79. No program issues had been identified to cause any concern to the Group. ILRAD's mandate was clearly focused and TAC commended it highly. The staffing pattern was somewhat unique and provided for continuity of program on the one hand but also an input of new talent and expertise.

IITA

80. The Quinquennial Review of IITA is underway and will be completed in early November. There were interesting innovations in the farming systems program. IITA had been asked to act as host for a number of other activities and this was a question that IITA management and the Review Panel would be examining. Dr. Gamble had pointed to difficulties in controlling costs and this was another question that the Panel would be examining.

IBPGR

81. TAC recognized that the Board has exercised an important catalytic role and has done a great deal in working out arrangements for substantial programs of assembling, preservation, characterization and utilization of genetic resources. Considerable progress had been made in data storage and retrieval systems through a substantial contract with the laboratory at Boulder, Colorado. This absorbed a large percentage of the budget and no doubt the Board would wish to examine the appropriate scale of that operation over the long-term. The Board had commissioned a study on vegetable germ plasm. The Board's increasing workload had led it to request an increase in staff for its Secretariat, with which TAC was in sympathy. In sum, TAC highly commended the work of the IBPGR.

CIMMYT

82. CIMMYT was reviewed in 1976 and has subsequently been taking action on the review recommendations. Attention had been drawn to the need for greater forward planning and long-term development. This was being tackled by an in-house review and the results would be reflected in next year's budget paper. Progress had been made in establishing regional teams to work
with national programs. This accounted for some of the budget increase this year. Mutually satisfactory arrangements were being worked out with ICARDA for respective responsibilities in the ICARDA region.

IRRI

IRRI's program continues to be productive and dynamic. Regional services are being developed. IRRI had close links with national programs in the region and TAC recognized the positive value of this. No doubt IRRI would be exploring alternative mechanisms for this type of cooperation. Further progress was being made in addressing all sectors of rice production and the problem of farming patterns in cropping systems in which rice is one component. TAC commended IRRI's program.

ILCA

ILCA had had an extremely difficult year with a change of leadership and very unsettled conditions in the host country. The Group should display patience and understanding. ILCA needed a great deal of flexibility to adjust to a changing situation and future developments could not be reliably forecast. The staff should be commended for their constructive and positive outlook and their continuing efforts in a difficult situation. Good progress has been made on documentation and ILCA had carried out a comprehensive in-house review of every project. A team from TAC headed by Sir John Crawford visited ILCA in March of last year after a period in which representatives of ILCA's Board had acted in the capacity of director. The size of ILCA's program would continue to cause concern to the Director and his staff. It was important to review the monitoring program in the context of the mission of ILCA. It should be a means to an end and not an end in itself.

ICARDA

The development of ICARDA was still at an early stage, but the site in Syria was now being taken over and field work on this site could be undertaken during this year. The site looked very promising. The Director would be working on a full time basis from October 1977. The former ALAD staff should be commended for their effective work under difficult circumstances. The site in Iran had been identified but there were still a number of steps to be taken before ICARDA could operate there.

Discussion of Center Programs (Agenda Item 8)

A speaker expressed concern at the state of food production in the Arab world. This had deteriorated since the beginning of the decade. Between 1970 and 1975, the cost of agricultural imports had quadrupled, whereas agricultural exports had only increased slightly. Basic food commodities accounted for 85% of agricultural imports in 1976, of which wheat was by far the most important. All Arab countries were now wheat importers. If the area as a whole was to achieve self-sufficiency by 1985, production
between now and then must increase by 120% for wheat, 130% for sugar, and up to 185% for meat and milk. Clearly, this required a major development effort. There was, however, great agricultural potential in the area, together with substantial financial resources.

