

**Draft Minutes**  
 Center Directors Committee  
 Interim Meeting  
 San Juan, Puerto Rico, 22, 30, 31 May, 1993

Attendance:

Dr N Fadda, Director General, ICARDA  
 Dr G Nores, Director General, CIAT  
 Dr J Sayer, Director General, CIFOR  
 Dr D Winkelmann, Director General, CIMMYT  
 Dr H Zandstra, Director General, CIP  
 Dr J Hawtin, Director General, IBPGR  
 Dr P Sanchez, Director General, ICRAF  
 Dr J Ryan, Director General, ICRISAT  
 Dr P Andersen, Director General, IFPRI  
 Dr R Lenton, Director General, IIMI  
 Dr L Brader, Director General, IITA  
 Dr J Walsh, Director General, ILCA  
 Dr R Grey, Director General, ILRAD  
 Dr N Mateo, Director General, INIBAP  
 Dr K Lampe, Director General, IRRI  
 Dr C Bonte-Friedheim, Director General, ISNAR  
 Dr G Terry, Director General, WARDA

Chairman

Dr L Pullin, Representative, ICLARM  
 Mr Ben Wedeman, ICARDA

Observer  
 Secretary

Opening Remarks

The Chairman, Dr Fadda, opened the meeting by noting the attendance for the first time of the Director General of CIFOR, Dr Jeffrey Sayer. He informed the Committee that due to the change of Director General at ICLARM that center was only able to send a representative, who had asked to attend the meeting as an observer. The Chairman asked the Committee members whether it would be proper to admit ICLARM's representative as an observer.

Dr Walsh reminded the Committee that in the past acting directors general had been admitted, but never representatives. It was agreed that this practice should be observed; but that ICLARM's representative could attend the open sessions of the CDC as an observer.

### **Item 1: Adoption of the Agenda**

It was agreed to include a session to review the outcome of the Mid-Term Meeting. The Agenda was then adopted (Attachment 1).

### **Item 2: Adoption of CDC Minutes, 21-22 & 31 October 1992**

The minutes were adopted as circulated.

### **Item 3: Matters Arising from the Minutes**

The Chairman stated that he had implemented all resolutions that required action on his part and reported on those actions to Center Directors as and when they were taken. One exception was the request to European donors to accord the CDC an observer status in their meetings. On this point, Dr Bonte-Friedheim added that he had agreed to ascertain the contact person in the European group (which changed with the venue of the meeting), but until this CDC meeting the host country was not known<sup>1</sup>.

Dr Bonte-Friedheim referred to Mr Preston's comments on NIRs (Newly Independent Republics) of the former USSR and Eastern Europe and stated that the time had come for Centers to send Mr Preston their comment. While the CDC was contemplating asking Mr Preston for help, it should also offer help to facilitate his task. Several Centers indicated that they were already doing some work in this region under various agreements with the Russian Federation and certain E. European states, but that this work could not be expanded on core budgets. The EEC and the European Development Bank were very interested in Eastern Europe and could be sources for additional funding. However, the view was expressed that Centers should not give the impression that their concern was purely an excuse for securing additional funding. The situation was fluid, and urgent action was essential. It could not await ICW and a draft should be agreed upon before the end of the current CDC meeting.

Drs Bonte-Friedheim, Andersen and Lampe agreed to assume the task of drafting the proposed letter.

---

<sup>1</sup> During the CG Puerto Rico meeting, Norway was identified as the host country. The Chairman approached Stein Ble, who conducted an informal enquiry among European representatives present at the CG MTM. There was much sympathy for the CDC proposal, but no consensus. An invitation could not, therefore, be extended. It is to be noted that a similar previous approach by TAC had also been turned down.

## Item 4 Reports from **Sub-Committees**

### 1. Public Awareness, Resources and Governance

#### a) Report of **PARC** Chair

Dr Nores noted that the 1993 funding situation has deteriorated. The system was confronting a funding crisis. PARC had met with the CGIAR Chairman and, discussed the situation and called for a strengthening of resource mobilization by the CG. The Central issues were resource mobilization, incentives and stability across the system.

In the discussions that followed, it was noted that ad hoc opportunities had been used to establish contacts and inform donors. As an example, when the Chairman of the CG visited Africa, he met with one of the Vice-presidents of the African Development Bank. This meeting led to another with the CG Chair during ICW in Washington. A seminar had been proposed for AfDB Officials to expose them to the work of the CGIAR. In January this year, IFPRI had a very good media seminar in Washington, targeted to the influential community, media and congressional staff.

The AfDB Bank's Technical Assistance Fund might be a good source of funding for Centers. Although the Fund was intended to provide assistance on a bilateral basis to member countries of the AfDB, funds might be accessed by Centers which have strong joint programs with SSA NARS.

As to other donors, it was mentioned that Gus Speth, the new Administrator at UNDP, was quite supportive of the CG system. UNDP, would welcome proposals from the Centers for the use of Global Environmental Facility funding. On the other hand, in a recent meeting of the Asian Development Bank, agricultural development was mentioned only twice. The Bank's agricultural sector budget had been halved. The **relationship** between the Bank's planning and agricultural units was poor. There was, however, sympathy for the CG system expressed by the Bank's President in a visit to IRRI. But funding would be tougher in the future if the CG System did not change its general policy.

One **aspect** that hampers Center fund-raising efforts was that they had no communications among themselves on what donors were doing. As an example, a division chief from the World Bank recently visited ISNAR to discuss agricultural projects in Africa, and stressed the World Bank's interest in supporting such projects. Afterwards this official approached the Dutch donor to seek support for what appears to be a World Bank initiative to mobilize funds to be put up for bidding on a competitive basis. In a situation where the

Netherlands would reduce the levels of its development aid, the proposal would compete with Centers for funds and would erode the funding that Centers currently receive. The matter should be followed up with the World Bank to ascertain the real intention behind it. A proposal that CDC members approach relevant regional World Bank Executive Directors to discuss the matter received general approval.

The need was stressed for Centers to share information about the donor situation in general. Trends should be monitored to determine reasons for changes in donor attitudes. The question was posed as to whether Centers had identity, vision, managerial or leadership crisis, with the funding crisis just the tip of the iceberg. The nature of such a crisis would have to be identified. Centers needed a better mechanism to obtain information. Information was time sensitive, and might become useless if not followed promptly. We did not receive information on donors systematically and needed to set up a mechanism to share such information.

The CDC was reminded that it had approved a joint approach to the donors. Such approaches did not need to rule out individual centers approaching donors directly. In an early round of contacts most donors preferred a common approach, rather than meeting with each Director General individually. The view was expressed that Centers were too modest in their approach to the donors. Big donors should be targeted collectively. An example was the successful fund raising operation for the Africa Facility which brought in about US\$ 1.2 billion. The CG System needed to set a target of US\$ 500 million to US\$ 1 billion, mobilize important people, declare our objectives, and aggressively seek to meet it, otherwise too much effort would be spent for small rewards. The system was faced with a 20 percent shortfall, approximately US\$ 50 million which could be secured through an endowment of the order indicated. Was it possible to convince World Bank President Preston and other influential people such as former US President Carter, to lend their support? In a comment on the idea it was emphasized that, for it to succeed, the Cosponsors should be associated with the initiative, lest they perceive it as an attempt to bypass them. A drawback of the proposal was that those eminent people might hold opinions that might not strictly coincide with those of IARCs, and try to pull them in directions that were not of their choice.

**PARC's** work on fund raising and public awareness was commended, but some CD's expressed doubts as to whether it was best suited to address administrative matters and such topics as fund stabilization. They did not feel comfortable with PARC working on behalf of centers on such a broad mandate.

Dr Nores asked CDC to define the areas where it did not want PARC to work. Short of a clear directive PARC would continue to operate as before. The final

output of PARC in the area of incentives would include recommendations to the CDC on the balancing mechanism, overheads, and the stabilization mechanism. The Group would decide what to do with these outputs. He stressed that PARC was working closely with the CG Secretariat and that the CG might want to share the results with the donors. This work could produce a useful document for ICW. On the subject of resource mobilization PARC would continue exploring and developing ideas for expanding the core resource base of the CGIAR System. PARC would circulate the minutes of their last meeting shortly after the CDC meeting. CDs were encouraged to send specific suggestions regarding new donors and funding possibilities to the Chairman of PARC.

