

(21a)

CENTER DIRECTORS' COMMITTEE
Washington DC. October 22-23, 1992
(Including open and closed sessions)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

1. **Opening of the Meeting.**

The Chairman opened the meeting with brief remarks. He welcomed Dr. per **Pinstrup-Andersen**, new Director General of IFPRI and discussed logistical and secretarial arrangements for the meeting. He provided a brief summary of the Chairman's activities on behalf of the group since the June, 1992 meeting in Nairobi and ensured that the **Program** and **Agenda** of the meeting had been distributed. The **Program** and **Agenda** were adopted and are attached in Annex 1.

2. **Adoption of the Minutes of the June 17-18 and 19-20, 1992 Meeting.**

The **Minutes** were adopted with the following corrections:

- Item K, page 7 is corrected by deleting the reference to a **formal** presentation.

- Annex 7 should include a 4-5 page document clarifying the structure of the committee. Dr. Zandstra will provide this to CDC members.

- Annex 3, page 3 is corrected to indicate that advice and guidance will be sought from the IFRD Pension Fund.

It was noted that not all members have the final and correct version of Annex 8. Dr. Zandstra will distribute.

3. **Matters Arising from the Minutes.**

Dr. Fadda indicated he will distribute copies of **ICARDA's procedures** for depreciation accounting.

4. **Report by Chairman of CDC/TAC Executive Committee Meeting, Rome, June, 1992.**

The Chairman reported briefly on his meeting with TAC in Rome in June, 1992 immediately after the CDC meeting in Nairobi. He indicated he had:

- reported on the CDC/SSA NARS Roundtable and relayed the 14 points identified at the **end** of the Roundtable. He indicated TAC commended this initiative and requested information on initiatives in Asia and Latin America;

- summarized for the full TAC the discussions between the TAC Chairman, **Mike** Arnold and Center Directors in Nairobi;

- reported the CDC decision that there should be a joint CDC/TAC initiative

on an ecoregional approach to international agricultural research;

- reported on the membership of CDC **standing** committees;
- submitted the interim conclusions of the **Sub-committee** on Priorities and Strategies on **TAC's** priority analysis and resource allocation exercise;
- finalized the timetable for the Medium-term **Plan** submissions;
- **reported CDC** views on **TAC** liaison scientists, **procedures**, visits, etc., and conveyed the CDC open invitation to **TAC** scientists to visit Centers whether or not they were the official liaison scientist assigned to those Centers.

In discussion it was noted that **TAC does** not **regard** the current priority assessment **and resource** allocation exercise as **work** in progress but **as** work that will not be revisited at this time. It **was** noted that the **CDC** and **TAC** will need to adopt a longer-term **approach** to priority analysis, and ensure much closer collaboration in future analyses.

5. Final Decisions on Agenda Items for Discussions with the Following: CBC, CGIAR Chairman, TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat Executive Secretary.

A. CDC/CBC Meeting, 23 October, 1992

The following items proposed for discussion **during** the **CDC/CBC** meeting were confirmed:

- a. ecoregional research in the **CGIAR**
- b. a strategy for the **CGIAR**
- c. 1998 resource envelopes for the second Medium-term Plans
- d. **IARC/NARS** relationships.

It was agreed also to **discuss** the restructuring of **ICW**.

It was agreed further that:

- e
- the matter of strategy should be given priority,
 - the discussion should focus on the outputs of the **CG** centers rather than the inputs,
 - the **CDC/CBC** ideas and philosophy for strategy development **should** be discussed with Bank President Preston,
 - one of the points to stress with **Bank** President Preston at the dinner on **October 27 was** continuity of the position of **CGIAR** Chairman at the Senior Vice President level.

With regard to the 1999 resource envelopes, **TAC** had acknowledged that these are indicative figures for planning purposes; and that the envelopes for the livestock centers were not definitive.

B. CGIAR Chairman Meeting, 23 October, 1992

The **CDC Chairman** confirmed that the **CGIAR Chairman** had agreed to the following topics for discussion during the **CDC/CBC/CG Chairman's** meeting:

- a. the governance of the CGIAR,
- b. the *changing* role of the CGIAR Secretariat,
- c. the role of the World Bank and regional banks in resource mobilization,
- d. other business.

It was agreed that resource mobilization is the critical issue to **discuss** with the Chairman and that he should be thanked for his efforts in this regard. **It was agreed** also that the **CDC Chairman** should raise the restructuring of **ICM**,

C. TAC Meeting, 24 October, 1992

The Chairman identified the agenda proposed by TAC for discussion:

- a. progress towards a CGIAR strategy on plant genetic resources,
- b. progress on developing a CGIAR policy on plant genetic resources, biosafety and intellectual property rights,
- c. scientific quality in the CGIAR,
- d. progress of the CDC/TAC Working Group on ecoregional research,
- e. Center/TAC initiative for mobilizing resources for the CGIAR.

It was **agreed** to add to the agenda the recommendation of the **SI** ———tee on Priorities and Strategy to establish a Joint CDC/TAC Committee on Priority Assessment to provide a **mechanism** for exploring priority issues in the future.

It was **agreed** also to seek clear signals **from** TAC on the **procedures** and steps relating to review processes for the future.

D. Executive Secretary of the CGIAR Secretariat Meeting, October 22, 1992

The Chairman identified the agenda items agreed upon with the **CGIAR Secretariat Executive Secretary** for discussion:

- a. CG Secretariat role in the Public Awareness and Resources Committee,
- b. changing role of the CG Secretariat,
- c. preparation of **1994-98 MTIP** financial tables,
- d. **UNCED Agenda 21**.

This agenda was **agreed** on with the addition of the responsibility for bearing the **costs** of External Program and Management Reviews. Center Directors also **agreed** to raise several governance issues:

- the role of the Secretariat relative to the Centers and the World Bank,
- participation by the Executive Secretary in the CDC,
- the role of Resource Persons from the CGIAR Secretariat in External reviews.

6. Reports from Subcommittees.

A. Public Awareness and Resources.

The Chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Awareness and Resources presented his report which is attached as Annex 2. He noted that the report contained considerable detail to facilitate input from interested parties. He noted further that, while the report included specific proposals, PARC is particularly interested in getting feedback from the Centers on the underlying principles in time for its next meeting.

The Directors took the following decisions:

a. Terms of Reference of PARC. The PARC Chairman indicated that the changes in the terms of reference are primarily editorial but do make clear that the main focus of PARC is to increase core as distinct from complementary funding which was more likely to be sought successfully by Centers operating individually. The Directors endorsed the Terms of Reference as representing the thrust of the collective action between PARC and the CGIAR to expand the resource base.

b. *Balancing Fund*. The Directors endorsed the principle of reciprocity involved in PARC's recommendations relative to the *balancing* fund and left to further deliberation by PARC the actual levels to be applied. They noted that questions remain to be answered on the relationship to TAC priorities and on whether the Bank will see itself as funding the less attractive Centers or the less attractive programs.

c. Approach to Bank President Preston. The Directors agreed to discuss with the CBC the development of a strategy for approaching the President at the President's dinner. It was proposed and accepted that Don Winkelman and Wally Falcon prepare presentations on behalf of the CDC and the CBC respectively, to be delivered if the occasion presented itself.

It was noted that all other matters in the PARC report are for information only. The PARC Chairman indicated that PARC wanted feedback on its report. It anticipates firm proposals for the Mid-year CDC meeting and final proposals for the donors at ICW 93. Its goal is for the new procedures on the *balancing* fund, overhead and the stabilization mechanism to go into effect with the new MTIPs on January 1, 1994.

B. Benefits Committee.

At the request of the Chairman of the Benefits Committee the Center Directors' meeting was declared the official Annual Co-sponsors Meeting of the AIARC. Mr. Roy of IFDC was in attendance as a Co-sponsor.

The Benefits Committee Chairman presented his report which is attached in Annex 3 and brought the Directors up to date on the establishment of the Inter-center Service Office, its establishment and recurrent costs, initial fee schedules for service, financial controls, procedures for indemnifying IIE, Center/AIARC contracts, new policy, and the retirement fund.

The Directors approved the **report** and its recommendations, and **expressed its** appreciation to the Chairman for the work he and his committee have **done**. The Center Directors approved the following:

- the **CGIAR** and the **IFDC** are the **sponsors** of **AIARC**; the **CG** centers **are** represented on the **Board of Directors** of **AIARC** - non-associated centers and other centers **and** organizations, who **were** also receiving services from **III** or who may **wish** to join **AIARC** in the future, can join as clients and not be **sponsors** or **have** seats on the **Board of Directors**;

- expenditures till the **end** of the year will **be covered** from medical **insurance** and litigation funds without **assessing** the Centers further. An additional **\$150,000** will be utilized from the **same source** as initial working capital;

- an administrative budget of **\$682,000** for **1993**;

- an initial fee schedule (**see Annex 3** for details) and a plan to monitor the schedule at the **end** of one year;

- disbursement and **banking procedures** similar to those currently in use in **CGIAR** centers **and** a temporary liability policy pending the arrangement of permanent coverage;

- an audit of the off-shore plan preparatory to indemnifying **III** against future claims;

- the development of **AIARC/CGIAR** center and **AIARC/non-CGIAR** center contracts for review and approval by Centers;

- a moratorium on new members for one year;

- the recommended increase in insurance premiums for **1993**;

- the temporary postponement of the **testing** of the equity status of the Centers' pension scheme;

- continuing to hold on behalf of the Centers for the immediate future the two funds managed by **ICARDA**, the Centers' Joint Account and the refunds from **Van Breda** and **Airco** litigation.

C. Documentation and Information.

The Chairman of the Sub-committee reported on two items. First, he indicated that setting up the Information Management **REM** was continuing in line with the proposal contained in the Committee's report to the June meeting of the **CDC** (see Annex 4 to the Minutes of that meeting). The **comments** of the Directors have been incorporated. An annual report will be prepared for the June, **1993 CDC** meeting.

Second, he announced that the 17 disk **CD ROM** set of the Compact International Agricultural Research Library (**CIARL**) has been issued. A World

Bank New Product Announcement is attached as Annex 4.

The CDC **commended** the Chairman and his committee for their work and requested ISNAR to explore with CTA funding to provide copies of the set to **Lome Accord** countries.

D. Sustainability and Environment

The Chairman of the Committee on Sustainability and the Environment **noted** that most of the issues under this topic had been collapsed into the **next** discussion topic, i.e., an "Ecoregional Approach to International Agricultural Research (CDC/TAC Initiative)". He noted, however, that the booklet published on "Sustainability Research" **conducted** at LARCs **was** out of print. The group decided:

- the booklet should retain the orientation to **making** the subject understandable to non-scientific **persons** outside the CGIAR system;

- the Center Directors should have the opportunity to make inputs on specific **changes** and that the Center Directors should have the opportunity to comment on a draft;

- the draft should incorporate the output from the February workshop of the Ecoregional Approach **Working** Group and should be prepared in time for the **May, 1993** CDC meeting.

E. Ecoregional Approach to International Agricultural Research (CDC/TAC Initiative).

The Chairman of the CSE reported on the activities of the Joint CDC/TAC **working** Group on Ecoregional Approaches to International Agricultural Research which had been initiated at the June CDC meeting. **His** report is attached as Annex 5.

The discussion dealt with the following matters:

- TAC's perception of the ecoregional concept. It **was** felt that TAC saw this matter as still open but that it wanted the work that **has** already been done to be utilized;

- the development of the concept as a basis for judging **MTIPs**. It was felt that to do so would mean that the concept would have to be accepted by June, **1993**;

- the necessity of having multiple models of ecoregional approaches for different situations and missions rather than a single approach. The Chairman requested Directors to extract appropriate portions of their dealings with ecoregional activities and mechanisms and forward them to him by E-mail;

- the problem created by the tendency to include everything in the ecoregional concept as reflected in the **Terms** of Reference;

The CDC accepted the **Chairman's** report and took the following actions:

- approved the nomination of Guido Gryseels of the **TAC** Secretariat to the Working Group,

- approved a request to the Executive Secretary to **assign** Mike Collinson to the Working Group,

- approved the draft Terms of Reference with **minor** modifications **and an** agreement to include a preamble which presents this effort in the context of broader, international concern about sustainability research needs,

- endorsed February 2-4, 1993 and Davis, Ca. as the time and location of the next Working Group meeting. The draft **agenda** and Working Group report will be distributed to DGs in **advance** to facilitate input. The February meeting output will be in the **form** of a close-to-final draft which will go to the May conference of **60-70 persons** organized by the Secretariat at the Mid-year Meeting in 1993.

The Chairman of the CSE noted that the task of the Working Group is to point to but not to resolve the *many* issues involved in the ecoregional concept and requested Directors to make staff study of and response to the relevant documents a matter of **urgency**.

F. Sub-Saharan Africa

The Chairman presented his report (attached as **Annex 6**) under four topics: a. Center Directors **SSA/NARS** Roundtable; b. ISNAR study of **Sub-Saharan** NARS; c. **ISNAR** study of small NARS; and African Highlands Initiative.

a. Center Directors SSA/NARS Roundtable. The Roundtable has been reported very positively and follow-up work is continuing in several areas:

i. NARS Follow-up Conference. ISNAR is **assuming** responsibility for assisting NARS in the arrangement of a NARS only conference. The Directors decided:

- the meeting will consist of NARS only,
- the meeting will be seen as preparatory to another CD/NARS meeting,
- a meeting of Center Directors and **NARS** with donors may eventually be held but planning **for** it should be deferred until after the next CD/NARS meeting,
- to accept SPAAR's offer to assist in the planning of the NARS meeting,
- both meetings should be structured to ensure a tangible product,
- while the site of the NARS meeting had not been firmly set it was understood that it will be in Africa. Similarly, it was agreed that the next CD SSA/NARS meeting will be in West Africa.

ii. Intermediate Biotechnology Service. **ISNAR** has developed a **proposal** for the funding of an "Intermediate Biotechnology Service". The meeting decided:

- **ISNAR** will keep the Directors **informed** on progress on the project,
- **ISNAR** will advise Centers of issues to be followed up **once** the recruiting process is completed and the project takes shape. In the meantime Centers should **send** input on the proposal to **ISNAR**,
- Brader and Gray will review the proposal on behalf of the Center Directors,
- to add **SPAAR** to the list of recipients of the proposal,
- **ISNAR** has the lead for this activity and will report to the **CDC** when priority activities have been identified. Action **by** the CDC is deferred until then.

iii. Joint CDC/SSA-NARS Activities on Ecoregional Research. Further action on Joint CDC/SSA-NARS activities on Ecoregional Approaches and Resource Management research is suspended until the concept is clarified by the CDC/TAC **Working Group**.

b. **ISNAR** Study of **Sub-Saharan** African NARS and c. **ISNAR** Study of Small NARS. Action on both **was** deferred pending reports from **ISNAR**.

d. African Highlands Initiative. The Chairman reported progress on the African Highlands Initiative which is a consortium of **8** CG and non-CG centers **and 7** East and Central African NARS for natural resource management **research** in East and Central Africa. The group endorsed the report and noted that the workshop to be arranged in Kampala in January, 1993 **should** be organized with a view to **concrete** outcomes. It indicated further that Dr. Zandstra should be kept informed of the initiative as it **was** developing as a potential model of an "ecoregional approach".

G. Intellectual Property Rights.

The Chairman presented the report of the committee on Intellectual Property Rights. The report is attached as **Annex 7**.

The Chairman reported **that** following decisions taken at the Center Directors' meeting in June, 1992 the document entitled "Suggested Guiding Principles of the International Agricultural Research Centers on Plant Genetic Research and Related Intellectual Property Rights Issues" was distributed. The **CGIAR** discussion document on "Intellectual **Property**, Biosafety **and** Plant Genetic Resources" **was** also distributed to the NARS, NGOs and Private Companies. No written **feedback** has been received.

The Directors mandated the Sub-committee on Intellectual **Property** Rights to undertake an analysis of the implications of such matters as Plant Breeder's Rights and the use of Material Transfer Agreements in the exchange of plant genetic resources. Such analysis **has** been requested by a group of NGOs. It was

noted that there are possibilities for funding of the study potentially by **The Netherlands Government**. Note was **taken of** the need to distinguish between property rights in **terms** of plant materials and those relating to books and other patented materials.

A draft Basic Agreement (so-called **Model E**) placing the CGIAR **base** collections under the auspices of the FAO has been assessed by the **FAO** legal office **to** be an acceptable basis for further negotiations. Accordingly, **the** model will be submitted to **FAO** for review and eventual adoption by the **FAO** commission on Plant Genetic Resources. The submission must be made to the Commission **in time** for its April meeting and any **comments** on the model should be **made** to Geof Hawtin with that timeline in **mind**. Contacts between centers and NARS or NGOs should be reported to Lukas Brader so he can keep an update on that.

The Directors endorsed the Committee's report.

H. Plant Genetic Resources

The Chairman of the Sub-committee on Plant Genetic **Resources** gave a brief background to the Joint **CD/TAC Working** Group on Plant Genetic Resources indicating that neither this Group **nor** the Inter-Center Working Group had yet met. He distributed a **paper** "*Changing Responsibilities and Roles for PCR Within the CGIAR System*" (**Annex 8**) which is an **IBPCR paper** developed following the Center Directors' concern at its June, **1992** meeting about elements of TAC's strategy which raised immediate system-wide issues. Discussion of the paper **was** deferred until the Saturday meeting with **TAC**.

As a result of the **IBFGR** survey, the Chairman noted a number of issues to be resolved, including:

- the roles of Centers in relation to the genetic resources of the gene pools of species for which their centers have responsibility,
- the need for an expanded effort on species which are important in key eco-regions but which are not covered by the mandate of any existing center.

The Directors decided to elevate the status of the Inter-center Working **Group** to address policy and strategic issues.

The Chairman noted that the next meeting of the Working Group on Plant Genetic Resources will be held in February, **1993** to consider these and other issues including the legal status of germplasm collections, the **CGIAR's** role in post-UNCED activities and in the proposed Fourth International Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources.

I. Report of the **DDGs'** Meeting

The Chairman of the **DDGs'** group presented its report, attached **as Annex 9**. The **DDGs** deliberated on the following items:

1. establishing harmonized policies governing the inter-center posting of international staff,

2. exchanges of experiences in the application of cost cutting measures,
3. the transfer of responsibilities from IIE to AIARC,
4. spouse employment within Centers,
5. report of UNEP/NORAGRIC/CGIAR meeting on GIS,
6. structure, **agenda** items, and assignments for the DDG meeting at ICW 93.

The Center Directors endorsed the report with thanks and agreed:

- Jack Doyle should be asked to provide a report of the GIS meeting for inclusion in the CDC Chairman's report,

- to express appreciation to the Government of Norway for its support of work on data exchanges and information methodology,

- to the addition of an item on disciplinary matters to the DDG agenda for next year.

It **was agreed** that the decision on what issues the DDGs should bring to the CDC for information or approval should be left to the **DDGs**.

J. Session With the Executive **Secretary** of the **CGIAR** Secretariat,

The CDC discussed the following items with the Executive Secretary of the **CGIAR**:

1. re-organization in the World Bank,
2. CG Secretariat role in the Public Awareness and Resources Committee,
3. changing role of the CG Secretariat,
4. preparation of **1994-98 MTIP** financial tables,
5. **UNCED** Agenda 21,
6. payment of costs of EP/M Reviews,
7. role of the Secretariat in linking the World Bank and the Centers,
8. role of the CG and TAC Secretariats in EP/M Reviews.

1. Reorganization in the World Bank. The Secretary explained the Bank reorganization in which **OSP** which is headed by the **CG's** chairman will be divided into 3 areas - human resources, institutional development and sustainable development - each headed by a vice-president. The CG Chairman will move to the President's Office as a vice-president, special assistant to the Bank president. In addition to his **CGIAR** responsibilities, he will head a task force working on the issue of the quality of the Bank's work. This arrangement will continue until September, **1993**. The Secretary's hope is that responsibility for the **CGIAR** will remain in the President's office at the current Chairman's Vice Presidential level, assigned to one of the managing directors or located with an appropriate vice-president. He hopes that the CGIAR's needs for continuity of leadership will be recognized in the long-term decision.

2. Secretary's role in PARC. The Secretary **commended** the formation of PARC **and the manner** in which it works and indicated that because of the importance of **the area** he had assigned **more** resources and planned **to add** more in-the-future either through additions or through the redirection of current resources.

3. Changing role of the Secretariat. The Secretary noted that the Draft **Business Plan** put out by the Secretariat described its role and **urged** Centers to **read and comment**. The role is essentially that of a multi-client service unit **with** responsibility to serve the entire **CGIAR** system. He indicated that **the** Secretariat would give strong support to PARC resource generation activities. He noted that the Secretariat's budget had been cut by error in the Bank **but** that he had not sought to correct the situation as it would have meant reducing Center allocations thereby setting a dangerous precedent.

4. Preparation of 1994-1998 MTP Financial Tables. This topic **was** not discussed.

5. UNCED. The Secretary **thanked** the Directors for the help their Centers gave in preparing the John *Spears*' document for donors. He indicated that the document had been well received.

6. Payment for External **Program** and Management Reviews. The Secretary noted that the CGIAR system as a whole **pays** for reviews in that the CGIAR Secretariat makes a one time allocation of funds from the total funds available to the CGIAR. He indicated that he will ensure that this perception prevails among Secretariat staff.

7. Role of the Secretariat in Linking the Centers and the World Bank. The Secretary noted that there was a constant need to inform the Bank of **CGIAR** activities and to influence perceptions. This was done through formal and informal contacts. Presentations by Center Directors **passing** through Washington were helpful and encouraged. He described the Advisory Committee and liaison scientists assigned to the Centers by Michel Petit and **suggested** that Directors establish contact with their liaison scientists and invite them to visit their Centers.

The Secretary agreed that the Directors will be kept informed of the Secretariat's activities in strengthening relationships in the Bank. The possibility of an event similar to the AID day with Bank staff will be explored though it **was** acknowledged that all previous attempts at **such** events had been unsuccessful.

8. Role of **TAC** and the CG Secretariat in External Program and Management Reviews The Secretary noted that responsibilities for organizing and ~~managing~~ reviews are shifting to **TAC** while the CGIAR Secretariat is retaining responsibilities at the level of policy and panel selection. He noted the desirability of the **same** people being involved in all aspects of the review and sought input as to how best to divide labor so that reviews are strengthened. The Secretary noted that there were both positive and negative aspects to involvement by the two secretariats and the mixed roles they perform. He recognized the problem of undue influence and indicated the need to promote collegiality between Secretariat staff and the Centers and the inappropriateness of policing-style actions by Secretariat staff. He indicated that ~~immediate~~ steps would be taken

in line with the discussion and that he would consult with the Centers involved following the next reviews. The Group discussed the matter of logistical arrangements for reviews and it was **agreed** that **much** of this activity should shift to the Centers.

General Observations on the Overall Health of the System

The Secretary noted that the system is facing a time of decreasing resources which in turn is causing nervousness among the donors. The effect is to generate such **groups** as the Herdt **Working Group**. He indicated the need to cooperate with the donors and to endeavor to **steer** the process in meaningful directions.

The Secretary noted that the system is in a crunch, not a crisis, and that **it** is most important for the Center Directors to continue to develop strategies **and** to work towards solutions. The Directors thanked the Executive Secretary for his frank and understanding comments.

K. FAO/IARC Task Force

The Chairman of the Task Force reported that the Task Force had not formally been convened. Brader and **Lampe** have held conversations with FAO and **UNDP** and reported that UNDP is willing to fund cooperative activities between FAO **and** Centers up to an amount of US **\$250,000 per** project. Several centers have submitted proposals which are being reviewed. It was **agreed** that no **more** proposals should be submitted until decisions are **made** on those already submitted and until the FAO leadership issues are resolved.

L. Priorities and Strategies

The Chairman of the Standing committee on Priorities **and** Strategies reported on committee activities and distributed several documents: the **minutes** of the October 19, 1992 meeting of the committee, a cover **memo** and an annotated outline of a CGIAR strategy paper. (Attached as Annex 10).

The Chairman reported that the committee had deliberated on three issues: follow-up on the TAC Priorities and Strategies exercise, consideration of a strategies paper, and an addendum to the CDC Chairman's report to the CGIAR. Several issues remain unresolved following the TAC Priority Assessment exercise, particularly with regard to the methodologies **and** interpretations of the analysis, e.g. (i) the manner in which baseline values were adjusted and subsequently modified to arrive at priority **indicators**; (ii) the rationale for the choice of weights used; (iii) the extent of disaggregation which is feasible and desirable in setting system priorities, in particular, whether the **procedures** used to determine the priority to be accorded the various research **and** research-related activities across commodities, region and centers are adequate.

The committee also reported the development of an annotated outline of a strategy paper which had been put together from previous efforts, subsequent comments **and** the TAC expansion paper. It proposed the formation of committees to pursue efforts with regard to both priorities and strategies.

After discussion, the Directors **agreed:**

1. to take leadership on the development of a strategy for the **CGIAR**,
2. to form a joint CDC/CBC/TAC Committee to oversee **2 tasks:** the development of a short crisp strategy statement for the CGIAR **and** to **make input** on priority assessment, allocation and resource envelopes,
3. to leave it to the Joint Steering Committee to decide how to organize itself to complete these tasks,
4. to make the development of the short strategy statement the first priority, with a draft to be presented to the Mid-term meeting of the Group in **Puerto Rico** in **May, 1993** and a final product at ICW 1993. The priority assessment tasks will be lower priority.
5. to get clear at the outset the Committee's lines of reporting and its relationships with related **tasks** and **committees** in the **CGIAR**,
6. to assure that the Joint Committee will in fact be able to assert leadership and not only react to TAC's initiatives,
7. to not try to change current priorities, allocations and envelopes but to prepare for the future,
8. to appoint Gray and Ryan to the Joint Committee as the CDC representatives with Pinstrup-Andersen as the alternate,
9. to **seek** to have one of the CDC members serve as the chairman of the committee,
10. to provide **some** funding **and** to seek editorial and other support talent as needed,
11. to avoid CDC and CBC representatives from the same Center on the Committee.

These proposals were discussed and confirmed with the CBC,

7. Proposals for Restructuring ICW.

The CDC Chairman reported that the Working Group on Restructuring ICW had met to consider how to utilize the two annual meetings, ICW and the Mid-term Meeting, to ~~maximize~~ information sharing and decision making. Some recommendations have been made and will be implemented this year on information sharing. Little progress has been made on improving the process of decision making.

In response to the request for ideas to be relayed to the Working **Group** it was noted that:

- the experiment proposed for ICW 1992 creates a problem for small centers with

a global mandate,

- ICW should be reserved primarily for the Centers and not general system business or general development issues,
- there should be wide but balanced coverage and that the role of the Centers should be clear,
- the donors are reported to be tired of "show and tell" presentations **from the** Centers at ICW, and feel that something has to change. The Herdt Committee is trying to identify issues that the donors as investors in the **system are** concerned about,
- the arrangements for **1992** were confusing in that **some** centers are not involved at all and **some** centers are not involved in presentations in areas **for which they** have a mandate, etc.,
- some small donors feel they do not have the resources to participate in the parallel sessions **as** structured for **1992**.

It was **agreed** that Directors should make input to Bob Herdt and the chairman of the CG and that the matter would be put on the **agenda** for the Saturday wrap-up meeting.

8. IFAR

The Chairman recalled that at its last meeting the CDC had decided to warn IFAR that no further funds would be forthcoming and indicated that a letter had been sent to IFAR to that effect. He indicated IFAR had responded with a request to make a presentation to the group and would do so later. In discussion it was noted that apart from the merits of any proposal IFAR might submit, support of IFAR constituted a questionable and potentially embarrassing use of Centers' **core** funds.

After hearing IFAR's presentation the group indicated that no cogent reason was apparent for rescinding the earlier decision. The incoming chairman was mandated to write to IFAR indicating that **1992** was the last year of support and that no further support would be forthcoming. Concern was expressed that it had been understood earlier that the funding provided would **pay** for the publishing of the country profiles, a result that now seemed to be dependent on additional funding. It **was** decided that follow-up contact between IFAR and the CDC will determine the status of the country profiles.

