

30Oct90

16:00-17:00 Item 14: Follow-up

Minutes: Center Directors Meeting  
23Oct90, Washington DC  
See Agenda

The meeting was convened at 8:30 with all 13 Centers Directors in attendance.

D.L. Winkelmann (Chairman)

C. Bonte-Friedheim	R. Sawyer
J. Faaland	L. Stifel
N. Fadda	L. Swindale
A. Gray	E. Terry
K. Lampe	D. van Sloten
G. Nores	J. Walsh

Item 1: Opening.

Winkelmann reminded the assembly that its aim was to discuss themes of importance to most centers and to reach conclusions on actions to be taken. Just Faaland was introduced as the new Director General of IFPRI. The agenda was approved. The minutes of the Mar90, Torgiano meeting were approved. (Several noted that the minutes had not reached them.)

Item 2: TAC paper on Expansion of the System.

This was the major theme on the agenda, discussion focused on synthesizing a reaction to TAC's major paper, 'Expansion of the System'. It was agreed that the paper is among TAC's best efforts, that we should respond to it as positively as possible. We noted that several of our earlier recommendations had been included but that the important recommendation on funding had not been incorporated. We had advocated five years of guaranteed funding from current donors to each entering entity.

The suggestions on restructuring the system were noted. Few comments on the strategy were advanced. It was observed that eco-regional research would bring new actors into the scene and that perhaps universities would play a stronger role. The tone of advocacy for increasing emphasis on basic and strategic research was contrasted with the insistence of several donors that we continue to work nearer to the NARS, indeed on activities characterized as technical assistance.

We concluded that we must bring these anomalies to the attention of TAC; perhaps in conjunction with discussion of the TAC paper on priorities.

It was observed that the importance given to resource management might jeopardize CG attention to the poor, that the paper shifts the balance of CG activities, and while encouraging that expansion in well defined ways the paper is not at all precise on what activities might be reduced. There is a suggestion that technical assistance like activities can be reduced but it was observed that donors are of two minds on this theme.

(JW) opined that the TAC paper on expanding the system contains several inconsistencies and lacks a strategic framework. Several opined that action on the papers recommendations would be postponed to a later session.

Several other themes were noted during the course of the discussion: that Africa NARS are strongly critical of centers, that it is desirable for ISNAR to update its data on Africa NARS, that it would be good to have a position paper on advantages and disadvantages of increasing NARS to further involvement in international research or training, and that we should move quickly to interact with TAC on priorities/strategy paper.

(For more on the paper see paragraphs 3, p.3 in our report to System, attached.)

Item 3: IFAR.

In order to accommodate John McKelvey, Chairman of the IFAR Board, we advanced IFAR on our agenda. (JM) and Dick Sawyer gave us an overview, concentrating on recruiting efforts and on IFAR'S effort to build up areas of common opportunity with the US private sector.

In our discussion we noted IFAR is a pilot project with a three plus year horizon focused on raising money in the US, where chances of success seemed good, from the private sector and other non-traditional sources.

Our questions related to concept, is it flawed, and to implementation, why has so little been done. It is acknowledged that IFAR has not adequately focused its efforts but (RS) opines that the new director will do so. There was agreement that centers gaining from IFAR on debt swaps should share with IFAR. We did not set a fee. There is still doubt about the concept-- under what circumstances can we obtain significant funding from the private sector-- but agreement that we must stay with our commitment for two more years of support and that we should reflect our dissatisfaction with progress. 2

Continue with financial support, ask (RS) to keep us apprised of activities and of other ways in which we might support IFAR effort, ask (RS) to apprise IFAR of our dissatisfaction with progress.

Item 4: Allocation process and McWilliam Committee Report.

Given that the report, with its recommendations about the process for allocating 1991 funds, had already been submitted it was felt that we had little opportunity to influence the turn of events, hence should spend little time in discussion. Two observations were made. It was opined that the McWilliams Committee had not been empowered to make recommendations on particular allocations but rather on the process, hence had exceeded its formal license. Several argued that the only suitable basis for allocations in 1991 1990 allocations as advocated by the McWilliams Report,

should be at the heart of the process. Others noted that some believe that the TAC process for approving five year budgets was so flawed that the resulting budgets had little credibility.