#### b) System Development and Mobilization of Long-Term Support

Dr Brader told the CDC that the group of Center Directors (the Group of 10) that had attended the management training course in Majorca had held an informal discussion during the course. They had considered the System's functions, and highlighted between 20 and 30 of the most important, which were then grouped into three main clusters: development, NARS/IARC cooperation, and decision making. The gist of his report was a set of options including the establishment of a Development Office; reorganization of the CG Secretariat; engaging a public relations firm; formation of a 'group of champions' of the system; and 'latching on' to the Sustainable Development Commission.

The Secretariat was reorganizing itself to make the present system work. New people were being recruited. The proposal of reorganization was a difficult one, calling for coalition building and vision. Center views should be put forward much more forcefully. The task should be led by a 'door opener', someone with vision. Does the Vice President of the World Bank have the time to convey the message and build coalition? The concern here was with major efforts regarding the crisis of system leadership. Since ICW last October there had been two revisions of funding levels, a lead time of less than six months instead of two years. There was a real need to decrease the reaction time of the System and also to change the attitude of some stakeholder groups who do not always take into account the interests of the Centers.

In an answer to a question on why the proposed Development Office should be independent, it was noted that there was a governance problem directly related to the Secretariat. At present, Centers had no voice or vote at the Secretariat, nor in the accountability of the System. The Secretariat was accountable only to the World Bank and that was not good enough. Centers needed to take bold moves otherwise the situation at the Secretariat would be 'business as usual'. Were the Secretariat to be totally revitalized within the next

three months, there would be no need for the proposed initiatives.

The reverse of governance was accountability. Centers had made diplomatic approaches to the Secretariat, but none had been addressed. There was no accountability there. The best hope was the Center Directors Committee ~~that~~ was where the governance rested. The proposal to establish a Development Office is a way to avoid the subject.

Other CDs stressed ~~that~~ the Centers should use the existing institutions. 'We don't create leadership and vision by creating a new office'. The proposed Development Office would not be welcome to the Secretariat. It would create its own agenda, and much time would be wasted in infighting. The Secretariat was getting the message and there were new initiatives coming out of the Secretariat that were very good. Nonetheless, they had problems articulating what the System was all about. If they brought in bureaucrats, then we would have a problem.

The Group of 10 had assumed that there was a lack of leadership in the System, and the current discussion appeared to confirm this assumption. Now the CDC must reach a decision. Every member of the CDC wanted to preserve and enhance the System, but all must insist on having a more explicit voice in the System.

The System had structural flaws because there was no entity coordinating it. Centers had not yet written terms of reference for the CG Secretariat. Recent changes made this imperative. A few years ago, many Centers kept a low profile and encouraged support for the NARS. At that time, the problem was not how to obtain funding, but how best to use resources. Now they had changed the approach. The CG Secretariat was in the same situation, and only recently had become concerned with fund raising. Slowly but surely there was evidence of change. The question was: Should it be done from inside or outside the System?

The Secretariat had been often criticized in the past, but in all fairness, Center Directors should ask how Centers had managed their relationship with the Secretariat. The Secretariat was 'our' Secretariat. We should take ownership of it. There was no point in proposing the establishment of a new office.

It was suggested that it might be helpful if the CDC could formulate a statement to the Secretariat stating that the issue of governance in the CG System had been addressed and the function of the Secretariat considered by Center Directors who felt that the role of the Secretariat should be reviewed, and that the CDC and CBC should have participation as there was a perception

in the CDC that the Secretariat was not accountable enough to this group of stakeholders. Some felt that such a statement should be the last of several actions. Center Directors should first talk with other stakeholders particularly the Cosponsors, possibly in the presence of TAC Chairman so that they were not caught by surprise. The wisdom was questioned of being too explicit in stating Centers' concern with governance and leadership. Further, before broaching the subject, Centers should have agreed on the issues that they wished to discuss with stakeholders and the Secretariat. They needed to clear up their own ship and do their homework before they moved on.

The problem was lack of leadership in the system, ~~not at the~~ center level. Donors were asking for changes which they did not think the center directors could implement on their own. The Secretariat should provide **full** leadership. One donor, SAREC, was reported to have expressed impatience with the System for its sluggish pace of change. Constructive and assertive dialogue with the CG Secretariat was needed, not more meetings and position papers.

The Retreat One of the recommendations of the Group of 10 was that Centers met together in a Retreat with a professional facilitator to agree ~~on~~ a strategy or a vision which would then be taken to the World Bank, the Secretariat, the donors, NARS, and other stakeholders. Keystone Center had worked with CIMMYT in this capacity with good results.

The CDC Committee on Priorities and Strategies had found the crystallization of a vision a very elusive task. Documents such as 'Food for the Future' 2nd 'Experiment in Research' could help define where Centers were, and should be, going. The Retreat might provide Centers with what they were after. At this stage, both referred-to documents would be required. After the Retreat, we might come back with one idea. That would be the time when the vision is crystallized. This point of view was not challenged, although there was a preference to use 'Strategies' rather than 'vision'. There was consensus that the Meeting should be confined to issues of leadership and governance.

Drs Ryan, Winkelmann and Andersen agreed to prepare for this meeting and were also assigned the task of identifying a facilitator and agreeing on the terms of his assignment.

### c) **Involvement of NARS**

Dr Ryan presented this topic, stressing that the Centers faced three important issues in the area of **NARS-IARCs** relations: 1) ownership of the System; 2) the representation of NARS in the System; and 3) coalition building with the NARS. The preferred scenario should be coalition building, including strengthening

## a

ties with universities, NGOs, and the private sector. Some of the options to improve the situation might be: reduction of the 'fees' for entry in the CG System and acceptance of in-kind contributions; an ecoregional dialogue; and nominations to the CG Board of Trustees.

For success in implementing these ideas, the culture of the CG System would have to change to one of true partnership with NARS. It was important to identify and implement joint studies and highlight successes. The role of NARS in the global system should receive greater publicity. In this, FAO was cited as a potentially important player that could act as a useful vehicle to emphasize the importance of NARS.

On the question of NARS role in governance, the view was expressed that fixed term representation was inadequate. The Herdt Committee had made recommendations in this regard, but it would be better to wait until after the upcoming leadership change at FAO.

The CG had a list of 180 names for possible membership in various bodies of the System, but only a few from NARS were actually nominated. This had already created a negative backlash. On closer contacts with NARS, it was mentioned that IRRI was producing two progress reports a year for its Board of Trustees, and was sending copies to the NARS. They had reacted positively to this initiative.

IBPGR's Board of Trustees was studying its relationship with the NARS. Initially, the relationship could be dealt with at a center level, but later it would have to be addressed System-wide. One useful approach would be to start holding TAC meetings in the regions, and Centers should seek donor support for such meetings.

It was important to avoid by-passing the smaller NARS. They complained bitterly about the system. They felt the CGIAR system was geared to the larger NARS.

It was suggested that the phrase NARS be changed to NARDS (National Agricultural Research and Development Systems).

## d) Decision Making at the System Level

Three topics were considered under this item:



1. A report by Dr Hubert Zands 'a on behalf of the Group of 10 Center Directors
- 2 The report of the Working Group on deliberation and Decision-Making Process, (the Herdt Report)
3. Mr Visvanathan Rajagopalan communication on the 'Eminent Persons Panel'.

Dr Hubert Zandstra presented the Group of 10 deliberations on decision making in the CGIAR. The report characterized the current state of decision making at the CGIAR as lacking a clear and shared vision of the CGIAR by its component groups; an inability to deal with the **consequences** of system expansion; a historical inability to close down activities in the system; a lack of functional fora for consultation by stakeholders on priority setting, strategy formulation and resource allocation; and a lack of system-wide ability to implement and monitor action on decisions made.

After considering several options, the Group of 10 were in favour of establishing an Executive Committee of the CGIAR with wide representation of the cosponsors, donors, NARS, CDC, CBC and TAC, with the CGIAR Executive Secretary sewing as the EC Secretary. Among the tasks of the proposed EC would be: setting the Agenda for CGIAR Meetings; review recommendations made by various bodies of the System; making recommendations of its own; recommending modes of implementation and monitoring; governing the functions of the CG Secretariat and TAC; and serving as a champion for the CGIAR.