9. UNCED Agenda 21.

The Chairman noted that the UNCED report was put on the agenda to ensure Center Directors are involved appropriately in follow-up. It was agreed that:

- the initiative was appreciated and the Executive Secretary and John Spears were to be commended,

- the cooperation between the Executive Secretary and PARC on this matter was a cause of optimism for the future,
- the tone of discussion during ICW would give some guidance as to what action Center Directors might take for the future,
- the matter would be deferred till the Wrap-up Meeting and that Dr. Zandstra should lead the discussion based on his responsibilities in regard to sustainability.

10. Medium-Term Plan Preparations

The Chairman indicated that it would be useful to get some sense of the issues and problems from Centers which had submitted MTPs, especially as the CDC had indicated to the TAC Chairman it wanted to discuss next steps in the process with him. The following comments were made:

- considerable difficulty has been experienced transforming plan ingredients into the financial tabular form required by TAC. In particular, TAC's instruction that figures on networking should reflect only the time of staff hired as network coordinators and not scientists participating directly in network activities was a particular problem. Differences in the application of instructions on such issues will make cross-center comparisons difficult;
- the use of different criteria for 1994-98 makes any comparison with 1992-93 impossible. An example of this is the new generic activity 3G in production systems and management which used to be part of natural resource management 1.1. The result is that it makes it appear that Centers are doing little in natural resource management and that there has been a dramatic reduction in that activity. One Center indicated that TAC had found a paragraph explaining the reason for the discontinuities between 1992-3 and 1994-8 acceptable;
- there does not seem to be any requirement to revise MTPs following review by TAC or after "the big bang" next year. This means, Centers who have yet to prepare their plans are in the position of being able to use the guidance TAC is providing this week, thus having an advantage over Centers who have prepared their plans this year;
- the preparatory visits of TAC scientists have proved helpful both in preparing the plan and in facilitating understanding at the level of TAC at the time of presentation. The visit can be especially helpful if it occurs well in advance even before a draft is prepared;
- TAC finds the scenarios very useful. They are especially helpful for clarifying the consequences of funding cuts. It may be wise to present only the essential plan in open session as the scenarios may bring reactions from donors one way or the other;
- TAC has indicated that it is not there to approve or disapprove but only to comment. It is appreciated by TAC if plans stay within the envelope and if the tables reflect what is actually happening at the Center. TAC is appreciative of

brevity. Key issues seem to be relations With NARS and inter —ter cooperation;

- TAC responded positively to distributing the minus 10 scenario as a brief confidential document.

The observation was made that it would be advantageous if the responsibility for the review of the non-technical aspects of the Medium-term plans were transferred to the CG Secretariat which already looks at the budgets. This may help resolve problems of lack of communication existing between TAC and the Secretariat on plan reviews.

11. Joint CDC/CBC Meeting.

The CDC Chairman welcomed the CBC and the CBC Chairman assumed the chair. The groups reviewed the agenda adopted by the CDC including:

1. Ecoregional research in the CGIAR,
2. A strategy for the CGIAR,
3. 1998 resource envelopes for the second Medium-term plans,
4. IARC/NARS relationships,
5. strategy to interact with World Bank President Preston,

and added the following items:

6. timing of the change in the CGIAR chairmanship relative to next year,
7. fund raising - how is it going and how can CBC help,
8. inter-center collaboration,
9. Bonte-Friedheim candidature for FAO director generalship.

New Center Board Chairs and Directors General were introduced.

1. Ecoregional research in the CGIAR. In the absence of Dr. Zandstra the CDC Chairman gave the background to the CDC/TAC Working Group on an Ecoregional Approach chaired by Ambassador Blake and its plans to hold a workshop at Davis, Ca. in February, 1993. At that time the Working Group will draw together input obtained by REM and will develop a paper on the methodological aspects and organizational implications of ecoregional research. This material will be presented to the donors at the ecoregional seminar associated with the Mid-year meeting in Puerto Rico in May, 1993.

It was noted that all Centers consider themselves involved in ecoregional research. There is a wide range of degrees of involvement in the natural resources management aspect - land, water and biodiversity. All Centers are involved in ecoregional research to the degree that it is an attempt to rationalize services to NARS. It was noted further:

- that the purpose of the assignment was to respond to donors who had urged TAC to follow through on the implementation of ecoregional research,

- there is agreement among DGs that a range of acceptable models can be developed - perhaps a minimum set will be developed. TAC seems to be in

a posture of listening to what the DGs have to say,

There was agreement that the process currently underway needs to be allowed to mature and develop and should not be brought to closure prematurely,

2. A Strategy for the CGIAR. The CBC Chairman explained the CBC's frustration at not having a document it could share with donors and that it now believed it very important that as a first step the CBC have a document that it could agree on internally.

Jim Ryan, Chairman of the Standing Committee, described CDC activities on a strategy for the CGIAR, and the joint CDC/CBC endorsed the substantive and procedural decisions made by the CDC to establish a CBC/CDC/TAC Joint Committee on priorities and strategies. TAC's participation was to be sought at the joint meeting with TAC the following day. The CBC will advise the Chairman of the CDC of its selections for the Committee.

The CBC expressed its willingness to participate in providing funding for the Joint Committee. It was agreed the Joint Committee will advise the CBC of its funding needs.

It was further agreed that the CBC will join the CDC in presenting the final product to the CCIAR, hopefully with the prior endorsement of the CGIAR Chairman. The lunch with the Chairman would be used to inform the Chairman of the proposal with a view to final approval during ICW. It was decided to seek the Chairman's advice on how to announce the initiative and, if it meets the Chairman's approval, to do so in the reports of the Chairmen of the CDC and the CBC.

3. 1998 Resource Envelopes. This topic was deferred because of time limitations.

4. IARC/NARS Relationships. This topic was also deferred.

5. Strategy to Interact with President Preston. The CDC Chairman reported the CDC discussion on the need to utilize carefully the opportunity of the dinner with the President to open the door to broader support for the CGIAR within the Bank. He noted that the CDC had proposed that Wally Falcon and Don Winkelmann prepare presentations in case the opportunity for speaking arose. The meeting endorsed the CDC proposal.

Relevant to Eastern Europe it was noted that the CGIAR Chairman has encouraged activity there and at least 7 Centers are currently involved. The CGIAR, however, has not made a policy decision on this matter and some aid agencies are reticent to have their funds spent there. This is a topic that requires further consideration soon.

It was agreed also that it was important to inform the President by whatever means become available of the keen interest of the CDC/CBC in the location of responsibility in the Bank for the CGIAR with someone at a high level and with authority, and in a manner and location that provided continuity.

6. Fund Raising. The Chairman of PARC reported that **PARC** had resulted from the merger of committees on public awareness and fund raising and had been joined by the Executive Secretary of the CG Secretariat so that it was now a joint CDC/CG secretariat activity. Its purpose was to expand the financial basis of core programs by focussing Secretariat and CD public awareness activities on a donor by donor basis. He indicated it had set in motion a series of studies with a view to developing incentives for expanding contributions to core programs among both existing and potential donors. These involved the *balancing fund*, overhead and the stabilization mechanism.

PARC's intention is to place its recommendations before the CDs and to be approved by the CGIAR to be effective in January, 1994 with the Medium-term plans. It was noted that the basic purpose of PARC is not public relations but to increase the level of accountability and transparency in the relationship between the Centers and the donors.

7. Collaboration Between the Centers. This topic was deferred to the next meeting.

8. Bonte-Friedheim Candidacy for FAO Director Generalship. The CBC Chairman noted that Bonte-Friedheim had been nominated by the German Government for the position and would bear all expenses related to the candidacy. It was noted that the ISNAR board had taken a neutral position and had issued rules relating to such candidacies.

In closing the meeting the two chairmen expressed thanks for the opportunity to meet and it was decided that the meetings would continue at future ICWs. The attendance of the incoming CBC Chairman at the CDC wrap-up meeting was raised and later assented to by the CDC.

12. Meeting with the CGIAR Chairman.

The Centers joined with the CBC and the Executive Secretary of the CG Secretariat in a lunch with the CGIAR Chairman followed by a discussion structured by the agenda previously agreed to. The discussion was wide ranging. No firm decisions were intended or made.

13. Special Topics.

A. Food Policy Research.

The Director General of IFPRI sought advice on how IFPRI might proceed with food policy research given that IFPRI's core interests and requests and opportunities for collaboration far surpassed available resources. He raised several possibilities:

- joint initiatives between IFPRI and the other centers such as the conference he proposed in a letter to the CGIAR Chairman in relation to ICW 1993 on the topic of agricultural productivity;

- networks of scientists from the Centers such as the meeting of social scientists held recently at ISNAR;
- data sharing;
- the posting of scientists at different centers.

Overall, the IFFPRI DG expressed concern about the level of expectations in relation to the level of resources given that he wants to work with as many enters as possible. It was **agreed** that the problem also applied to the subject matter oriented centers and to **some** degree to the commodity oriented centers. It **was** noted that in the follow-up to UNCED there would be a **good** entry point for IFFPRI if the Inter-center Working Group on Plant Genetic Resources **began** to consider policy issues. It was noted that there were issues here of interest to ISNAR also. ICRAF noted that IFFPRI would be a welcome **partner** in the slash and burn initiative if a way could be found for IFFPRI to participate without opening the door to other organizations whose participation was not as justifiable, A possible entry point **would** be attendance of an IFFPRI scientist at the next meeting of the steering committee of the slash and burn initiative in Indonesia in February, **1993**. Issues may also emerge from the workshop on the Eastern Highlands Initiative.

The issues were summarized as follows:

- IFFPRI will continue its bilateral relationships **and** these will be the heart of its activities,
- it will consider conducting conferences of **broad** interest,
- networks will be explored, e.g. on common property rights,
- it will take a look at how IFFPRI might work with other centers in the natural resources management area,
- UNCED Agenda **21** will be reviewed as a possibility for follow-up,
- there is strong support for the idea of a conference on world food needs 30-50 years hence but this **would** be better as a free-standing conference rather than connected with ICW **93**. It was noted that a major service could be done to help the system avoid the problems inherent in a dual objective program if the emphasis on natural resource management were permitted to cause **such** a division. Centers cannot argue that ecoregional activities are complementary. Research on productivity **and** natural resource management are often seen as competitive but, in fact, the contribution of productivity research on natural resources is often indirect in that it decreases the need to put marginal lands into production. In this sense there are no ecoregional centers but **only** ecoregional programs and activities.

B. Recognition of Past Services to the CGIAR.

The matter of recognition of the past services to the CGIAR was raised, Dr. Sanchez was requested to do **some** background work and to make recommendations

to the next meeting.

C. Working Group on Ecoregional Approaches.

Dr. Zandstra indicated that several sources, including the Chairman of CDC, TAC, Ambassador Blake and himself, had expressed concern about the progress being made by the Working Group. He proposed, therefore, that the Working Group may need to be convened more than once before May, 1993. In particular, he proposed a 1 or 2 day meeting around December 10 preparatory to the already scheduled February meeting. The group approved the proposal. Dr. Zandstra will approach The Netherlands Government to see if funds can be taken from their funding.

D. Uma Lele Letter.

It was decided that the letter was written to individual Centers and did not call for a CDC response. Individual centers may respond to the letter in terms of their interests. It was noted that the proposed conference conflicted with already planned meetings and, while technically desirable to many Centers, its hosting by a single university for the purposes named raised a number of questions.

14. Other Business.

A. CDC Representation at the Meeting of European Donors.

It was proposed that the Chairman write to the European donors suggesting that the CDC be represented at the European donors meeting two weeks before ICW. The group agreed.

B. Meeting with Former CGIAR System Employees (Information only).

ISNAR will be holding a meeting in The Netherlands of all former employees of the CGIAR and its Centers to keep them informed on the CGIAR system and ISNAR.

C. The Netherlands Liaison Office (Information only).

The Netherlands Government is establishing a linkage office between Wageningen and the CGIAR. It would be useful to demonstrate Centers can work with this office. The DG ISNAR noted that European countries giving more than .7% of GDP are under pressure from the costs of domestic initiatives to reduce these amounts.

D. SPAAR Meeting at ISNAR November 18-19, 1992.

An earlier decision giving the SSA Sub-committee responsibility for relations with SPAAR was reinforced and the SSA Chairman indicated that he would ensure representation of the CDC at the forthcoming SPAAR meeting.

E. Funding of CDC Activities.

It was proposed that the CDC establish a fund consisting of .1% of the next

year's core budget of each Center to fund special activities. It was noted that procedures already existed and a fund had been established. Any modification of the existing procedure would be left to the Chairman of the Benefits Committee who handles the CDC funds.

The following items relating to CDC activities were also noted:

- the preservation and accessing of the CDC corporate memory is important, especially for new-comers to the Group. It was noted that all Centers have copies of the minutes of CDC meetings and the ISNAR library has an index of all CDC minutes and decisions taken;

- understandings were developed formerly among Center Directors that any Center wishing to hold an inter-center conference would give notice to the CDC and get its approval. Under such conditions travel and per diem costs would be paid by the centers concerned and any other costs associated with the activity would be paid by the hosting Center. Centers were reminded that conforming to this process is a way of ensuring the payment of costs associated with inter-centers activities. While exceptions did occur it is important that they be handled carefully;

- it would be useful to recompile a list of CDC decisions, especially those with financial implications. This could possibly be done through a combination of a small working group and the existing compilation at ISNAR. No final decision was made on this matter.

F. Attendance of CBC Chairman at CDC Wrap-up Meeting.

The meeting considered the request of the CBC Chair to attend the Wrap-up Meeting. The following decisions were taken:

- the purpose of the Wrap-up meeting would be to assess ICW, to see what steps the CDC might take next and to develop marching orders for the future;

- the meeting would be closed with the following exceptions: the request of the CBC Chair to attend would be acceded to, and the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR Secretariat and the Chairman of TAC who would be advised of the meeting with the understanding they were welcome to attend;

- if it proved necessary to close a part of the meeting fully that would be done.

G. Public Awareness.

Dr. Winkelmann announced that at the Wrap-up Meeting he would be proposing a Centers-wide initiative on public awareness and the commitment of an amount of funds approximately equivalent to that being given to IFAR.

15. Election of Officers.

The Chairman confirmed that Dr. Fadda would succeed the current Chairman

and that Dr. Nores would succeed Dr. Fadda as Chairman in the 1993-94 year. The Executive Committee for 1992-93 will consist of Drs. Terry, Nores and Fadda.

In the discussions it was noted that in going forward there were no precedents that would affect movement to the next person in sequence.

ANNEXES

1. Program **and** Agenda
2. Report of the Public Awareness **and** Resources Committee
3. Report of the Benefits Committee
4. World Bank New Product Announcement
5. Report of the Sustainability and Environment Committee
6. Report of the Sub-Saharan Sub-committee
7. Report of the Sub-committee on Intellectual Property Rights and Plant Genetic Resources
8. Paper on Changing Responsibilities and Roles for Plant Genetic Resources within the **CGIAR** System
9. Report of the Deputy Director Generals' Meeting
10. Report of the Standing Committee on Priorities **and** Strategies.

Annex 1

Meeting of the Center Directors Washington, D.C.
October 22-23, 1992
World Bank Room F-1244

Program and Agenda

Thursday, October 22

I. Closed Session

- 0830 Chairman's Opening Remarks (Terry) - Logistics and secretarial arrangements
(Terry) - CDC Chairman's Report to the Group
- 0900 Adoption of CDC Minutes 17/18 and 19/20, June 1992
- 0915 Matters arising from the previous Minutes
- 0930 Brief report by CDC Chairman on TAC/CDC
Executive Committee June 1992, Rome (Terry)
- 0945-1030 Final decisions on Agenda Items for: (i) CDC/CBC meeting 10/23/92
(Terry); (ii) CDC/CBC/CG Chair meeting 10/23/92 (Terry); (iii)
CDC/TAC/CBC meeting 10/24/92 (Terry) --- --
- 1030-1100 Coffee Break
- 1100-1230 Reports from Sub-Committees
1. Public Awareness and Resources (Nores)
2. Benefits (Fadda)
3. Documentation and Information (Walsh)
- 1230-1400 Lunch
- 1400-1530 Reports from Sub-Committees (continued)
1a. Sustainability and Environment (Zandstra)
1b. Ecoregional Approach to International Agricultural Research
CDC/TAC Initiative (Zandstra)
2. **Sub-Saharan** Africa (Terry)
3a. IPR/PGR (Brader/Hawtin)
3b. Joint TAC/CD Committee on **PGR** (Brader/Hawtin)
- 1530-1600 Coffee Break

II. Open Session

1600-1700 Report of DDG's ~~meeting~~ (Matlon)

III. Closed Session

1700-1800 Closed session with CGIAR Executive Secretary

1800-1830 FAO/IARC ~~Task~~ Force Update (Brader)

Friday, October 23

IV. Closed Session - Report of Committees (continued)

0800-0830 Priorities and Strategies Sub-Committee (Ryan)

0830-0900 Proposals for Restructuring ICW (Terry)

0900-1030 IFAR - (closed)
UNCED - (Ryan)
MTP Preparations - current experience (Ryan)
IFAR (~~Open~~) with Brady and Sawyer

1030-1100 Coffee ~~Break~~

V. Open Session

1100-1300 CBC/CDC Joint meeting

1300-1400 CBC/CDC/CG Chairman Working Lunch

1400-1530 CBC/CDC/CG Chairman Structured Discussions

1530-1600 Coffee ~~Break~~

VI. Closed Session

1600-1700 1a. Special Topics (i) Food Policy Research (Pinstrup-Andersen)
1b. New Initiatives

1730-1800 Election of CDC Executive for November 1992 to November 1993

Note:

1. Topics for discussion with CG Chairman will include:

(1) The governance of the Consultative Group; (ii) The changing role of the CG Secretariat; (iii) The role of World Bank and Regional Development Banks in resource mobilization for the CGIAR; and (iv) Other Business.
2. Topics for the Closed Session with CG Executive Secretary will include:

(i) CG Secretariat role in Public Awareness and Resources Committee (PARC); (ii) The changing role of the CG Secretariat; (iii) Preparation of MMTP 1994-1998 financial tables; and (iv) UNCED Agenda 21.
3. Please note that it has been confirmed there **will be a wrap-up CDC** meeting on Saturday, October 31 to discuss output from ICW92.

EMail 143 - 22

To: Center Directors
A. von der Osten
cc: R. Tadvalkar
From: G.A. Nores, Chairman of PARC
Date: September 25, 1992
Subject: Minutes of PARC Meeting

In order to keep you informed on PARC's deliberations and on actions being initiated, and to obtain prompt feedback from you as members of the various Donor Liaison Groups -DLGs (which are responsible for developing donor profiles and suggesting specific actions to enhance our collective accountability to the respective donor agencies and increase their constituency support to fund the CORE programs of the centers), the Committee recommended to share with all Center Directors the minutes of our last meeting.

Given the sensitive nature of some of the notes recorded, the PARC encourages you to regard these minutes as RESTRICTED PARC INTERNAL DOCUMENT, NOT TO BE COPIED. We encourage you, however, to make those comments and suggestions that you consider appropriate, particularly to improve PARC's information base, and to provide feedback on donor specific subjects and events as you became aware through your visits to the various donor agencies.

Looking forward to receiving your comments before our next CDC meeting to be able to consider them at next PARC meeting. Please notice that our next meeting is to be held at IFPRI on Wednesday, 25 of October, from 15:45 to 17:45 hrs.

Sincerely,

Gustavo Nores

NOTE: Annexes 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1 and 3.3 will be shared with you at our CDC meeting.

RESTRICTED PARC INTERNAL DOCUMENT
NOT TO BE COPIED

MINUTES OF MEETING OF PARC of 6&7/9/92

Present: Nores (GAN), Winkelmann (DW), Hawtin (JH), von der Osten (AvdO), and Tadvalkar (RV).

1. Interpretation of TOR of PARC

The PARC discussed its TORs as approved by the CDC and suggested brief additions for clarity purposes. These are in highlighted in "bold" in Annex 1. In relation to the Donor Liaison Groups -DLGs, there was consensus that:

- The DLGs should continue, they should build on the strengths of their members,
The Chair of PARC should request the Chairs of DLGs to report on initiatives taken and on their plans of action with respect to each existing or potential donor,
- In the short-term DLGs should focus on identifying donors priorities and their match with the CGIAR core agenda (i.e.: CGIAR Priorities and Strategies and MTPs of CGIAR centers).

1.b AGENDA (Attachment 1)

It was suggested to add to the Agenda the need to develop a brief document explaining why donors should invest in Core rather in Complementary activities, by explaining the benefits derived from funding core (e.g.: continuity for long-term research, ability to attract good scientists, risk of distorting CGIAR priorities through complementary funding, etc). The topic was added as Agenda item 6.1.

As per the suggestions made by the Execom of the PAA, it was added to the Agenda: (6.2) Donors Profile and (6.3) Quarterly newsletter.

2. Internal incentives for Core Funding

CGIAR Secretariat (Tadvalkar) tabled working notes in Annex 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3.

2.1 Balancing Fund (Annex 2.1)

The CGIAR Secretariat reported that the WB Special Grant Committee made the decision to continue with 15% WB contribution to the CGIAR as donor of last resort. The new Budget Director (Vice-president for Finance, Steven Eckles) chairs the SGC and supports this decision. The PARC concluded that, at this stage does, not seem needed or urgent to encourage other donors to join the Balancing Fund as 15% is regarded sufficient for the purpose. In fact, to the extent that other important donors allocate their

contributions to the core budget of the centers approximately as per the TAC recommended levels of core budget, they are behaving similarly to the donor of last resort. There is no indication that any of these major donors will change drastically this practice in the immediate future.

The current policy (as described in Annex 2.1) is applied in two stages with estimates being made at the beginning and toward the end of the year. The CGIAR Sect is publishing information on pledged and disbursed core contributions regularly so as to provide for transparency (ex-post).

The current policy implies that contributions are reduced to a 15% level (over three years) after a three-years contributions from the Balancing Fund in excess of 20%. DW raised the question why target to 15% maximum and not to continue with 25%? First, allowing 25% in perpetuity does not represent an incentive for the respective centers to expand their core support. Second, from the donor perspective centers close to the ceiling (e.g. above 20%) for long periods, gives room for the perception that such centers do not attract other donors for specific reasons and, as a result, donors may lose confidence on them. In such cases it might be opportune for TAC to either review or confirm priorities as well as resource allocation for the respective center and, if necessary, for all centers. The reverse should also hold for centers that are consistently receiving grants from the donor of last resort fund below, say 5% of their core budget. Consistent under- and over-pledging may indeed signal that TAC recommended levels of resources may not be in accordance with donors' perceptions on priorities, or with their policies. Being independent from donors and centers and well informed about the nature of the Core and Complementary activities of the Centers, the TAC is in the best position to express opinion on the subject, and ratify or rectify its initial recommendation on resource allocation. AvdO advises not to make the solution more complicated than the problem we are trying to solve. The PARC must be sure that the implementation of policies and practices being recommended are both feasible and indeed help achieve the goal set for.

Should the automatic (self-regulating, broad and negotiated) mechanism as currently applied by the CGIAR Sec be implemented at the same time so as to induce the TAC intervention? The PARC recommends that the CDC endorses the principle that the decreases or increases in the allocations of WB grants from the balancing fund take place automatically, unless TAC has ratified or rectified the recommended levels for resources allocation. The opinion of the majority of the PARC was that the percentages to be requested from the WB by the centers be made explicit as follows:

(A) When a Center has received more than 20% of its executed core budget for three consecutive years, indicative figures for Center's requests of WB grants should be scaled down over a period of three years as follows: to 21% in year 4, 18% in year 5, and 15 % in year 6.

(B) Centers be entitled to request up to 5% of their approved core budget and up to the ceiling of the level recommended by TAC (upper bound of TAC recommended envelope); independently of whether their level of underfunding is below 5%.

2.2 Overhead Charges (Annex 2.2)

CGIAR Sec proposed a Working Group made out of project and finance officers from the centers (e.g. CIAT, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IIMI and/or IITA), two staff from donors (e.g. EEC, GTZ or SDC and USAID) and CG Sec staff to conduct the base study on overhead charges.

It was agreed that the study should include:

- Centers current practices for various types of SPS including estimates of total overhead inclusive of direct and indirect cost-recovery (e.g. headquarters and non-hdqts based projects, small projects, funds "in-trust", etc.)
- Donors current practices
- Practices followed by other International institutions: FAO, Winrock Int., US Universities and European institutions, ...- Recommendations on overhead levels for restricted core and complementary projects that will represent incentives to fund core.

It is expected that the WG will make the report available to the PARC by early March 1993. RT to contact centers and donors on the basis of the PARC recommendation.

2.3 Stabilization Mechanism (Annex 2.3)

There are two options for protecting centers for a period of, say two years, against unexpected host country revaluation, namely: (a) Insurance/stabilization mechanism, or (b) Soft, long-term borrowing facility (e.g.: 2 years of grace plus 3 years for repayment). Option (b) should be explored but the possibility of obtaining such a facility from the WB appears to be rather low at present.

It was concluded that option (a) should be explored fully. There are four potential sources of income to build up the stabilization Fund to a pre-defined target level, namely:

(1) contributions from the centers as percentage of their core budget, e.g. nominally 1%,

(2) surplus from the Balancing Mechanism - donor of last resort, including surplus arising from possible future devaluations of the US dollar,

(3) windfall gains originating in devaluations of host-country currencies, and

(4) one-time contribution from donors (e.g. WB, and donors whose currency revalue significantly -via increases in their contributions to the core budget of the centers that would generate an equivalent surplus in the Balancing Fund (2).

The PARC concluded that a study should be commissioned ASAP by the CGIAR Sec to identify:

- (a) the target size for the Stabilization Mechanism, and
- (b) alternatives to accelerate the build-up of the Fund so it becomes operational as early as possible.

For example, the study could be based on historical data but would entail a simulation exercise based on possible future scenarios in terms of dollar parity vis-a-vis the ECU, and hypothetical scenarios of host country devaluations/revaluations and estimates of basket of expenditures by centers including 2 or, at most, 3 currencies.

The study could assume that the Stabilization Mechanism aims at protecting centers at 75% level from adverse host country inflation for up to two consecutive years (until TAC/CGIAR reviews system-wide resource allocation). Centers would be expected to contribute 75% of the benefits derived from host country devaluations (above local inflation minus CG recognized dollar inflation). Claims and contributions from/to the stabilization fund should be done on the basis of published official indicators of inflation and exchange rates (in a transparent and mutually accountable way, including audited basket of expenditures in the 2 or 3 selected currencies). Excess WB contributions to a center in a particular year would be discounted the following year from the first tranche contribution of the WB.

3. Major Initiatives

3.1 Bellagio Meeting and Blue Ribbon Panel (Annex 3.1)

The PARC agree that the concept should be supported but defined with the assistance of professionals that would be able to tap ideas for the process and what it takes. This requires a full time person to learn about the processes that would be most appropriate to obtain the desirable output and to identify the shortest possible route to achieve it. The Memo by Ernest Corea (Annex 3.1) represents a start. The PARC encourages the CG

secretariat to make available a significant portion of the time of E. Corea for further exploration of the concept with selected people that have been involved in successful major initiatives in the context of G-7 or DAC submits, or UN related successful initiatives.

There was consensus that the initiative should be eventually be carried out by a Blue Ribbon Panel -BRP, chaired by a recognized international figure (e.g. WB President Mr. Preston, Jimmy Carter, Maurice Strong, Brudtlandt, Koe, Cousteau, S.S. Ramphal) and other outstanding figures that could constitute a WG or task force, some of which could be members of the BRP (e.g. Chairman Rajagopalan, Frank Karel, Bob Blake, Robert Craig, Roberto Savio, M.S. Swaminathan, ...). AvdO to brief and obtain feedback from Chairman Rajagopalan, and to brief E. Corea.

3.2 Endowment Fund: Genes for the Future

The PARC endorsed the ideas as proposed in Annex 3.2. There was consensus that the "Perma-frost" idea, because of its appeal and value as an image creation tool for the donors contributing to the Fund, it should not be sold cheaply. Perma-frost should be regarded as the ice on the cake, but the Fund should be able to fund the larger task. The CGIAR should aim at deriving not less than US\$ 10 million for funding on-going CGIAR core activities (e.g. Center's gene banks and IPGRI). But the CGIAR could sell the concept of the Fund as an instrument to catalyze the best and more cost-effective system for conserving and making available genetic resources to humanity for hundreds of years. It was agreed that IBPGR will prepare a first draft of the Technical study on the so called "pyramid of projects" that could be potential candidates for funding through the EFund. The objective of the study is to be able to define the Concepts and the Purpose of the Endowment Fund, on the basis of the CGIAR interest and dominant concerns for biodiversity, so as to be able to define **the priorities** and identify target levels of the required endowment. The first draft paper prepared by the IBPGR will be tabled to the Inter-Center WG on Plant Genetic Resources at its January 1992 meeting, to obtain feedback on ranked priorities and estimates of the associated costs.

