

CENTER DIRECTORS, COMMITTEE MEETING  
WASHINGTON D.C.  
October 19, 21-23, and 29, 1993

DRAFT MINUTES

1. CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

The Chairman, Dr. Nasrat Fadda, opened the meeting and welcomed the group. He indicated that Dr. Chris Bonte-Friedheim, DG ISNAR, wished to make a personal statement. Dr. Bonte-Friedheim reviewed the selection process for the position of Director General of FAO and indicated that the selection should be made by November 10, 1993 with the successful candidate assuming office on January 1, 1994. ISNAR Board has a contingency plan for the position of Director General of ISNAR should it be needed.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The published agenda was adopted with minor changes (Attachment 1).

3. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the CDC Meeting held in Puerto Rico on May 22, 23 and 30, 1993 were adopted as presented (Attachment 2).

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Chairman noted actions on matters arising from the minutes which were approved as outlined in Matters Arising from the Minutes (Attachment 3), with the following notations:

- the request of the CBC to discuss further Center support of the CBC Chair's costs had been withdrawn;
- IFAR has been informed of the CDC decision not to renew support to this Fund which may have now been disbanded;
- the World Bank's response to the CDC letter on possible collaboration with Eastern Europe, although phased in a standard format; left the door open.

5. SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. PARC Related Activities.

The outgoing chairman of PARC, Dr. Gustavo Nores, reported on the Committee's activities (Attachment 4). The highlights of the report and the ensuing discussions follow.

## I. Balancing Facility

PARC has reviewed proposals put forward by the CGIAR Secretariat to amend the balancing procedure by which the World Bank allots funds to Centers not receiving full funding for collectively approved strategies and priorities. The paper recommends continuing the contingency function **of** the facility and proposes additional functions of encouraging fund-raising either by matching center efforts or by acting as donor of first, rather than last, resort. The Chairman reported that PARC had been unable to reach agreement on a response to the document (Attachment 5) and was raising the matter for CDC consideration before **ICW**.

A number of issues were raised in the discussion:

- o while the current use of the balancing facility is a factor contributing to the CG as a system, it is not the essential element: that exists more in the collaborative and cross-center programs;
- the paper and its proposals assume a level of homogeneity of size, function and outputs among the centers that does not exist;
- o there is a need for a mechanism to avoid large fluctuations in funding from year to year, additionally, the facility, as it currently operates, provides no incentives for centers to raise more funds than they need to get full Bank support;
- the current system deprives the Bank of discretion in allocating funds; this is contrary to logical expectations Bank staff may have, and, to a degree, neutralizes decisions by other donors;
- in view of the differences in Centers' interests, perhaps a hybrid solution is best, one which meets some of the interests of all Centers, but not of all of the Centers at all points;
- the long-term effects of uncertainty and fluctuations will be two-fold: causing Centers to withdraw into short-term programs, and introducing an element of uncertainty into inter-center activities. From this point of view, each Center's uncertainty is liable to impact on the centers with which that Center cooperates;
- o the balancing facility makes it easier for donors to be committed to long-term programs. It would be advantageous if all donors contributed to the balancing mechanism rather than having this responsibility left to the Bank;
- the balancing facility would not be needed if donors made longer term commitments, though this would not necessarily avoid problems of annual fluctuations;
- retaining heavy reserves is not a feasible means of avoiding large annual fluctuations for it involves an opportunity cost and can result in the perception that the center has ample funds;
- in terms of giving the Bank discretion in allocating its funds, the Bank would have to establish a staff function to achieve that purpose. But it was noted that the Bank already spends staff time on its funding of the centers;

- o while it is logical for the Bank to want some discretion in the allocation of **its** funds, the Chairman of the CG is also a Vice-president **of** the Bank and, therefore, it is logical for the Bank to support the system.

It was noted that the balancing facility as it currently functions is unacceptable and that it is not in the CDC's interests to report **its** inability to reach consensus. It was suggested that perhaps it would be adequate to state the principles the CDC wished to have embodied in the final **outcome**. It was **felt** that, in view of the work that had already been done on the issue, it would be advisable to relate the CDC response to one of the stated options, **even** if some modifications were added.

There was general agreement in favor of the second option, labelled "up front distribution and gap filling". A number of suggestions were made which constituted modifications of this option, including:

- o enlarging the group of co-sponsors, possibly to include ADB, AfDB, IBRD, i.e. the major financial institutions;
- o expanding the Bank's role as donor to include the co-sponsors.

A proposal was put forward that the CDC response to the Finance Committee include the following comments:

1. appreciation for the initiative producing the proposals;
2. that wider issues could have been addressed in the **two** Secretariat papers;
3. that the proposals impact centers differentially depending on a number of factors;
4. that all donors contribute to the balancing mechanism;
5. support for Option 2, i.e. up front support and gap filling, with the modifications listed above.

The following additions to the response were proposed:

- o gap filling should be defined as the third option in the tables attached to the Secretariat paper;
- the basis for measuring the gap should be the average funding of the prior three years;
- o expanding the "donor of last resort" to include the financial institutions as listed above.

It was agreed that the incoming Chairman of PARC would draft the response, recognizing that it should be transmitted to the Finance Committee in time for its meeting on Thursday, October 21, 1993.