Several Center Directorsexpressed concern at the creation of yet another body within the CGIAR, bringing with it increased work and added responsibilities. There was doubt as to whether the current governance of the system required the degree of authority envisaged for the EC and whether this might not be seen as a challenge to the Cosponsors. Smaller donors were likely to oppose it as they might view it as reducing their influence.

Since the subject of governance and decision making was specifically addressed by the Herdt Report, the CDC decided to proceed to a consideration of this report. Dr Fadda summarized the 10 recommendations of the report. These envisaged a continuation of the two-meetings a year format, but with different foci (e.g. system-wide and center-specific); the holding of parallel **sessions** at ICW; the holding of MTM in countries where CG Centers were located; the establishment by the CGIAR of a standing Committee on finance and another on evaluation as well as ad-hoc working groups on specific issues such as major shifts in strategy and priorities; a single mechanism for CGIAR public awareness work; and a regional round-table format for exploring and reflecting views of developing country agricultural researchers.

A wide ranging discussion of the report was summed up in a report subsequently submitted to the CGIAR meeting and adopted as an official document of the Meeting. Briefly, the CDC complimented the Working Group and indicated that the **majority** of the WG recommendations were in line with the CDC thinking. The CDC, however, made a few observations:

1. While appreciating the merit of holding MTM in locations where CGIAR Centers are located, the CGIAR should not ignore the public awareness **opportunities** which meetings in donor countries offer.
- 2 The CDC **appreciates** the emphasis on an increasing role for the Secretariat in public awareness and fund raising.
3. The Concept of establishing standing Committees on finance and evaluation is seen by the CDC as a useful Innovation which could prove to be a workable substitute to an earlier proposal for establishing an Executive Committee.
- A The Working Group report is silent on CDC participation in the deliberations of the Group and its various committees. A request was made to the CGIAR Chair to accord the **CDC** full membership of the CGIAR.

#### e) Chairman's **Proposal** on an Advisory Panel

On the Eminent Persons Advisory Panel proposed by Mr Rajagopalan, a few Centers had responded. While mostly they **approved** the idea in general, some had reservations on the need for another standing committee or thought it might be difficult to constitute. The Panel could represent the System and possibly generate new ideas, but was not intended to provide actual leadership or solve the System's **problems**.<sup>2</sup>

#### 9 Technical Proposal on Possible **IARC** Support to the Public Awareness Association (**PAA**)

In introducing the subject Dr. Winkelmann stated that PAA had reviewed its functions and activities. Its seminars **and** training activities had helped.

---

<sup>2</sup> in the executive session of the CGIAR, Mr Rajagopalan stated that he had found some difficulty in securing the services of the type of person he had in mind for the Panel. The delay and changing circumstances had convinced him to postpone action on this proposal for the foreseeable future.

Through extended negotiations, the **CG** Secretariat would bring in two people to deal with public awareness and public relations in collaboration with the Executive Committee of the PAA, chaired by Frank Karel of the Rockefeller Foundation. The Secretariat had undertaken to consult closely with Mr Karel in matters of guidance, over sight and priority setting. What was now needed was a budget for a post to supplement the persons moving into the Secretariat. The person filling this position would be responsible for the production of videos, and plan quasi-country activities in Europe, Japan, and the **US/Canada**. These activities would be carried out by public relations professionals. The proposal would cost around **US\$ 200,000**.

In a comment on this introduction it was stated that there seemed to be a failure to distinguish between public awareness on the one hand and lobbying, education and extension, on the other. It should be realized that donors were few and very sophisticated. Their decisions were based upon a rigorous review. Producing videos and pamphlets would not alter their decisions. It would help to be known, but donors were influenced by many things, foremost among which was the quality of what IARC produce.

**If** Centers were to influence the donors it was necessary to work on those who could have an impact on our Centers. Centers must not become too deeply involved in public relations work, but needed to combine the expertise of their own people with the skills of those who could most effectively reach the media. There were many ready to work on behalf of the System and Centers should send them a strong signal that they meant business through their commitment to contribute and act collectively in a sustained effort.

It was noted that **US\$ 200,000** did not represent an excessive investment. The System was, in fact, investing a good deal more than **US\$ 200,000** in public awareness already. Funds alone were not, however, sufficient - the efficiency of the current information services had to be increased. Centers had INTAGRES, IFAR and the CG Secretariat to do these things. Was it **CDC's** view that none of the three was doing its job?. We must try to figure out how we could fix what we already had before investing into something new.

**In** the US, there were many institutions which were suffering from a drop in funding. Were they using public relations to remedy the situation? Centers needed to find out what they could use in the donor countries to put their message across. In a reference to a press day held in Australia, Dr Lampe said that the coverage of the event was very good. This was the kind of public awareness activity that created a positive climate among countries, regions and IARCs. Several speakers agreed that the activity in Australia was 'highly successful'. It would have been helpful if such an activity had been an inter-center function. In reply Dr Lampe pointed out that this particular activity

had been an Australian initiative. He also noted that his upcoming attendance at the annual meeting of Swissaid was a Swiss initiative. The question was asked why, in Australia, there was a preparedness on the part of the donor to project the System. Why wasn't there the same willingness among donors around the table last week? How could Centers get people prepared to give them the right advice? It could have been that, in the case of Australia, it was a situation of mutual self-interest.

It was noted that public awareness activities had to be very specific. Success was also highly dependent, ~~upon~~ on the people involved. Key individuals needed to be identified who had the right kind of knowledge. PARC should compile a list of people that would be helpful in this regard.

By the end of discussion, there was a general agreement in favour of supporting the PAA at the level proposed by Dr Winkelmann. The Secretariat would be approached for at least a portion of that amount, otherwise Centers would provide it in full. INIBAP, being a Center with a small budget, felt that it might not be in a position to contribute as much as other Centers. The majority felt that contributions should be proportionate to Centers' core budgets.

## **2. Sustainability and the Environment**

Dr Zandstra reviewed this topic, noting that there was a proposal to change the name of the CG to the Consultative Group for International Agricultural and Environmental Research - CGIAR. The implication was that more emphasis would have to be put on the environmental aspect of the CG System's work. If not, he warned, the system-wide budget would be down to US\$ 150 million in five years.

NARS comments on the report were useful and donor reaction positive. Many of the points had to be further discussed. Contact had been made with UNEP on issues of the environment and land use.

## **3. Priorities and Strategies**

Dr Ryan distributed a draft of a document 'Food for the Future', which his Sub-Committee had prepared. The Committee sought substantive comments on this document particularly on whether it captured the sense of vision being sought. The intended audience was non-specialist stakeholders, and the purpose was to ~~to~~ marshal and rekindle support for the System. It targeted the ministerial/policy making circles, while another document 'Experiment in Research', was designed for technocrats. The documents would be redrafted and ready by ICW 1993.

During the ensuing discussion it was suggested that the data in 'Food for the Future' be updated. There were reservations on the paper's subtitle - Research Strategy - as an overstatement. It was a good public awareness document on what the System was but not a strategy. Dr Ryan agreed and noted that Food for the Future was an attempt to create interest in the challenge and in the System. The second document, 'Experiment with Research' was intended to be a strategy. It was an attempt to capture in a few pages the rationale for expansion and ecoregionality and other priorities, and to emphasize how the CG's role in the coming years would differ from the past. Various changes in the name were offered including 'Food for a Sustainable Future', and 'More Food for a Better Future'.

Regarding the section on new strategies for a new generation of problems, IARCs should convey that they were not the only actors and that they were willing to form alliances with other groups and institutions, particularly NARS, to address these problems. They should also stress the importance of human resource development.

#### 4. Sub-Saharan Africa

The Chairman of the SCSSA, Dr Terry, circulated the Committee's Progress Report which dealt with events and actions in this area over the preceding 12 months.

##### 1) SSA/NARS Agricultural Research Meeting

The Nairobi meeting had requested ISNAR to assist leaders to organize their own meeting, without outside participation, in preparation for a full meeting with Center Directors. In following up this request, ISNAR had sent a questionnaire to ascertain interest in such a meeting, circulated a summary of the outcome, advised NARS to establish a small Steering Committee to plan for the meeting, and used the occasion of the SPAAR sponsored consultation between SSA/NARS and the CGIAR on ecoregionality to further discuss the proposed meeting.