3.3 Wild Cards

DW reported that the PAA made a study on how much other organizations were spending on PA efforts. The CGIAR is investing far much less than other organizations. The idea of raising funds through a massive public campaign, similar to that of the UNICEF or WWF attempting to tap the contributions of individuals worldwide, should be discuss at the forthcoming course at CIMMYT on fund raising.

The idea of a CGIAR Foundation should also be explored at the forthcoming meeting (see note on the Bourlaug Fund -Annex 3.3. The idea is that many institutions might be co-opted to make one-time contributions to a CGIAR Foundation (e.g. Sasakawa Foundation, Siemens Foundation, Sony, Itachi, Bosh, IBM, Rank Hobbies McDougals and, in general, large multinational corporations in the consumer goods field).

3.4 Tribe book: the idea is to write a new book along the lines of the "Doing well by doing good" from a broad international perspective. Tribe is working on a draft outlined addressing why is in the self-interest of donor countries to fund the CGIAR. The point was made that the emphasis should be placed on the collective North-South common interest, one sustainable world approach, so the arguments made do not become controversial from the perspective of the South, NGOs, Biodiversity Convention spirit, etc... It must capitalize on the common agenda, the close links between population, equity and environmental problems, the building of a better world, and possibilities of exploiting win-win opportunities. CGIAR Secretariat to interface with Tribe on the outline and table a draft proposal at next PARC meeting.

4. Priority Donors and Plans of Actions

The criteria used for prioritizing donors were: (a) potential short-term risk, (b) growth potential, and (c) whether there was a senior official within the donor agency speaking for the CGIAR.

EEC: There is a perception that there is some risk after the departure of Gruner next year. The potential for tapping Lomme funds is large but bureaucracy is also rather complicated. CIRAD and ORSTOM have resident staff at Bruxelles to liaise and facilitate the process of project approval.

Information gathering effort: (1) JP-J to contact Lafourcade, former head of WB Office in Paris, on ideas for approaching DG-1 at EEC. (2) The CG Sec will hire a consultant for a 2-week, fact finding mission on the EEC (e.g. Ziebeck). The idea is that the consultant will develop a comprehensive donor profile including sense of emerging priorities and opportunities. Ziebeck should visit with C B-F before visiting Bruxelles.

E. Terry considers that the idea of EEC funding WARDA through Lome funds is not a bad idea, but extremely complicated if not impossible to get the 15 countries to agree. He is working on 4-5 country project proposal. There seem to be an opportunity for Centers working in Africa to submit Core projects to EEC via the Lome window, and jointly catalyze the support of the Ministers in Africa by sub-region.

Regional Banks

IDB: GAN briefed the PARC on the status and outlook regarding the IDB future contributions to the CGIAR Centers. The trend is to reduce contributions to the unrestricted core to the 3 Centers in LAC, and to fund projects to centers outside the region. The PARC agreed that it is particularly important that the all centers present special projects to fund core activities, not complementary activities. To the extent that this is achieved the damage to the entire System (i.e. all centers) will be minimized. The three centers based in LAC are submitting only projects to fund on-going core activities.

There is a risk that the approval process takes more time than anticipated, and bit of procrastination, will lead to the Board considering the 1992 contribution during early 1993. AvdO to follow on USAID support. GAN to follow up with Zandstra and Iain MacGuillivray on CIDA support. DW and GAN to follow up with Rea and Vice President Conrow on adopting a fast track for approval of 1992 contributions so as to be able to sign the contract and hold a press conference during ICW92.

AfDB: AvdO, ET and Chairman Rajagopalan had a very good visit to the Bank. They visited with the Vice President of the Bank and a large group of the relevant staff. The bad news is that the Bank net profit (where their contribution to the CGIAR centers used to come) has dropped close to zero. The good news is that the Vice President that received Raj and AvdO pledged support from other sources. There is still a large risk, and AfDB needs close follow up. Chairman Rajagopalan will visit with the President of the Bank in during the Bank-Fund annual meetings in September. There is an urgent need to assemble a campaign (including impact materials) for the AfDB. ET might have specific suggestions. The strategy adopted with IDB may serve to illustrate possibilities.

AsDB: There was consensus that the AsDB has potential for significant increase in funding core activities of the Centers in the region and, therefore, a strategy should be developed to generate support at the Board and management levels. The IDB strategy may serve to illustrate possibilities. It seems advisable that a sub-group of CDs be constituted ASAP to assemble and lead such a strategy (e.g. KL, RL, McKay, and later the DG of CIFOR). KL might have specific suggestions. The strategy should be conceived as a System effort. The President of AsDB might attend the Inauguration of IIMI facilities in Sri Lanka.

CIDA: There was a clear perception that, while there is no indication that the unrestricted contribution of CIDA to the CGIAR centers is at risk, the importance of this key donor (US\$ 15.6 M) and the turnover in the CGIAR contacts at CIDA calls for the assembly of a strategy to help consolidate the support of this important donor. JH, as Chairman of the respective DLG, will

coordinate a consultation meeting (i.e. BOT Chairmen, members and CDs) on how to go about consolidating the support of CIDA. I. MacGuillivray to be contacted by JH ASAP, to consult with him on outlook for funding, perceptions on priorities, and how to help consolidate the CIDA support.

IDRC: The perception of IDRC President is that there is no food problem and that the CGIAR is taken care off. There is urgency to have the Canadian friends of the CGIAR approach the President (K. Bezansson) to help correct such a perception as it could eventually translate into nominal or real damage to CIDA and IDRC contribution to the CGIAR. If Ann Whyte attends ICW a luncheon meeting could be organized with the Canadian friends of the CGIAR. JH to contact AW, and depending on her answer, organize the invitation with AvdO and the meeting with the Canadians BOT members present.

Germany: AvdO discuss with friend in GTZ on how to mobilize an increase in the contribution. The priorities are for Eastern Europe, immigrants issues and for solving economic issues within Germany. Hulse, chairman of the Budget Committee, invited DW to visit him and his colleagues. DW will coordinate with AvdO on possibility of joint visit. KL and CB-F might have specific suggestions on how to approach authorities in the Ministry of the Environment.

SDC: The joining of Switzerland the UN System and the WB capital subscription implies that the contribution to the CGIAR needs to come from previous allocated funds for 1993 and possibly in 1994. The PARC concluded that there is an urgent need to let Paul Egger know that we all stand ready to help him consolidate the support to the System at this time of legitimate but competing demands for funds.

Japan: J Ryan is updating the profile on Japan. KL and other might have specific suggestions. There is a potential for a significant increase in the Japanese contribution to de System. Chairman Rajagopalan and AvdO to visit in December or January and visit with the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Agriculture. Mr. Kanai, who is replacing Mr. Fujita as Director of the Ag. Res. Council, will visit the CG Secretariat next week. Several CDs have or will be visiting Japan during the next few months. Given the importance of this donor, it is of particular importance that the CDs, after visiting Japan, share summary reports with the rest of the CDs, or at least with the Chairman of PARC, the Chairman of the DLG (J Ryan who is preparing the donor profile) and AvdO (who is preparing the visit of Rajagopalan to Japan). The PARC considers of particular relevance that CDs adhere to the principle of proposing only Unrestricted Contributions, i.e. not special projects.

5. Possible New Donors

Indonesia has indicated its intentions to join the CGIAR in the near future. Prospects are good in the case of Japan also, The System should be alert at the possibility of Russia joining the System. A brief profile of major US, European and Japanese Foundations compiled by HvL was circulated to PARC members. The subject of how to approach selected Foundations will be discussed at next PARC meeting.

6. Links with PAA and Excom

Frank Karel (RF) is the new Chairman of the PAA and of the Excom. DW (as co-chair of PARC) and JH will continue serving as liaison between the PAA Excom and PARC.

DW proposed that the CDC consider the possibility of investing in PA activities under the control of the PAA Excom a sum equivalent to the contributions made by the CGIAR Centers to IFAR. The PARC endorses the proposal made by the PAA Excom, DW to request Chairman ET to include the subject on the CDC meeting agenda.

6.1 Document on Why Core: The PARC endorses the idea that a brief document be developed on the justifications for assigning priority to expanding the core base of the system from the perspective of both share-holders (investors) and stake holders (centers and NARS). The CGIAR Sec to commission such a document, possibly to the CGIAR Sec Scientific Advisers.

6.2 Quarterly Newsletter: The suggestion made by the PAA Excom of the CGIAR Sec issuing a regular newsletter on Fund Raising activities was discussed. The PARC is of the view that a Fund Raising public newsletter is probably not advisable because of confidentiality reasons. However, the PARC see the usefulness of a brief newsletter issued by the CG Secretariat including information on forthcoming events and the opportunities for PA support to fund raising activities. It decided that the Minutes of the PARC be circulated to Center Directors as a confidential, internal report to share information and obtain prompt feedback from the DLGs and individual CDs.

6.3 Donor Profiles

An example donor profile prepared by H. von Loesch and Marianne Fuchs-Carsch was tabled. The subject will be discussed at the next meeting of the PARC on the basis of these and other profiles prepared by the CGIAR Sec and the one on USAID prepared by DW. HvL is looking at the possibility of using a software for systematizing donor profiles or developing one.

List of potential resource persons: it was agreed that a list of potential resource persons from the Centers and their BOT for:
(a) contacting specific donor or their constituencies, and for
(b) PA activities, should be prepared on the basis of suggestions from Center Directors, CGIAR Sec, and the PAA Excom. Suggestions should be sent to the Chairman of PARC.

The meeting was adjourned at 1805 hrs, Labor Day.

AGENDA PARC MEETING
September 6-7, 1992

The tentative Agenda for our meeting as discussed with the CGIAR Secretariat includes:

1. Interpretation of TOR of PARC
2. Internal Incentives for Core Funding:
 - 2.1 Balancing Fund (CG Secretariat to table current policy and draft explicit proposal)
 - 2.2 Overhead Policies (CG Secretariat to propose process for completion of studies on current practices and for analysis of alternatives)
 - 2.3 Stabilization Mechanism (CG Secretariat to propose alternatives for building the Fund and timetable for studies and recommendations)
3. MAJOR INITIATIVES
 - 3.1 Major initiative for tapping new environmental funds (CG Secretariat to propose format for Bellaggio Benchmark Meeting and Blue Ribbon Panel to secure support of G7 and 18 DAC)
 - 3.2 Endowment Fund (Hawtin/Nores to propose process for developing proposal for Genetic Resources Endowment Fund)
 - 3.3 Wild Cards (WWF, ,UNICEF style, CGIAR Foundation - CG Secretariat to elaborate).
4. Priority Donors and Plan of Action (including PA)
 - EEC (CG Sec.)
 - Regional Banks (IDB: Nores, AFDB and AsDB CG Secretariat)
 - CIDA & IDRC (Hawtin, CG Secretariat)
 - Germany (CG Secretariat)
 - Switzerland, Austria (CG Secretariat)
 - Nordic Countries (PPAndersen)
 - Japan (CG Secretariat)
5. Possible New Donors (CG Sect.)
6. Links with PAA and its Excom - Plan of Action.
 - 6.1 Document on why Core
 - 6.2 Donor's profile formats
 - 6.3 Quarterly Newsletter.

1. PURPOSE

To help INCREASE DONOR CONFIDENCE AND expand the financial resource base of the CGIAR funding the core programs of the centers through coordinated constituency building action plans on a donor by donor basis THAT DEMONSTRATE ACCOUNTABILITY AND BUILD ON THE MATCH BETWEEN DONOR'S PRIORITIES AND THE CGIAR CORE AGENDA.

2. COMPOSITION

The PARC would be integrated by four (4) Center Directors and the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR (AvdO). Center Directors would serve for a minimum of two (2) years and their terms staggered so as to provide continuity.

3. FUNCTIONS

- a. To assemble a long-term master plan for expanding the CORE resource base of the CGIAR system and, after consultation with other CGIAR actors (e.g., CDC, CGIAR Chairman, donors group), to define concrete priority actions.
- b. With inputs from the DLGs, to identify individual donor priorities, their match with CGIAR strategy and agenda, short and medium term funding possibilities, (this includes identification of who makes decisions, donors modes of operations, who are the most influential constituency group, donor's and constituents priorities, concerns and perceptions about the CGIAR and its agenda, and perceptions on possibilities of expanding funds) and to propose and develop (in close consultation with the respective Donor Liaison Group) constituency building action plans for individual (actual and potential) donors, including tailored PA strategies and VIP or Blue Ribbon missions.
- c. LIAISE WITH THE PAA AND ITS EXCOM ON ALL ISSUES THAT PERTAIN PA ABOUT THE CGIAR SYSTEM AND to develop guidelines for updated donor information base accessible to Center Directors of all Centers, and to inform Center Directors on identified opportunities for funding core activities.

4. SECRETARIAT

The PARC will be supported by staff in the CGIAR Secretariat AND BY STAFF FROM THE CENTERS ON SPECIFIC TASKS.

5. MEETINGS

The PARC will need to meet 3 times a year for 2-3 days to study proposals by members, DLG, and staff on 3 above, and define actions.

NOTE: Additions suggested by PARC (6/9/92) in Capital letters.

Center Directors PAARC meeting - September 6-7, 1992Topic: IncentivesWorld Bank funding policyBackground

World Bank funding is provided as a balancing donor to meet the approved core funding requirements of individual centers after all other donors have indicated their intentions. The balancing amount is limited to **25%** of the core funding of the centers. This policy provides stability to the system by ensuring the funding of the collectively approved **CGIAR core programs**. On the other hand, since individual donors indicate their preferences by varying the financial contributions to individual centers, the balancing policy masks the funding preferences when they differ from the collective program approvals from the same donors. Finally, by definition a balancing policy reduces the incentive for individual centers in attracting more core funding for their programs. Centers accept this loss of incentive as quid pro quo for receiving guaranteed funding for core programs.

Application of the policy

Based on an overall estimate of core funding CGIAR secretariat mechanically calculates individual centers' needs for balancing funding. At the end of the year, amounts provided are published in the CGIAR financial report. (annex table 1)

In order to ensure that donor long term funding preferences are not masked, the CG secretariat, in implementing the balancing policy, monitors the balancing requirements of centers over a period of time. While differences between funding and program approvals on a year to year basis are quite normal, a significant gap over a period of time probably indicates a problem.

In general, if a center continues to receive balancing funding within the range of **20-25%** over a three year period, the secretariat advises the center to reduce its call for balancing funding.

The reduction is accomplished over a period of three years or so to reach a balancing level of 15% representing the average World Bank contribution commitment to the CGIAR system. Examples of centers where this policy has been applied are : ICARDA, IFPRI, ISNAR and ILCA. The policy is likely to be applied to WARDA and ILRAD in 1993.

Possible modification

The balancing policy works reasonably well in terms of providing stability and reducing distortions (by limiting the period to three years). However, centers whose programs and funding are matched therefore do not receive balancing funding. From one perspective therefore they are worse off because they have successful in receiving funds from donors other than the World Bank. On the other hand the Bank's intent in serving as a balancing donor is to serve as a donor of stability thereby contributing to all the centers. The question is whether it may be useful to establish a "floor" for the contribution in symmetry with the existing "ceiling" of 25%. A possible floor could be 10%. Attached table 2 shows the implications if this policy had been in effect in 1992.

World Bank Balancing Grants (1984-1992)

	World Bank Contribution (in US\$ millions)									World Bank Funding as Percentage/m of Center's Approved Funding								
	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992 (est.)	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
CIAT	1.33	1.30	0.75	1.00	0.43	3.00	3.22	4.82	5.34	6%	6%	3%	4%	2%	11%	11%	17%	20%
CIMMYT	1.54	2.00	1.69	2.20	2.00	2.40	3.33	3.95	4.40	8%	10%	7%	9%	8%	9%	12%	15%	17%
CIP	0.04	0.40	0.10	0.25	3.00	1.71	2.40	1.85	1.00	0%	3%	1%	2%	17%	9%	14%	11%	7%
IBPGR	0.44	0.25				0.45	0.30		0.63	12%	4%	0%	0%	0%	6%	4%	0%	7%
ICARDA	4.87	4.75	4.50	4.80	4.80	4.25	4.30	4.00	3.70	23%	24%	23%	26%	28%	23%	22%	20%	20%
ICRISAT	1.38	0.70	0.50	2.08	2.11	1.85	3.58	2.79	3.44	5%	4%	2%	8%	8%	6%	12%	10%	12%
IFPRI	0.82	1.22	1.28	1.35	1.68	1.33	1.78	1.46	0.75	20%	26%	25%	23%	19%	15%	20%	17%	9%
IITA	4.90	5.00	4.50	4.20	5.40	4.35	4.07	3.39	3.87	23%	24%	20%	21%	26%	20%	17%	15%	11%
ILCA	2.68	3.26	3.20	2.00	2.50	4.07	4.30	4.71	4.00	21%	23%	21%	14%	15%	20%	21%	23%	20%
ILRAD	1.57	1.20	1.40	1.25	1.80	2.42	2.80	2.52	3.24	17%	13%	13%	11%	14%	18%	21%	19%	25%
IRRI	0.90	2.00	1.50	2.10	1.95	1.95	3.40	2.89	1.85	4%	9%	6%	8%	7%	7%	11%	10%	6%
ISNAR	0.92	0.96	0.80	1.06	1.55	1.77	1.75	1.00	1.00	27%	23%	21%	19%	23%	24%	26%	14%	15%
WARDA	0.71	0.75	0.73	1.00	1.00	1.29	1.60	1.56	1.50	24%	24%	25%	24%	19%	21%	25%	24%	24%
Total	22.10	23.19	20.95	23.29	28.22	30.84	36.83	34.94	34.72	13%	13%	11%	12%	13%	13%	15%	15%	15%
Stab Fund 1/	2.20	4.31	7.45	6.71	1.78	2.50	-2.50	0.17	0.39									
TOTAL	24.30	28.10	28.40	30.00	30.00	33.34	34.33	35.11	35.11									

1/ Allocation of the World Bank contribution to the Stabilization Fund.

2/ An advance from the Stabilization Fund of \$2.5 m was made in 1990 to enable centers meet their operating levels.

World Bank Grants to the CGIAR Centers

Center	Current Policy				Revised Policy				Simulation Changes	
	Amount		Share of App. Grants		Simulation (min. 10%)					
	Actual	Estimate	Actual	Estimate	Amount	Share of App. Grants				
	1981	1991	1991	1992	1991	1992	1991	1992		
CIAT	4.82	8.34	17%	20%	4.70	5.10	17%	19%	0.12	0.24
CIMMYT	3.05	4.40	15%	11%	3.83	4.17	14%	16%	0.11	0.23
CIP	1.85	1.00	11%	7%	1.78	1.52	11%	10%	0.07	-0.52
IBPGR	0.00	0.63	0%	1%	0.74	0.80	10%	10%	-0.74	-0.27
ICARDA	4.00	3.70	20%	20%	3.82	3.53	20%	19%	0.08	0.17
ICRISAT	2.70	3.44	10%	12%	2.83	3.10	10%	12%	-0.04	0.25
IFPRI	1.40	0.75	17%	0%	1.43	0.83	16%	10%	0.04	-0.08
IITA	3.30	3.87	15%	17%	3.28	3.87	14%	17%	0.10	0.20
ILCA	4.71	4.00	23%	20%	4.63	3.82	23%	19%	0.08	0.18
ILRAD	2.52	3.24	19%	26%	2.47	3.12	18%	24%	0.06	0.12
IRRI	2.89	1.85	10%	6%	2.08	2.88	10%	10%	-0.00	-1.03
ISNAR	1.00	1.00	14%	15%	0.07	0.04	13%	14%	0.03	0.06
WARDA	1.50	1.50	24%	24%	1.53	1.44	24%	23%	0.03	0.06
total	34.84	34.72			35.11	35.11			-0.17	-0.39
Slab Fund	0.17	0.39								
WB Grant	35.11	35.11								

Center Directors PAARC meeting - September 6-7, 1992

Topic: Incentive

Overhead charges on project funding for center activities

Background:

Important role of project funding in overall center funding - 27% total donor funding provided in this form for the CGIAR as a whole.

Donor perspective - ability to finance specific activities, identification of donor with activity, legal requisite for funding CGIAR centers.

Center perspective - undertake programs of bilateral interest not otherwise possible from unrestricted funds. Mobilizing resources not available in unrestricted mode.

CGIAR perspective - useful financing window for undertaking worthwhile activities consistent with CGIAR mission, no concerns as long as projects cover full costs of activities without hidden subsidies for overhead costs. 1986 CGIAR agreement for charging overheads as mechanism for full cost recovery.

Current issue: In context of limited core funding centers have legitimate incentives for attracting project funding for complementary programs. However, overhead charges not consistently applied by all centers. Individual donors not always willing to pay overhead costs. Consequently, core funders subsidize project donors for complementary programs.

Proposal: To review current practices of centers regarding overhead - calculation, methodology and practice.. Identify problem areas i.e. centers and donors. Suggest practice for adoption by centers and CGIAR.

Modality: Working group of [three] centers with most experience with overheads, one or two donor representatives with financial background and CGIAR secretariat.

Time frame: Review to be completed for implementation no later than 1994.

Center Directors PAARC meeting - September 6-7, 1992

Topic: Incentives

Stabilization mechanism

Background

The stabilization mechanism **was** created in 1983 to protect center funding from loss **in** purchasing power due **to** adverse inflationary or exchange **rates**. The concept was that centers benefitting **from** favourable **trends** would pay into the fund and the losers would be **compensated** **by** the fund. Over **a period of** time the **gains** would offset the losses.

Starting from an initial contribution of about \$1 million in 1983, the balance in **the fund** rose of about \$19 million by 1987 mainly due to the steady weakening **of US** dollar. **Not** unexpectedly **as** the **dollar** strengthened during the following **three years** the entire balance **was paid** out resulting in suspension **of the** mechanism last **year**. The mechanism **was** successful **in** serving **as a** buffer against **OECD** currency variations. **It was** less successful in buffering **centers** against host country inflation simply because the fund did not always receive gains from host country devaluation although **it was** forced to pay out the losses.

Future of the mechanism

The question **arises** whether such a mechanism should be reactivated and **if** yes how it should be financed. **On a** purely technical basis the need for such **a** mechanism has clearly not diminished.

As far as the financing issue is concerned some broad parameters first **on** the size of the **fund**. (a) **OECD** currency **risk** The level of \$15-20 **million** identified in the study conducted in 1986 for **OECD** exchange **rate risks** may be on the low side. About 50% of **the** core funding portfolio is non-dollar; an adverse 10% annual change in exchange rates will exhaust the fund in less than two years. (b) Host country inflation: It is difficult **to** estimate the appropriate level because there is no predictable cycle for CGIAR host country inflation. **i.e.** unlike **OECD** currencies which appeared to have followed **an up and down** cycle. One arbitrary solution could be to assume two years of inflation budgets or about **\$20** million. In summary, a sustainable stabilization mechanism may require a funding level of **as much as** \$50 million and no smaller **than** \$15-20 million.

Funding possibilities

Some possibilities for building up the fund - centers contributing **x%** of their budgets for a **period** of **y** years before any claims are entertained. e.g. **A** 1.5% contribution by each center over five years will result in about \$20 million. Obviously this is a significant cost to the centers in the current funding environment. Another **possibility** to convince a major donor like to the **World Bank** to establish **a** revolving fund - this would **require** some assurance on **how** the **CGIAR** would replenish the fund. Another source **is** the small amounts that sometimes remain unallocated at year end out of the **World Bank's** allocation (\$0.5 - \$1 million).

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 26, 1992

TO: Alexander von der Osten

FROM: Ernest Corea *EC*

NSION: 38930

JECT: Resource Mobilization Project

1. Gustavo Nores and Derek Tribe has each suggested the need for establishing an international "blue ribbon" support group to develop initiatives and make contacts at high political levels on behalf of international agricultural research, Bob Blake, meanwhile, has proposed that a high visibility, international blue ribbon panel should be convened to "take a new look at global agriculture and review the mission and organization of agricultural research in and for developing countries."

2. When these suggestions were discussed at the Secretariat on August 12, it was suggested that a panel should meet at Bellagio, Gustavo Nores inquired whether the Secretariat could produce a brief note outlining a project, which would involve a "blue ribbon" panel and whose main objective would be the acquisition of more core funds by the CGIAR, especially in the post-UNCED context,

3. The attached draft attempts to do that, by fusing the Nores/Tribe and Blake proposals. A three stage proposal is outlined as follows:

First: A Concepts Meeting at which a "blue ribbon" panel reviews the role of international agricultural research, particularly in the post-UNCED context; and defines a rationale for increased donor commitments to the CGIAR system;

Second: A Program of Visits to selected donor countries/agencies by members of the "blue ribbon" panel to seek stronger, longer term commitments to the CGIAR system; and

Third: A Bellagio Benchmark Meeting, convened by the "blue ribbon" panel and attended by authoritative representatives of donor countries/agencies, at which the CGIAR broadly subscribes to the rationale referred to above, and donors are persuaded to make long term commitments to the CGIAR system.

4. These events will need to be carefully planned. Three essential pre-requisites will be the selection of a panel whose credentials are impeccable, the selection of a panel chairman with

access to high levels of government, and *tho* efforts of a convener who can keep the process moving.

5. There is no guarantee that the proposed process will succeed. But we will never know unless we try.

6. I should emphasize that the attached note is a working draft which requires discussion and revision.

cc: Ravi Tadvalkar, Heinrich von Loesch

Attachment

ECorea:zv

Working Draft

CGIAR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION PROJECT

- Desired Outcome

Commitment by major ODA "players" to increase their annual CGIAR contributions to a level compatible with their contributions to other key development institutions (e.g. IDA); or a commitment to provide an agreed percentage of their total ODA to the CGIAR.

- Process

Step #1 - Concepts Meeting.

At this meeting, a "blue ribbon" panel would review the role and relevance of international agricultural research, particularly in the post-UNCED context; estimate the need for CGIAR centers; and define a rationale for increased and long-term donor commitment to the CGIAR system.

- Panel members (men and women) should be familiar with the work of the CGIAR system, but emphatically this should not be a "CGIAR panel." The stature of each panelist, internationally or regionally, should be unquestionable. A regional balance of panelists seems appropriate.
- The "power house" of the panel should be a chairman and secretary-convenor who can work well together.
- The chairman would need access to high levels of government. The following candidates are offered as a starting point for discussion: Enrique Iglesias, Robert McNamara, Shridath S. Ramphal (Guyana, former Secretary General, Commonwealth of Nations), and Maurice F. Strong.
- The secretary/convenor should have strong credentials; have free time for organization including travel, and be energetic. Two possible candidates are Robert Blake and Derek Tribe.
- Much will depend on the definition of a rationale in support of continued/increased support for the CGIAR system. The rationale would, of course, build on the strengths of the system but would be closely meshed with a range of international realities including the political interests of donors and dominant international concerns (many of the latter were spelled out by Bob Blake in his letter of May 13 to the CGIAR Chairman).

Step #2 - A Program of Visits to donor countries/agencies.

The purpose of these visits would be to persuade national leaders of the case for continued/increased support for the CGIAR.

- To keep costs down, and create a businesslike atmosphere, the visits could be undertaken by a sub-group of the panel.
- The effectiveness of these visits would depend very much on: the level at which the sub-group is received- Strong and Ramphal have both led and/or been associated with such efforts in the past, though for other causes.

Step #3 - Bellagio Benchmark Conference.

The panel will convene this conference whose participants will consist of the panel itself, donor representatives, developing country representatives, and representatives of the CGIAR system including the chairman, Center Directors, etc. The overall objectives of the meeting would be to seek new horizons for international agricultural research and re-commit the international community to provide the CGIAR system with adequate, long-term resources.

- Continued interaction between panelists and donors will be required to turn commitments into reality.
- Such interaction should be complemented by PARC and the Secretariat.