Item 5: TAC and Priority Setting.

Discussion of this theme was limited by the absence of the promised TAC paper. Even so, exchange proceeded over lunch with certain positions coming clear--that transparency is a desirable thing, that a relationship between priorities and allocations is a good thing for 'core unrestricted' funds, that some feel that restricted funds and special projects should be outside the influences of the allocation process, that a formal mechanism cannot be expected to provide precise descriptions of preferred resource flows, that a and Program Committees, and that there should be a role for centers in subjective dimensions of TAC's effort. There was a strong sense that CDs should contribute to TAC's deliberations, especially in terms of identifying important parameters and in setting reasonable ranges of values for each.

We agreed that each of us should contact the DeWit Committee as we see fit and share our observations with all colleagues, that we should have a five person committee to look for patterns within our communications, and that those patterns should be described to the DeWit Committee. DLW to appoint a committee.

Item 6: 1991 Funding.

The mechanisms for resolving the short fall between likely pledges and TAC endorsed budgets was discussed. Some advocated dividing the shortfall on the basis of approved '91 budgets, others favored the TAC/CG plan of basing on the 1990 budget. Several noted the lack of clarity in funding definitions, some commented on CGSec's withholding of portions of windfall gains from exchange rate changes. There was general support for rebuilding the stabilization fund with what appeared to be an endorsement for more precise ground rules and less opportunity for negotiation in its future applications. It was agreed to appoint a committee to prepare a note on the stabilization fund for CGSec.

DLW to appoint a committee.

Item 7: Gender.

Discussion revolved around comments at 1990 mid-term meeting including Poat's paper and up-coming session with TAC. It was agreed Centers should be equal opportunity plus presentation,. The Collinson draft about training on gender issues was discussed and we agreed to a positive stance but with training to be initiated after an assessment of current status of equity and analytical themes within centers.

DLW to respond to Collinson.

Item 8: Committee Reports.

a. Fund Raising: Led by (RS) we discussed this theme, especially as it pertains to the way the recently appointed CD committees will interact with CGSec on fund raising. (RS) pointed to Nores work with BID as a model. It was recognized that BID support is still a problem for 1990. (ET) reports on good response to his visit to African Development Bank.

b. Benefits Committee: NF reported on reimbursement of savings on insurance and on the three player competition for center business, won again by IIE. He asked endorsement to take next step on study of possible center-management tasks now in hands of IIE, with other possible tasks to be added.

It was agreed that a modest amount of some US 75t should be invested to complete a study on self supply of support services and to continue negotiations with IIE for a three year contract but with a six months termination clause. (More on this committee's work at the open meeting.)

c. Library and Documentation: LSwindale noted that a report by John Woolston recommends a stripe review of communications, that TAC seems to be paying some attention, that a meeting of appropriate staff might substitute for such a review, and he asks for support in a subsequent discussion report in open session.

It was agreed to support (LSw) suggestion.

d. Board Membership: Five small donors have few Board members. It was agreed that we would all exchange information on any potential Board members from those countries and would ensure that the information is on file with CGSec. There is now a considerable uniformity on Board terms, with all centers permitting no more than two three year terms. Some are enlarging Boards in order to bring on more potential donors.

e. SACCAR: (LSw) reported on draft MoU prepared by LSw/GN committee, of SACCAR's acceptance, and of ICRISAT use for a particular case. One further change was suggested, that dealing with the appointment of existing staff members.

(LSw) will look into this and report back if there are hitches.

26Oct Open Session

f. Africa Committee Report: Three themes were reported on: group interventions in SSAfrica, center influence on the investments by NARS, and an ISNAR project to inventory human capital in SSAfrica. ISNAR also talks about an 'indicator series', proposes to do two-three countries as a test, wants centers' endorsement.