87. Recent studies showed that the irrigated crop area could be increased from its present level of 10.5 million hectares to 26.7 million hectares by better utilization of available surface water. If the mandate of ICARDA was to be concerned only with winter rainfed agriculture, then ten of the 20 countries in the area would be excluded, including the most important Arab agricultural producers, namely all of Egypt, much of Sudan, and the potential irrigated areas of the Tigris and Euphrates valleys. Earlier documentation on ICARDA had not excluded irrigated agriculture as was done in the 1978 Program and Budget report. Irrigated agriculture had its own complex problems which needed intensive high quality research. Some contribution could be expected from IRRI, CIMMYT, ICRISAT, ILRAD and ILCA in their respective fields. However, he felt that much stronger international effort was justified and necessary. He noted that it had been originally thought that Lebanon would be the site of the central research station and there would be two substations in Syria and Iran. Now, however, there would merely be an administrative headquarters in Lebanon with limited research in the Bekaa valley. This caused him concern and he asked whether this was prompted by the uncertain conditions in Lebanon or because of some other reason. He drew attention to the great agricultural potential of Sudan which moreover had an extremely low population density. It had great potential as an exporter of food commodities, and his organization had therefore formulated a ten-year agricultural development program for the Sudan. Conservative estimates suggested that the rainfed area in agricultural production in the Sudan could be increased from the present level of 12 million acres to 71 million acres and the irrigated area from 3 million acres to 9 million acres. This still left at least 200 million acres of potentially productive natural range land for livestock production. He felt that the Consultative Group had as yet paid little attention to the Sudan.

88. Another speaker pointed to the importance of irrigation and the prospects for relatively cheap improvements in water management. The greatest potential lay on irrigated land in that region and while there were social reasons for paying attention to the more marginal areas, the decision to concentrate on rainfed land was, in his view, questionable from an economic and a social viewpoint. He had been involved in the early preparatory work for ICARDA which had included consideration of work on irrigated land.

89. The Director General of ICARDA stated that the mandate given to him and as understood by his Board clearly placed the emphasis on rainfed agriculture. This did not automatically exclude irrigated agriculture. He felt that ICARDA should be allowed to concentrate initially on rainfed agriculture, bearing in mind that it may well move into the irrigated areas when it was wise to do. A selection of new crops was being made under irrigated conditions as well as rainfed and was proving effective. ICARDA would expect
to acquire expertise in irrigated agriculture. Water management was of prime importance. The decision not to invest substantial capital in Lebanon was due to the risks involved. In addition to the two ICARDA stations, he hoped that ICARDA would develop extensive networks which would prove more effective but less costly than heavy capital investment in other stations. ICARDA's mind was still open on all these questions, but in his view much of ICARDA's work would be relevant at least to the northern Sudan.

90. The Chairman mentioned that the Sudan had been subject to great international attention, perhaps more than any other country in the developing world in the area of food production. The CGFPI had considered the food investment program for the Sudan which had attracted much interest. A World Bank project was being developed for national research.

91. Concern was expressed about the proportion of CIAT's research budget going into beef, which some thought a rich man's food, whereas the proportion going to beans and cassava remained stable. On the IBPGR, the same speaker noted that the budget allocated to the contract of the University of Colorado remained at about $400,000 a year, although the major components of the system had already been developed.

92. Replying, Dr. Cummings thought that "beef program" was a somewhat misleading title. The program was concerned with nutrition, soil management, forage crops and soils, with beef as the present product.

93. In confirming that the proportion of the budget for the beef program had increased, the Director General of CIAT pointed out that more of it was going to resource development rather than the animal component. Beef was the tool for the utilization and development of a vast natural resource. He noted that CIAT economists had concluded beef could well be defined as a staple food in Latin America.

94. The Chairman of the IBPGR pointed out that the contract with the University of Boulder had stimulated intense debate among his Board. The question was whether the Board was allocating enough for this operation in view of the difficulty of getting existing collections documented and together with future collections, effectively used. It was agreed that the major cost should be borne by the users. The proportion of the Board's budget going to the University of Boulder was steadily decreasing.

Report and Discussion on CG Meeting Cycle (Agenda Item 9)

95. The Chairman referred to the Secretariat's memorandum of July 29 which set out some of the factors governing the scheduling of CGIAR meetings. It recommended that this year the Group hold a second meeting in mid-November at which it would be decided whether one or two meetings would be needed in 1978. Should there be two meetings, they should be in May and October; if one, in October. It was proposed that half the meetings would be held in Washington, and about half elsewhere. It was proposed that the meeting in November 1977 be held in Paris.
96. A speaker wondered whether informal meetings of some members of the Group might be a substitute for a second full meeting. Some items were of limited interest and could be addressed to a smaller group. He hoped it would be possible to make do with only one full meeting a year. He questioned whether the Group was not now too large for effective decision taking.