• Planning/Organization

- (i) Agreement by PARC and CGIAR Secretariat on outcome, process, planning, etc.
- (ii) Establishment of a small PARC-Secretariat working group to plan and organize events, The Secretariat will need an almost full-time focal point (HVL?) for this activity.
- (iii) Selection of possible secretary-convenor; letter by CGIAR Chairman inviting him/her to serve.
- (iv) Listing of potential panelists; letter by CGIAR Chairman inviting potential members to serve, and informing them of convenor's role,
- (v) Preparation of background "briefs" for meetings by PARC-Secretariat working group. This would take note of post-UNCED context as well as of C7 interests/priorities, while stating the case for

donors to infuse CGIAR system with substantially increased resources.

- (vi) Pre-meeting electronic communication by convener using Secretariat facilities.

- Public Awareness

The extent to which the envisaged meetings should be "open" as well as the kind, extent and timing of public awareness activity connected with the project needs to be agreed on in advance.

- Finance

If PARC and the Secretariat agree that a project of this kind should be undertaken, special funding should be sought from interested donors.

File: WORKDRAF
Date: August 26, 1992
ECores:zv

opportunity

The UNCED Biodiversity Convention has created worldwide awareness of the importance of preserving biodiversity for the future of humanity. This awareness has created a unique opportunity to attract the interest of large corporations to enhance their public image by supporting a worldwide effort to conserve biodiversity for future generations. The CGIAR is in unique position to catalyze the creation of a mega-endowment fund for such a purpose. The offer of the Government of Norway to make available a permanent safe location for holding in trust for humanity and in perpetuity duplicates of existing CGIAR and national collections represents an opportunity that should not be missed or used for small or restricted initiatives, but as the pivotal and selling point of a major initiative. Large international corporations may be attracted to contribute to such a fund if they are allowed to advertise their contribution in a way that their public image is enhanced.

Developing the Proposal

Developing a proposal for a mega-endowment fund entails an iterative process of conceptualization and project and institutional development which includes definition of:

- (a) Objectives of the Fund:
- (b) Range and scope of the projects and activities eligible for funding, and prior definition of relative priorities from the CGIAR perspective:
- (c) Endowment size target(s) and alternative paths under various scenarios for its development over time in relation to (b);
- (d) Legal status and governance: principles, restrictions, and rules of management for allocation of proceedings from the Fund, and oversight mechanisms:
- (e) Identification of potential contributors to the Fund and selling of the idea:
- (f) Negotiations on endowment size, rights to advertise sponsorship, legal aspects, conditions, governance, fiscal controls, size and scope of activities to be financed:
- (g) Formal and legal steps for creation of the Fund.

steps (a) to (c) should be done on the basis of a technical study summarizing the pyramid of projects that could eventually be funded and their approximate costs in order to define alternative sizes of the Fund. It is proposed that the PARC discusses (a) who could assume the responsibility for commissioning or carrying out such a study (e.g. a CDC Task Force, the CGIAR Sec, IPGRI in consultation with PARC) and (b) how would such study be funded.

Step (d), (f) and (g) requires the inputs of a legal counsellor specialist on creation of endowment funds. Step (e) may require the input of a public figure as a convener.

Wild cards**THE BORLAUG FUND**

(The Norman Borlaug Fund for Sustainable Development of 'Agriculture)

- Mission:** Produce cheaper and better food for the poor
 Make agriculture, forestry and fisheries the steward of nature
 Conserve genetic resources in agriculture, forests and fisheries
- Procedure:** Establish national committees based on Friends of CGIAR groups
 Request recognition as charity
 Obtain free advertisement space in media
 Offer paid subscription to BORLAUG magazine
 Urge contributions for specific purposes (e.g. project of the month; center of the year)
 Urge donor governments to match pledges with equal amounts
 Urge donors to absorb administrative costs of national committee
 Request national recognition as NGO
 Request recognition by ECOSOC and FAO (observer status)

Report of the Chairman
AIARC Board of Directors
to the
Sponsors Meeting in Washington DC
October 22, 1992

1. THE ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTERS (AIARC).

Sponsors Meeting

AIARC sponsors are required to meet at least once a year to receive the report of the Chairman of the Board of Directors, appoint the Chairman and directors where necessary, and give guidance to the **Board** on all matters relating to the **AIARC**.

In this context distinction is to be drawn between the **sponsors** and the clients. The sponsors are the CG-associated Centers and IFDC (a major user of I.I.E. services), which have been receiving services from I.I.E. and were also represented on the Benefits Committee. The clients are a group of small centers that were grandfathered into the **AIARC** as well as any new organizations (other than future AIARCs admitted to the CG system) that are accepted as participants in the various **AIARC** benefit plans. These will have no representation on either the Sponsors' or **Board's** meetings.

Inter-Center Service Office

Progress. The establishment of ICSO is proceeding on schedule and within the approved budget. Since our meeting in August at ICRAF all office staff (7 in number) have been appointed and early indications suggest that they constitute a very competent and highly motivated team. They *are* quickly mastering the details of the Centers' joint benefit plans and each has **been** assigned specific Centers for which they will act as coordinators. The office has met the contingency requirement of being able to **assume** all the services provided by I.I.E. at short notice. The office is already running the payroll data in parallel with I.I.E.

Establishment Costs. At the end of September, establishment costs have reached **\$187,000**, including office furniture and equipment, consultancy fees and salaries. **This** leaves \$163,000 from the approved establishment costs to cover expenditures to the **end** of the year. All these costs will be covered from the medical insurance and litigation funds. **AIARC Board** recommends not to recover these costs through service fees. The Board also recommends the allocation of another \$150,000 from the *same* source as initial **working** capital. This is a precautionary measure intended to avoid any disruption in the early days of the office's operation. This amount would be considered as part of the establishment costs.

Recurrent Costs. An administrative budget of \$682,000 for 1993 was approved. This is within the amount (\$700,000) authorized by CDs in the Nairobi meeting.

Initial Fee Schedule. A tentative fee schedule has been recommended for 1993, the first year of operation. Centers would pay \$120 per year per employee enrolled and be charged fees related to the services provided.

The proposed fees are:

<u>Service</u>	<u>Rate, \$/person/year</u>
- payroll, simple	100
- payroll, complex	280
- insurance	120
- pension	180
- no start-up fee on enrolling	-
- no fiscal management units	-

Thus a Center receiving all these services will pay \$520 or \$700 per enrolled employee/year. In addition, a levy of \$500/year will be collected from each Center. On average, the costs are only 70% of the 1992 I.I.E. fees, but the savings will vary depending on the services used. The operation of the schedule will be monitored for up to one year and reviewed in the light of experience.

Financial Controls. The Board approved disbursement and banking procedures that safeguard the Centers' fund. These are comparable to practices normally operative at the various Centers.

In this connection the AIARC will be contracting for liability insurance to cover **any risks** arising from the administration of the benefit plans. I.I.E. had **named** the DGs in its liability coverage, specific to cases which might arise from the administration of the insurance and pension plans. centers will be contacted to ascertain whether this coverage duplicates **insurance** which Centers may have covering trustees and officers, with a view to fashioning the **most** effective insurance coverage in these **areas**. In the meantime, a policy offering the current coverage will **be** taken out.

Indemnifying I.I.E.. Individual Centers will each have to conclude their relationship with I.I.E. by signing off on the final balances with, **and** indemnifying, I.I.E. against future claims. The Board has engaged an outside audit of the off-shore **plan** and will notify the Centers when it is determined that this area is cleared **for** individual notifications.

Center/AIARC Contracts. The Board reviewed two types of contracts with AIARC: one between the sponsoring Centers, the other with the clients. Some changes were suggested and are being incorporated into

a final version which will be circulated to **all** participating Centers for signature.

New Members. It will be recalled that all Centers/organizations using I.I.E. who expressed a wish to join AIARC have been accepted in the new arrangement. However, several others have asked to join the AIARC plans and subscribe to its services, The Board thought it wise to recommend a one-year moratorium before the question of admitting new members will be considered. In the meantime, profiles of Centers/organizations that might be eligible and conditions of admittance would be worked out.

2. THE RETIREMENT PLAN.

Status of Funds. Funds in the various plans were as follows:

AIARC RETIREMENT PLAN STATISTICS

as of March 31, 1992

Plan	Fixed	Equity	Total	Number of Participants
TIAA/CREF	\$12.455	\$11.675	\$24.130	377
OFF-SHORE	\$64.075	\$28.964	\$93.038	1162
PROVIDENT FUND	\$6.849		\$6.849	950
TOTAL \$ Value	\$83.379	\$40.639	\$124.018	
MULTI CURRENCY.	Fixed	Equity	Total	
Yen Value	145.826		145.826	230
ECU Value	0.864		0.864	230

Values are expressed in millions.

"Off-Shore participants" includes 260 non-active accounts.

Performance. The low performance of the equity plan reported upon in previous meetings has persisted, particularly in the case of the off-shore plan. The returns for the first 9 months of 1992 were:

	<u>EQUITY</u>	%		<u>FIXED INCOME*</u>
<u>On-Shore</u>				
CREF	0.7		TIAA	7.5
MONY	4.9		MONY	6.7
<u>Off-Shore</u>				
Alliance	4.4		Generali**	8.0

* Annualised on the basis of 3rd Quarter

** Annualised on the basis of 3rd quarter, for \$ account only

New Generali Plan. The current profit sharing with Generali on income above the guaranteed rate is:

	Generali	centers
Interest earnings	10	90
Capital gains	50	50

Theoretically, the capital gains component could be exploited by selling appreciated bonds, which yield higher returns to Generali, while retaining low-yielding shares. The Board renegotiated the sharing formula to 75/25 (Centers/Generali) for interest profit as well as capital gains. Applied to the past five years, the new formula would have had little, or slightly beneficial effect on the centers' share. Because the new formula is less prone to manipulation, however, the Board recommends its acceptance. If agreed, the contract will be renegotiated on this basis.

Another, perhaps more serious issue with Generali is that the Retirement Funds are held in the name of Generali and not the Centers, and the Centers have no safeguards if Generali is liquidated or declared bankrupt. Two options are being considered: insuring the retirement funds; or establishing a trust in the name of ALARC, acting on behalf of the Centers, and managed by Generali on the same terms as under the present contract. The latter option appears the less costly and is being pursued.

In their Nairobi meeting, Center Directors suggested that the possibility of investing the retirement funds with the World Bank retirement schemes be investigated. We have sought a meeting with the officials concerned which, we hope, will materialize before our meeting at the end of this ICW.

Insurance. Van Breda advised the Board that in the light of recent levels of withdrawals (resulting mostly from very few major files) the

medical insurance premium for 1992 will increase by about 10% or \$200,000 for all Centers. The Board reviewed the details with Van Breda and agreed to recommend the increase to the Centers.

Testing. On the strong recommendation of both Wyatt and I.I.E. Center Directors had agreed to authorize I.I.E. to arrange a one-time testing of the equity status of the Centers' pension scheme. In spite of their earlier insistence, I.I.E. and Wyatt reported to the AIARC Board that recent decisions by the U.S. tax authorities have made testing unnecessary for the time being. The new office will keep watch on developments and should there be any change will report to the AIARC Board for guidance on future action.

Joint Funds. ICARDA, as the Center currently chairing the AIARC Board, manages two funds: the centers' Joint Account; and the refunds received from Van Breda and the Airco litigation.

The balance of the Joint-Expenses account now stands at about \$175,000. This is higher than the ceiling of \$150,000 agreed upon by Center Directors. The excess resulted from ICRAF collecting the full cost of the Nairobi meeting from individual Centers, rather than charging a due share to the joint expenses account. Costs that will be incurred during ICW will reduce the balance, but, unless Center Directors decide on a major activity during 1993, we propose not to levy contributions to this fund next par.

The refunds totalled about \$1.7 million and earned another \$30,000 in interest. Costs to-date, including expenditures on consultancies, legal fees and travel costs prior to the establishment of the office, add up to \$459,000, leaving a balance of \$1.28 million. With the transfer to ICSO of \$150,000 as a working capital, we shall enter 1993 with a balance of \$1.12 million. Apart from adjustments that will result from apportioning costs to participating Centers, I suggest that the balance should continue to be held on behalf of the Centers for the immediate future.

The sponsors endorsed all the specific recommendations of the AIARC Board.

New Product Announcement

Date of Publication: August 1992

Contact: Marketing Unit (202) 473-2033
Reference No.: IBRD PA1221

New CD-ROM Product Offers Extensive Agricultural Research Library on 17 Compact Discs

**compact International Agricultural Research Library,
Basic Retrospective Set 1962-1986 (CIARL BRS)**

Now agricultural researchers worldwide can have instant access to
@ 0,000 pages of essential research material without leaving their computers.

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), an informal association of 40 public and private sector donors, is creating one of the world's largest full-text libraries on CD-ROM. And **CIARL BRS** comprises the first publication in this major research collection.

CGIAR, sponsored by the World Bank and other international organizations, **supports** agricultural research centers around the world. These centers develop new ways to increase sustainable food production and improve the nutritional and economic well-being of low-income people.

CIARL BRS is a set of 17 CD-ROM discs that provides a comprehensive library of agricultural research. At the touch of a few keys, users access

- complete text, images, and catalogue records for some 1,350 titles originally published by 20 agricultural research centers worldwide
- key books, serials, and proceedings published between 1962 and 1986—totaling 2,000 documents
- more than 190,000 pages of materials converted to text
- over 50,000 monochrome images, including all graphics and photographs
- 1,900 selected color images—such as maps and field guides

The Master Disc of the set provides indexes to the entire collection—a set of fully searchable catalogue records and a handy finding aid for easy subject access to documents.

The World Bank, Office of the Publisher, 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433, U.S.A.

The retrieval system is designed to give users many search options. These options range from simple searches for beginners to advanced search techniques for more experienced users. In mere seconds, a search can find every occurrence of a word or phrase. Each search automatically includes the text of tables.

While documents in CIARL ERS come in 11 different languages, most materials are in English, Spanish, and French. Moreover, all interface prompts, text messages, user aids, and the reference guide are included in these three languages.

CIARL ERS documents cover six broad research areas

- *developing new technologies to increase productivity on farmers' fields
- *protecting the productivity of natural resources on which agriculture depends
- *helping developing countries to formulate and carry out effective food, agriculture, and research policies
- *strengthening national agricultural research systems in developing countries
- *conserving germplasm and making it available to all regions and countries
- *building links between institutions in developing countries and other elements of the global agricultural system.

CIARL ERS requires an IBM-compatible microcomputer with 550K free memory, hard disk, and standard CD-ROM drive. Any monitor—from monochrome to VGA—can display text and monochrome images, while color images can be displayed on EGA or VGA color monitors.

The text prints on any standard PC printer. Monochrome images print on 24-pin printers, laser printers, and other printers in laser-printer emulation mode. Color images print on selected color printers. The user's reference guide provides instructions for getting started.

Subject Categories Agricultural research / Computer-readable information

Order Stock #12179 / \$1,950.00 / Price code T19

The Joint CDC/TAC Working Group on
Ecoregional Approaches to International Agricultural Research

Report to the CDC

October 22, 1992

The Joint CDC/TAC Working Group on Ecoregional Approaches to International Agricultural Research (WG) was developed at the June 1992 CDC meeting. At the TAC meeting in Rome that month, it was agreed that TAC would join the working group. TAC has welcomed the joining of efforts and has contributed greatly to the Working group.

The present constitution of the Working Group is:

Ambassador Robert Blake	Convener
Michael Arnold	TAC breeder
Kenneth Cassman	IRRI agronomist
Mike Collinson	CG Secr economist
Louise Fresco	LWU agronomist
Karl Harmsen	ICRISAT land use
Bob Hart	INFORUM ecologist
Peter Matlon	WARDA economist
Tony Fischer	CIMMYT physiologist
Krishnan Jain	INDIA

Brian Belcher at CGI437 has agreed to serve as WG editor.

The working group has made quite a bit of progress by exchanging ideas through the ECO-REM, a CGNET mediated electronic conference. The REM now counts with more than 30 participants.

We have obtained financial support from DGIS of the Netherlands to the amount of DFL90,000.- for certain costs, particularly those associated with added communication costs and the January workshop.

The TORs have had extensive discussions and TAC has through that process stressed its concern that strong emphasis be given to working out an institutional scenario that departs from the ecoregional perspective as developed by TAC. TAC does not appear to consider the ecoregional approach up for discussion. It feels that what is left to be done is to find the most effective way of implementation. This implementation should in particular respond to concerns TAC perceives among donors about possible duplication of tasks and competition for mandates among centers.

Prior to the CDC meeting two meetings related to the working group were held at ICW:

1. A meeting of Alec McCalla, Mike Arnold, Hans Gregersen and Hubert Zandstra on Sunday night, October 18.

2. A preparatory meeting on Tuesday October 20 at the CG secretariat, from 6:30 till 8:00 pm involving the Convener and several DGs and WG members.

At these meetings the attached agenda was decided on for the joint CDC/CSE meeting Wednesday, Oct. 21., (3:30 -5:30) at IFPRI. In addition the following proposals for the workshop were formulated at the October 20 meeting:

1. The workshop should be kept small: some 15 or less participants, made up of the WG members, two additional NARS specialists, the TAC Chair and the CSE Chair.

2. The workshop should be considered as a drafting group or preparatory workshop. Participants would prepare documents for the CGIAR's consideration at its May 1993 meeting and- for the Conference on Ecoregional Approaches immediately after it. The documents would address the agreed upon TORs and must show intellectual substance and analytical validity.

3. Of the possible Locations, Wageningen, Washington or Davis, California, the latter was proposed. The time proposed was Jan. 25-29 (this was later changed to Feb. 2-4).

4. The outcome of the workshop will be considered a product of the joint working group. It will be provided to TAC and to the CDC who may independently comment on it to the May CGIAR.

5. TAC will prepare an analysis of the ecoregional approach components included in the center MTP's to provide added insight into the institutional and implementation related aspects. This analysis will be shared with the WG and the CD's.

The Oct. 22 meeting followed the agenda developed earlier.

Ambassador Robert Blake's opening statement stressed the importance of the WG output communicating clearly to an audience outside the CGIAR what the CG is doing in sustainability and how. He indicated his own perception of the importance of this WG within the context of the changing climate of international relations in the U.S. and elsewhere; the need for improved sustainability research is real, but the political climate points to a need to get that message across. That need should inform this group as much as do the internal, CGIAR, needs.

Reporting procedures for the WG to TAC and the CDC were discussed; it was felt that progress reports would be made separately and that a final report following the May workshop will be made to a joint meeting of TAC and the CDC. It is hoped that the REM will be used to its potential to keep all interested parties informed and allow good communication.

There was some discussion of the need for more support from the CG and TAC Secretariats. Two possibilities to meet this need are:

1. TAC has nominated Guido Gryseels to the WG. It is hoped that he will be able to provide considerable analytical input, especially with regard to looking at new MTPs for overlaps, gaps and potential for collaboration vis a vis sustainability research, relations with NARS and the ecoregional approach.
2. Mike Collinson offered to spend more time on WG issues. This would be very welcome. For example, the group discussed the possibility of Mike Collinson and Guido Gryseels developing an outline for a model ecoregional approach. This would then be augmented by DGs and used to develop some models.

The CDC is asked to consider these options. In the second case, the CDC should direct a request to Alexander von der Osten.

The meeting addressed the WG Terms of Reference. Draft TORs, developed with considerable REM consultation, were accepted with minor modifications, and an agreement to include a preamble which presents this effort within the context of broader, international concern about sustainability research needs.

Review of Working Group timetable and expected outputs: Some concern has been expressed by TAC and others that, while progress has been made on issues of methodology, there has not been much progress on the institutional issues. More commentary is needed in this area. Specific assignments will be made. Centre Directors and others monitoring the REM are urged to provide comments. Progress has been made in the area of methodology: this has been assembled but needs considerable editing. Inputs on other issues will be incorporated and drafts circulated for comment.

More information is needed on ongoing activities. A second request will be issued which makes clear that we are interested in all natural resource enhancing/conserving activities, whether within or across regions.

The WG must address the ecoregional approach as defined by TAC.

The workshop timing and location was discussed. The best combination seems to be Feb. 2,3, and 4 in Davis California. It will involve a small group - the WG members and selected NARS representatives. Draft agenda and WG report will be circulated to DGs in advance to facilitate input from them. The workshop output will be a revised draft report, more or less in its final form, which will go as input to the May Conference (60-70 participants; organized by CG Secretariat).

The working group's progress was assessed against the TORs. At this stage we have approximately 70% on the methodology and perhaps 20% on the rest. Assignments will be made to fill gaps.

In addition to the issues raised in the agenda, there was considerable discussion of around various interpretations of the exact nature of the WG's task. There is discomfort with the TAC

concept of the ecoregional approach, and a strong reaction against terminology such as "ecoregional responsibilities" and "ecoregional entity" from DGs. A main function of the WG should be as a forum to raise and, as much as possible, to resolve these issues. The WG will deal in parallel with the natural resources and sustainability issues on the one hand and the institutional issues on the other.

It is suggested that the CDC Chair's report on the WG's progress focus on progress made, including notable increase in understanding of the concept. The mandate should be kept flexible and the group's dual emphasis, on natural resources/sustainability and on the ecoregional approach should be mentioned.

CDC/CSE Meeting
with the Working Group on the Ecoregional Approach

Wednesday, October 21, 3:30 pm

Agenda

1. Opening statement.
2. Statement of clarification on the membership and role of the Working Group on the Ecoregional Approach, and procedures for reporting to TAC and the CSE of the CDC.
3. Discussion and finalization of Working Group Terms of Reference.
4. Review of Working Group timetable and expected outputs.
5. Discussion of Workshop plans: Issues include timing, location, participants, structure, agenda, expected outputs and relationship to the May conference.
6. Summarize the progress of the Working Group and recommend topics to be addressed or activities to be initiated.
7. Drafting of a statement, on behalf of the CDC Chair, reporting the Working Group's progress to the CGIAR.
8. Other.

Terms of Reference

21/10/92

1. Assemble information on current Centre programmes of research on the conservation and management of natural resources. Assess the extent to which these programmes incorporate an ecoregional approach (as defined by TAC) and evaluate their effectiveness in supporting national programmes, especially in research that combines productivity with sustainability.
2. Review the objectives of natural resources management research (NRMR). In relation to these objectives assess what can be done internationally and by the CGIAR. Develop a research agenda to address resource management and sustainability issues.
3. Develop a methodological framework for research on sustainability of NRM and its operationalization. Identify strategic research issues for international research on bio-physical, socio-economic and policy aspects of resources management. Develop methodological approaches that link strategic research with farmers responses to production-conservation tradeoffs under different policy scenarios.
4. Assess the organizational and operational implications and appropriateness of implementing the TAC concept of an ecoregional approach, especially in relation to the proposed division of responsibility into "global", "subject matter" and "ecoregional", the nature of the strategic research to be undertaken in these contexts, and the need for coordination of Centre activities across commodities, agroecological zones and geographical regions.
5. Consider, in general terms, possible operational relationships to implement desirable patterns of activity among the three types of Centres, as well as between Centres and other international organizations (including regional organizations).
6. Review objectives of Centre collaboration with national research systems, consider the most desirable points of linkage, and assess mechanisms for avoiding duplication and overload.
7. Identify appropriate mechanisms for monitoring impact and criteria for assessing the success of research related to the conservation and management of natural resources and for the contribution to national systems.

CENTER DIRECTORS' COMMITTEE
WASHINGTON DC. 1992

Sub-committee on Sub-Saharan Africa
October 21, 1992

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The Chairman opened the meeting and welcomed members of the sub-committee and other attendees:

members: J. Walsh, C. Bonte-friedheim, L. Brader, R. Gray

representatives: B. Scott (ICRAF), Y. L. Nene and L. K. Mughogho (ICRASAT)

other participants: M. Toure (SPAAR), K. Cleaver (WB), R. Cummings (AID)

secretary: R. Ayling.

The Chairman identified four agenda items:

- Center Directors SSA/NARS Roundtable
- ISNAR study of Sub-Saharan NARS
- ISNAR study of small NARS
- African Highlands Initiative

1. Center Directors SSA/NARS Roundtable

The report of the Center Director SSA/NAR Roundtable in Nairobi has been published in English and French and distributed. Thanks were expressed to ISNAR and ICRAF for their work in this regard. Several follow-up activities to the Roundtable are continuing:

a. Follow-up NARS meeting. ISNAR has assumed the responsibility to work with the NARS to facilitate a follow-up meeting. It was agreed that:

- this meeting will consist of NARS only,
- the meeting should be seen as preparatory to another CD/NARS meeting,
- the Center Directors should be involved in setting the agenda for this CD/NARS meeting,
- a meeting of Center Directors and NARS with donors may eventually be held but planning for it should be deferred until after the next CD/NARS meeting,
- SPAAR's offer to assist ISNAR in the planning of the NARS meeting is accepted,
- both meetings should be structured to ensure a tangible output,

- while the site of the NARS meeting had not been firmly set it was understood that it will be in Africa. Similarly, it was agreed that the next CD SSA/NARS meeting will be in west Africa.

b. Biotechnology. In line with its responsibility to assume leadership in this area and follow-up activities with SSA/NARS, ISNAR has developed a proposal to obtain donor funding for an "Intermediate Biotechnology Service". The proposal is fully developed and calls for biotechnology services to bridge the gap in developing nations between biotechnology needs and capabilities. ISNAR is currently recruiting for the project in anticipation of receiving funding. It was noted that the project will respond to some of the issues discussed with NARS at the Roundtable.

The meeting decided that:

- ISNAR will keep Center Directors informed of progress on the project,

- ISNAR will advise Centers of issues to be followed up once the recruiting process is completed and the project takes shape. In the meantime Centers should pass any input to ISNAR.

- Brader and Gray will review the proposal on behalf of the Center Directors.

- SPAAR is added to the list of recipients of the proposal.

c. Information Management. ISNAR has the lead and will report to the CDC when priority activities have been identified. Action by the SSA is deferred until then.

It was noted that the Compact International Agricultural Library, Basic Retrospective Set, 1962-86 in the form of 17 CD-ROM disks has been completed and will be distributed to NARS.

d. Ecoregional Approach/Natural Resource Management. Further action in this area will be deferred until the concept is clarified by the ongoing CD/TAC Working Group on ecoregional approaches to international agricultural research and other CGIAR activities.

Observations on the Roundtable. A number of observations were offered on the Roundtable:

- the Roundtable has been very positively reported. Subsequent meetings will have different priorities but the Roundtable opened up a useful dialogue.

- the structure of the meeting broadening the scope of participants beyond ministry of agriculture research leaders to include universities and NGOs was successful and should be continued.

- the procedure of beginning the dialogue between NARS and CDs by a meeting among NARS themselves as a precedent to meetings with donors was endorsed.

- SPAAR would be a useful and appropriate mechanism to involve donors in meetings with NARS but it is too early to hold such meetings. The CD/NARS interaction needs to crystalize first.

- The WARDA paper on "A Program of Partnership" between IARCs and NARS is drawing favorable comment from NARS including those at the SPAAR meeting in Abuja. The paper is useful but needs further work.

2. ISNAR Study of Sub-Saharan African NARS.

This topic was deferred pending a report from ISNAR.

3. ISNAR Study of Small NARS.

This topic was deferred pending a report from ISNAR.

4. African Highlands Initiative.

ICRAF reported progress on the African Highlands Initiative since the June Nairobi CDC meeting:

- the Task Force has met twice and will meet again on November 5. The initiative has been renamed the "Consortium for Natural Resource Management Research for Eastern and Central Africa".

- NARS participants in the Consortium are Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda, Kenya, zaire, Ethiopia and Tanzania, and IRAZ as a regional entity.

- The Centers involved are CIP, CIAT, CIMMYT, ICRAF, ILCA, IITA and INIBAP, AND TSBF.

- Other Centers expressing interest include AVRDC, IFPRI, ISNAR, ICLARM and IBSRAM.

- 2 consultants are visiting involved NARS and will report to the November Task Force Meeting. The focus of the consultant report will be to identify a. new areas of research of common interest and, in particular, areas which may have been neglected previously; b. research areas where integration of activities between NARS and IARCS may be advantageous, and c. training and information and documentation.

- The World Bank regional office in Nairobi is engaged in a parallel effort to develop a framework for action for agricultural research in East Africa. The two efforts are being closely coordinated. The World Bank sees the Highlands Initiative as a potential component of its research framework and there are good funding prospects from this source.