##### 2) ISNAR's Activities in Biotechnology for NARS

This program would be carried out through the Intermediary Biotechnology Service (IBS) - a special project funded initially by the Netherlands. The initiative was to improve developing countries' understanding, access to, and understanding of modern biotechnology tools. In its first year it would pay special attention to activities in Africa. A meeting and an African Plant Biotechnology Network were planned.

### 3) Information Management (IM) Assistance to SSA/NARS

The **1992** Nairobi meeting also requested ISNAR to take the lead in the area of information collaboration and management. ISNAR had defined its role as facilitator and analyst to promote responses, assist NARS, IARCs and others to come together and insure that IM issues were part of the research agenda of the various stakeholders. In January **1993**, ISNAR in partnership with CTA and CABI cosponsored a consultation on the IM needs of NARS of SSA as well as SPAAR, ISNAR and CIMMYT. The meeting adopted IM needs as an agenda item for the next SPAAR information system meeting.

### 4) ISNAR Study of SSA/NARS Indicator Series

ISNAR had launched in **1992** Phase II of this series intended to update and improve the statistical basis for the analysis of policy issues. Half the SSA NARS had responded to a questionnaire on the subject. ISNAR planned to have credible statistical briefs for at least **30** countries.

Commenting on these four aspects all of which involving ISNAR, Dr Bonte-Friedheim referred to the NARS consultation (Point **1**) and informed the Group that a meeting was scheduled to be held in Benin in September **1993**. There was already a steering committee of three NARS leaders charged with developing the agenda for this meeting. ISNAR would provide administrative support, with Holland paying for the gathering and Sweden and Switzerland invited to provide some inputs. Holland had made sure that the NARS would be on the ICW **1993** agenda, and that one of the NARS leaders would attend.

The project 'Intermediate biotechnology service for NARS', also funded by Holland, had a **workplan** and a steering committee, and had lined up potential donors. These included Norway and the United Kingdom. The project had a five year duration, with a possible extension of three more years. Several developing countries had shown interest in the project.

With regard to information management, eight people from developing countries had participated in a discussion at ISNAR on problems in Africa. Dr Bonte-Friedheim distributed a one page note to CDC members, a copy of which was sent to CAB for further discussion.

ISNAR in **1990** had published a book with time series on NARS until **1985**. Donor support had been sought for its continuation, but none had been forthcoming. Using Italian unearmarked funds ISNAR undertook a review of the NARS in SSA and plans to publish **15** to 20 country reports. He suggested that these reports become a System-wide project, with a major donor paying US\$

**US\$ 200,000** with an open subscription list. If ISNAR did not receive some sort of external support, it would discontinue the series. There was praise for the series and some support for the idea that it should become a system-wide effort. There was also a suggestion that publications on IARC cooperation with the NARS and ISNAR's series should be combined.

A Center Director, although eager to strengthen cooperation with NARS, questioned the wisdom of helping NARS to hold meetings such as that in Benin. In allowing NARS to choose the location, Centers were excessively generous. In reply, Dr Bonte-Friedheim said 'whatever you do is wrong. If we had told them they had to meet in a particular place, we **would have** been accused of dictating to them'.

IRRI had established a rice biotechnology network to ensure that advanced technology methods are used. The African documentation referred to by Dr Bonte-Friedheim was very useful. The International Fund for Agricultural Research (IFAR) did a documentation of IRRI's work in Africa. Should not efforts in this regard be combined to avoid duplication? SPAAR was expecting to have a consolidated funding mechanism in support of this activity and had asked some centers to contribute to their plan of action. Dr Terry then asked Dr Ryan to brief the group on this activity.

Dr Ryan stated that ICRISAT had been asked to cooperate with SPAAR on sorghum research, initially in West Africa. It would be a focal point for cooperative research on sorghum among the NARS. Mali had been identified as a leading player for sorghum. It was not yet clear how the framework for this activity would relate to network activities. ICRISAT had offered to host the sorghum pole at its WASIP Mali Center. The situation was still evolving, and the funding arrangements were not altogether clear.

It was noted that the initiative was designed to help African NARS integrate natural resource management research and commodity research. There was a request that some attention be given to how aquatic systems can fit into some of these activities. The Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana and Malawi would be founding members in general research in aquaculture, and there was scope for links in biotechnology.

There was a need for a regional Information officer from the CG Secretariat to attend to the public awareness aspect of this activity.

5) Consortium for Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) for the Highlands of Eastern and Central Africa

At ICW 1991, CDC/SSA Sub-committee had requested ICRAF to coordinate this

work. ICRAF had prepared a brief Concept Note, discussed it informally with IARC representatives **in** the region and in a meeting of 7 NARS directors held in Nairobi in June **1992**. The participants agreed to establish a task force to be chaired by ICRAF. The objectives were the development of an INRM program and ensure cooperation among the various organizations concerned. A task force of two consultants was commissioned to prepare a background document which was discussed in a meeting held in Entebbe, Uganda, in January **1993**. The Task Force would continue its work, a workshop would ~~be~~ held during **1993**, and a coordinating unit would be established with the assistance of ICRAF.

#### 6) Thirteenth SPAAR Plenary Session

In introducing the subject, Dr Terry stated that the session was held at the Hague in November **1992**. The meeting had recommended several actions including:

- establishment of a consolidated funding mechanism to support activities identified under FFA's
- collaboration in the FFA for East and West Africa between the CGIAR, NARS and SPAAR in the formulation of ecoregional mechanisms
- a revision by the SPAAR Secretariat of SPAAR strategy and preparation of its MTP
- convening individual country round-table discussions to develop an agricultural strategy for Africa
- activating the SPAAR working group **on** networking
- endorsement by SPAAR of a request put by the Inter-Governmental Authority on Drought Development (IGADD) to assist in the design of the FFA for agricultural research in East Africa.

#### 7) SPAAR Technical **Consultation** on **Ecoregional**ity

A meeting sponsored by SPAAR and the Netherlands was held at the African Development Bank (ADB), Abidjan, in April **1993**. The meeting was a follow-up to the Nairobi **CDC/NARS** discussions. It was attended by national and regional agricultural research leaders from SSA, TAC Chair and members, CG Secretariat, **IARCs** and donors. A 14 point summary was issued (and was available to the CDC). These would feature in the TAC commentary on the **TAC/CDC** Working Group draft statement.



## 5 Documentation and Information

Dr Walsh gave a brief summary of the CD-ROM project, which he said was going ahead but was encountering some copyright problems, which were being resolved. He called the Committee's attention to the Haravu Report on **INFOREM**. The Report had analyzed the experience gained so far in computer-based conferencing using a messaging system such as CGNET and concluded that it had some draw-backs including: it was not interactive; it lacked a sense of urgency; members had found it difficult to integrate participation with their **day-to-day** work; contributions were too long; and small Centers with **staff** limitations found it difficult to participate effectively.

On the other hand, discussions on the INFO 92-REM had helped in the generation of ideas. The real value of the facility had been in obtaining greater knowledge of the work of Centers in some areas such as library and documentation services, and publication programs, and in the **exchange** of useful information, software and ideas.

The Haravu's Report suggested the establishment of a Task Force from Center staff with a clear mandate to produce a working document for the consideration of CD's. In the meantime, INFO 92-REM should continue to be used as a medium for interaction among professionals for one more year after which it would be evaluated. Finally, a formal meeting was proposed with a view to making progress in identifying initiatives and collaborative actions.

## 6 **FAO-IARC** Task Force

Dr Brader briefed the group on the work of this Task Force. There were several small cooperative project proposals, involving **FAO** and four centers - ICARDA, ICRISAT, IITA, and CIAT. He expressed doubts about the availability of 'follow-up funding', but added that it was important to be seen pursuing it. He concluded by observing that it was advisable to wait until the beginning of next year when the new Director General of **FAO** had assumed his post.

There was a question on whether UNDP had actually set aside funds for **IARC-FAO** cooperation. Dr Brader said that funds had been made **available** to 'develop ideas', but that so far no specific project funding had been discussed.