97. The Chairman thought that the increasing size of the Group was due to a desirable widening of interest and a broadening of the financial base. However, it was difficult for a group of this size to arrive at a consensus and he felt this put a greater burden on the Secretariats to prepare papers which would allow efficient decision-making. When this had been done and when the issue was of the type that lent itself to that approach, he felt the record was good. Complex and amorphous issues created more problems that he felt could be handled in stages. The Group was not yet unmanageable. He noted that one way of handling the increasing work load was to set up a structure of committees which had advantages as well as disadvantages. There had, for example, been discussion of setting up a program committee and there was a standby committee which could perform some of those functions if needed that could handle business quickly, but on the other hand would deprive some members of the opportunity to take part in the decision making. There was a real question of whether activities should be structured at the expense of full participation.

98. A speaker felt that despite the large number of participants, the discussion had been fruitful and compared favorably with other international meetings. His delegation felt that the discussions should involve full membership. He thought the memorandum made a persuasive case for a single annual meeting. The participation of Centers Directors was most important. He felt it premature to think in terms of a committee structure. He suggested that the center presentations he linked to the comments of the Chairman of TAC. His delegation would welcome a single meeting in October and it would be particularly helpful if this could follow immediately after the World Bank-IMF annual meeting.

99. The Chairman noted a consensus in support of the Secretariat's recommendation that the Group work towards the objective of one meeting a year in October with the possibility of considering two meetings a year if necessary, one in the spring and one in October, divided between Washington and elsewhere. He noted that some issues could not be quickly solved but should not be left pending for too long. Therefore, a flexible approach was necessary.

Matters Introduced by Centers (Agenda Item 11, advanced to Item 10)

100. Dr. Nickel, speaking as this year's Chairman of Center Directors, noted the appreciation of the centers for the strong support they had received. He felt this year's exchange of ideas had been very fruitful.
101. **TAC Quinquennial Reviews.** The Directors felt that Quinquennial Reviews done so far had served useful functions both in the reports themselves and in the preparatory activities and in the discussions and exchanges of views that took place. Centers recognized the need to define objectives, strategies and tactics, and Quinquennial Reviews stimulated such activities. Centers recognize the value of constructive criticism. They also recognized the primacy of each center's Board in reviewing program and ensuring proper balance. When Boards had been actively engaged in this, it was not surprising that the TAC Review Panels found themselves in general agreement. Centers were in active dialogue with TAC to explore means of improving the ability of future reviews to detect weaknesses and recommend improvements.

102. **Staff Quality.** Referring to Recommendation 13 of the Review Committee that recruitment be as broad as possible and every effort be made to ensure staff vitality, and that equivalent staff enjoy equivalent privileges, Dr. Nickel noted that a major effort was made by the centers to identify and hire the best candidates. Recruitment information was broadly circulated. Centers were aware of the need to ensure staff vitality. A problem had arisen which had implications for budgets and for staff morale. Centers generally had a policy of salary equity without reference to nationality. However, host country nationals were taxed and some countries tax their nationals on the basis of citizenship rather than residency. Hence, there were considerable differences in take-home pay for staff doing the same job and receiving equivalent gross salaries. Directors had considered tackling this problem in a manner similar to the UN agencies. They therefore propose to approach their Boards with proposals to move towards equal take-home pay for equal work. The budget proposal currently before the Group did not include any adjustment for this change. The Group should therefore be forewarned that requests for budget revisions may be forthcoming if the Boards decide to follow such a course.

103. **International Service for Strengthening National Research Capacities.** The Directors greatly welcomed this initiative but had a number of questions. Was such a service to be complementary to the activities of the centers? If so, centers should be adequately represented in the formation of the policies and programs of the service. Secondly, direct contact with national and regional programs was essential. It was hoped that the proposed service would facilitate rather than substitute for such contact. The service should substantially relieve pressure on the centers for greater involvement in national programs than resources permitted. The Directors thought it essential to continue outposting some staff for regional services and limited bilateral cooperation. They hoped that the establishment of the proposed service would not lead to the conclusion that the centers should substantially reduce these efforts.