- The proposed organizational structure consists of the Consortium

exercising overall responsibility with individual discreet projects being undertaken by appropriate lead Centere, groups of Centere or other entities. Implementing entities may be IARCS or other centers of excellence depending on the topic.

- currently available funding is more than adequate for the first year's planning. IDRC and the Rockefeller Foundation have committed funds.

- A workshop is tentatively planned for Kampala in Uganda in January, 1993 to plan the implementation of Task Force recommendatione.

The report was received with thanks and the following decisions taken:

- The etepe taken were endoreed.

- The Kampala workshop will be organized with a view to producing epecific outputs.

- Dr. Zandetra will be kept informed of the organizational structure of the project as a model of an approach to ecoregional reearch.

Annex 7

CD Committee on Intellectual Property Rights

Report of Meeting **held** 21 October 1992

Following the decisions taken by the Center Directors Committee in their meeting of 19-20 June **1992** in Nairobi steps have been taken to send the "Suggested Guiding Principles of the International Agricultural Research Centers on Plant Genetic Research and Related Intellectual Property Rights Issues" as well as the CGIAR Discussion Document on "Intellectual Property, Biosafety and Plant Genetic Resources" to MARS, NGOs **and** Private Companies.

The Committee on IPR noted that so far no written feedback had **been** received. It **urges** the various Centers to follow up on this matter. In cases where the above documents still **had** to be **sent** an explanatory note on the activities **so** far undertaken by the Committee could be **added**, **such a** note would be prepared by the **Chairman**.

Further analyses may be needed of *the* implications of **matters** such as Plant Breeders Rights and *the* **use** of material transfer agreements or the *exchange* of plant genetic resources, in particular with **NARS**. **This** could either be done at the level of each Center or as **a** joint **study** of the **CDC**. The CDC is requested to take a decision on this.

The Committee on IPR had earlier prepared a draft Basic Agreement (so called **Model E**) **placing** the CGIAR base collections under the auspices of **FAO**. The Committee **has** been informed by **the** FAO Legal Office that the form and contents of this draft agreement are in principle acceptable **as** a **basis** for further negotiations. The Center Directors should now decide that they **want** to take further action on this model E agreement to allow submission *to* FAO for review and eventual adoption by the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources.

THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
TECHNICAL ADVISORY **COMMITTEE**

Fifty-Ninth Meeting, IFPRI Hqs., Washington D.C. (USA), 19-24 October 1992

CHANGING RESPONSIBILITIES AND ROLES FOR PGR WITHIN THE CGIAR **SYSTEM**

(Agenda Item 7)

Objectives of the Discussion

At its 57th Meeting, TAC discussed a draft paper prepared by IBPGR entitled "Towards a CGIAR Strategy for Plant Genetic Resources". This paper referred to major changes in the global perspectives on PGR and identified new needs for cooperation among Centers. TAC agreed to a suggestion that the matter be taken up by Center Directors and subsequently discussed at TAC 59 in the joint session with Center Directors and Board Chairs. A document entitled "Changing responsibilities and roles for PGR within the CGIAR system", prepared by IBPGR and incorporating a survey of the views of individual Centers, conducted by IBPGR at the request of Center Directors, is attached for discussion.

TAC SECRETARIAT

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

October 1992

Changing Responsibilities and Roles for PGR Within the CGIAR System

Introduction

1. The 1991 External Review of IBPGR¹ recommended a well-coordinated programme on PGR across the whole CGIAR System. In the TAC document "A Review of CGIAR Priorities: Advanced Working Draft", presented at ICW 91, plant genetic resources **were** identified as ~~one of the key areas~~ for which ~~an~~ international system will continue to be required. As a follow-up, IBPGR prepared a discussion paper "Towards a CGIAR Strategy for Plant Genetic Resources". ~~This~~ paper was intended to complement a CGIAR Statement on Intellectual Property, Biosafety and Plant Genetic Resources, drafted at the January 1992 IPFUPGR meeting in Rome, which in turn built on the CGIAR Policy on Plant Genetic Resources, published in 1989.
2. The draft discussion paper "Towards a CGIAR Strategy for PGR" was sent for comments to all CG Centers and the revised version (see Appendix I) was presented to and discussed at TAC 57 in March 1992 and referred to the Center Directors who met in Nairobi in June 1992. The Center Directors decided that the views of the individual Centers should **be** sought on key strategic elements which **'are** relevant to System-wide resource allocation decisions to **be** made by TAC. They decided further that other issues **raised** in the discussion paper should **be** taken up by the Inter-Center Working Group on PGR (ICWG). IBPGR conducted ~~an~~ opinion survey on key elements of the proposed strategy (Appendix II) the summarized results of which are attached (Appendix III). A first draft of the summary was sent to all Centers which had responded to the survey and their reactions or comments have been incorporated into the attached version.

Opinions of the Centers

3. All Commodity Centers accept full responsibility for the collecting, conservation and documentation of their respective mandate species, directly or in a coordinated fashion with other responsible institutions or NARS. Nevertheless, **many** of the Centers still **see** a significant role for IPGRI with their mandate species, especially in the **areas** of coordination and networking as well **as** on research of generic problems. They consider that this role should **be** greater for the non-mandate crops

¹ *In this document the acronym IBPGR (International Board for Plant Genetic Resources) ~~has~~ been used in relation to past and current activities, while for proposed future action reference has been made to IPGRI (International Plant Genetic Resources Institute). It should be realized, however, that IBPGR will continue to operate under the administrative umbrella of FAO until IPGRI's Headquarter Agreement with Italy has been ratified by the Italian Parliament.*

which are presently conserved by the Centers (minor millets, bambara groundnut, etc.).

4. Coordination of **PGR** activities across the CG Centers and with **NARS** by **IPGRI** was seen to **be** especially relevant for species which are important in two or more (eco) regions for which only one Center has a mandate, as well as for important species which occur in different ecoregions and which **are** not mandate crops of any Center. Especially in the case of the latter category of species the crucial role of the **NARS** in the conservation and use of PGR was stressed. **All** Centers agree to assist **IPGRI** in one way or another to strengthen these systems, since they **are** seen as the basis of the global PGR conservation and use effort.
5. The majority of the Centers have expressed their willingness to assume more responsibility for the conservation and use of species of ecoregional importance, provided that additional funds **are** made available. Some Centers seek further elaboration of the ecoregional concept before clarifying their position. In general, the Centers **see** an important role for **IPGRI** in the coordination of ecoregional genetic resources activities with the **NARS**, primarily in the form of networks. The possibility of the direct involvement of **IPGRI** staff in these efforts was generally supported.
6. The need for adequate coordination within the CGIAR System is underlined by the Centers themselves (**see** Appendix **III**, Table 4). Most Centers **see** a coordinating role for **IPGRI** in global scientific and/or policy issues and a continuing role for the **ICWG** as an important forum for discussion and internal coordination.

Possible future roles for **IPGRI** and the **ICWG**

7. **IBPGR** has in the past assumed certain responsibilities in the CGIAR for global genetic resources issues. **During** the past two years **IBPGR** has taken a representative role on behalf of the System in relation to biological diversity and genetic resources in the **UNCED** process and the development of the Convention on Biological Diversity. There will **be** many opportunities for the System to be involved in the follow-up of these issues in the post-**UNCED** phase. The continuing involvement of the CGIAR in post-**UNCED** action concerned with genetic resources is especially important because of the implications of the Convention for the ways in which access to and exchange of genetic resources **will** be handled by CGIAR client countries that ratify the Convention. Moreover, the possibility is **emerging** of CGIAR Centers placing their collections under the auspices of **FAO** and having a direct interest, therefore, in the work of the **FAO** Commission on PGR. **IBPGR** already has a role in relation to the Commission which is agreed in the Memorandum of Understanding on Programme Cooperation between **FAO** and **IBPGR**.
8. At the MTM 1992, the CGIAR unanimously adopted a working document entitled "**CGIAR** Discussion Document on Intellectual **Property**, Biosafety and Plant Genetic Resources" prepared by the TAC/CD's Committee on Plant Genetic Resources. In

this document it is recognized that "As trustees of international germplasm collections, the Centers have an obligation to manage them for the benefit of the world community" (see Appendix IV).

9. In the context of an examination, commissioned by IBPGR, of the legal status of collections held by the CGIAR Centers, a model-agreement was developed under which the IARCs could consider bringing their collections under the auspices of FAO under the legal umbrella of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources. This model ("Model E" - see Appendix V) which differs in appropriate detail from the models developed by FAO for signature by countries,
 - (a) recognizes that "the Center retains trusteeship over the designated germplasm" and
 - (b) **requires** the Center "to undertake to make the designated gemplasm available from its active collection for the purpose of scientific research, plant breeding or genetic resource conservation, without restriction, either directly to users or through FAO, either on mutually agreed terns or free of cost."
10. Subject to the agreement of CDs and TAC, IBPGR would now propose to ~~seek~~ the approval of the Commission to introduce Model E, alongside the country models, as an appropriate agreement for signature by those IARCs that choose to sign it.
11. IPGRI is willing, as part of an expanded coordinating role in the System, to continue to represent the CGIAR in actions on biological diversity and genetic resources that unfold through the various international fora in the post-UNCED era. To do so effectively, IPGRI will **require** more frequent consultation with the Centers on matters of common interest than has been available in the past through the ICWG.
12. In line with its Strategy, IPGRI will continue to provide assistance to NARS to increase their capacities in conservation, research, information and training focusing especially on species and problems which the NARS regard as ecoregionally important. **IPGRI** will also take a role, where appropriate, in ~~facilitating~~ networking for these species. The majority of Centers see an expanded cross-Center role for **IPGRI** in relation to ~~ecographically~~ important crops. IPGRI would be willing to assume this role or to assist other Centers to do so but it is inevitable that, in either scenario, additional core staff and funds would be **needed** to support this new function within the CGIAR.
13. The ICWG will, in future, have a more important function to ~~perform~~ as a forum for discussion of issues related to international custodianship and exchange of germplasm as well as to changes within the CGIAR itself and the new challenges for Genetic Resources Units that these changes will bring. It might, for example, give further consideration to some of the questions canvassed in the opinion survey, especially on the genetic resources aspects of non-mandate crops. Its individual members will have to play the role of nodal contact points within their respective Centers for consultation between the Centers and IPGRI. To facilitate this demand for increased activity by the ICWG, IPGRI is prepared to provide a secretariat for the ICWG which currently has a rotating chairmanship and no secretariat support.

Role of the CD/TAC Committee on PGR

14. The Joint CD/TAC Committee, comprising two Center Directors and two TAC Members, was set up initially to develop the CGIAR Policy on Plant Genetic Resources published by IBPGR in 1989. It has continued to meet subsequently to discuss various policy issues. It receives the Minutes of the ICWG although the ICWG **reports formally** to the Center Directors' Committee. It may be timely for TAC **and** CDC to review **and** if necessary redefine the role of the Joint Committee.

TOWARDS A CGIAR STRATEGY FOR PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES: A DISCUSSION PAPER BY IBPGR

Introduction

- 1) This paper has been prepared as a contribution to the ongoing debate within the CGIAR on its future priorities and strategies, and specifically relates to plant genetic resources. It addresses a number of issues of concern at the CG-System level, many of which have been raised by the recent External Review of IBPGR ~~and the paper~~ **OR** priorities for the **CGIAR** discussed by **TAC** at its meeting in Washington, October 1991. In this paper TAC has identified plant genetic resources as one of the key areas for which an international system will **be** required in the long term. It aims to complement the CGIAR policy statement on Plant Genetic Resources, prepared at the Rome IPR/PGR meeting in January 1992, which in turn builds on the 1988 **PGR** CGIAR policy document. It also complements the IPGRI long-term strategy, also currently under development.
- 2) No country, however rich in natural genetic diversity, can ever hope to be fully self-sufficient with respect to plant genetic resources, the foundation of crop improvement. It is therefore necessary to ensure that genetic materials be available to those that need them and this will continue to require international mechanisms.
- 3) It is now widely recognized that the global plant genetic conservation effort is largely unable to provide the necessary security for plant genetic resources, due to a serious lack of funds, lack of appropriate technology, and the need for improved institutional structures **and** implementation mechanisms at all levels,
- 4) Given these current and long-term needs, the IARCs are uniquely positioned to play a key role internationally in the conservation and use of plant genetic resources. It is suggested that this function of the CGIAR system should be substantially strengthened and expanded over the coming years.

IARC's Present Involvement in PGR

- 5) **The** original mandates of the commodity Centers of the CGIAR were strongly focussed on crop improvement and plant germplasm was assembled mainly to support the Centers' breeding programmes. Over the years, the Centers have built up sizeable collections of their mandate species. However, there **are** currently wide differences among the Centers with respect to their plant genetic resources programmes. For example:
 - some **see** their PGR programme primarily as a support service to their breeding work, while others take a broader view and also accept responsibility for maintaining base collections as part of an international conservation strategy for the entire crop gene pool

- some restrict **PGR** activities to mandate crops while others cover additional species which are not of direct concern to their current crop improvement work, e.g. minor millets at ICRISAT, faba bean and peas at ICARDA, Andean roots and tubers at CIP and bambara groundnut at IIT.
 - in the case of INIBAP, its strategy is built entirely on networking, with existing institutions having an interest in the genetic resources of Musa.
- 6) IBPGR and other Centers are assisting National Programmes through training, technical assistance and dissemination of information. They have also been involved in substantial collecting activities for a wide range of cultivated and wild species. They are also conducting research on problems relating to plant genetic resources conservation and use.
 - 7) IBPGR/IPGRI has taken a lead within the CGIAR for promoting crop genetic resources networks, and many other **IARCS** provide leadership to such networks or are key participants in them.

Towards Global Cooperation on **PGR**

- 8) The conservation **and** use of PGR is receiving increased and widespread attention around the world. There is a growing concern over **both** the alarming rate of genetic erosion and the inadequacy of current attempts to conserve PGR. This concern extends, in many cases, to materials already held in genebanks. As a result of past efforts by **FAO**, **IBPGR** and others, a global system is emerging which recognizes the **need** for conservation and use activities at the local, national, regional and international levels.
- 9) A global strategy for the sustainable conservation **and** use of plant genetic resources requires the commitment of the world community **to** safeguard the total diversity of useful plants. This diversity includes germplasm already maintained as ex situ collections, in national programmes, in CGIAR Centers, and other collections, as germplasm occurring in protected areas, **as** well as germplasm outside present conservation efforts.
- 10) National programmes have the primary responsibility to try to safeguard the plant genetic resources present in their own country. They should **be** considered as the building blocks of any international effort. Their activities should include creating an inventory of the plant genetic diversity, itself **an** integral part of biodiversity, existing in the respective countries, and ensuring that the plant genetic diversity **be** safely conserved and its use facilitated. National programmes on plant genetic resources need to be strengthened so that the individual countries **can** undertake these activities and thereby meet their own needs for plant genetic resources conservation and use, and play an active role in the global effort. It is not necessary for all countries to have a large-scale programme. However, it is necessary to have at least a minimum capacity effort, this minimum capacity reflecting a clear government commitment to plant genetic resources work.

- 11) The plant genetic resources programmes of the CGIAR centers should support and complement national efforts, and play a stronger role in promoting regional collaboration.
- 12) The Keystone International Dialogue series on Plant Genetic Resources, in the report of the final plenary session held in Oslo, June 1991 proposed the establishment of a "Global Initiative for the Security and Sustainable Use of Plant Genetic Resources". The initiative, which identifies potential roles for players including the CGIAR Centers is summarized below:
 - a) **An** Inter-Governmental Council (IGC) served by a small secretariat, to take a broad policy oversight.
 - b) **An** Executive Board (EB) appointed by the IGC, with authority to make decisions on issues delegated to it by the IGC.
 - c) A Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to provide advice to the IGC and EB, and
 - d) A Fiduciary Agent (FA) responsible for the management of a special fund for PGR, and operating under the guidance of the IGC/EB.

This proposal has received widespread attention, especially within the context of the preparations for UNCED and Agenda 21.

- 13) At a follow-up high-level Consultation on the Global Initiative, hosted by SAREC in January 1992, the Keystone proposal was further discussed and elaborated. It was agreed that FAO's Commission on Plant Genetic Resources is the logical body to form the IGC. However it was noted that some changes **are** needed in order **to** fully meet the criteria recommended by the Keystone Dialogue for such a body. The Consultation further considered that **IBPGR/IPGRI** would **be** a logical 'platform' for hosting the STAC. There was considerable optimism at the meeting that additional funds would **be** made available for PGR activities as a result of UNCED, although how much, and how they would **be** managed is unclear. The Keystone Dialogue called for a minimum of \$1.5 billion for the **period** 1993 - 2000.
- 14) This is likely to lead to new opportunities to extend the global activities on plant genetic resources. The CGIAR should **be** prepared to play **an** active role in this international initiative as suggested during ICW91.

The Strengths of CGIAR Centers

- 15) The CGIAR has a number of strengths in the **area** of PGR:
 - Expertise primarily **in ex situ** conservation and use of PGR

- Basic infrastructure for **PGR** conservation
- Because of their international nature and the established linkages with National Programmes, the opportunity to play a coordinating role both within the framework of **PGR** networks and in regional collaboration on PGR
- The opportunity to assemble and study a wide range of genetic diversity within the crop gene pools of which a substantial part is represented in many of their collections
- Expertise and capacity in research, technology transfer and training which could be directed more specifically to PGR
- Expertise in germplasm health and exchange
- Expertise in germplasm documentation and capacity to maintain central databases of crop gene pools

Increasing Commitment of the CGIAR to PGR Conservation

- 16) The CGIAR, in the current revision of its priorities and strategies, has stressed the need for greater attention to resource management, including PGR, and is considering new structures and mechanisms to address issues on an eco-regional as well as a global basis. Given this revision, the importance of plant genetic resources activities of the CGIAR Centers within the global context and the emerging global system, it is clearly an opportune time for the CGIAR to develop a system-wide strategy for its work on PGR.
- 17) The **CGIAR** currently concentrates mainly on a limited range of crops, the so-called mandate species. However, with the implementation of research on an eco-regional basis, the range of species which will become important to the work of the Centers **will** increase. Although substantial crop improvement work may be carried out only on the mandate crops, in order to serve the needs of the NARS, the Centers will need access to a far wider range of germplasm than at present in their resources management research e.g. in developing alternative crop rotations and patterns, integrated pest management systems, soil management techniques and in assessing possibilities for agricultural diversification. In addition, with the inclusion of forestry and agroforestry within the scope of the CGIAR, genetic resources of perennial species and in situ conservation will take on an added importance. **This** will **require** a substantial increase of **resources** allocated by the CGIAR Centers to PGR activities.

Future Role of the CGIAR Centers within the Global Conservation Effort

- 18) The concept of national sovereignty over the plant genetic resources of a country, now included in the International Undertaking, implies also the responsibility of that country to ensure that its genetic resources **are** adequately conserved.

Through taking, strengthening and complementing national efforts, the CGIAR Centers will play an increasing role in the management of natural resources and particularly of **PGR** at a regional level.

- 19) In view of the varying needs and different capacities of countries to conserve and exploit their **PGR**, the role of Centers will range from providing technical advice and long-term safety duplication to an active participation in the conservation activities of the country, including monitoring of plant diversity, **as** well as collecting, storing and studying species of actual or potential importance at a national or regional level.

Conservation Strategies

- 20) The IARCs can play a leading role in the development of appropriate conservation strategies for the genepools of interest to them. These strategies should involve an appropriate combination of in situ, farm/community-level and ex situ methods. The Centers have traditionally concentrated their **PGR** conservation activities on ex situ collections. However, with the inclusion of forestry and agroforestry within the **CGIAR** purview, and the increasing recognition of the importance of wild types and species, added attention must be given to in situ conservation methods by providing the necessary scientific background to National Programmes.
- 21) Where several Centers have a common interest in a particular genepool, they will need to develop a common strategy for the conservation of that genepool. The division of responsibilities between Centers is likely to be based on criteria other than those used for the division of responsibilities for the breeding work.
- 22) Whatever decision be taken by individual Centers regarding the extent of their involvement particularly for additional species, it must be recognized that any commitments made **are** likely to have long-term priority setting. The trusteeship of **PGR** held by the Centres implies **a** long-term responsibility.
- 23) The level of involvement of Centers **in PGR** activities **can** be divided into three broad categories depending on the crop genepools they **are** dealing with:

a) "**Mandate**" crops.

These **are** crops for which the Centers have active breeding and research programmes. For these crops the Centers have the responsibility to ensure that effective conservation measures **be** in place. It is proposed that, for such species, Centres should accept responsibility for the conservation and adequate documentation of the entire genepool (domesticated and related wild species). Such responsibilities involve being custodian/trustee of the germplasm collections and playing a key role within the context of a global plan of action for conservation and use, to be agreed upon by **all** players involved.

b) Plants of actual or potential **importance** within an **eco-region**.

Centres which take on additional eco-regional responsibilities, will need to determine, in consultation with National Programmes, which species are likely to be of importance within a given eco-region and decide the extent to which they will take on responsibilities for the genetic resources of those species. Much can be done in a partnership/networking mode with other interested institutions. However, it is likely that in many situations, Centers will have to consider taking on responsibilities for certain aspects of PGR conservation of these species. This might involve long-term conservation, documentation, research, germplasm enhancement and networking.

c) Other plants.

These are crops falling outside of the scope of Center activities (e.g. crops of local importance, some plantation species, etc.). However, even for these species, Centers might wish to consider making available long-term storage to National Programmes that lack such facilities - i.e. with full responsibility and sovereignty over the material remaining with the depositor.

Germplasm health and safe movement

- 24) **As** custodians/trustees of germplasm collections, CGIAR Centres play an important role in the exchange of germplasm. They also play an important role in improving the knowledge required to safely conserve and exchange germplasm.

Information and Documentation

- 25) Germplasm documentation is central to any conservation and use system. Genebank accessions **are** of limited value in the absence of accurate information about them. The usefulness of **many** of these collections would be enhanced if more evaluation **data** were also systematically included within the databases. Centres should also consider **extending** the information to other components of the genepool which they may not themselves hold. There is still a need for greater standardization of databases held in the various Centers in order to facilitate the exchange of information. **An** important role will be to make **this** information available in a more user friendly form. Traditional knowledge about the use of species also needs to **be** included in documentation efforts.

Research

- 26) There **are** many fundamental problems associated with the conservation and use of plant genetic resources that require urgent attention, from the identification and surveying of genetic diversity, **and** the development of appropriate conservation technologies and strategies, to improved techniques for the distribution of genetic resources, and improved systems for evaluation and documentation. Given their large germplasm holdings and facilities, the Centres have a responsibility to

greatly increase their involvement in research relevant to the genepools of interest to them. The results of this research could also be applied to other species and circumstances.

- 27) **IPGRI** sees, as one of its roles, the provision of leadership in the development of a global research strategy for PGR. The commodity Centers should participate actively in this process.

Collectively the Centers can make a major impact in addressing the global agenda.

Training

- 28) Training in PGR conservation and use should ~~be~~ seen as an important component of the Centers' training programmes. There is the need both for specialized courses and for wider exposure of the concepts and techniques of PGR conservation within more general courses, such as those provided for plant breeders. A coordinated approach to PGR training across the system is needed to build up national capabilities.

Forestry

- 29) A dialogue between IPGRI, ICRAF and CIFOR (and **FAO**) has already ~~started~~, in order to develop a coordinated strategy for the activities of the CGIAR on the conservation and use of forest and agroforest genetic resources.

The Role of **IPGRI** within the CGIAR

- 30) IPGRI is the CGIAR institute solely devoted to the conservation and use of PGR. Its mandate covers all useful plants on a global level **and** thereby also complements the efforts of the other CGIAR Centers. Within the CGIAR, IPGRI sees its role as encompassing the following:
- coordinating a system-wide genetic resources research strategy
 - playing a facilitating role, within the context of overall coordinations by the ICWG, for aspects such as documentation, information and provision of scientific and technical advice
 - operating in close collaboration with other Centers, particularly with respect to regionally important crops. IPGRI is willing, subject to resources being made available, to play a leading role in association with Centers GRUs in conservation and use activities on these crops, including the allocation of **staff** time to assist with collecting, conserving, characterizing, documenting and distributing germplasm of non-mandate species.

- participating and jointly conducting training courses.

Planning and Coordination

- 31) Joint planning of a system-wide programme on **PGR** is required for the CGIAR system to provide effective leadership in the conservation of plant genetic resources. Such planning will provide a nucleus of activities that will stimulate research and conservation activities in national programmes and in the work of other institutions.
- 32) Better coordination is needed in the future especially if, as proposed in this paper, greater attention be given to **PGR** and greater attempts be made to develop common approaches and strategies. Two mechanisms for coordination currently exist:
 - a) The Joint TAC/Centre Directors Committee on Plant Genetic Resources, and
 - b) The Inter-Center Working Group on Plant Genetic Resources.

The first has a broad role in policy oversight while the second is more directly concerned with action at a practical and technical level.

Prerequisites for the Implementation of a Future CGIAR Strategy

- 33) To enable the CGIAR system to play its full part in the global PGR effort, a number of issues need to **be** addressed:
 - a) Resources allocated to PGR activities will need to **be** substantially increased. Facilities need to **be** expanded/upgraded, staffing and operational budgets need to **be raised**.
 - b) Genetic resources work needs to **be** given a **status** that reflects its increased **importance** in the overall programmes of the CGIAR. This increased **importance** should also **be** reflected in the **status** given to GRUs within the organizational structure of individual Centers.
 - c) The ICWG on PGR should **be** given a clear mandate from Center Directors in order to operate authoritatively.
 - d) **As** trustees of the **PGR** held in their collections, Centers should **be** willing to submit to international inspection/monitoring.
 - e) In addition to IPGRI representation, the CGIAR should seek to be represented at the FAO Commission (e.g. by the chair of the ICWG).

CGIAR Strategy for PGR - Opinion Survey

The CGIAR commodity Centres play a major role, internationally, in the **conservation and** utilisation of the genetic resources of the crop species in their mandates, including, in some cases, other cultivated and related wild species in the same gene pools. In addition, several Centres have accepted base collection responsibility for crops which are not in their research mandate but **are** cultivated in their eco-regions, eg. minor millets, ICRISAT; bambara groundnut, IITA.

TAC, in its Review of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies, recognises a continuing lead role for the Commodity Centres in international efforts on the collection, conservation, characterisation, evaluation and enhancement of germplasm of crops of global importance. In adopting an eco-regional approach and increasing the research effort on natural resources conservation and management, **TAC sees** the eco-regional Centres having a cooperative role with respect to plant genetic resources.

Plant genetic resources **are** a component of the natural resource base of every country and in the same way as soil and water resources, agricultural development depends on their secure conservation, **careful** management and sustainable exploitation. Countries have now committed themselves to the conservation and sustainable use of their biodiversity by signing the Biodiversity Convention. In broadening its genetic resources' activities to include species of eco-regional **importance**, the CGIAR **will** have to take account of these national commitments.

Identification of the species of eco-regional importance and the conservation and management of diverse ranges of species, **will** necessitate **significant** involvement of the NARSs. For example, the maintenance of long-lived **perennials** will require NARSs to expand their efforts in *in situ* conservation. Networking among countries and institutions having a common interest in a particular gene pool is seen as an appropriate method for organising the contributions of all parties and coordinating activities.

Since the local focus required for research, conservation, evaluation and use of eco-regionally important species strongly implicates the **NARSs**, it **calls** for coordination both with and between **NARSs** in a particular eco-region and between eco-regions in the case of species that **are** important across regions. If the Centres **are** to provide a back-up service to the national programmes, it may necessitate an expansion in their facilities, personnel and funding for genetic resources. In addition, the scientific and technical assistance to NARSs **will** have to **be** augmented in order to **aid** them develop their programmes and fulfill their commitments to the Biodiversity Convention.

IPGRI has identified four strategic objectives in its mission:

- 1) to assist countries, particularly developing nations, to assess and meet their needs for plant genetic resources conservation, and to strengthen links to users
- 2) to strengthen and contribute to international collaboration in the conservation and use of plant genetic resources
- 3) to develop and promote improved strategies and technologies for plant genetic resources conservation
- 4) to provide an international information service on plant genetic resources

In relation to the CGIAR strategy for increased research on natural resources management, IPGRI foresees that in fulfilling its objectives, it has a significant responsibility in activities on species of eco-regional importance. IPGRI's role and those of the commodity and eco-regional Centres, need to be clarified, as well as that of the System as a whole vis a vis the NARSs regarding future action on plant genetic resources.