Dr Bonte-Friedheim told the CDC that he had attended the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture, which met every two years. There he made a brief statement on behalf of the IARCs. He characterized the response of participants as positive. It was a good idea to have one center **represent** the entire system.

There was general agreement with this point of view, particularly that it was more cost effective. It was pointed out, however, that the approach should be more systematically organized and coordinated, possibly by the CDC. Members agreed to take a closer look at the issue during the Retreat in October.

## 7. Committee on Reviews

Dr Winkelmann had to return to CIMMYT because of an unexpected urgent business. The presentation of his **Committee's** Progress Report was, therefore, postponed to the CDC October meeting.

## 8. Association of the International Agricultural Research Centers (AIARC)

Dr Fadda reported on the progress in the establishment of the AIARC office and other matters relating to staff benefits.

### a) AIARC

The AIARC office was operating smoothly as from the start of 1993. Teething troubles were few and much below assumptions and the few cases that had arisen were promptly dealt with. The office had assumed all the tasks that had been performed by IIE and was also in the process of adding functions which had previously been contracted out to service providers, such as ACCURECORD. There was one major issue **outstanding** - a discrepancy of about US\$ 1.0 million between what IIE pension records showed and what could be traced at Generali, the manager of the off-shore, fixed-income insurance funds. The matter was being actively pursued by AIARC and IIE staff and auditors. The intention was to reach an amicable solution without recourse to litigation.

### b) Comparative Study of Staff Salaries and **Benefits**

Although Dr Fadda had been appointed as a **one-man** ad-hoc Committee on salaries, he sought advice and worked with the AIARC Board and Office. After consultation with these and with all Centers, Dr Lowell Hardin and Mr Bill Gormbley were engaged **to** conduct the study. Their work had been progressing well, but just before the Puerto Rico meeting had a set back resulting from a serious car accident involving Dr Hardin and his wife. Mr Gormbley, with strong backing from AIARC office, was continuing the work and was hopeful that the study would be completed on schedule to be submitted to CDC in October.

Centers had responded well to the consultants' questionnaire, but there had been a relatively poor response to the Directors General part. This was an important input for the judgmental section of the report. If additional responses were not forthcoming during the coming few weeks, this Section could be delayed.

In answer to a question on the reason for engaging two consultants rather than one, Dr Fadda said that the two were acting as a firm covering two different components of the study - the statistical and judgmental. The arrangement did **not** add to the cost which was, in fact, cheap. Further, the AIARC office had been working with the consultants on the development of a methodology that could be used on a routine basis in future updates of the study.

It was stated that ICRISAT's legal advisor was concerned at the wording of the text in the AIARC Agreement relating to indemnifications. Dr Fadda requested a clear identification of the text in question, so that it could be looked into. In the meantime, he informed the CDC that AIARC had taken out an insurance policy which covered fiduciary liability related to AIARC operations of Center Directors and DG's. It also covered each Center for any errors in administering the insurance **and** retirement plans. This policy did not cover Centers, their officers and trustees for matters not related to IARC benefit plans. AIARC had been instructed to circulate a detailed explanation of the specific coverages.

### c) Insurance

The **1992** medical claims experience was appreciably higher, by **66%**, than that of **1991**. This was primarily caused by an unusually high number of peak files, three of which averaged about **US\$ 300,000** each. There was also a rise of **14%** in the number of claims, **3%** in the number of insured persons and **61%** in the level of reimbursements.

On the implications for the future of the increased medical claims, it was clear that such trends would be reflected in the levels of premiums when the current insurance policies came up for renewal. Although the current policy was valid until the end of **1997**, medical insurance rates were negotiated annually in the last quarter of the preceding year with a ceiling of **10%**. Should the proposed premium rates represent an increase of this level or more, the policy holder would have the right to cancel the medical benefits at any date before **31 December**. **No immediate** action was called for from this CDC meeting, but it was necessary to give an early warning.

In answer to questions, Dr Fadda stated that Centers should be aware of the meaning of 'official business' for insurance purposes - commuting between home and place of work was excluded. SOS evacuation was only to the nearest

point where adequate treatment was available. Costs beyond that point would have to be borne by the Center or staff member.

**d) Costs of the CBC Chair**

Dr Fadda reported that he had received a note from Dr **Dillon**, CBC Chair, indicating that the CBC was in favour of a levy of **US\$ 2000** per Center to cover the additional cost of the incumbent incurred in the performance of the special duties that go with the post.

There was some sympathy with the request, but also concern that it would set a precedent that could open the door for similar claims by the CDC Chair, Chairs and members of the standing committees and others. On the whole, the current practice of Centers bearing the cost of activities in which they were participating for the good of the system was to be preferred and maintained. In the long-run, such costs were spread evenly among Centers. The CBC Chair would be informed accordingly.

**Item 5: ICWG Meeting on Plant Genetic Resources and the CGIAR Strategic Paper**

**1. Draft Report of the Inter-Center Working Group on Plant Genetic Resources (ICWG-PGR)**

Dr Hawtin, representing Dr. Mike Jackson, Chairman of the ICWG-PGR, reviewed the report of the ICWG-PGR meeting held at ILCA in February. Participants at that meeting had discussed the draft system-wide strategy for PGR, and reviewed the comments of the last CDC TAC/CBC meeting. Some changes were proposed to the statement and the ICWG felt that it could now be put forward to the **CDs**, although it was recognized that there were still some outstanding issues. Other topics covered at the meeting included the changing global system of PGR, the rapidly evolving CG System and its implications, the concept of ecoregionality and its implications, eg. for the range of species covered. The ICWG-PGR thought it had the capacity to play a more prominent role in policy issues within the CGIAR and to this end sought the active participation of **IFPRI** and **ISNAR**. It was recommended that livestock and aquatic genetic resources also be included within the Group's terms of reference and suggested that the Working Group be renamed the **Inter-Center Working Group on Genetic Resources (ICWG-GR)** to reflect this shift. The Group was in the process of setting up a remote electronic meeting (REM) to continue discussion on matters of common interest.

Regarding the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources, it was originally anticipated that the issues of trusteeship would be resolved, but that did not turn out to be the case. Several NARS had begun to question the value of the

multilateral approach, possibly because UNCED had put emphasis on bilateral arrangements. There was much political rhetoric, but the CGIAR must continue to fight for a multilateral system. Trusteeship, therefore, remained a major issue to be addressed.

The fourth technical conference on plant genetic resources is to be held, tentatively in Germany in **1995**. There will be individual country reports on the state of plant genetic resources, as well as crop reports. Furthermore, a global plan of action on the next major steps to be taken in plant genetic resources will be worked out. IBPGR is already involved in the process, and hopes that other centers will also participate.

Finally, given the complexity of these issues and the rapidly evolving situation, there were real opportunities for a funding increase for plant genetic resources. Center Directors should look at the genetic resources activities of the system as a whole. TAC Chair, Dr McCalla, was keen for TAC to undertake a system-wide review of plant genetic resources, possibly in **1994**.

Several CDC members commented on the legal status of germplasm collections and the trusteeship concept. If an agreement on trusteeship was not reached with FAO, what was the fallback position? Dr Hawtin replied that Centers had already declared themselves trustees and that there was nothing to stop them from acting as in the past. However, they were seeking an explicit endorsement for this concept by a recognized inter-governmental body. Without it collections risked becoming frozen in time. FAO's endorsement was very important.

On whether or not it might be wise, for reasons of security, to seek both multilateral and bilateral agreements, Dr Hawtin noted it was important to avoid putting restrictions on access to germplasm. This did not mean that individual centers could not have bilateral agreements. However, the in-trust collections covered by the proposed agreement with FAO must be governed by multilateral agreements. Others added that the CGIAR should let the international debate on this topic continue. The CG should not be too closely identified with a particular camp.

ICLARM expressed satisfaction that the P (for plant) would be removed from the title for the Inter-Center Working Group for (Plant) Genetic Resources. Centers should try to avoid limiting discussion on this topic strictly to plants. It was observed that FAO was setting up an animal and plant genetic resources commission. They would be differentiating between plant and livestock germplasm.