104. **US Title XII Legislation.** The Directors were in active and continuing consultation with those implementing the US Title XII legislation. This provided an excellent opportunity for links with US institutions which would complement the work of the centers. Similar contacts with research
institutions elsewhere in the world were being actively pursued. The Chairman noted that the change in US tax legislation presented a serious problem for the Centers as for many other organizations employing Americans outside the United States. He urged the centers to consult with the Secretariat on the financial implications before carrying their proposals too far since there were important financial implications for the Group as a whole.

105. Responding to Dr. Nickel's comments on the quality of staff, a speaker noted that some in the developed countries were becoming increasingly concerned about the supply of scientists, particularly young scientists with tropical experience.

106. The Chairman noted the need to secure a balance between a qualified international staff suitably paid to ensure the right motivation and at the same time securing proper economy.

Technical Services for Support of National Research (Agenda Item 10)

107. The Chairman drew the attention of members to a proposal which had been sponsored by a group of donors chaired by Dr. Treitz. Dr. Treitz, noting that the Group and TAC had repeatedly emphasized the importance of strengthening national agricultural research, sketched the background to the current proposal. He welcomed the prompt steps that were being taken to follow it up. The paper prepared by Mr. Graves was not intended as a decision-making document but as the basis for further discussion. This would be confined to agricultural research and not the broader questions of agriculture and rural development. It was recognized that agricultural research in the developing countries was generally weak and this prevented or slowed up the transfer of the international centers' work to the farmers' fields. The need to transfer technology to national institutions was an increasing burden on the international centers. Participants in the Munich meeting had proposed an international service for national agricultural research to support the work of the international centers and to provide a coordinating role. There was no intention of depriving centers of their training activities nor their right to work in the farmers' fields. The proposed service was intended to complement and not duplicate the work of existing organizations. The proposed service would have a small core budget but extensive field operations. Although part of the CGIAR system, it would not represent a major new claim on funds.

108. Dr. Cummings reported on TAC's discussion of the paper at which Center Directors had been present. TAC recognized that although the centers depended very largely on the effectiveness of national programs, yet their capacity to help them was very limited. A stronger commitment was needed to help developing nations strengthen their research capabilities. A large number of institutions were involved and their efforts needed coordination. In endorsing in principle the proposal before the Group, TAC felt the need for further definition in relation to cooperative activities between the centers and developing countries and to the ongoing bilateral assistance programs. TAC recommended that the management of the centers be asked to
participate actively in any further development of the proposal. It was also important to involve developing countries and possible sources of assistance. TAC, therefore, recommended the establishment of a task force to include representatives of the centers, the LDCs, TAC, CGIAR members and the Co-Sponsors.

109. The representative of the World Bank noted that the Bank was strongly committed to the CGIAR and was a major source of funds for agricultural development, including agricultural research. The Graves paper had identified the needs and the donors were being challenged to do more to meet them. The Bank would play its part in this. The approach in the Graves paper had merit, but there may be other alternatives. Parts of the proposal needed much closer examination. It was important to be realistic about what could be achieved. Very many other factors were involved in the overall process of raising farm production. Secondly, the proposed service could only hope to meet a very small part of the overall demand. An obvious constraint was the shortage of skilled manpower. The Bank found that it took between 40 and 50 man-months of external manpower to develop a research project to the operational stage. This was in addition to national manpower inputs. During implementation it was not uncommon to need between 70 and 80 man-years of specialized external expertise to implement a project over a five-year period. Therefore, say 12 projects in operation would need some 75 specialists. There was a great lack of internationally experienced research planners and administrators. The proposed program, focusing as it did mainly on manpower, would have to be linked closely with government and donor commitments to provide capital funds and the continuing government commitment to long-term research programs.