A number of the issues were raised in the IBPGR paper "Towards a CGIAR Strategy for Plant Genetic Resources", which was discussed by TAC in March 1992 and was referred by TAC to the Centre Directors. We only had time to consider the issues very briefly at our last meeting in Nairobi. Since the ICWG could also not take-up a detailed consideration of the document before ICW92, it was agreed in Nairobi that I would seek the views of individual Centres on those key elements of the proposed strategy requiring immediate attention with respect to system-wide resource allocation decisions that TAC will have to take in evaluating Centres MTPs. Other issues raised in the paper should be discussed later by the ICWG. It is planned to have a response on the key issues ready for the TAC meeting in October.

Against the background presented above, I have drawn-up a list of questions addressing issues which need an early answer in order to take the development of a System-wide strategy for plant genetic resources further. I would appreciate receiving your responses to these questions and your comments on any other important issues in the proposed strategy which are not covered in the list below.

I would appreciate receiving your replies by **25** August. We will then prepare a synthesis report which we will share with other Centres in the first week of September, before sending the paper to TAC.

Questions

- 1) Does your Centre consider that it has the responsibility to ensure that the entire genepool(s) of its mandate crop(s), including related wild and domesticated species, is collected, conserved and documented ?
- 2) Are there additional responsibilities or activities concerning the genetic resources of a) the mandate crops b) the non-mandate crops for which your Centre recognises a conservation obligation, in which you see **IPGRI** playing a part ?
- 3) **How** would you propose that the conservation, enhancement and use effort on species of eco-regional importance, **be** organised (eg. network coordinated by your Centre, your Centre hosting a network Coordinator, support to national programmes to undertake the full range of activities, etc.) ?
- 4) What responsibilities do you foresee your Centre accepting in relation to the conservation and use of eco-regionally important species (eg. conservation of base and/or active collections, research, **prebreeding**, training, etc.) ?
- 5) What role and/or activities would you ~~see~~ **IPGRI** taking in genetic resources work on species of eco-regional ~~importance~~ to your Centre (eg. research on generic problems, documentation-central databases, training, coordination among Centres working on Same species, strengthening NARSs, coordinating networks, etc.) ?
- 6) What could your Centre expect to provide in terms of additional personnel and facilities to deal with eco-regionally important species ? Would the direct involvement of **IPGRI** personnel assist your Centre in assuming expanded responsibilities ? Would you welcome such direct involvement?
- 7) **JPGR** **sees** its primary objective **as** assisting national programmes. How, and to what extent would you see your Centre assisting **IPGRI** in strengthening the contribution of national programmes?
- 8) In a System-wide programme for plant genetic resources, what would you see as the respective roles of a) the global commodity Centres b) the eco-regional Centres c) **IPGRI** d) the Inter-Centre Working Group on Plant Genetic Resources (ICWG)?

TOWARDS A CGIAR STRATEGY FOR PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES: OPINIONS OF THE CGIAR CENTERS

Summary

As part of the ongoing debate within the CGIAR on priorities and strategies, a key component is the possible implications for the PGR activities/responsibilities of the individual Centers. As a follow-up to the paper presented to TAC in March 1992, **IBPGR** conducted an opinion survey among the Centers on some of the key issues.

This report summarized the responses of 15 Centers.

Almost all the crop commodity Centers accept full responsibilities for the conservation and use of the entire genepools of their respective mandate crops. In the case of non-crop commodity Centers such as ICRAF and ILCA the genepool "concept" does not readily apply since they deal with a very broad range of genera and species, frequently non-cultivated.

Almost all the Centers ~~see more~~ or less extended roles for IPGRI in the conservation of their mandate crops and non-mandate crops for which the Centers have current responsibilities.

In general, the majority of the Centers would only accept additional responsibilities in the conservation and use of species of eco-regional importance if and when additional funds **are** made available. Two Centers would either not accept additional responsibilities at all, or would not like to get involved in conservation activities of eco-regional crop species. In general, networks and well coordinated efforts with **NARS** **are** seen as most appropriate.

All Centers identified clear roles for **IPGRI** in genetic resources work on species of eco-regional importance, the most important ones **being training**, network coordination, research on generic problems and strengthening **NARS**.

The majority of the Centers ~~reported~~ that they would be unable, without additional funds, to provide personnel and facilities to deal with eco-regionally important crops. Almost all Centers would welcome the direct involvement of IPGRI **staff** to assist the Center.

A general willingness exists to assist IPGRI in its efforts to strengthen national programmes on **PGR**, either **as** part of the existing overall efforts to help **NARS** or, more specifically, through cooperation and/or provision of facilities **and** personnel (networking, training, research).

There exists a clear opinion among the Centers that the conservation of **PGR** in the System **needs more** coordination. Many Centers have indicated that **IPGRI** would be the most suitable institution to assume this responsibility **in** close consultation/coordination with the Inter-Center Working Group on **PGR**.

Introduction

1. During the period that the CGIAR System debated its future priorities and strategies and that the management of natural resources was given special attention in the context of UNCED, IBPGR had prepared a discussion paper as a contribution to the ongoing debate on the future CGIAR strategy for the management and use of plant genetic resources. The latter had been identified by TAC as one of the key areas for which an international system will be required in the long-term.
2. The discussion paper **aims** to complement the CGIAR Policy on Plant Genetic Resources published in 1988. During the January 1992 meeting in Rome, additional aspects of the CGIAR policy on PGR were discussed and included in a general discussion paper on Intellectual Property, Biosafety and Plant Genetic Resources. A revised version was presented and briefly discussed at the Center Director's Meeting in Nairobi in June 1992 and it was agreed that the Inter-Center Working Group on PGR should carefully review the paper. Since the Working Group could not take up a detailed consideration of the document before ICW92, it was agreed that IBPGR would seek the opinion of the individual Centers on the key elements of the proposed strategy and prepare a paper summarizing Centers' reactions for the TAC Meeting in October 1992.
3. The opinion survey was prepared in such a way that it would allow conclusions about the general attitude of the Centers with respect to the proposed strategy as well as, more specifically, the individual Centers role in the maintenance and use of crops with an eco-regional priority. It was further planned that the opinion survey would assist the individual Centers in the preparation of their respective Medium Term Plans. A copy of the opinion survey is attached (Appendix I).
4. Other topics not addressed in the survey (eg. legal **status** of collections, duplication etc.) will be addressed later by the ICWG.

Conservation and use of PGR of mandate crops

5. From a PGR perspective, the CG Centers fall into the following broad categories:
 - A. Commodity Centers with a clear crop mandate: CIAT, CIMMYT, CIP, ICARDA, ICRISAT, *INIBAP*, IRRI and WARDA.
 - B. Commodity Centers with a mandate for a category of crops (CIAT - tropical forages, CIFOR - forestry species, **ICARDA** - forages, ICRAF - agroforestry species, ILCA - forage species).
 - C. Centers without a specific crop or category of crop mandate: IPGRI.
 - D. Centers with certain responsibilities of relevance to PGR conservation and use: IFPRI (policy issues) and ISNAR (strengthening NARS). **d**
 - E. Centers with a mandate without any direct relevance to PGR: **IIMI**, ICLARM and ILRAD.

6. Does your Center 'consider that it has the responsibility to ensure' that the entire genepool(s) of its mandate crop(s), including related wild and domesticated species, is collected, conserved and documented?

The extent of the responsibility accepted by Centers to ensure the collection, conservation and documentation of the entire genepools of their mandate crops is presented in Table 1.

Center	Crops/category of crops	Remarks
CIAT	5 cultivated <i>Phaseolus</i> spp. genus <i>Manihot</i> and 18 tropical forage species	Accepted responsibilities as per CIAT-IBPGR base collection agreements
CIMMYT	Maize, hexaploid wheat and <i>triticale</i>	Entire genepools; close cooperation with ICARDA on wheat
CIP	Potato, sweet potato and "several minor Andean root and tuber crops"	Entire genepools
ICARDA	Barley, lentil, faba bean, durum wheat, bread wheat, kabuli chickpea	Entire genepools; for barley global responsibility may be shared with other institutions through a network
ICRAF	No specific mandate species; more than 2000 multipurpose trees	Plan to concentrate on 20 species; genepool concept not so important for agroforestry species; cooperation with other Centers (CIAT, ICRISAT, IITA, ILCA and IRRI)
ICRISAT	Sorghum, pearl millet, chickpea, pigeonpea, groundnut, minor millet	Entire genepools; for minor millets only base collection responsibility
IITA	Cassava, maize, plantain, cowpea, soybean, rice, yam, agroforestry spp.	Entire genepool responsibility for <i>Vigna unguiculata</i> and <i>Dioscorea</i> spp Germplasm of other species also conserved
ILCA	No mandate crops; species useful for livestock feed	Genepool concept does not really apply; responsibility for collecting, conservation and documentation accepted
INIBAP	Banana and plantain spp	Entire <u>Musa</u> genepool.
IRRI	Rice	Entire genepool of <i>Oryza</i> and related genera
WARDA	West African rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> and <i>O. glaberrima</i>)	Entire genetic variability of its mandate crops with respect to collecting, conservation and documentation
CIFOR	Forestry species	

7. *Are there additional responsibilities or activities concerning the genetic resources of a) the mandate crops b) the non-mandate crops for which your Center has a conservation obligation, in which you see IPGRI playing a part?*

Almost all Commodity Centers listed activities for their mandate and non-mandate crops in which they see a clear role for **IPGRI** to assist them in additional responsibilities and/or activities. (Table 2).

Table 2. Frequency of Center responses on IPGRI's potential roles in conservation of mandate and non-mandate species (N = 11)

Activity	Mandate crops	Non-Mandate crops
Exploration/collecting	2	2
Conservation Desse	1	2
Coordination of duplicate base collections	1	1
Documentation/information (including international germ-plasm database development)	2	3
Evaluation of germplasm	1	-
Networking/coordination/cooperation	5	4
Research (specific and general)	3	2
Training	2	2
Ensure availability of entire (indexed) genepool;	1	-
Identification of donors	-	1

Eco-regional important species

8. *How would you propose that the conservation and use effort on species of eco-regional importance, be organized (eg. network coordinated by your Center, your Center hosting a network Coordinator, support to national programmes to undertake the full range of activities, etc.)*

Regarding the organization of the conservation and use of species of eco-regional importance, one Center (CIMMYT) replied that it had no intentions now to get involved in other than its mandate species but would consider joining IPGRI and others when a comprehensive strategy has been developed. CIAT sees an important role for the other IARCs, the private sector and regional networks, and sees a supportive role for IPGRI in institution building and training of national programme staff. CIP is prepared to coordinate "the other species" and is willing to host an eco-regional network coordinator at the Center to help with these activities. ICARDA would welcome the hosting of an IPGRI appointed network coordinator, with adequate funds to support national programmes. ICRAF plans to handle its own networking with NARS and foresees a need for a network coordinator for species other than multipurpose trees (MPTs). ICRISAT sees network coordination by the Center with a specific crop mandate as most efficient and effective. For non-mandate crops, the Center could host a crop germplasm specialist from one of the NARS participating in a network of which the Center and IPGRI should be a part. Depending upon the availability of sufficient funds, IITA would be prepared to coordinate activities on eco-regionally important species itself and sees IPGRI's role to formulate an effective strategy for the conservation and use of eco-regional crops. ILCA sees it appropriate that the lead center for eco-regional activities accepts the coordinating responsibility for germplasm conservation. INIBAP, through its coordinated network and IRRI, through support to national programmes, both are prepared to play a more prominent (regional) role in PGR in close cooperation with IPGRI. Network cooperation with IPGRI staff, but without taking over the responsibilities of NARS, are seen as important aspects of such cooperation. WARDA has a coordinating role in the varietal improvement and cropping systems activities of mandate and eco-regional crops in West Africa.

9. *What responsibilities do you foresee your Center accepting in relation to the conservation and use of eco-regionally important species (eg. conservation of base and/or active collections, research, prebreeding, training, etc.)?*

CIAT does not plan any significant role in the conservation of crops of eco-regional importance, except for an active collection to be established for selected multipurpose trees. ICARDA sees its responsibilities related to the availability of extra funds and would give highest priority to storage of base collections. ICRAF is not yet in a position to make commitments but envisages that it could take responsibility for key MPTs (presently 5 species) in the bimodal African highlands. IITA, as a focal point for networking is prepared to hold the base collections and to distribute core collections for use. ILCA would be prepared to continue to take major responsibility for forage species and to hold active and base collections through "reciprocal agreements". It would also cooperate in training and research activities on other crops. INIBAP foresees further

responsibilities in several areas of germplasm conservation, research, breeding, training and documentation. IRRI considers, at present, an expanded role to be premature but could see the CG Centers accepting base collection responsibilities whereas the **NARS** hold the active collections. WARDA is prepared to take full responsibility for the conservation and use of the germplasm of the rice gene pool and to establish working collections of other crops in rice-based cropping systems. The answers are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of the additional accept

important crops.

Activity Center	Active. collections	Base collections	Research	Training	Net- working	Cooperation with others	(Pre) breeding	Documen- tation	Strengthen- ing NARS	Remarks
CIAT	— *)	—								*) except for MPTs
CIMMYT	—	—								
CIP		+ *)	+ 1)	+ 1)	+		+ 1)			1) Whenever expertise available *) For crops related to mandate crops
ICARDA	+ *)	+ *)	+ *)	+ *)		+	+ *)	+ *)		*) Depending avail- ability of funds
ICRAF	+	+								Planned for 5 selected species
ICRISAT										Willing to accept responsibilities provided funds avail- able on agreement by Governing Board
IITA		+			+	+))				*) Distribution of core collections
ILCA	+ *)	+ *)	+	+						*)Through reciprocal agreements
INIBAP	+ *)		+	+	+		+	+	+	*) in vitro
IRRI		+		+))	+))	+))		+))	+))	*) Possible future responsibilities
ISNAR									+	In cooperation with IPGRI
WARDA	+))									*) Establish working collections

10. What role and/or activity would you see **IPGRI** taking in genetic resources work on species of eco-regional importance to your Center (eg. research on generic problems, documentation-central databases, training, coordination among Centers working on same species, strengthening NARSs, coordinating networks, etc.)?

All Centers see a major involvement of **IPGRI** in the genetic resources work on species of eco-regional importance. The following suggestions were made by the various Centers:

1)	Collecting	3 Centers
2)	Documentation - central databases/uniform management systems	5 "
3)	Training (on general issues)	8 "
4)	Research on generic problems	7 "
5)	Strengthening NARSs (specifically genebanks)	6 "
6)	Coordination of networks/regional projects	6* "
7)	Coordination of non-crop-specific PGR issues	4 "
8)	Coordination among Centers	
	working on same spp.	3 "
	non-mandate spp.	2 "
9)	Advisory role (in general)	1 "
10)	Back-up of all activities on Musa germplasm	1 "
11)	Fund raising	1 "

* (one Center replied; "as long as crop is not handled by other CGIAR Centers")

11. What could your Center be expected to provide in **terms** of additional personnel and facilities to deal with eco-regionally important species? **Would** the direct involvement of **IPGRI** personnel assist your Center in assuming expanded responsibilities?

The general tendency is for Centers to **see** some involvement in **PGR** aspects of eco-regionally important species if additional funds were to **be** made available (ICRISAT and CIP). Some centers are not prepared **to** get involved in the conservation **and** use of crops of eco-regional importance (CIAT, CIMMYT), whereas *INIBAP* did not indicate a clear expanded role. The following concrete possibilities have been suggested:

Cold storage space (black box storage)	2 Centers
Hosting or cooperation with IPGRI staff/coordinator of network	6 "
Assume all required PGR activities if funds available	1 "
Cooperation with IPGRI on seed health, biodiversity assessment and biotechnology	1 "
IPGRI should only get involved in research of low priority to Centers	1 "
Eco-regional responsibilities of non-mandate crops is a long-term issue (ICRISAT)	1 "

12. *How, and to what extent would you see your Center assisting IPGRI in strengthening the contribution of national programmes to the conservation and use efforts on species of eco-regional importance?*

Strengthening National PGR Programmes is one of the priorities in IPGRI's new strategic plan. The Centers were asked how and to what extent they could assist IPGRI in this respect, with a focus on the conservation of eco-regional crops.

CIAT:	indirectly through strengthening NARS; support to regional networks and training.
CIMMYT :	only programmes maintaining and using maize and wheat.
CIP:	work with other Centers in a more coordinated way. Centers would provide facilities and personnel for training, research/thesis work, etc.
ICARDA:	complementing each other; pooling resources; division of responsibilities through a regional network.
ICRAF:	in any way possible; ICRAF could advise IPGRI and facilitate contacts.
ICRISAT:	willing to joint/hands; availability of Center's facilities for joint training and other relevant activities.
IITA:	logistic support through contacts and networks; supplying expertise and research capabilities; black box storage (depending on availability of funds).
ILCA:	part of current programme; networks; training activities; PGR activities
INIBAP:	part of INTBAP's primary objective: would welcome back up from IPGRI, especially related to Musa .
IRRI:	training activities and documentation, mainly through Rice Genetic Resources Working Group.
ISNAR:	joint approach in areas of national resource management policy.
WARDA:	the involvement of IPGRI in the established Task Forces on crop improvement and cropping systems can provide a valuable vehicle for strengthening National Programmes.

13. *In a System-wide programme for plant genetic resources, what would you see as the respective roles of a) the global commodity Centers b) the eco-regional Centers c) IPGRI d) the Inter-Center Working Group on **Plant** Genetic Resources (ICWG)?*

As the respective roles of the a) global commodity Centers, b) the eco-regional Centers. c) **IPGRI** and d) the Inter-Center Working Group on **PGR** (ICWG) in a System-wide programme for plant genetic resources, the following activities were identified as summarized in Table 4:

Table 4: The roles of the Global Commodity Centers, Eco-regional Centers, **IPGRI** and **ICWG** in a System-wide **PGR** programme.

Center	Global commodity Center	Eco-regional Center	IPGRI	ICWG
CIAT	Conservation and use. Coordination (network). Training.	Conservation and use. Regional germplasm networks. Acquisition germplasm for NARS's .	Coordination conservation & use of non-mandated species. General assistance to NARS . Coordination sister Centers of non-crop-specific PGR issues.	Discussion forum for system-wide PGR issues.
CIMMYT	Maintenance & use mandated genepools.	Not clear which species. Focus on policy issues.	Overviewing global, regional conservation efforts. Detecting deficiencies. Coordination.	Mechanism to harmonize efforts within CG.
CIP	Secured conservation, evaluation & utilization. Base collection maintenance.	Develop networks; promote wider utilization & complement <i>ex situ</i> conservation by <i>in situ</i> .	Conservation, evaluation & use of non-CGIAR crops, especially minor crops with potential use.	To establish linkages between IPGRI and GRUs ; determine research agenda, coordinate joint activities.
ICARDA	Manage of global info system. Coordination networks storing safety duplicates of regional base collections.	Regional data bases. Host coordinator. Active & base collections. Evaluate & enhance use.	Coordinate CGIAR PGR policy. Represent CGIAR on PGR matters. Develop & promote strategies & technologies for conservation. Assist Nat. Programmes. Complement IARCs by focusing on non-mandate crops	Forum for discussing strategic issues. Coordination of PGR activities. Exchange platform for experiences.
ICRAF	Maintenance of global collections.	Concentrate on non-mandated crops of eco-regional importance. Coordination.	Research on key issues, recalcitrant <i>seeds</i> , <i>in situ</i> conservation, information & training.	Collaboration and cooperation. Select key species.
ICRISAT	Primary responsibility for collecting, conservation, documentation and improvement of mandated crops.	Maintenance of active collections and exchange	As per their well-defined objectives and roles.	As per their well-defined objectives and roles.

IITA	Lead collecting, conservation & documentation of mandate crop germplasm.	Lead activities in eco-regional species with other IARCs and NARS .	Lead role in initiating, promoting and coordinating global PGR activities. Coordinate research and initiate consultation on system-wide issues.	Define system-wide research needs. Formulate common strategies. Forum for discussion on germplasm issues.
ILCA	Maintenance of PGR Center of excellence for mandate crops.	Concentrate on evaluation & use of germplasm through farming system approach.	Facilitate and coordinate PGR activities throughout system. Central role in information dissemination & in research on genetic problems.	Forum for discussion of technical issues & increasing cooperation. Development of policy on PGR and related issues.
INIBAP	*)			
IRRI	Maintenance global germplasm of mandate genepools. Coordination of PGR activities.	To be determined.	Coordination of PGR issues, e.g. IPR, legal status of collectors etc.	Should be given greater authority to develop and implement policy on PGR . Prepare discussions for joint TAC/CD Committee. Driving force; regular meeting, consultation.
ISNAR	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
WARDA	Maintenance and use of regional genetic variability in cooperation with global commodity center.		Coordination collecting and exchange of germplasm among centers; providing training and methodological guidelines.	

***)** INIPAB wants to achieve the success of germplasm management for the next generation through a greater awareness of the global responsibility of NARS personnel.

The Implication of Applying the Legal Concept of ~~Trust~~ to Germplasm Collections at CGIAR Research Centers'

by Wolfgang Siebeck and John Barton

There is growing concern among scientists, policymakers, and genetic resource activists over the question of who owns and controls the germplasm collections found at a number of GCIAR research centers. Past reviews have found that the legal status of these collections is unclear; the formal legal agreements that established some centers could be interpreted as giving the host country rights to a center's germplasm collection if the center is officially closed, moved, or shut down due to hostilities or a natural disaster. In fact, a recent survey by the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources found that most centers appear to hold that their genebank collections **are** part of the center's assets and would **be** treated as such in case of dissolution: the collections would become property of the host government and, generally, could be disposed of by the government without restriction.

It is our view, however, that a CGIAR center's genebank collection cannot be considered among the assets of a center - such as land and equipment - that would revert to host country ownership in the event of closure. CGIAR policy has clearly stated that the centers play a custodial, or trustee, role: genetic material is collected from source nations with the understanding that it **will** be used for the benefit of global research. A center's trusteeship responsibility has to be seen as irrevocable **as long as** it legally exists. **As** a result, the genebank material held at CGIAR centers should be considered legally beyond the reach of the host nation government.

Background

Each of the 18 centers in the GCIAR system have been established under very different legal arrangements (a number, for example, were established before the creation of the CGIAR). **As** a result, they enjoy different degrees of protection from intervention by public authorities of the host country.

In the past, a major concern for the centers has been the free movement, privileges, and immunities of scientists and staff, which to **an** important degree influence the centers' ability to recruit competent **staff**. But surprisingly little concern has been expressed about the unencumbered movement and storage of germplasm.

Growing public awareness of the importance of CGIAR genebanks, however, has prompted this question: What would happen to these germplasm collections if political

¹ This article, published in Diversity Vol. 8, No. 3, 1992, is a summary of the report the authors prepared for IBPGR, entitled "The legal status of CGIAR germplasm collections and related issues".

changes, war, or natural disaster were to threaten their existence? Recent events in Ethiopia, for example, where the fate of the national genebank remained uncertain for some time during civil turmoil, have lent urgency to the debate.

The legal arrangements under which most centers were set up - formally known as "establishment instruments" and/or "headquarters agreements" - contain explicit provisions on the dissolution of the center and the consequent disposition of the center's assets. Generally, land and improvements would pass back to the host state (which usually provided them to the center in the first place). Other assets would stay within the host country and be distributed to institutions with objectives **similar** to those of the dissolved center.

These legal arrangements, however, differ substantially from one center to another and - except for one center - they **are** silent on the **status** of the center's germplasm collection. In light of this silence, should a center's germplasm collection be treated as assets like real estate and improvements?

Such legal interpretation might have been acceptable in the past, but could not be challenged in light of the CGIAR's **1989** Policy Statement on Plant Genetic Resources. Under the heading "ownership", this document states that "it is the CGIAR policy that collections assembled as a result of international collaboration should not become the property of any single nation, but should be held in trust for the use of present and **future** generations of research workers in **all** countries throughout the world".

If these germplasm collections **are** held in trust, and not owned by the centers, who owns them if a center ceases to exist?

Previous Reviews

This question and other concerns have prompted at least two earlier reviews of the legal environment in which the CGIAR centers operate, one by the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources in **1986**, the other by the ~~Technical~~ Advisory Committee (TAC) of the CGIAR in **1988**. In addition to these reviews, individual centers have reviewed their legal positions.

The FAO Commission' **1986** comprehensive review of the legal status of national and international institutions operating genebanks concluded that CGIAR centers can be considered international **only** in a loose sense because of their international support and objectives, and because of their relative autonomy within their host countries.

They cannot be considered 'international' in the strict sense, the FAO concluded in its Legal **Status** of Base and Active Collections of Plant Genetic Resources (CPRG/87/5), "since they are not created by a formal treaty concluded among States or other international legal persons, and their activities are not directed by States or such other international legal persons... Notwithstanding this international support and their enjoyment of certain international privileges, the International Agricultural Research Centers (**IARCs**) are usually national corporations, established and operating under the law of their host state".

At the same time, the Commission **found** that, **because** control over policy information and policy implementation was shared between national and international representatives on

the centers' Boards of Trustees: " ...irrespective of their legal status, these **IARCs** cannot be considered simply as national institutions. Therefore, the genebanks maintained by the IARCs **are** neither under the control of any given State or national authority, nor in the private sector. Their **status** is, in fact, *sui generis* (unique).

The Commission also found that, in the majority of cases, the plant genetic resources held in national genebanks were considered property of the government of the state. But the Commission concluded that the legal ownership of germplasm held by the CGIAR centers remained unclear - especially in light of the disparate assessments received from a number of CGIAR centers, which revealed that some centers considered themselves owners of their germplasm collections while others did not.

"There is no certainty that, if a legal dispute regarding the ownership of material actually arose, a court would support this position [of ownership], the report concluded. In fact, the lack of legal provisions in the documents under which IARCs have been established generates an element of uncertainty in the settlement of the problem of ownership. Since the IARCs *are* mostly national corporations established and operating under the law of their host state, the ownership of the plant genetic resources would be, in principle, governed by the national law applicable to the IARCs concerned".

In its separate 1989 report on plant genetic resources - *CGIAR Policy on Plant Generic Resources* (TAC Document AGR/TAC:IAR/88/4) - TAC suggested that "ownership of genebanks held by the (CGIAR's) Commodity Centers [was] partly conditioned by their agreements with their host countries", adding that these differed considerably among centers. Based on a survey of the Commodity Centers, the TAC document included a description of the legal arrangements of individual centers with respect to the long-term security of their germplasm collections. The TAC document suggested that Center **boards** give high priority to the ownership issue and, where necessary, seek to revise headquarters agreements.

The TAC document recognizes the need for long-term security of the centers' germplasm collections, while at the same time accommodating the many nations' political sensitivities concerning the ownership and value of germplasm originating from within their territories. It avoids **taking** sides in the disputes over whether a country has a sovereign right over its germplasm and can control its outflow, but suggests that once a country has collaborated in a collection effort, any ownership right to the collected material ceases. The germplasm is then held by the CGIAR centers "in trust" for **all** people.

By using the trusteeship concept - which was subsequently adopted **as** CGIAR policy - TAC suggested a basis for the centers' genebank operations which, we believe, offers a sustainable legal framework. Besides the TAC and 1986 CGIAR reviews, individual centers have reviewed their legal position from time to time. As noted above, a recent (1991) survey by the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources found that **all** but one of the centers that replied appear to still hold that their genebank collections **are** part of the center's assets and would be treated as such in case of dissolution: the collections would become property of the host government and, generally, could be disposed of by the government without restriction.

We disagree with this interpretation. In our view, the trusteeship concept calls for a different interpretation.

The Trusteeship Concept: Consequences for CGIAR Genebank Collections

The CGIAR stated in 1989 that "it is CGIAR policy that collections assembled as a result of international collaboration should not become the property of any single nation, but should **be** held in trust for the use of present and future generations of research workers in all countries throughout the world".