In spite of general approval, it was stressed that if new commodities were included under the ecoregional rubric, Centers might have to renegotiate their memoranda

of understanding and bilateral agreements. Adding new commodities could run into sensitivities.

Referring to the pamphlet 'People and Plants - The Development Agenda', Dr Hawtin informed Committee members that their financial support would be solicited. He had already received positive feedback and sought CDC's views on publishing Spanish and French versions. The costs would be around US\$ 1 per copy, or US\$ 3,000 for 3,000 copies. A note would be circulated with the details. Dr Nores was in favour of a Spanish edition and offered to have the text translated at CIAT. There was also support for a French edition. The general idea of a system-wide brochure on plant genetic resources, was endorsed.

The System was under pressure to think as a system. If it succeeded in this, it might be able to get additional funds. It needed to build on what it was doing now in what it would do in the future. The ecoregional approach provided a useful framework for linking the current activities of the centers. The process must be kept going.

It was pointed out that individual Centers were spending 5 percent of their budgets on plant genetic resources and the system as a whole spent about 10 percent. More, however, would be needed to extend activities to other species. Dr Hawtin observed that this depended on how the role and responsibility of the CGIAR in this area were defined. The System should continue to act as a major player in ex-situ conservation, but must not continue to be seen as a conserver of genetic resources for its centers alone.

CDC was reminded not to lose sight of the high prominence attached to biodiversity and the accusation that the green revolution had eroded it. A new chapter needed to be written on the green revolution. This was an important task for the CGIAR. A concern was expressed that Centers were being driven into inefficient conservation methods by political pressures.

## **2 Paper on the Convention on Biological Diversity and the CGIAR**

Dr Hawtin informed the CDC that the paper was intended as a contribution to a broader discussion on this issue. He had distributed it to inform members but not for detailed discussion on this occasion. It was agreed that it could be scheduled for discussion at a later meeting.

## **3. Funding Proposal for Plant Genetic Resources**

Dr Hawtin told the Committee that the Henry Shands letter was a personal initiative to help obtain US funding for CG plant genetic resource activities. Shands was eager that the System be seen as a global one. It was necessary to persuade the outside world that 'we are a system'.

## **4. Progress Report on Intellectual Property Rights**

Dr Brader introduced the Progress Report of the CDC Sub-Committee on IPR, and

made the following points:

- The CGIAR MTM at Istanbul last year had adopted a working document on IPR and requested Center Directors to take further action on the matter. After extensive consultations involving Centers, NARS and other stakeholders, the CDC IPR Sub-committee made slight revisions and, with these, the guidelines were ready for use by the various Centers to formulate their own guiding principles.
- A study was being carried out with some NGO's on the implication of the adoption of Intellectual Property Protection and Plant Breeders Rights on plant breeding and the use of plant genetic resources for the world as a whole and for developing countries in particular. This initiative was being financially supported by IDRC and SAREC. It was expected to be completed by the end of 1993.
- With regard to self-declared trusteeship, the IPR Sub-Committee had initiated negotiations with FAO and the FAO Commission on PGR to bring the IARC collections into the FAO International Network of ex situ Collections.

In answer to a question, Dr Brader stated that the discussion related to base collections as defined by Centers and generally referred to collections intended for long-term storage. These would be covered by the FAO Agreement.

## Item 6: Other Issues

### a Collaborative IARC Activities Relating to Integrated Agriculture

The CDC agreed to address this topic later via E-Mail.

### b. Linkages Between Private Consultant Firms and CG Centers

Dr Bonte-Friedheim suggested that the CDC discuss this topic at its next meeting. There were requests for Center staff to work as consultants. Although IARCs were on the NARS side and should not compromise this status by working with donors, they should not be 'holier than the Pope'. He expressed a readiness to prepare a two-page outline with the option of presentation at the next CDC meeting. This was gratefully accepted.

### c. International Nutrition Conference

Since Dr Andersen had presented his report to the CGIAR, he felt that he did not need repeat the performance. Dr Fadda said that in the Executive session of the Group IFPRI's contribution to the Conference was highly valued and IFPRI had been thanked for its role. The CDC added its own thanks.

### d. Support for IFAR

Dr Fadda reviewed the history of IFAR. Although the Fund had been clearly advised last November of the CDC decision to discontinue grants to it, it had made fresh approaches to all Centers and at least one had agreed to contribute.

Enquiries from Centers received by Dr Fadda in his capacity as CDC Chair, had convinced him that it was advisable to bring the matter once again to the attention of the CDC with a view to taking a common stand.

Several Center Directors stated that, in line with the CDC decision, they had discontinued their support to IFAR. IIRRI had assisted not in cash but by printing some of IFAR's pamphlet, which the Center did not consider a breach of the understanding among Centers. The quality was so poor that IFAR was told that IIRRI's help would not be renewed. IITA had given support because IFAR had played an important role in mustering support for a project.

In a comment it was stated that IFAR had written to Center Board Chairs in an approach that could be only described as 'divide and conquer'. The CDC had no cause but to confirm the decision it took in its preceding meeting. It was also important that the CBC Chairs be informed so that Chairs refrain from taking a different position.

As to the attitude to be taken with regard to IFAR's country briefs, it was stated that they were almost ready. They could impress those not familiar with the CGIAR, even though they were full of inaccuracies. The CDC should consider providing IFAR with the US\$ 30,000 they were requesting to finish the publications and then wish them good luck. In approving the allocation of US\$ 200,000 a few days earlier for the PAA, the CDC was sending a message about the importance it gave to public awareness activity. It might be that CDC should consider rescuing the investment it had already made. Another suggestion was that Centers contribute the requested amount but only if UNDP, which had financed the pamphlets, could not do so. The Secretariat should also be approached.

There was strong support to the view that the matter be put to rest as quickly and as diplomatically as possible.

#### e. International Population Conference

Dr Bonte-Friedheim told the Committee that the conference would take place in Cairo in 1994, and that IFPRI would represent the System. Dr Andersen added that he had attended a preparatory meeting the week before and had received funding from the Rockefeller Foundation to hold a 25 person round-table.

The CDC agreed to have IFPRI represent the System at the Cairo Population Conference.



## f. Evolution of Training

Dr Bonte-Friedheim told the Committee he had prepared a paper on training activities. It was agreed that the paper would be put on the agenda at ICW 93.

### Item 7: Election of Committees

At the suggestion of a number of Center Directors, the CDC agreed to replace the traditional method of election through informal consultations, by a structured process involving nomination, secondment and election. Elections proceeded according to the new system.

The new membership of Sub-committee is as follows:

#### CENTER DIRECTORS' SUB-COMMITTEES 1993-1994

Executive	Fadda Terry Nores	(Chairman)-(to October 93)
Benefits	Fadda Winkelmann	(Chairman) To serve in tandem. If he declines, CDC will decide at ICW 93
Documentation & Information	Lenton Hawtin Mateo	(Chairman)
Public Awareness & Resources	Andersen Hawtin Lampe Sayer	(Chairman)
IPR & Plant Genetic	Brader Hawtin Lampe Mateo Ryan	(Chairman)

Sub-Saharan Africa	Terry Bonte-Friedheim Brader Fitzhugh Gray Sanchez	(Chairman)
Sustainability & Environment	Zandstra Lenton Nores Ryan Sanchez Sayer	(Chairman)
Priorities & Strategies	Ryan Andersen Bonte-Friedheim Gray Lampe	(Chairman)
<b>CDC/CBC/TAC Joint Com. on Priorities and Strategies</b>	Ryan Gray	(Chairman)
<b>FAO/IARCs Task Force</b>	Brader Lampe	(Chairman)
Ad-hoc Committee on Reviews	Winkelmann	(Chairman)
Ad-hoc Committee on Salaries	Fadda	(Chairman)
Ad-hoc Committee on Retreat	Andersen Ryan Winkelmann	(Chairman)
Joint <b>CDC/TAC Com.</b> on Plant Genetic Resources	Hawtin Ryan <b>Hayashi/Zimmerman</b> Riley	

## Other Committees/Representation

Public Awareness	Winkelmann	(Chairman)
Association Executive	Andersen	
Committee	Hawtin	

<b>Ad-hoc</b> Committee for <b>Liaison</b> with UNEP	Zandstra
	Sanchez
	IDRC (?)
	UNEP (?)