110. The representative of FAO stressed the importance of parallel emphasis on extension, training, farmers' organizations, governmental policy and all the other services to help farmers increase production. Each country had different needs, and efforts to strengthen national agricultural research faced sensitive and complex problems. There were a number of reasons why national research was currently inadequate. First, there was a shortage of financial resources and this activity had not been accorded high priority. Secondly, developing countries had been reluctant to ask for outside help in politically sensitive areas. Thirdly, the developed countries through bilateral or multilateral programs, had not always attached high priority to strengthening national agricultural research. In view of this, he questioned whether the creation of a new mechanism would be meaningful. There was already a confusing number of development organizations involved in assisting national research. It may be queried whether a new mechanism would bring additional resources or merely increase the competition for currently available funds. FAO had long been involved in this activity and was increasingly engaged in helping developing countries strengthen their research capabilities. There were at present some 600 projects of this kind. FAO had made organizational changes to strengthen this activity. FAO was ready to share its experience with the CGIAR and to consider ways in which its organization could contribute to providing the services needed. If necessary, the Director General might consider seeking more resources for
increased support by CGIAR donors to research and development activities. The proposal prepared by Mr. Graves needed further study. FAO would be prepared to assist and contribute to the work of the task force.

111. Another speaker agreed that the proposal needed further study. The terms of reference of the task force should include an examination of alternatives. There were a number of issues. For example, should the new organization be active in promoting extension services? How far would it go beyond strict research? Secondly, it may be that the proposed new organization should be concerned with the key educational institutions in developing countries such as the agricultural universities. He was not necessarily recommending this, but it illustrated the kind of question that needed study. There were questions surrounding the relationship between the new service and the centers. However, it should not be merely the creature of the centers, but should be responsive to the needs of the developing countries. The financing arrangements would be somewhat novel. How could the proposed scale of core funding be justified? Perhaps, like a consulting firm, the service should get going merely with working capital. On the other hand, there might be something to be said for providing some small core budget in order to secure the independence of the service.

112. Another speaker warned against trying to apply the formulae which had worked well for the CGIAR to the much more difficult problems of national research. The task force needed members with wide experience in this difficult field.

113. In welcoming the proposal, another speaker pointed out that national research could be strengthened in a number of ways. For example, experienced scientists from developed countries could work in the field alongside less experienced scientists in developing countries. Secondly, study groups on special subjects could be sponsored. Language problems could be reduced by an information service. The views of those currently involved in managing research in developing countries would be very useful in developing the program further.

114. Another suggested that the traditional extension techniques of the Western world had not proved suitable for the developing world. Technology transfer was highly location specific. The terms of reference of the task force should reflect this. Its members should include people knowledgeable about the weaknesses of agricultural research organizations. He drew members' attention to the establishment of a new fund—the Arab Fund for Science and Technology. Its feasibility was currently being studied with the participation of the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development and the Kuwait Fund. The task force should get in contact with the latter organizations and the new fund, if it had been established by that time.

115. A speaker referred to the FAO regional meeting of November 1976 in which the need for increased donor support of national research programs had been urged. He felt that CGIAR support for the current initiative would lead to greater involvement by donors. The directors of the international
centers knew the problems best and their support for the proposal was crucial to its success. The task force should include representatives of the proposed beneficiaries.

116. Concern over the proposed establishment of a new organization was expressed by a speaker from a developing country. However, he felt that much effort would have been spared if such service had been established long before. Although the effort to develop research programs had to come from the developing countries themselves, nevertheless this had been largely neglected up to now. Developing countries needed to be aware of the importance of research.

117. It was suggested by another speaker that the Group invite the Chairman to assume responsibility for selecting members of the task force and such other consultancies as may be necessary. The task force should have balanced membership representing all major interested parties as well as balance of expertise. The Graves paper was a useful starting point, and it should not be necessary to begin again from scratch. The task force should bear in mind the limits that the Group had set for itself. Donor views should be taken into account. The proposed service should perhaps not expect continuing core support, but after an initial fund should live on its ability to secure contracts.

118. In supporting the proposal for a study, a speaker pointed to the importance of developing countries having comprehensive long-term policy and development programs for all the factors affecting food production. They needed help in formulating these, some of which was forthcoming from existing institutions. Research should not be separated from development. The emphasis should be on strengthening of national systems and not simply the linkage with international centers. Careful definition of the boundaries and modus operandi of the new service would be necessary. There were definite advantages in associating such a service with the CGIAR.