Interpreting the concept of "trust" included in the **CGIAR** statement is particularly important in two possible contemporary situations:

In the first scenario, a center builds a collection of germplasm that it has received from a variety of nations in trust. The center then moves from the host nation (which is sometimes but normally not the source of the genetic material). **This** departure could be the center's choice, or the center might be forced out by a decision made by the host government. Is the center's germplasm collection subject to the host nation's control? Or must materials in the collection **be** returned to the source nation? Or must they be transferred to another center that will conserve them or use them for research purposes?

In the second scenario, a center considers the possibility that someone **will obtain** a patent or other form of intellectual property rights protection on genes within their germplasm collection. Is the center also free to obtain such protections? Must it **obtain** them if it fears that a third party will obtain such protection? If it does obtain protection, what are its rights and obligations with respect to any financial proceeds?

Origins of the "Trust" Concept

To attempt to answer these questions, one must first consider the formal international meaning, if any, that **can be** attributed to the **term** "trust" - a concept that the CGIAR almost certainly used in a relatively non-technical way.

Although there is little formal international law in the **area**, the leading international application of the trust concept is in the international **trusteeship** arrangement under which certain nations served as trustees for formerly dependent areas at the end of World War II.

The most careful study found on the history and origin of **this** trust concept - *International Mandates and Trusteeship Systems: A Comparative Study* by R.N. Chowdhuri (Martinus Nijhoff: The Hague 1955) - found that Spanish legal scholars of the 16th century were the source of the intellectual concept of a trust obligation. However, the first quoted use of the word trust in this international context was by an English politician, Edmund Burke. Burke's use undoubtedly reflected the fact that the legal doctrine of a trust is, in large part, a unique Anglo-Saxon concept.

"The trust owes its particular character to the **more** or less accidental circumstances that **in** 15th century England, and for 400 years thereafter, there were separate courts of law and equity...", A. Scott & W. Fratcher wrote in their 1987 *The Law of Trusts*. "It was possible therefore for one person to have the legal title to property and for another to compel him to exercise his legal rights for the other's benefit. There would be nothing extraordinary

about the trust if the matter had stopped there. But the course of equity went further **than** merely to impose personal duties on the holder of the legal title. They gave the beneficiary an interest in the property and gave him protection in the enjoyment of that interest. **The** result is almost unique: a double form of ownership. Down below is the trustee who holds the legal title; above him is the beneficiary who has the equitable ownership".

The concept is so unusual - but also broadly useful - that nations recently negotiated a special Hague Convention on the Law Applicable to Trusts and on Their Recognition. **The** draft convention is designed to ensure that the relative rights of the trustee and the beneficiary **are** recognized in those jurisdictions in which the trust concept is unfamiliar.

The Anglo-Saxon Tradition

In Anglo-Saxon law, a trust is created by a settler who places certain assets in trust under the control of a trustee for the benefit of a beneficiary. A **will**, for example, might direct a trustee to manage, control and operate a business until a minor heir becomes old enough to take over. At that time the trust would **be** terminated and the assets of the trust given to the heir.

Under this Anglo-Saxon theory, a trust in genetic resources might have been created by the 1989 CGIAR Policy Statement of Plant Genetic Resources, which stated that a center's germplasm collection was "held in trust for the use of present and **future** generations of research workers in **all** countries throughout the world". Alternatively, the 1989 declaration could be seen as a recognition of a preexisting situation: **CGIAR** genebanks **collected** germplasm as trustees under **an** implicit understanding with the nation of origin.

In the first case, by analogy, the **CGIAR**, acting as owner, would be placing the materials in trust, under its **own** (or the center's) trusteeship. In the second case, source nations gave the material to the centers in trust, under the centers' trusteeship.

In either case, the beneficiary would **be** either the present and future generations of research workers, or the **farmers** of the developing world, who benefit from the work of those researchers.

In general, under a trust of this type, the assets held in trust **are** not regarded as assets of the trustee, so that a third party could not obtain the assets in settlement of an obligation of the trustee. It is clear, then, that the implication of the Anglo-Saxon law is that the host nation would not **be** able to obtain genetic resources from the trustee (a center) without the assent of the beneficiary (researchers and/or developing world farmers).

Under this body of law, the trustee is "under a duty to the beneficiary to take reasonable steps to take and **keep** control of the trust property", and "to use reasonable care and skill to preserve the trust property". Thus, under the analogy, the trustee centers are obliged to maintain their germplasm collections carefully. **This** obligation could include, for example, taking steps to ensure that the germplasm is duplicated in different geographical zones, irrespective of political circumstances, in order to protect it from loss.

With respect to obtaining intellectual property rights, possible analogies cut both ways, but generally favour the right of the trustee to obtain patent protection only if the

interests of the beneficiary are carefully protected. **As** noted, the trust must be operated for the benefit of the beneficiary. This requires the trustee "to use reasonable care and skill to make the trust property productive".

In the case of institutions holding germplasm for the benefit of humanity, one can easily argue that obtaining intellectual property protection is a way to gain protection against the possibility that a windfall profit would **be** gained by the private sector and thus be lost from the international public sector research community.. Although the prospect of financial support for research may itself be a proper goal, this would be a much stronger argument if there was any **risk** that a private **right** in the material would adversely effect the developing world farmer. Thus, the trust doctrine gives support for a right - or even an obligation - for centers to patent genes in their collections.

The negative argument is that traditional trust law greatly restricts self-dealing on the part of the trustee, out of fear that transactions between the trustee and the trust could be unfair to the beneficiary. For example, a trustee cannot sell trust property to him- or herself; likewise, the trustee is not to commingle trust assets with his or her own assets, unless so permitted by the terms of the trust. Thus, the doctrine reflects a strong fear that the trustee will place his or her interest **ahead** of that of the beneficiary.

By analogy, then, it would be essential for the CGIAR or the center to administer any patenting and the use of any royalties in a way that transparently ensures that these resources would be used for research that does benefit humanity.

Implications of Trusteeship for the CGIAR Genebanks

Certain material held by the CGIAR centers and genebanks is presumably not subject to the trust doctrine. Certainly this is the **case** for proprietary material supplied under a specific contract. It is probably also the **case** for material that has received breeding attention and is improved from the material supplied in trust - there has long been a differentiation between unimproved germplasm and advanced material developed from such unimproved material.

Advanced material is considered to reflect **an** intellectual input separate from that of the unimproved sources. Such material is clearly the center's asset; the center has full rights to patent or dispose of it (save as those rights **are** affected **by** a particular grant or contract). **As** a center asset, such material would normally follow the terms of the center's establishment **arrangements** and host nation agreement upon dissolution.

But the material in genebank base collections is, we believe, subject to the trust concept, no matter who is the formal legal owner. This is the clear implication of the CGIAR's declaration; it is also the implication of the **FAO's** International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources, which recognized "the universally accepted principle that plant genetic resources **are** a heritage of mankind". The question of formal ownership is relatively unimportant; what is important is that the centers have the responsibility to preserve and apply the material for the benefit of scientific research and the developing nations.

In developing the implications of the trust concept, however, we recognize that we are on untrodden ground. The application of this body of law to international genetic

resources (or other similar resources) has not previously been attempted. Hence, we attempt to interpret the concept as well as possible and with the help of the Undertaking.

A Center's Responsibility to Conserve Genetic Resources

Under the trust concept, the trustee is, as noted above, under a duty to the beneficiary to take reasonable steps to take and keep control of the trust property, and to use reasonable care and skill to preserve the trust property. This corresponds to the FAO Undertaking's emphasis, for example, on placing plant genetic resource activities on a firmer financial basis. The ideas of the trust concept clearly apply: the centers **are** obligated to maintain the germplasm carefully, and may have, for example, **an** obligation to ensure that the material is duplicated in order to protect it from loss. Likewise, they must **seek** to ensure that it is widely available for plant breeding should access be threatened by national action or the activity of a party gaining intellectual property rights over the material.

Responsibilities Upon Closure of A Center

Uniform domestic interpretations of the trust concept, as reflected in the draft Hague Convention, imply that the host nation has no control over the genetic resources contained in an international gene bank. Under the domestic law analogy, the host nation can be no more than a creditor - and the entire operation pattern of international research suggests exactly the same result on a policy basis. Indeed, this is a major point of the FAO Undertaking's position that "plant genetic resources... should be available without restriction." The materials cannot be taken by the host government; instead, they must be saved for the benefit of the global research community.

Trust principles are slightly less clear as to whether the source nations of germplasm would be entitled to regain the materials under any circumstances. Their interest is clearly adverse to that of the world community, which has built up expectations deriving from the existence of the trust. Indeed, it is traditional Anglo-Saxon trust law that a trustor, in general, has power to revoke the trust only if that power was reserved or in certain mistake-like situations. This would suggest that the source nation has lost rights over the material. (In contrast, under a French draft law, the trust assets would return to the original owner - either the genebank or the source nation - upon the dissolution of the trust unless the trust document has stated otherwise.) The FAO Undertaking certainly suggests an approach emphasizing global availability. It is thus the more sound principle that a center's genetic materials should be transferred to the global research community rather than the source nation. This way, they can be available to all.

Responsibilities With ~~Respect~~ To Intellectual Property Rights

As noted above, the trust arguments cut both ways with respect to intellectual property protection. Conservation and support for global research suggest that, if intellectual property rights are plausible, they be taken out in the name of the public sector rather than the private sector. This may even be implied by the obligation of the trustee "to use reasonable care and skill to make the trust property productive." At the same time, the trust concept warns against self-dealing (although it is abundantly clear that the international centers are expected to use the materials for breeding). And both the trust concept and the FAO Undertaking suggest that intellectual property rights should never be exercised to the detriment of the developing nation farmer. Thus, any such rights should be waived or

exercised at a zero royalty in developing nations, save perhaps as part of a carefully supervised mechanism of private distribution to developing nation farmers.

Moreover, should there be patenting, the trust concept implies an obligation to ensure that any resulting profits (such as revenues from royalties less the costs of obtaining an enforcing patents) are transparently used for the benefit of the entirely global possibilities include a special fund or account or some form of review by an outside group.) The funds would, of course, still be used for research - but the broader community might have a say in defining the research goals. And it would undercut the trust concept if the profits were used to reduce donor nation support for the international agricultural research system.

Impact of Joining The Proposed FAO Base Collections Network

What **are** the implications for the ownership and control of germplasm if a center chooses to join the FAO's proposed base collections network?

In our view, it would be possible for a center to join the network if the current proposals are modified to accommodate the centers' position as custodians. While we believe the gains from such a move would be small in terms of **strengthening** the legal status of the materials, the centers would **gain** political standing in case a genebank operation is under threat of war, civil disturbance, interference from country authorities, or natural disasters. We also believe that the centers' accession to the proposed FAO network would encourage countries to follow the example; this could lead to more effective international oversight of national genebanks.

As part of the Undertaking, the FAO Conference called for "an internationally coordinated network of national, regional, and international centers, including an international network of base collections in gene banks, under the auspices or the jurisdiction of FAO, that have assumed the responsibility to hold, for the benefit of the international community and on the principle of unrestricted exchange, base or active collections of the plant genetic resources of particular plant species".

Part of the purpose of **this** provision was to provide the collections with any additional formal legal status that would derive from their **affiliation** with the **FAO**, **an** organization with formal international personality. As the FAO suggested: The ultimate responsibility for the conservation of plant genetic resources covered by this network and for unrestricted access to such resources, should rest with an intergovernmental authority such as FAO. **In** this way, conservation and free exchange of these valuable resources would enjoy greater stability, since it would not depend solely on the policy, financial **means**, or diligence of any single government or institution. The conservation and unrestricted availability of plant genetic resources would, so to **speak**, be underwritten by an intergovernmental organization. Similarly, policies relating for example to the resources that should be preserved, or to access to such resources for plant breeding and scientific purposes, would be subtracted from the unilateral decision-making power of individual governments or institution.

The Three Models

The FAO has developed several model agreements for placing genetic resources in the FAO network. The Joint Center Directors/TAC Committee on Plant Genetic Resources has suggested consideration of three of the models, known as Models B, C, and D.

The three Models differ in several important respects. In general, Model B transfers the materials most completely to the FAO and Model D transfers them least completely (Model C is intermediate). **All** three models are designed for signature by national governments; all include clauses for arbitration, ultimately with a neutral appointed by the President of the International Court of Justice (ICJ).

Under Model B, which is intended place the materials under the jurisdiction of FAO, ownership of material is transferred to FAO and national governments renounce the right to subject germplasm to national legislation. The national government retains ownership in the other cases.

The other models only place the materials under the "auspices" of the FAO. Model B gives the FAO a right of access to the premises and a right, under certain circumstances, to require administrative action to protect the material, as well as a right to set policies for the material. Of these FAO rights, only the right of access is included in Model C, but the host government agrees to involve FAO in the decision-making process. The FAO has none of these rights in Model D. Models B and C include a procedure for bringing financial difficulties to the attention of FAO; there is no such provision in model D.

Applicability to the Centers

Because these models all involve national governments, none is directly applicable to the CGIAR genebanks - certainly an implication of the above analysis is that the plant genetic materials in the **CGIAR** genebanks **are** not now held by host governments. Adaptation to a center-FAO pattern would require a number of technical changes; for example, it is not clear that an International Court of Justice role in dispute settlement would be appropriate.

In general, as trustees, the CGIAR centers **are** responsible for managing the materials for the benefit of "present and future generations of research workers in **all** countries throughout the world". Although it is possible to exercise this right through the FAO, the Centers will probably **be** able to manage the materials most effectively if they retain as much authority and flexibility as possible. This would suggest a model close to Model D. With the other models, there would **be** a need at least "to associate FAO with the policy-making process" for policies "in respect of activities related to the designated germplasm (Model C. Article 5). Thus, some decisions might have to **be** delayed, for example, pending consideration by the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources or the FAO Conference.

At the same time, an adaptation of Model D - we call it "Model E" - might be valuable. Model E would put the collection under the "auspices" of the FAO. It would not define ownership: neither FAO nor the center would **be** described as owning the germplasm, but the center might **be** described as holding it in trust. The FAO and the center would both agree to help defend the rights of the beneficiaries of the materials in the rare event that the future of the materials depended on a formal legal action. **An** appropriate arbitration process would **be** defined.

For most realistic threats to the materials, legal arguments will probably be overridden by such exigencies as a natural disaster or civil war. In the rare case that formal legal proceedings matter, that proceeding could **be** in a court that might consider trust logic or interpret a host-nation agreement on a reasonable basis. Bringing in the FAO provides

an additional international legal basis for action in the even rarer cases that international legal proceedings will matter and the local proceedings fail to recognize global interests.

A Way To Strengthen International Solidarity

Legally, the Model **E** arrangement would marginally reinforce the status of a center's genebank collection. More importantly, it may well strengthen international solidarity should the need arise to mount a rescue operation for a genebank that is jeopardized by war, civil disturbances or natural disaster. FAO would certainly **be** called upon to coordinate a rescue operation, in its role of a "senior custodian" of all genebank collections in the world, both national and international.

Because of its custodial relations with such genebanks, FAO would **also** be in an excellent position to orchestrate an evacuation and determine where collections should **be** relocated.

While FAO would have the lead role, we believe it should work closely with **IBPGR** and the CGIAR. We would see this as a mutually supportive collaborative effort. This would also set a strong example for national genebanks to follow, thus helping to bring stronger international oversight to a global conservation strategy which currently lacks effectiveness.

Other Options

While the inclusion of a CGIAR center's base collection in the FAO network may be desirable legally and politically, a center may still want to strengthen its current legal status. This would be particularly true for those centers which currently have establishment arrangements that **are** based on the law of the host country and could be modified by legislation in the host country. Another approach would **be** a standard agreement to be signed by each center and its host **country**. (This could also **be** a convention or statement to be signed by all host countries, all countries in which centers hold assets, all CGIAR centers and CGIAR members, or a majority of these groups.) Such an agreement would explicitly recognize the trust **status** of the materials and impose a strong obligation on these governments to facilitate center operations. Because of our perception developed in this paper that center germplasm collections are not part of center assets and therefore **will** not become the property of the host country in case of a center's dissolution, we do not **see** the need for either of these options as a legal mechanism of protecting these collections. These options might, however, contribute to political recognition of the trust concept and might facilitate border treatment if germplasm shipments, especially phyto-sanitary and quarantine regulations where they impede imports and export.

Our overarching recommendation is that the germplasm held in CGIAR genebanks be widely duplicated; this is **far** more important than any formal legal approach to strengthening the safety of these materials - which **are being** held in trust for **all** of **us**.

**BASIC AGREEMENT
TYPE E**

**AGREEMENT PLACING CGIAR GERMPLASM COLLECTIONS
UNDER THE AUSPICES OF FAO**

PREAMBLE

The [Name of Centre] (hereinafter referred to as the "Centre"), supported by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (hereinafter referred to as "CGIAR"), and the **Food** and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (hereinafter referred to as FAO);

Considering the importance to humanity of protecting and conserving germplasm for future generations;

Considering the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources adopted by the FAO Conference at its Twenty-second Session **in** 1983 (Resolution 8/83) and in particular Article 7 thereof; and the "Agreed Interpretations" of the Undertaking adopted by the FAO Conference in 1989 and 1991;

Considering the Memorandum **of** Understanding Between the **Food** and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International **Board** for Plant Genetic Resources (IBPGR) dated September 21, 1991, on the respective roles of the two organizations in establishing, maintaining and managing base collections and setting standards for these collections;

Considering the strong support FAO, as one of the co-sponsors, has provided **and** continues to provide to the **CGIAR**;

Considering the growing importance of the germplasm collections held in trust **by** the International Centres supported **by** the CGIAR **as** part of the global germplasm conservation strategy sponsored by FAO;

Considering the decision by the CGIAR of [date] encouraging the International Centres supported by it to place their germplasm collections under the auspices of **FAO**;

Considering that the Center has expressed the wish that its collection of plant germplasm should **be** recognized as part of the international network of base collections in genebanks under the auspices of FAO;

Have agreed as follows:

Article 1 BASIC UNDERTAKING

- (a) The Centre undertakes to place under the auspices of FAO within the international network of base collections its collection of plant genetic resources listed in the Appendix hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "designated germplasm"), and catalogued and published by the Centre in print or machine-readable form from time to time, under the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement.
- (b) The Center maintains its collection of plant genetic resources under long-term storage conditions (hereinafter referred to as "the Centre's base collection") and under medium-term storage conditions (hereinafter referred to as "the Centre's active collection").

Article 2 RECOGNITION OF CENTRE TRUSTEESHIP

The Centre retains trusteeship over the designated germplasm.

Article 3 PREMISES

- (a) The premises in which the designated germplasm is conserved shall remain in charge of the Centre.
- (b) The Centre agrees, however, that FAO shall have a right of access to the premises at any time and the right to inspect ~~all~~ activities performed therein directly related to the conservation and exchange of the designated germplasm.

Article 4 MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

- (a) The Centre shall continue to ~~be~~ responsible exclusively for the management and administration of the designated germplasm in compliance with internationally accepted standards.
- (b) FAO may recommend action, if it considers such action to ~~be~~ desirable in order to ensure the proper conservation of the designated germplasm.
- (c) If the orderly maintenance of the germplasm collection of the Center is impeded or threatened by whatever event, including *force majeure*, FAO shall assist in the evacuation and/or disposal of the collections.

Article 5 POLICIES

The Center shall continue to be responsible exclusively for determining policies related to the designated germplasm, subject, however, to the provisions of Article 8 hereinafter.

Article 6 STAFF

- (a) ~~Staff~~ assigned to manage and administer the designated germplasm shall be employed and remunerated by the Centres.
- (b) FAO shall ~~furnish~~ technical backstopping to the ~~staff~~ on request.

Article 7 FINANCES

The Centre shall remain entirely responsible for financing the maintenance of the designated germplasm.

Article 8 AVAILABILITY OF DESIGNATED GERMPLASM

The Centre undertakes to make the designated germplasm available from its active collection for the purpose of scientific research, plant breeding or genetic resource conservation, without restriction, either directly to users or through FAO, either on mutually agreed terms or free of cost.

Article 9 DURATION

This Agreement is concluded for a period of ten years and shall be automatically renewed for a further period of ten years unless notice of non-renewal is given in writing by either party not less than one hundred and eighty (180) days before the end of any ten-year period.

Article 10 SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

- (a) Any dispute concerning the implementation of this Agreement shall be settled by mutual consent.
- (b) Failing mutual consent, such dispute may be submitted, at the request of either FAO or the Centre, to an arbitral tribunal composed of three members. Each party shall appoint one arbitrator. The two arbitrators thus appointed shall designate by mutual consent the third arbitrator, who will act as the presiding arbitrator of the tribunal.
- (c) If within two months after the receipt of a party's **notification** of the appointment of an arbitrator the other party has not notified the first party of the arbitrator he has appointed, the first party may request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to appoint the second arbitrator.
- (d) If within two months after the appointment of the second arbitrator the two arbitrators have not agreed on the choice of the presiding arbitrator, such presiding arbitrator shall be designated by the Secretary-General of the United Nations at the request of either party.'
- (e) Unless the parties to the dispute decide otherwise, the tribunal shall determine its own procedure.
- (f) A majority vote of the arbitrators shall be sufficient to reach a decision which shall be final and binding for the parties to the dispute.

Article 11 TERMINATION

- (a) Either FAO or the Centre may terminate this Agreement at any time by giving notice to the other, one year in advance of the termination date.

- (b) FAO or the Centre shall, in such case, take all necessary measures to wind-up joint activities in an appropriate manner.

Article 12 AMENDMENT

- (a) FAO or the Centre may propose that the Agreement be amended by giving notice thereof.
- (b) If there **is** mutual agreement in respect of the amendment, the amendment shall enter into force on whatever date is set.

Article 13 DEPOSITARY

The Director-General of FAO shall be the Depositary of this Agreement. The Depositary shall:

- (a) send certified copies of this Agreement to the Member Nations of FAO and to any other Government which so requests;
- (b) arrange for the registration of this Agreement, **upon** its entry into force, with the Secretariat of the United Nations in accordance with Article **102** of the Charter of the United Nations;
- (c) inform FAO Members Nations of:
- (i) the signature of this Agreement in accordance with Article **14**; and
 - (ii) the adoption of amendments to this Agreement in accordance with Article **12**.

Article 14 COMING INTO FORCE

This Agreement shall come into force upon signature by the authorized representative of FAO and the Centre.

**United Nations Food and Agriculture
Organization**

[Name of Centre]

by:
(signature)

By.....
(signature)

Date:

Date..

APPENDIX

DESIGNATED GERMPLASM

Collections held under long-term storage conditions (Centre Base Collection), and medium-term storage conditions (Centre Active Collection):

list species
give location of storage facilities

REPORT OF MEETING OF DEPUTY DIRECTORS
22 OCTOBER, 1992

The annual meeting of Deputy Directors General focussed on six agenda items which had been proposed either by Deputy Directors themselves, by Center Directors during their June meeting in Nairobi, or by the CG Secretariat. These items included:

1. Establishing harmonized policies governing the intercenter posting of international staff.
2. Exchange of experiences in application of cost cutting measures.
3. Progress report on transfer of responsibilities from IIE to AIARC.
4. Spouse employment within centers.
5. Report of UNEP/NORAGRIC/CGIAR meeting on GIS.
6. Structure, agenda items, and assignments for DDG meeting at ICW93.

1. Policies for Intercenter Staff Postings.

This topic was introduced by Dick van Sloten of IBPGR who had prepared a brief working document in preparation for the meeting. The objective of our present discussion was to identify the key issues on which problems could occur and to solicit input from all centers as to their positions and recommendations concerning these issues. These information would then be utilized by an ~~ad hoc~~ subcommittee, under van Sloten's direction, to prepare a final set of observations and recommendations to be presented to the CDs, following DDG review and endorsement, at ICW 1993.

Seven key issues were identified which required resolution and/or on which agreement was required between guest and host centers. These were: (1) the legal status of guest scientists within host countries, (2) whose personnel policies should apply to guest scientists, that of the guest or host centers; does this vary for different components of those policies, (3) the hiring of local staff should be done under whose legal or contractual authority, (4) should the full cost of host facilities used by guest scientists be charged against the guest institution, (5) should overheads be charged, if so at what levels, and should these be harmonized across the system, (6) what level of coordination between centers should be required in the formulation of work plans for guest scientists, and (7) what are the appropriate lines of reporting, supervision and evaluation for guest scientists; in particular how are these responsibilities to be shared between centers.

.These issues were discussed drawing on a range of center experiences, and will not be fully summarized here. Near consensus, however, was achieved on several points which will feed into Dick van Sloten's future report. First, these types of relationships will become more important in the future as ecoregional approaches to research become a central driving force in CG activities. For this reason, a degree of harmonization was highly desirable. Second it was agreed that a distinction needed to be made between postings in which the guest scientist is working within a truly collaborative project involving the two centers, and cases in which the guest scientist is simply employing host center facilities in otherwise semi-autonomous work. This case, it was agreed, will become less frequent overtime as ERA become more broadly adopted. Third, greater joint planning and reaching of agreements on all of these issues need to be achieved between the two centers than has often been the case in the past in order to remove potential points of conflict or misunderstanding. Fourth, with regard to harmonization of personnel policies, it was agreed that a general principle to follow is that visible components of personnel benefits packages should follow more closely host center practices, whereas invisible components should follow guest center practices. Fifth, overheads are real costs and could be fully charged; however as these differ from center to center it should not be expected that harmonization would be either efficient or equitable.

A sub-committee consisting of DDGs from IIMI, ISNAR, IFPRI, ILCA and WARDA will work together with van Sloten to develop recommendations to be presented to the CDs at ICW 1993.

2. Cost Cutting Measures.

This topic was presented by Roger Rowe of CIMMYT and Ken Fischer and Edward Sayegh of IRRI who reported on innovative approaches employed at their respective centers to identify areas where significant economies could be achieved. CIMMYT described an IDEAS program which seeks the participation of staff at all levels to suggest areas where savings are possible. These suggestions are reviewed by a standing committee. Individuals who submit winning ideas are given cash awards and public recognition. Although to date only some \$50,000 annual savings have been achieved, it is an effective means of building cost awareness and achieving a sense of participation and shared responsibility in facing budgetary problems. IRRI detailed the systematic Task Force approach it used to reduce budgets during the last three years. Again a high degree of participation combined with clearly articulated priorities were characteristic. A full report of the IRRI Task Force will be circulated to all centers for their information. Experiences at other centers were briefly reviewed and underlined the importance of broad participation to achieve meaningful reductions and contribute to building center moral.

Finally, it was recommended that a major review of international staff benefits (similar to the Thornston reports done some years ago) be carried out to evaluate the congruence of center benefit packages

with current and prospective international market conditions. While the review should concentrate on the CG centers, it should broaden its focus to include institutions outside of the CG, particularly institutions affiliated with donors, with which valid comparisons could be made. The objective is to determine whether some adjustments in benefit packages should be made to achieve system wide economies.

3. Transfer of Responsibilities from IIE to AIARC

This topic was introduced by Jim McMahon who provided a historical summary of events leading to the decision to leave IIE and a review of progress and the current status. Questions were fielded by McMahon, other members of the AIARC Board present, and by Nancy Weslowski, financial officer of AIARC. Weslowski made an appeal that all correspondence with IIE be copied to AIARC from now until 31 December, when the transfer will take place, as both systems are currently running in parallel. Two issues of concern were raised. First, international staff have not been adequately informed of the transfer, in part due to breakdowns in intra-center communications. It was suggested that AIARC send correspondence to individual staff members affected by the transfer to allay current uncertainties. Second, steps needed to be taken by staff to confirm the accuracy of their reported pension positions before 31 December. All DDGs were encouraged to visit the Arlington offices of the AIARC during ICW to be able to report back to staff in the centers. Finally, it was decided to include AIARC activities following the completion of the transfer on the agenda for the 1993 DDG meeting, and in future meetings if judged to be necessary, to ensure a fuller flow of information.

4. Spouse Employment.

This topic was introduced by Michael Collinson and Deborah Merrill-Sands and animated by Madelaine Blair, a consultant to the CG secretariat. Center experiences were exchanged on a range of issues concerning employment of staff spouse, including shared positions. Most centers reported considerable success in the individual cases where spouse employment opportunities had been realized, but indicated that only a very small proportion of potential cases have or can be successfully addressed. Concern was raised that by focusing more attention on programs of this nature, expectations could be raised beyond a level that could be reasonably accommodated. Nevertheless, there was a consensus, that more imagination and effort needed to be applied to the problem. DDGs requested the CG Secretariat to provide a report providing more detailed cases from other institutions where successes have been achieved to serve as possible models. It was agreed that the topic would be discussed in greater depth next year, hopefully with greater information available.