(JW) reported that the committee: had endorsed ISNAR 'series' but recommended discussion with CDs and with SPAAR,

that coordination and liaison should be for major functions (including such themes as training, common payments, MoUs, facilities, and staff movements). Recent developments in SPAAR were mentioned with an apparent emphasis on regional activities while NARS seem to favor support to countries. We looked at earlier efforts to shape common ventures. The mid-altitude maize based systems venture seems to be moribund but the West Africa effort is still alive and with significant funds.

We agreed that all should send copies of agreements with governments and regional entities to ISNAR so to form a common file.

g. Library and Documentation: LSwindale reported that the first materials are nearly ready for distribution. He points out that there are sufficient materials for a second retrospective and that proceeds from sales of the first could finance the second. It was agreed that further work should be proceeded by a meeting of selected communications people which should be held at ILCA in early 1991. That group, plus others who might attend, should go on to frame an agenda for a third quarter '91 meeting to discuss, among other things, themes raised in the Woolston report. Finally it was agreed that the preservation project should be folded into the Library/Documentation Committee.

LSwindale and John Walsh will call the shots on the two meetings.

h. Benefits Committee: N. Fadda reported on several themes: 1) Airco litigation is moving on, 2) that Wyatt is ready to look at self-financing medical costs, 3) that medical costs are appreciably lower in Europe than in US hence those on that side of the world should look to Europe, 4) that there will be a reimbursement from van Breda on 1989 medical costs, 5) and that IIE was low bidder on the three player competition.

Same ol3  
stay after meetings in:  
- Case of IIE  
- All papers  
- D.C.  
- Dr. King

We authorized the modest fee required for the Wyatt study and authorized continued negotiation with van Breda in anticipation of a three year contract with a clause for cancellation.

i. Levies: N. Fadda reported committee's recommendation that on those common activities where benefits can be clearly separated that each center pay its own part, that on all activities where individual benefits cannot be established (e.g. public awareness) or where it would be too costly to do so (e.g. the Sunday affair) we charge a common fund. He further recommended ~~that each center would~~ contribute US 8t initially and all subsequent contributions would be on the basis of budgets. We agreed to this. I assume we will clear accounts near year's end. I assume we will handle 1990 expenses in this way.

to whom?

Each center will ensure appropriate notification and implementation.

j. Plant Genetic Resources: Dick van Sloten reported on the inter-center meeting with assistance from Roger Rowe,

who had served the meeting as secretary. The major theme was that much of the CG held materials is not duplicated and that records are also not duplicated. After discussion it was agreed that IBPGR will.

Identify collections most at risk, identify alternative sites for temporary duplicates, monitor process with inter-center and TAC groups, and lay out options for the longer term, including sharing of software.

k. Communications Committee: (ET) reported and asked for counsel. He noted that over 40 groups have received copies of the report and that a few have responded with quite detailed comments. It was noted that good papers of this kind could be put on ICW agenda giving centers more time in the sessions.

We will all respond quickly to ET who will incorporate changes and refinements for early return to us and discussion at June meeting.

Item 9: Themes for Jun91 meeting.

We talked briefly about themes for Jun91 and John Walsh, who will chair the meeting, took notes on the conversation, listing themes for discussion.

Item 10: DDG's Report.

We there turned to the report of the DDG's on the themes of their meeting. Roger Rowe presented the report. All centers were represented at the meeting with 21 persons in attendance.

On harmonizing expenses for NARS staff on travel status with our support, after sharing information it was seen that the only real problem is with incidental expense. Most vary from US 10-20/day. It was agreed to keep on top of this.

On future technical meeting, it was evident that communications are not adequate among centers and within centers. It was asked if DDG's should plan on an annual meeting similar to this year's session. (I think it was agreed that we should do so unless the evidence shows it to be unnecessary.)

On service sources, especially hotels, information was shared. For now, Kramer/CIAT will get details from Boston based group and come back to us via e-mail. We might then be asked to estimate demand by city.

On allowances for staff based in other centers, virtually all are following the same scheme. There are one or two problems and there will presumably be worked out.