119. Another speaker emphasized that the task force should look at alternatives other than the mechanism proposed in the Graves paper. He agreed that the transfer of technology to developing countries was exceptionally difficult in part because it involved sensitive questions of national priorities. Consequently, a review of the service’s activities by TAC could be much more burdensome than the paper suggested. There was no single right way of strengthening national capacities and therefore a flexible approach was necessary. He hoped that the creation of a new institution would not limit the present cooperation between national programs and the international centers.

120. A speaker noted that in preparing for the forthcoming UN Conference on Science and Technology, the developing countries would be analyzing their national research needs.

121. The Chairman noted a unanimous decision to establish a task force. Elements of the terms of reference had been suggested by a number of speakers. There were a number of critical questions about the mandate of the service.
Would it be a research service or a research and development service, or again, research or research and extension? And there were a number of issues surrounding the appropriate relationship between the proposed service and other organizations. What alternatives to the specific proposal in the Graves paper should be considered? What form of service should be ultimately recommended? Then there were questions surrounding the financial needs of the service and the mechanisms for providing them, such as for example, the size of the core budget, the need for capital funds, and the possible sources of funds. There were also issues connected with the manpower needs of the service and the available supply. An area of major concern was clearly the relationship between the combined proposed activity and the activities of the international centers. And finally, there was a range of questions concerned with the governance of the service itself. The next step would be to abstract from the comments that had been made a preliminary terms of reference. He, as Chairman, was prepared to appoint the task force. In view of the very long list of requirements for representation on the task force, individuals would be selected who could represent a variety of constituencies. The task force would need staff assistance, some of which could be provided by the Secretariats. In addition, it would probably need some expert assistance. It was hoped that donors to the Review Fund would authorize the use of the remaining balance in that Fund for this purpose. As to a timetable, the Group should move with "all deliberate speed." The task was a major one and would obviously need very careful thought. On the other hand, the problem was important and needed quick action. Although a progress report should be available at the November meeting of the Group, the final report might not be available until the fall of 1978. There would be opportunities to comment on the draft terms of reference at the November meeting.

Financial Support in 1978 and Thereafter (Agenda Item 12)

122. Pointing out that firm pledges were not normally made before November, the Chairman noted that it would be useful to have a preliminary indication of donor commitments at the present meeting. From the figures in the Integrative Report, it appeared that the total amount requested for 1978 would be about $88 million, without taking account of any new activities.

123. Mr. Mashler opened the pledging by stating that subject to the approval of the UNDP Governing Council in January, UNDP would make available to the core programs of centers in 1978 a total of US$4.1 million. In addition, US$2.26 million would be allocated to special projects of centers. This was the largest allocation which the UNDP had ever made to the CGIAR and represented a total of 1.5% of total operating funds for 1978.

124. Mr. Nooter, emphasizing the high regard of the US Government for the work of the centers, stated that it was their intention to continue their previous practice during 1978 of providing up to 25% of the total, which in this case would be up to a maximum of US$22 million. This was subject to the usual caveat about the provision of adequate funds from the US Congress process, which should be completed within a few weeks.
125. Mr. Mirheydar stated that the contribution of Iran for 1978 would be US$2 million, subject to approval of next year's budget.

126. Mr. Lindores could not provide full details at this point, which would be given in November. However, the Canadian percentage increase in total contributions to the centers would be approximately the equivalent of the percentage increase of total requirements as submitted in the budget proposals.

127. Mr. Dithmer said that the Danish contribution for 1978 was expected to be DKr 4.4 million, roughly the equivalent of US$730,000. In 1979 the contribution might be of the order of DKr 5.4 million, equivalent to US$870,000 and for 1980, DKr 6.5 million or US$1.05 million.

128. On behalf of Germany, Dr. Treitz was authorized to pledge an amount of DM 14 million for 1978 and for 1979. This was of the order of US$6 million, and is roughly 7% higher than 1977. He noted that negotiations were going on in his government in the hopes that the amounts he had mentioned might be increased. However, the outcome was still speculative.