5. GIS Meeting.

Jack Doyle reported on a meeting of GIS specialists in Norway in September sponsored by UNEP, NORAGRIC, and the CGIAR. The meeting was

successful in creating inter-institutional linkages between both CG and non-CG institutions, linkages which can be exploited in the future for the exchange of data and information on methodologies. The DDGs expressed appreciation for the effort of UNEP and requested the continued support of Norway to play coordinating and technical support roles in this important new area.

6. structure, Agenda, and Assignments for the DDG Meeting at ICW93.

In view of the success of this year's meeting, the group agreed that it may be necessary to increase the amount of time allocated to discussions in 1993. It was agreed that topics next year will be grouped into two sets, those of a primarily administrative nature, and those that are more programmatic. Although the group felt that two separate meetings was not desirable, the two sets will be addressed sequentially allowing for some change in the group compositions depending on the topics identified. Up to a full day may be allocated to the meeting if the final agenda so warrants. It was also suggested that the DDG meeting precede the CD meeting by at least one day to permit preparation of a more complete and polished report. It was also agreed that the E-Mail preparations for this meeting were successful and should be encouraged next year with working papers prepared, circulated and commented upon thoroughly before the 93 meeting.

Calls for additional agenda items will be left open to be submitted to Aart van Schoonhoven, next year's chairman. The following agenda items were however, identified: (1) harmonization of policies for intercenter staff posting with van Sloten taking the lead, (2) Operations of AIARC with McMahon taking the lead, (3) spouse employment with Collinson taking the lead, (4) report on intercenter staff policies with IBPGR taking the lead, and (5) intercenter electronic communications with CIAT and ISNAR taking the lead.

In attendance: Robert Booth (ICARDA)
Jack Doyle (ILRAD)
Howard Elliot (ISNAR)
Curtis Farrar (IFPRI)
Ken Fischer (IRRI)
Hank Fitzhugh (ILCA)
Bob Huggan (INIBAP)
Masa Iwanaga (IBPGR)
Fritz Kramer (CIAT)
Peter Matlon (WARDA) Chrmn
Jim McMahon (ICARDA)
Yash Nene (ICRISAT)
Bill Powell (IITA)
Basilio Rodriguez (ICLARM)
Roger Rowe (CIMMYT)
Edward Sayegh (IRRI)
Aart von Schoonhoven (ICARDA) Rptr
Bruce Scott (ICRAF)
Filemon Torres (CIAT)
Dick van Sloten (IBPGR)

CDC conclusions on TACs priority and resource allocation exercise

The Center Directors deliberated at length on the TAC priorities and strategies exercise against the background of the useful dialogue with the Chairman of TAC at their meeting in Nairobi in June, 1992. They were most appreciative of the opportunity given to them for this dialogue.

Within our group of centres, a range of views were expressed on what should be the salient features of a reassessment of **CGIAR** priorities.

- o Some feel strongly the need for greater emphasis on the objective of poverty alleviation;
- o others want to move faster and more fully to programs for halting and reversing resource degradation;
- o some urge that there be more explicit attention to the perspectives of the farmers and to the requirements of production systems and their real life functioning;
- o others again ~~see~~ more definitive pay-off to research dealing with commodities on a global level;
- o a few express the conviction that the narrow focus on food production has served the system well and should be maintained, urging that exceptions should not be lightly accepted and - if so - should be unambiguously declared as such;
- o some see a need to enhance the priority of strengthening the capabilities of **NARS**, which would also permit more effective collaboration between **IARC's** and **NARS** ~~capacities~~;
- o others stress the need to go beyond food research narrowly defined, arguing that traditional **CGIAR** research, which emphasized the supply side of the food security equation - and with some really remarkable results - needs to be extended and strengthened to include more fully the demand side: effective purchasing power and its distribution, employment and income earning opportunities, particularly for the poor and specifically for women, and generally activities that can effectively enhance what we refer to as food entitlement.

Hence the Center Directors acknowledge the need for a more systematic, consistent and transparent approach to the assessment of priorities in the CGIAR to which they can associate themselves.

CDs wish to express their appreciation for the contribution **TAC** has made so far to the clarification of the foundations on which priorities for the evolution of the CG can be based. However, CDs also had a number of questions and reservations concerning data used, methodologies adopted,

results derived and interpretations given by TAC.

These include:

- the manner in which baseline values are adjusted and subsequently modified to arrive at priority indicators;
- the rationale for the choice of weights used;
- the extent of disaggregation which is feasible and desirable in setting system priorities - in particular whether the procedures used to determine the priority to be accorded the various research and research-related activities across commodities, regions and centres are adequate;
- and the sensitivity of the results to choice of alternative data sets and feasible ranges of values of the various parameters.

Therefore, **CDs** see TAC's "Review of CGIAR Priorities and Strategies" as a report on work in progress, the further development of which **CDs** would wish to encourage and to which centres would wish to contribute. From our consultations with the TAC Chairman, we understand that such interaction with CD would be welcome by TAC.

CDs would wish to contribute to further work on the priority exercise itself (the subject matter of chapters 1 to **12** of the TAC Review) and on the translation of priorities into strategies, structures and resource allocation (chapters 13 and **14**). For both of these tasks, centres will need to acquaint themselves better with data, methodologies and results as used, developed and derived by TAC and to explore other sources of data as well as alternative indicators, methodologies and interpretations.

The CD's Standing Committee on Priorities and Strategies has been charged with this responsibility, and will be seeking close cooperation with TAC for this purpose. The objective of such interactions would be to strengthen the base on which the whole exercise as well as resulting priorities and resource allocations are built and to make the analysis more readily amenable to CG-wide deliberations, judgement and decision.

TAC can play a key role in mobilising additional funds for the CGIAR. It could do this by asserting in a positive fashion its collective judgement that the priorities chosen and the quality of the science of the IARC's meet the challenges of poverty, food security and sustainability that face the developing world. Up to now TAC has been preoccupied with how to allocate resources under a declining funding base. It should not underestimate its ability to influence donors to increase their contributions.

October 23, 1992

To: Center Directors, Center Board Chairpersons
and the TAC Chairman

From: Jim Ryan, Chairman, CDC/SCOPAS

Subject: Draft Outline of the CG Strategy Paper

Attached is a draft annotated outline of a CG strategy paper for your review. The CDC/SCOPAS decided that this could form the basis for the preparation of a more carefully written document which would be carried forward by the proposed Joint CDC/CBC/TAC Steering Committee, as discussed the Joint CDC/CBC meeting on Friday, October 23, 1992.

In preparing the outline, CDC/SCOPAS has drawn on the earlier comments from Centers to CDC/SCOPAS; the outcome of the London consultation; and the TAC expansion, and the priorities and strategies papers.

It would be appreciated if you could review the outline and forward any comments and suggestions on its content by November 30, 1992, to me at ICRISAT. They will be incorporated as appropriate by the proposed Joint Committee and a revised draft circulated as soon as possible thereafter.

ELEMENTS OF A STRATEGY FOR THE CGIAR:

A DRAFT ANNOTATED OUTLINE

INTRODUCTION

Clear statement of purpose of the CGIAR. Emphasis on food self-reliance, poverty alleviation, and enhancing the environment using international **agricultural** research of a long-term nature. Dominance of "the system" and long-term core funding over individual centers and "special" **funding**.

Rationale for the CGIAR is to exploit international public good characteristics of international agricultural research, economies of scale, and spillovers.

Four primary elements:

- e germplams;
- e natural resource conservation and management;
- public policy and management;
- global information.

Research in the **CGIAR** is based **on** two pillars: global and ecoregional activities. Five basic activities: natural resources conservation **and** management; germplasm enhancement and breeding; production systems development and management; socioeconomic public policy and public management **research**; institution building to ensure sustainability of the above activities.

System has moved from "food first" imperatives of **1960s** and **1970s** to a broader research agenda requiring more donor support and of **a** longer-term nature than heretofore. Reemphasize though the continuing challenge of enhancing food supplies for the 90 **million** additional people born **in** the developing world each year. Describe our vision of the developing world in **2030** and the role the **CGIAR will be** playing in it.

CENTERS AND MECHANISMS

Importance of the distinction between activities and institutions. Institutions can engage in more than one **activity** and embrace global **and** ecoregional responsibilities.

Acknowledgement of the need to exploit economies of scale, location and management in current "centers with walls" to enhance: (i) the conduct of natural resource management research (strategic and applied) on an ecoregional basis; (ii) the extent and scope of intercenter cooperation; and (iii) collaborative relationships with NARS.

The need for TAC to play a facilitation role in rationalizing the above process to avoid duplication and delay(?). The need for creativity and lateral thinking by Center managements and boards if the medium/long-term vision of TAC is to be effectively addressed. Other national, regional, and international actors in agricultural R&D must be consulted in the above rationalization. Novel mechanisms for the conduct of both strategic and applied/adaptive natural resource management research involving NARS (broadly defined) and IARCs will be required. Networks, consortia, strategic alliances, etc. will all be involved. Creation of additional "centers with walls" will be the exception, although international networks without a central research "node" are not regarded as substitutes but as complements,

Consideration will be given to the addition of regionally-defined commodity responsibilities to designated ecoregional centers. These may include commodities currently not included in the commodity mandate of the CGIAR if it is judged they contribute to the self-reliance, poverty, and/or sustainability goals. The unifying paradigm in such multi-commodity improvement research at an ecoregional level would be their role in gaining an improved understanding of the ecological foundations of sustainable production systems and the scope for achievement of the above three basic goals of the CGIAR. Socioeconomic policy research will be an essential ingredient in this context.

Strategic research would increase over time at the IARCs. However, this does not mean on-station research would entirely replace on-farm research. Much strategic research involves on-farm research, especially in natural resource management and conservation. NARS will require strengthening in the conduct of natural resource management and conservation research.

Unlike **TAC**, the Centers contend that **in the long term**, there will remain **a need** for international research **on** natural resource management and conservation, **just as** there will be on strategic germplasm research, socioeconomic **and** policy research, **and** information. **In** the longer term **as NARS** become stronger and/or their own **regional** cooperation/collaboration grows, **so** ecoregional specialization by IARCs in **natural** resource management and conservation research may give way to global responsibilities for **this** type of agenda, perhaps based upon agroecological homologues which cross over ecoregional boundaries, that might define the agenda for them **in** the medium-term. At present, donors and **TAC** should recognize that the **CGIAR** appears to be according ecoregional and natural resource conservation and management research a higher priority in the **immediate/medium** term than is the case **in** most NARS. Hence, results should not be expected in the medium term but rather **in** the long term.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH NARS

There is an emerging consensus that the **CGIAR** is not solely responsible for a direct **and** leading role in strengthening of **NARS** and developing transnational mechanisms for scientific cooperation. However, **through** its own research, the **CGIAR** should actively support such activities. **CGIAR** efforts should **not** be **a** substitute for weak NARS, for institution building, or the strengthening of regional mechanisms for cooperation in research among NARS. The **CGIAR's** ecoregional mechanisms should involve emerging regional mechanisms **among NARS**.

IARCs should **only** pursue research and research-related activities with a **high** degree of **internationality** and spillover effects that transcend national and regional boundaries. **The** centers **can** play a key role in facilitating **linkages** among NARS.

In the longer term, the **IARCs** will continue to have a comparative **advantage** in human resource development activities with **NARS**.

A major aim of the **CGIAR's** communication and information activities in the longer term should be to improve information technology and management capabilities of NARS. This will enhance impact of both **IARC's** and **NARS'** research.

Links between IARCs and the private sector should be enhanced. Indeed, **IARCs** should explicitly state that they define **NARS** to include public sector research **institutions**, universities, the private sector, and appropriate **NGOs**.

GOVERNANCE

The **NARS** should play a more explicit role **in** the governance of the CGLAR system. The idea of regional advisory **committees** and/or explicit linkages with regional **NARS** associations such as **APAARI** and/or IFARD should be explored.

A **CGIAR** Chairman's Advisory Committee should be established **from** amongst donors. This will strengthen the Chairman's role.

TAC's role would be reviewed along with the **TAC** and **CGIAR** Secretariats. **In** particular, its close monitoring of the financial **inputs** of the centers **on** an **annual** basis. would be examined. The **focus** would be **on** evaluation of outputs of rather than inputs to the IARCs.

Mechanisms will be developed to establish close interaction with other actors such as **FAO**, **UNEP**, intergovernmental organizations, and NGOs. The experience of the CGIAR in developing such constituencies **in** the **run** up to **UNCED** and in the IPR dialogue would be the **starting** point.

The effectiveness of Centers' Week **as** the major interface for the stakeholders in the system is questioned. It needs to be made more efficient and more scope provided for **Centers** to dialogue **directly** with donors **as** a group.

FINANCE

Novel **funding** approaches would be explored by the **PARC** and **CGIAR** Secretariat. **The** private sector would be pursued **and also funding sources** arising **from UNCED**. **An** attempt would be made to have **contributions** to the **CGIAR** by donor countries treated **in** the **same manner** as their contributions to the World **Bank's** IDA replenishments. **The** latter **are** obligations of a treaty nature **on** governments based on

pledges. The **CGIAR** should endeavor to have a certain percentage of **IDA** contributions earmarked for the **CGIAR**.

Donors will have to **formally** accept their obligation to make long-term **core** commitments to the **CGIAR** based on agreed medium-term plans and strategies. **With** an increasing natural resource management and conservation research agenda, **the** payoffs will be both of a longer-term character **and** be more difficult to measure and articulate. The Chairperson of the **CGIAR** should assume more responsibility for fundraising, using **the** scientific credibility of **TAC** to lend support to his/her endeavors.

Centers who continue to require excessive funding from the donor of last resort over a five-year period should have **this** support reduced to an agreed maximum. **This** will create incentives for the Centers to arrange additional funding.

The regional development banks should be targeted for a concerted fundraising campaign by the Chairman of the **CGIAR**.

Broadening the "donor of last resort" to donors other than the World **Bank** should be considered seriously.

The **UNDP** should be required to revert to its original role **as** a major unrestricted core donor if it is to continue **as** a co-sponsor.

Indicative resource envelopes to guide Center planning will be a feature of **future** management of system resource **allocations**. These will be based upon agreed priorities. **TAC** should play a much less **intrusive** role in the budget process at the individual Center level.

The **CGIAR** Secretariat should be more **pro-active** in public awareness targeted at donors.

A clear strategy for relationships with countries of Eastern Europe is required which recognizes **the** challenges and opportunities they offer **as** prospective recipients and/or donors.

PRIORITIES AND IMPACT

The CGLAR should move away from a preoccupation with inputs/activities as the unit of management and priority setting to output or supply-driven goal-oriented budgeting/financing/evaluation. The wisdom of allocating resources on the basis of AEZ's or RAEZ's when research spillovers are pervasive must be questioned.

Core allocations to Centers should be based on a percentage of total core funding provided by donors, based on agreed priorities. The percentage would remain fixed regardless of total CGIAR annual funding fluctuations.

Measuring and publicizing impact will receive primary attention by the Centers.

CENTER DIRECTORS COMMITTEE
WRAP-UP MEETING
October 31, 1992
Washington, DC, USA

Minutes of the Meeting

Opening the Meeting

The Chairman opened the meeting **and** extended a welcome to **Dr. Derek Tribe**, Alexander von **der Osten** (Executive Secretary), **and** John Dillon (Chairman, CBC), **Alex** McCalla sent his apologies.

The Chairman introduced Dr. Tribe **and** invited him to **speak** to the group.

Derek Tribe

Dr. Tribe indicated that he **had** tried to understand the **minds** of the donors and the reasons for the decrease in funds. He believes: a. donors tend to believe food is in excess world-wide and **are** not convinced of the CG's case that more research is needed; b. donors frequently think the green revolution has had a negative effect; c. donors tend to respond to a disaster but not to a long-term disastrous situation; d. donors often claim that the developing countries themselves do not make agricultural research a priority. He noted **also** that research constituencies in developed countries tend not to **speak** up for international research funds because they fear that the products of **research** at international centers, especially in commodity research, will compete with commodities from these same developed countries. He noted **also** that NGOs tend not to support agricultural research because they focus on aiding the "poorest of the poor" and do not **see** the role of research.

Dr. Tribe is planning to write a **book** to do for CGIAR-sponsored research on a **much** wider geographic basis (**Europe** and eventually globally) what he did in Australia with his publication "**Doing** Well by **Doing** **Good**". He plans to have it available by August, **1993**. He will make the case for agricultural **research** and focus on the **CGIAR** as the main mechanism for providing answers to the major problem facing mankind, the production of food. Over the **next** year he will be calling on the Centers for material for this book. He wants success stories, examples, quotes, thoughts, issues, references - all related to demonstrating that **good** - agriculturally, socially, environmentally - to the economy, women, families, etc. - has come from agricultural research.

Material for Dr. Tribe's book should be sent to:

Em. Prof. Derek Tribe
Executive Director
Crawford Fund for International Agricultural Res —
Hilda Stevenson House
1 **Leonard** Street
Parkville, Vic., Australia 3052.

Date received : 19-1-93
Program / Department : DG
ICARDA NO :
Program No : DG/50

Dr. Tribe suggested **that** it **would** be helpful if letters of appreciation for **the** "Doing Good by Doing Well" **book** were sent to the appropriate minister in Australia. His address is:

The Hon. John Kerin MP
Minister of Trade and Overseas Development
Parliament House
Canberra, NSW, Australia.

Agenda for the CDC Wrap-up Seminar **October 31, 1992.**

The group established the following agenda:

1. The Hague Workshop for Financial Controllers
2. **CGIAR Programs and Resources for 1993**
3. Restructuring of ICW and Mid-term **Meetings**
4. Response to President Preston's Challenge
5. Agenda **21, UNCED** and Follow-up
6. Dates for **1993** Meetings
7. Discussions with Alex McCalla Re CDC/TAC Initiative on Ecoregional Approaches
8. Potential Support for Public Affairs Association
9. IPR and NGOs
10. Next **SPAAR** Meeting

1. The **Hague Workshop for Financial Controllers, Accountants, Etc.**

The CDC decided that while the proposed meeting was welcome and timely, the dates selected were problematic because all the Centers' financial officers will be very occupied with **MTPs**, etc. CDs suggested that this important meeting be rescheduled.

The Directors decided also that a study to develop proposals in the relevant areas - overhead, financial procedures, etc. - should be done first so that the projected **workshop** could deal with specific recommendations. The Executive Secretary undertook to implement the recommendation.

The study will encompass PARC's interests at the same time.

2. **Programs and Resources**

The Executive Secretary noted that **some** donors have not yet made their commitments for **1993** so the range (**254** million to **264** million) includes both firm pledges and estimates. He noted that **some** donors hope for an improvement **and** that some donors are developing a firm commitment to the CG which bodes well for the future. **On** the matter of incentives related to World Bank funding, the Secretary noted that this was a matter of World **Bank** policy and thus outside the CGIAR's responsibility.

The group decided that the best way to make input on this was through the

input PARC has requested from Centers. Centers were encouraged to give this matter urgent attention.

3. Restructuring of ICW.

Through the Herdt Working Group the CG has been **working** on two issues: increasing information sharing and improving the decision **making** process in formal CGIAR meetings.

Information sharing. The Directors discussed the experiment of parallel seminars at ICW this year and concluded it should not be repeated. The Chairman indicated that the Working **Group** accepted that it had not consulted widely enough and now had the assignment to canvass more broadly.

It was agreed that in view of the number of Centers presenting their MTIPs in 1993 maximum time should be allocated for this **task**. Relative to information sharing at ICW the following observations were made:

- there is need to find out why the donors feel they need to make changes in the existing format,
- with the expansion of the system from 13 to 18 centers it is inescapable that **more** time will be needed, possibly an additional day at both the Mid-term meeting and ICW,
- ways need to be found to use time at ICW more efficiently. Perhaps a **system** could be developed whereby pre-selected donors could be assigned the responsibility for the questioning on a presentation and for channeling the questions of other donors. This could be a way of including the small donors who have feelings of being excluded.

With regard to the Mid-term Meeting in Puerto Rico in 1993, it was agreed that there were two issues to be dealt with: ecoregional matters and the Medium Term Planning process/funding. In relation to ecoregional matters it was decided that:

- there will be a workshop of one and a half days which all Center Directors should attend. The workshop objectives are:
 - to clarify the conceptual framework of ecoregional research and its implementation,
 - specific analysis of proposed Center initiatives - responsibilities, overlaps, gaps, etc.
 - budget ramifications for the proposed ecoregional programs and activities,
 - alternative funding mechanisms and resources.

With regard to the decision making process and funding prospects the

Executive Secretary will consult with donors to find out their interests.

Decision Making. The Herdt Working Group has put forward a **proposal** calling for sub-working groups. The response from donors has been that **more** options for consideration are required. A questionnaire will be sent to **the** enters asking for their input.

4. The Preston Challenge.

The group discussed the dinner with Bank President Preston and his offer to hold a joint **CGIAR/Bank** press conference. It **was agreed** that:

- a short letter will be **written** after consultation **among** the incoming **CDC** Chairman, Chairman of **PARC** and Executive Secretary of the **CGIAR**, signed by the **CDC** Chairman **and** dispatched to President Preston within the next **48** hours. **The** letter will stress three points:

- a. thanks for his time and interest,
- b. there is coincidence between the Bank's and the **CGIAR's** goals,
- c. we will begin working on providing the three examples of breakthroughs he requested and we will get back to him soon.

- **PARC** will take leadership on identifying the stories for Preston in cooperation with the Executive Secretary,

- contacts with the President will be through the **CG** Chairman,

- the Executive Secretary will get a copy of the President's speech and clearance to quote it,

- while a number of success stories may be collected, only three will be sent to the President in line with his request'.

5. Agenda 21 - Follow-up Activities

The Executive Secretary indicated he will put out the revised **Agenda 21** document and that his intent is to follow it up. The following agreements were reached:

- the Executive Secretary will contact Stein **Bea** and ensure coordination of follow-up activities with Center Directors' inputs. Geof Hawtin has volunteered to participate in follow-up activities in consultation with Center Directors,

- the **CDC** interests are broader than biodiversity,

- the Executive Secretary will let people **know** when the revised report **comes** out **and** distribute copies,

- if Center Directors nominate a person to the Stein Bea Committee then the

Committee on Sustainability and the Environment should be the link and that Pedro Sanchez the individual,

- the Executive Secretary and the Chairman of **PARC** should take the lead in ensuring that Agenda 21 activities meet the needs of the **CGIAR**.

6. Dates of the Next Meeting of the CDC.

It was agreed that the next meeting of the **CDC** will be in Puerto Rico in association with the Mid-year meeting of the **CGIAR**. It was decided further that:

- in subsequent **years** Mid-year meetings should be held at Centers,
- the CDC should revert to the practice of meeting with **TAC in Rome in mid-year** when the June meetings are held in Rome,
- the meeting dates for **1993** will be:

CDC meeting	May 23
Mid-term meeting	May 24-28
Ecoregional meeting, 1&1/2 days	May 29-30

The CDC will consult on May 23 to decide what further meeting time may be needed. However, regardless of the amount of additional time required, CDs will be free to leave Puerto Rico in the morning of May 31,

- sites are already being sought for the **1995** meeting. It was decided that enters interested in being selected should propose their nomination through the CDC Chairman,
- in **1993** the Executive Committee of CDC will meet with TAC rather than the full committee. CDs having business with **TAC** will, of course, attend,
- topics for the agenda of the **1993** Mid-year meeting of the CDC should be sent by **December 15, 1992** to the CDC Chairman who will share them with Directors. The agenda will be finned up by 1 February, **1993**. High on the agenda will be the issues relative to incentives and overhead on which **PARC** has requested comment.

7. Ecoregional Approaches.

The Chairman of the CSE reported on discussions held since the full CDC meeting:

- there is **some** tension associated with the changing of roles and responsibilities. A suggestion by **TAC** Chairman that a formal steering committee be established has been dropped but four individuals will monitor events closely and keep each other **and** Center Directors informed. These are Mike Arnold, Ross Gray, Mike Collinson and Hubert Zandstra.
- the Convener is working satisfactorily, the **Terms** of Reference with a revised

Preamble will be distributed next week, and the annotated outline **has** been approved and will be distributed. **TAC's** view is that the committee should **address** Chapter 13 of **TAC's** Priorities and Strategies Paper,

- there is great time pressure so it is important for Centers to make their submissions to the **CSE** by December 15. Submissions should include current **and** projected regional and global research initiatives on natural resource management research in the MTIPs. These will be analyzed by the Working Group.
- the February 2-4, 1993 workshop at Davis, Ca. will be kept **small** and may include donors. It will draft a report which will go to the May seminar associated with the Mid-year meeting in Puerto Rico.
- the Ecoregional Seminar is **now** set for a **day** and a half. It is co-sponsored by TAC and the CDC, which arrangement will be continued. There is **\$150,000** of donor support, mainly utilized by **TAC** but the **CDC** will get **some** for participation by CDs and **NARS**. Additional funding **will come** from the CGIAR Secretariat. The sponsorship is symbolic but important.
- the current is running **towards** revisiting Chapter 12 **only** in the long term **and** building on Chapter 13 in the short term.
- outside consultants will be needed. It will be best to have them involved in the February meeting and not to delay their involvement until May. Names should be submitted to the Chairman of the CSE.
- the Convener **has** requested names of people in **NARS** he can contact to participate in Working Group activities. Names should be submitted directly in the next **24** hours.

The CSE Chairman requested models of ecoregional approaches that suit the objectives of Centers best. Models should include governance issues, how the problem is approached, how the model works, how the Center **plans** to **work** with other institutions, how structural **and** management issues are handled, etc. WARDA, ICARDA, **ILCA**, IRRI and others indicated they will respond.

8. Public Awareness

Dr. Winkelmann reported a need for funding for **three tasks** in relation to public awareness: a. bringing in professional public awareness experts to assist **in** specific **tasks**; b. continuing training of Center staffs in public awareness activities; and c. accessing professional public awareness counsel.

The group agreed to consider a proposal at its May meeting. In the meantime, the Public **Awareness** Association was invited to submit individual requests directly to Centers.

9. Intellectual Property Rights

The Chairman of the **IPR** Committee reported that the planned study described

at the CDC meeting will be much-broader **than** earlier anticipated and will **cover** **such** issues as the patenting of genes. Three donors will provide funding, **The** matter of how to proceed was referred back to the IPR Committee.

It was noted that the original intent of the CDC was to fine-tune **the** centers' interests in such matters as plant breeders' rights and material transfer agreements, and that the broadening of the study should not prejudice **the** Centers' interests. Center Directors will review plans to ensure **Centers'** interests are preserved.

In relation to NGOs it was reported that Pat Mooney and African friends **have** set up a steering committee to facilitate collaboration between Centers and African NARS. Brader reported that he had been asked on a personal basis to join **and** had accepted. He was asked and **agreed** to keep the CDC briefed on developments.

It was agreed to place **IPR** and relations with consultants on the agenda of the next CDC meeting.

10. SPAAR

It was noted that the next meeting of **SPAAR** will be held in The Netherlands **and** that ISNAR would be providing support. It was decided that CDs attending the SPAAR meeting would meet at **ISNAR** in advance though details of this meeting were not discussed.

11. Sub-committee on Priorities and Strategies (SCOPAS)

The Chairman **of** SCOPAS reported that a brief meeting of the Joint CDC/CBC/TAC Committee for Strategy Development had been held. It was proceeding to work on the strategy paper. A longer document may be developed first but the short, crisp document would be the one placed before the donors **in** May.

The issue of funding support for the strategy development **task** was raised **and** the Chairman indicated he would try to identify donors **who** may be interested. **The** CDC decided to support the effort to the extent of \$50,000 and instructed the **Chairman** to **come** back to the CDC if this was inadequate.

On the matter of the priorities assessment study the Chairman reported that the committee would be looking at the composition of that Working Group and requested nominations.

Other Business.

With regard to the projected retirement of the CGIAR **Chairman**, it was **agreed** that CDs should make their views **known** individually to the appropriate **persons**.

WARDA: CDC. WRAP