## Item 8. Any Other Business

### a) Report on issues covered by the CGIAR Executive (Closed) Meeting

Dr Fadda reported on a few issues raised by the Executive meeting. The following deals with those not covered elsewhere in these Minutes.

### b) UNCED Follow-up

It would be recalled that at ICW 92, Stein Bie was asked by the CGIAR Chair to develop proposals on how the System could respond to UNCED's Agenda 21. Among the points made in Mr Bie's report was that additional funds for UNCED were limited and that presenting old and on-going CG work in new wrapping would not qualify for new funds. 'Agenda 21 deserves Agenda 21 proposals'. Mr Bie suggested that the CG should concentrate, and develop programs, in three areas: soil and water; genetic resources; and human resources.

It was agreed that Mr Bie should pursue his work within an enlarged committee on which the Centers would be represented. Carlos Zurberti was to add an environmental component and the Secretariat to provide logistical support.

The CDC approved the nomination of Drs Zandstra and Sanchez to represent it on this Committee,

### c) NARS

The CDC/NARS Nairobi meeting had left a good impression. The CGIAR needed to continue the dialogue on how best to involve NARS. The subject would be on the Agenda of ICW 93.

Dr Bonte-Friedheim added that ISNAR had been asked to hold an African NARS meeting in time for reporting to ICW 93. Donor funding for this had been secured.

#### d) **Periodicity** of External Reviews

To cope with the needs of a larger CGIAR, it was suggested that reviews need not be automatically conducted every five years. While the concept was acceptable in principle, there was concern that very long intervals, e.g. 10 years, might not be acceptable or convincing to donors. Longer intervals between reviews should be resorted to only selectively.

#### e) Finance and Oversight Committees

The Group had approved the establishment of these two committees to act on behalf of, and report to, the Group. The participation of Centers or TAC was not considered. The composition of the two Committees would be:

##### Finance Committee

Australia

Canada

Germany

Japan

Denmark

UK

World Bank

Two members to be added from among developing country delegations.

##### Oversight Committee

Paul Egger

Henri Carsalade

VL Chopra

Ralph W Cummings, Jr

Robert W Herdt

John Holmberg

In an answer to a question, Dr Fadda said no detailed terms of reference were spelled out during the Executive Meeting, but he assumed they would be along the lines recommended by the Herdt Report. Once the Committees began to operate their role should become increasingly clear.

#### f) **Livestock Committee**

A seven-member Committee was established to develop a unified strategy and program for livestock research in the CGIAR and develop an institutional plan and a timetable for the creation of a single entity to undertake strategic research in livestock. The Committee was to be chaired by Dr Lucia Vaccaro. Other members would be the Chairs of ILCA and ILRAD, a veterinarian (preferably African), an animal production specialist ; and a social scientist, and Taff Davis (UK).

### g) Funding

Several donor representatives stated that they needed help from TAC to demonstrate to decision makers in their own countries of the adverse effects of reduced funding on the IARCs and provide arguments that would counteract the perception that the CG System was monolithic, flat and sheltered.

Dr Nores added that in a chance meeting with TAC Chair, he was asked to pass on a request to the CDC for information on downsizing that had taken place at the centers. TAC wanted to know the effects, the foregone benefits and the services not provided, as a result of the budget crunch. They aimed at a brief and concise 2 to 3 page document covering the period since 1989. The deadline for submission to the TAC Secretariat was 10 September.

One other comment was that Centers must be explicit about whether they were downsizing from the endorsed budget, or from real numbers. We should be clear about what our baseline was.

The CDC decided to ask for clarification of these and other issues from Dr McCalla.

### h) Winding-up Sessions

Dr Andersen suggested that a half-day meeting be organized during Centers Week to review the accomplishments of the proposed retreat. Dr Ryan was of the opinion that a three-day retreat would be too long. He suggested that the retreat last for two days, and that the third day be devoted to a CDC meeting at the same venue.

Dr Bonte-Friedheim suggested that one day be put aside immediately after ICW to discuss the outcome of the week. Dr Terry recalled that the CDC had agreed on the usefulness of such a meeting, but usually half the DGs would have left before its business was concluded.

The Committee accepted the proposal for a two day retreat followed by one day for a CDC meeting, and also to meet on Saturday morning after ICW to discuss the outcome of the Week. The full schedule of the meeting would thus be:

Sunday	17 October	Retreat
Monday	18 October	Retreat
Tuesday	19 October	CDC
Thursday	21 October	CDC
Friday	22 October	CDC
Saturday	30 October	CDC

### **i) CDC Hospitality at ICW**

Turning to the traditional Sunday brunch hosted by the Centers during ICW, Dr Fadda informed the Committee that last year's function had cost about US\$ 1,200 per center, totalling around US\$ 20,000. Dr Terry noted that while acknowledging that the cost was high, the event was an important opportunity to interact on an informal basis with ICW participants and was well worth the expenditure. Dr Hawtin advocated a more simple affair that would avoid the appearance of extravagance.

Dr Fadda interpreted the position of the CDC as **supportive** of the event but at a more modest level. He would work out details with Dr Andersen.

### **j) CDC Statement at ICW**

Dr Fadda noted that a statement would be expected from the CDC at ICW. He requested that each CDC **Sub-Committee** **provide** him with a brief note to be incorporated into a general statement.

### **k) Consultations on Plant Protection**

Dr Brader recalled that in 1989 an external study was made of IARC plant protection activities and submitted to TAC. The report touched on the need for more inter-center cooperation in plant protection, which was also an important topic in discussions during UNCED. He stressed that **IARCs** had much to offer in this area, and asked his Committee colleagues **if** it might not be useful **to** further develop ideas relating to plant protection, much along the lines of the meeting of **IARC** social scientists organized by the Secretariat.

Dr Hawtin said that he had sent a communication to Center Directors remarking on the large number of IARC scientists scheduled to attend the International Congress of Pathology. He suggested that IARC scientists attending the meeting discuss while there a system-wide approach to the topic. He promised to distribute copies of the plant pathology document to which he had referred earlier.

The CDC endorsed Dr Brader's proposal.

### **l) Responses to Mr Preston's Requests success stories**

Several CDC members recalled that the President of the World Bank had asked **IARCs** for three examples of breakthroughs made by Centers. It was suggested that Centers should compile their submissions to be sent jointly to the World Bank. Center Directors were urged not to present Mr Preston with 'second hand breakthroughs. They had to be original'. It was suggested that **PARC** work with the secretariat Public Awareness staff to develop the idea.

#### m) **IARCs and Newly Independent Republics (NIRs)**

In a follow up of a resolution of the current CDC meeting (Item 3), a draft letter to World Bank President Preston on current and possible IARC activities in Eastern Europe and the NIRs of the former USSR was circulated. In comments on this the CDC was warned that **IARCs** should not be too closely identified with the World Bank's activities in these countries, given the amount of controversy surrounding them. The Bank Vice President for Eastern Europe 'should be consulted before the final approach was made to the Bank President. It was necessary that ~~whatever~~ proposals Centers put forward be solid and responsible. There was a proposal to a Sub-Committee to develop the 'meat' for Eastern Europe, to be presented at ICW 1993. Several Centers stated that they were active in Eastern Europe, and were receiving frequent requests from various countries in the region. They all could put forward convincing proposals. It was important, however, to act quickly and not lose momentum.

Twelve Centers expressed a desire to participate in this initiative. It was agreed that within 20 days they would submit their drafts to the CDC Chair. Drs Andersen, Bonte-Friedheim and Fadda accepted responsibility for following up the **NIRs/Eastern European** initiative.

#### n) ~~Staff~~ Salaries

Dr Lampe noted that **IRRI** was currently holding discussions on salary adjustments, and said that the salaries of internationally recruited staff were to be frozen for one year. He asked other Directors General about the situation in their Centers. In summary, **IIMI**, **ILCA**, **ILRAD** and **WARDA** had frozen salaries; **ICARDA**, **ICRISAT**, **IFPRI** and **IITA** had given normal increases; **IBPGR** was in the process of deciding; **ICLARM** 'pending' and **CIP** 'not yet'.