129. Mr. Bell said that the Ford Foundation would expect to provide US$1 million in 1978 and again in 1979.

130. Mr. Whitelegg noted that the UK Chancellor had introduced severe government budget cuts which had led to the reduction in the overall aid program of something like 10%. Emphasizing the importance that his government attached to the work of the centers, he was able to say that his government had decided to increase its contribution for 1978 to £2.5 million, at the current rate of exchange approximately US$4.3 million. This compared with the contribution in 1977 of US$3.4 million, consequently about a 25% increase. This pledge was, of course, subject to parliamentary approval. He noted that in addition, the UK provided considerable other funds for research in the United Kingdom in support of the work of the centers.

131. Dr. Strand stated that the Norwegian contribution for 1978 and again for 1979 is expected to be NKr 10 million, approximately US$1.9 million.

132. Mr. Clevering, on behalf of the government of the Netherlands, noted an increase in the Dutch contribution for 1978 of approximately 10%. This would amount in 1978 to US$1.65 million for core funding and US$550,000 for outreach funding. His government was also supporting other organizations which were in close contact with the Consultative Group's system, such as work on postharvest technology, SEARCA, and agro-forestry. His government has substantially increased funds for programs in rural development and national organizations in the developing world.
133. Dr. Pino expected that, subject to the approval of its Board of Trustees, the Rockefeller Foundation would be able to make available US$1.25 million for 1978. The money would be available from the first of the year.

134. Dr. Daniels expected that IDRC would approve a contribution of approximately Can.$1.3 million for core programs in 1978.

135. On behalf of Australia Mr. Ingram stated that the contribution for 1978 would be Aus$2.465 million, approximately US$2.7 million. Total Australian contributions, including special projects and support for the TAC Secretariat, would amount to Aus$2.7 million, roughly US$3 million. Without being able to give full details of the breakdown, he expected that Australia would contribute for the first time to four additional centers—IIIA, ILRAD, CIMMYT and IBPGR.

136. Dr. Scarascia-Mugnozza, noting that the Italian national budget had not yet been approved, nevertheless expected that his government would make available approximately US$100,000 for 1978. The Italian National Research Council was at present considering an increase of the Italian contribution.

137. Dr. Wilhelm noted that Switzerland would make a contribution to core budget in 1978 up to the amount of US$1.3 million. In addition, there would be a number of contributions to special projects.

138. Mr. Yudelman stated that the World Bank would continue its practice of contributing up to 10% of the requirements of the approved programs of the Consultative Group System. This could amount in 1978 to something in excess of US$8 million. Subject to approval by the Bank’s Board, up to US$8.7 million might be expected for 1978 compared with expected grants for 1977 of US$7.9 million.

139. Dr. Olembo noted that UNEP intended to restore its contribution to the CGIAR system to US$600,000. He noted that some of the follow-up activities to the recent United Nations’ Conference on Desertification might lead to more funds being available for activities carried out in connection with the centers, particularly ILCA and ICARDA.

140. Mr. Epstein stated that the president of the Inter-American Development Bank was expected shortly to recommend to his Board contributions of up to US$6.2 million to the core budgets and capital requirements of the three Latin American centers for 1978. As in the past, this amount would be dispersed in national currencies of the host countries in which the centers are located. They would be drawn from the resources of the Social Progress Trust Fund. This represented about an 8% increase over 1977 and accounted for nearly 20% of the Bank’s total nonreimbursable technical assistance. Allocations between centers and support for capital items were still to be discussed. He expected a similar contribution for 1979 and 1980, but it was too early to be specific.
141. Speaking on behalf of the Asian Development Bank, Mr. Epstein read the following statement. "The Asian Development Bank cannot commit itself at this stage regarding its financial support for 1978 to CG-sponsored activities as they have to work out project proposals based on their individual consideration for support to research centers in Asia for their Board of Directors on a project by project basis. However, on a preliminary and noncommittal basis you may indicate that the Asian Development Bank in 1978 may consider a magnitude of about half a million US dollars of financial support for agricultural research activities in Asia subject to individual consideration on merit of project proposals and approval by the Board of Directors of the Bank."

142. Mr. Båge noted that Sweden was still working on a long-term budget for CG contributions. Pending adoption of that budget, he expected the Swedish contribution for 1978 not to be less than the contribution for 1977, which is SKr 10 million, approximately US$2 million.