On devolution, a general discussion turned up many forms of sharing and some problems--funding, agreement on bases and infrastructure, and long term commitment. These should be handled in paper for TAC/CG.

DLW to appoint a committee.

Item 11: Intellectual Property Rights.

We met with *Mr.* Zubeck on legal themes pertaining to intellectual property rights and to the Nov90 meeting to be held at ICRISAT.

Closed Session

Item 12: Public Awareness.

(RS) identified the several notable recent stories on center accomplishments, the role that the long term effort has had in making these possible, the part that Ed Sulzberger played in getting this effort on track, and the apprehension that CGSec plans suggest an under investment in the area. There was agreement on the desirability of continuing a well focused effort and reference was made to the study emerging from the Torgiano meeting which shows how three agencies pursue public awareness. It was agreed that spending could become excessive but there is no sense that we are near that frontier.

After discussion about strategy it was agreed that we would encourage AvdO to reconsider the CGSec strategy so as to include an experienced person dedicated to this work and linked with the communication programs of each center. There was also underlying agreement that, if CGSec does not proceed, we should take this on ourselves, financing from each center with the staff working out of IFPRI (an offer to Jun91 from JF), \ probably not IFAR (it is focussed on the US only) but preferably CGSec.

We endorsed a program of training for center staff to be held in Rome or WDC in Mar91 at a cost of about US 90t, exclusive of transportation and living expenses.

The Porter-Novelli relation was reviewed. We have committed up to US 45t, have spent US 15t, are waiting for results, and note that the company has not performed well on our behalf.

Finally we thanked Ed Sulzberger for his work on public awareness while at the CGSec.

Item 13: Other Business.

We elected ETerry to the Executive Committee as Chairman elect to succeed John Walsh. Along with CBCs we met with Mr. Thalwitz, Chairman of CGLAR. We then discussed the expansion paper and the priorities paper with the CBC's and the ideas emerging there are incorporated in DLW's report to the Group, especially those pertaining to close cooperation with TAC in developing and implementing the priorities framework. We met with AvdO for discussion about various themes. He seemed to endorse our idea about a strong commitment to public awareness.

Item 14: Follow-up.

We met again on Tuesday afternoon to review major points in the draft report for ICW90, to affirm two committees--one to work on issues pertaining to the priorities paper and the second to write a paper on sharing international responsibilities with NARS. (See appointments memos.) We also agreed on a stance for the Collinson note on training pertaining to gender (see note to M. Collinson).

AMENDED AGENDA

23Oct90

IFPRI

Closed Session

- 08:30-08:45 Item 1: Opening  
Welcome Recognitions  
Approval of Minutes Reviews of Aims
- 08:45-11:30 Item 2: TAC paper on Expanding the System
- 11:30-12:00 Item 3: IFAR
- 12:00-12:30 Item 4: Allocation process and McWilliam  
Committee Report
- 12:30-13:30 Item 5: Paper by TAC Standing Committee on  
Priorities
- 13:30-14:30 Item 6: 1991 Funding
- 14:30-15:00 Item 7: Gender
- 15:00-17:00 Item 8: Committee Reports--Fund Raising  
(Sawyer), Benefits Committee  
(Fadda), Library and Documentation  
(Swindale), Board Memberships  
(Bonte-Friedheim), SACCAR  
(Swindale)

26Oct90

Room EI-1200  
600-19th. Str.

Open Session

- 8:30-10:45 Item 8: (Continued) Committee Reports--  
SSAfrica (Terry), Library and  
Documentation (Swindale), Benefits  
(Fadda), Levies (Fadda), Plant  
Genetics Resources (van Sloten),  
Communications (Terry)
- 10:45-11:00 Item 9: Themes for Jun91 meeting
- 11:00-12:00 Item 10: DDG's Report
- 12:00-13:00 Item 11: Intellectual Property Rights

Closed Session

- 13:30-14:30 Item 12: Public Awareness
- 14:30-17:30 Item 13: Other Business  
a. W. Thalwitz  
b. With CBCs on Expanding the  
System and Priorities  
c. A. von der Osten--CGSecretariat