#### o) **Discussions** with *the CG Executive Secretary*

The CDC agreed that the CDC Chairman would raise the following points with the CGIAR Executive Secretary during their next meeting: general dissatisfaction with the performance of the Secretariat, especially the information flow; the need for more effective public awareness activities; the need for more intense fund raising; a desire for more transparent operations; and ~~sched'ing~~ a meeting with the CDC on every occasion attended by both sides.

Center Directors emphasized the need to institutionalize Center presentations to World Bank staff, rather than have such events based upon personal contacts. The initiative, should come from the Secretariat. It was pointed out that the World Bank staff included people whose job it was to liaise with the Centers. They should be involved.

**Item 10: Closure of the Meeting**

**The Chairman thanked Committee members for their input, and wished them all a safe and happy return journey.**



### Meeting with **Mr Ravi Tadvalkar**

The meeting with Mr Tadvalkar, which took place on **30 May 1993**, was not originally on the Agenda, but was arranged during the preceding week. Mr Tadvalkar presented his analysis of the recent funding trends and projections for the immediate future.

The news Mr Ravi Tadvalkar had to bring on the current funding situation were not pleasant. The Secretariat now estimated that core funding would be US\$ **232** million. This was down US\$ **9** million on the January figure when the total resources available to the Centers were put at US\$ **241** million, compared to approximately US\$ **254-264** million announced at ICW **1992**. There were three components to this cut:

- Five donors - France, Italy, the United Kingdom, Finland and UNDP had indicated that they would lower contributions from the **1992** level. The reduction totaled US\$ 5.5 million.
- There had been a reduction of US\$ 55 million related to a reduction in estimated project and restricted core contributions since January. Some of these reductions had not been anticipated.
- The Secretariat had assumed the World Bank contribution of US\$ 40 million would be matched by the donors. Now it appeared the matching contributions would not materialize.

At this point three courses were open to the Secretariat. These could be a revision of its calculations, budget reductions across the board, or a delay of the process until TAC completed its resource allocations process in early July. At present, there was no clear preference among these three options. The first option was the easiest, and most transparent.

In their comments, Center Directors felt that the Secretariat had not reacted adequately to the funding crisis and could have exerted greater efforts in fund raising. They pointed to the difficulties that progressive funding decline posed to their plans. There appeared to be a lack of transparency in the Secretariat's financial management. **All** these were causing problems and continued to do so. For example, this year the Secretariat had advised the World Bank to withdraw US\$ 65 million from ILCA's funding because of a revaluation in the local currency which was very damaging. The current policy of withdrawing money from centers long after centers had stopped benefiting from such trends was not helping. **It** was apparent that transparency was not yet in place, although Centers had requested it repeatedly.

Responding to this comment, **Mr Tadvalkar** stressed that the Secretariat had never told a donor that any center was over funded. The Secretariat had issued a funding advisory in January saying that there had been a major revision. This was established policy. If a major revaluation of the local currency occurred, funding changes would follow.

Mr Tadvalkar's attention was drawn to the fact that revaluation operated in more than one direction. It could result in nominal gains which were then canceled by a concurrent increase in salaries. Both trends should be taken into account. Mr Tadvalkar agreed that cost structures did change and were often accompanied by inflation. This, however, did not happen every year but sporadically.

The Secretariat was conducting a study with PARC on how to allocate resources and manage change. It was hoped that when the study was complete, the process would become more transparent. Regarding allocations, the Secretariat adopted mechanical adjustments. It did so because doing it any other way would be even more difficult.

It was noted that while the opportunity to help solve the problem was appreciated, the CDC was not the correct forum to solve this problem, and that decision should be made outside this Group. TAC had rules for such a situation, why were they not adhered to. Mr Tadvalkar confirmed the existence of such a mechanism. His intention in presenting other options was to share the information with the CDC. Steps would be followed up with TAC later, but this was the time to talk about it.

Several Center Directors voiced concern on using preliminary envelopes as a baseline for the **1993** budget. Center Directors were being faced with solving difficult problems and situations not of their making. The last reallocation of resources was based on Chapter **14**, written **12** to **14** months earlier. Since then, TAC's judgement had changed and now Centers were being faced with a different outcome. Last year and after much discussion, a formula was agreed upon. This year another formula was being used. What was the reason for the change? Mr Tadvalkar replied that in **1992** discussions on priorities were still going on. The operative framework for 1993 was related to the coming medium-term period. It was also observed that it would be worthwhile using different approaches to annual and within year adjustments. The former would be according to the agreed formula; the latter on a pro-rata basis. It was objected, however, that whatever figures were used now they could very well be superseded by the time that TAC put final touches to its resource allocation in **June/July**. Should the reallocation be postponed until after that stage had been reached?

Center Directors were disturbed at the fact that the Bank's matching funds fell short of expectations. Could this be corrected by Centers declaring certain project income as **restricted** core rather than complementary? There was a need to redefine core and complementary, and also remove the risk of being 'punished' if efforts to mobilize complementary funding were successful. Further, some of the donors that had reduced core funding, had maintained the overall size of their grants. No one seemed to have enquired on the motivation for the change in their attitude or whether it could be reversed. It could be that through special funding they could exert greater control. Mr Tadvalkar commented that it was evident that the primary cause for reduction was the on-going world-wide recession. Aid budgets had been reduced by up to 40% (Italy). Unless there were changes in the economic environment, the situation could not improve. Furthermore, some donors were

shifting their emphasis to ensure continuity between the funds allocated for the centers and the assistance they provided to the NARS. When core and complementary funding were discussed as much core as possible should also be retained. Japan, for example, wanted to support core programs. By shifting from complementary to core, it was possible, in the short term, to get more funding, but in the long term, Mr Tadvalkar would advise against it. The concept was attractive, but it could become complicated and the implications were dangerous. Finally, long-term adjustments must be considered because they were very serious. It was essential to determine whether a given activity was truly core. If bilateral support continued to decrease, the situation would only be exacerbated.

Donors who wished to use special funding because of the opportunities it offered for greater interaction with NARS should realize that there were transaction costs and that these should be paid into core budgets. A collective action might achieve this end. There was a suggestion that such costs should be set at 5%.

The view was expressed that shifting funds, such as those of UNDP, from complementary to restricted core, was either acceptable to donors or not necessary. Complications could arise and any such shifts should be carefully considered and be transparent. Mr Tadvalkar said that if an activity was generally believed as core but requested as complementary, it should be counted as core. Centers would have to assess as a group the likely impact of such an approach on donor contributions.

As to the Bank's attitude, the question was asked whether it would be prepared to split its contribution and use one portion according to the current formula and the rest to fill gaps in funding. Further, could the Bank make an exception to its formula, but within the ceiling it set for its contributions, in special circumstances? Mr Tadvalkar said that according to the Bank's current authorization, such a payment would be considered an advance to be deducted from the following year's allocations. There would be a day of reckoning.

It was clear that in most, if not all cases, Centers would go into the red in **1993**. The Secretariat should make donors aware of the negative effect that mid-year adjustments had. They should not blame Centers or accuse them of mismanagement if, by the end of the year, they could not balance their budgets. Looking ahead, **1994** was not likely to be better than **1993**. This required Centers to maintain their austerity measures and continue to make deep painful cuts.

On the appropriateness of using **1992** as a base year for the partitioning of funds between the older and expansion Centers, Mr Tadvalkar stated that the Secretariat had avoided reallocation of resources from one Center to another. Because Centers were under the balancing mechanism, the results were fairly close to what was expected. Any shortfall would be distributed according to the funding targets. Within 15 days, he said, specific details would be made available.

Center Directors expressed dissatisfaction that the Executive Secretary had not scheduled a meeting with the CDC at which its concerns could be ventilated. The

CDC Chair explained that for several years now no such meeting had been scheduled during MTM and past practice had prevailed. In hindsight, the decision not to do so was clearly wrong. The point was discussed during the preceding week with the Executive Secretary, who had agreed and promised to do his best to attend. It was also agreed that, in future, joint CDC/Executive Secretary meetings would be held wherever and whenever the sides were present. Furthermore, the tradition of meeting the CG Chair and the President of the Bank at ICW would be adhered to.

The Chair thanked Mr Tadvalkar for his finding time to address the CDC at short notice, for his detailed and clear presentation, and for his patience in responding to difficult, often challenging questions and comments.