143. Dr. Ali noted that the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development was at present reviewing its priorities, and he was therefore not in a position to make a specific announcement. He hoped to do so very soon.

144. On behalf of Belgium, Mr. Boddez noted that his country's total contribution would be BF100 million, somewhere between US$2.8 and US$2.9 million. This, however, was the total figure, including special projects.

145. Dr. Eggers stated that the European Economic Community expected to contribute two million European units of account for 1978, equivalent to roughly US$2.2 million. There was a faint possibility that this amount might be increased by about half a million European units of account, equivalent to US$0.55 million to a center in Latin America.

146. Noting that Japan could not yet make a specific pledge for 1978, Mr. Okamoto mentioned that efforts would be made to maintain and expand as far as possible the Japanese contribution to the CGIAR.

147. Mr. Amenechi said that Nigeria's contribution to the system would remain at the present level of N5 .5 million, equivalent to about US$750,000.

148. Summarizing the outcome of the pledges, the Executive Secretary, Mr. Lejeune, pointed out that there was still a number of uncertainties. For example, the United States and the World Bank provided matching funds, the absolute amount of which depended on what the rest of the Group could contribute. It was possible that new contributors might join the Group. Firm figures had not yet been obtained from all the donors present. Whilst the total needs of about $88 million for 1978 were not clearly covered at this stage, it appeared that the apparent shortfall would be manageable. Donors should be aware that total requests could increase again rapidly in 1979 due to the implementation of new capital programs. In view of the rapid pace of inflation and the difficulty in forecasting it, it was to be hoped that donors would consider at least maintaining their contributions in real terms. Although at the moment it seemed as though there might be a total gap of between US$2 and US$3 million, the Group had been in similar situations before and it was to be expected that this would be overcome by November.
Report on Implementation of Review Committee Recommendations (Agenda Item 13)

149. The Deputy Executive Secretary, Mr. Ritchie, reviewed the present status of implementation of the recommendations of the Review Committee. The present status of the group of recommendations affecting the CGIAR system as a whole was self-evident to members. The next major group of recommendations had been directed at the centers. They were of two main types. Recommendations relating to longer-term perspective of the centers, and secondly, those to do with off-campus activity. In order to put the first type of recommendation into effect, the Secretariat had suggested a number of steps, among which was the preparation by the centers of a statement on long-term objectives, priorities and criteria for program balance. This might be done in preparation for quinquennial reviews. CIAT had prepared such a document, which had been very useful. It was hoped that all the well-established centers would be able to give a more explicit statement of priorities and objectives in the coming year. Some centers had been more successful than others in following the recommendation that special projects be more closely integrated with core activities.

150. As for the recommendations concerning off-campus activities, Mr. Ritchie urged centers to let the Secretariat have copies of formal collaborative agreements between centers.

151. The Review Committee had recommended that Boards of Trustees define the criteria and procedures for selection of their own members. One center had provided a statement on this question, but the Secretariat would urge other center Boards to do the same. It was understood that a numbers of centers were considering putting CG nominees on their Board.

152. The Review Committee had recommended that donors try to be as flexible as possible in pledging and that support be maintained to individual centers for a reasonable period of time and not be withdrawn or reduced without ample notice. Secondly, it was recommended that contributions be made as promptly as possible. With the proposal that the World Bank establish a short-term financing facility, donors had responded well and so far it has not been necessary to make use of this facility.

153. TAC had responded to the recommendations of the Review Committee. Quinquennial reviews were being continued. Stripe analysis was underway and due attention was being paid to special projects.

154. As for the Secretariats, the recommendations that biennial budgeting be introduced and that the two Secretariats work more closely together in preparing program and budget commentaries, appeared to have been put into effect with little difficulty.

155. In general, progress towards putting the Committee's recommendations into effect had been good but somewhat slower in those areas requiring changes in procedure or thinking.
Time and Place of Next Meeting (Agenda Item 14)

156. There being no items of other business, the Chairman noted that the discussion of Item 9 had resulted in agreement to hold the next meeting of the CGIAR on November 16 and 17, 1977, in the offices of the World Bank in Paris.

157. The meeting closed at 12:45 p.m.
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