## ii. Towards a CGIAR Financial Strategy

The CDC discussed the Secretariat paper "Towards a CGIAR Financial Strategy" /Attachment 6) briefly and decided that it was a useful analytical paper but did not address the issue of where to go next or where to obtain additional funding.

It was decided that a letter should go to the Chairman of the CG indicating that:

- o the paper is an informative first step but needs to go further and present a strategy for expanding funding;
- o the next step could be to get the key actors together to discuss strategy and that the CDC stood ready through PARC to help in that process.

## iii. Overheads

It was noted that Directors of Administration had gathered statistics on Centers' overhead charges, and had proposed charging rates approved by center Boards. PARC was recommending that changes be made in the current procedures and that a study should be done to establish rates to be updated every 2-3 years. In the discussion, the following comments were made:

- the CDC should ask the Finance Committee to decide overhead rates, and that the CDC should propose targets;
- it is in the Centers' interests that donors pay overheads, but as overhead rates had possibilities for promoting competition between centers, the Finance Committee should be asked to propose rates to the donors;
- the CDC should take the lead in demonstrating that there are differences between institutions which warranted different rates. It was noted also that different rates could be considered for different types of expenditures, e.g. personnel and non-personnel costs;
- overheads are the means of earning income and should be maximized. This could be done through getting good information, i.e. getting information on different procedures, finding out what others charge, sharing information, etc.;
- centers with **U.S.** government contracts will be audited by **U.S.** government auditors and given a provisional overhead rate to be charged until the next audit. Centers may find the use of rates set by external auditors useful but these are not acceptable to the **U.S.** government;
- a problem to be resolved is who gets the overhead on collaborative projects. Centers need harmonious policies on this. This problem is further compounded by the fact that different donors have different policies which could occasion difficulties on shared projects.

It was noted that donors follow different procedures in terms of what they regard as line items and what they regard as indirect costs. As it is not possible to come up with a blanket procedure or set of rates, part of the answer to the overhead problem lies in carefully defining line items and including them in budgets.

The CDC decided that PARC should write to the Finance Committee on behalf of the CDC indicating that the question of overheads was a matter of concern, that it needed donor input, and that the CDC would look to the Finance Committee for guidance. It was further noted that the letter should be sent to the Finance Committee in time for its next meeting.

iv. Report on PARC Meeting, October 19, 1993

Dr. Per Pinstруп-Andersen, the Chairman of PARC, reported on its meeting on October 19, 1993 (Attachment 7). On behalf of the CDC, he expressed appreciation to Dr. Nores, the outgoing chairman, for the thorough documentation through which he has kept people informed.

a. New Terms of Reference for PARC

Dr. Pinstруп-Andersen, outlined proposed new terms of reference for PARC. He noted that new actors were now active in PARC's area of interest which induced PARC to propose new Terms of Reference. These envisage creating a new body by combining PARC and the Executive Committee of the PAA or by expanding PARC to include the PAA, two outside consultants, two members of the Secretariat staff (yet to be recruited) and the Executive Secretary. PARC would operate at the strategic level, setting strategy and guidelines to be acted upon by its action bodies or sub-committees. PARC would not try to decide issues of resource allocation between Centers such as the "donor of last resort", but would liaise with other bodies, such as the Executive Secretariat, and propose that it deal directly with the Centers. The CDC's input will be sought on the mandate for the new PARC.

In discussion, it was noted that the purpose of restructuring PARC is to join entities with overlapping responsibilities and diminish the current fragmentation. The value of merging and consolidation was accepted and discussion focussed primarily on ensuring that the new PARC would be fully accountable to the CDC. It was noted that while joint committees did not provide a complete analogy, the presence of the Executive Secretary on the existing PARC did set a precedent for non-CDC membership on a CDC committee.

The group approved the content of the PARC Chairman's report, indicating that PARC should remain a committee of the CDC. As such, it will have non-CDC members and will be chaired by one of its CDC members.

b. CDC Support to PAA

The Chairman proposed and the CDC agreed that the \$200,000 the CDC had previously committed to the Public Awareness Association for *its* activities be deposited with the AIARC. Disbursement by the AIARC from this fund would begin only after approval by the CDC of a program of work submitted by the PAA through PARC.

The CDC agreed that the Executive Committee of the PAA should be informed of the above decisions and *its* response reported back to the CDC.

B. Plant Genetic Resources

Dr. G. Hawtin, Chairman of the Committee on Plant Genetic Resources, reported on Committee activities. (The relevant documents are Dr. Hawtin's paper submitted to the CDC May, 1993 meeting and Dr. Fadda's notes of TAC's discussions of July 5, 1993 in Sri Lanka, as well as Dr. Hawtin's Fax of September 23, 1993, all of which have been distributed previously).

i. Biodiversity Convention.

a. Geneva Convention. In accordance with pre-convention agreements, a single paper was presented representing all of agriculture. There was insufficient input from non-CGIAR sources. At the Convention, the Secretary said the paper was important and indicated that it would be distributed. Eight people representing 5 centers attended the Convention. It was helpful to have the system well represented.

b. Bilateralism vs Multilateralism. The nub of the argument is whether the Convention takes a bi- or multi-lateral approach. Bilateral forces seem to have had sway but now NGOs and others are raising questions, especially with regard to agriculture where the CGIAR collections are central. Discussions may shift back to FAO which favors a multi-lateral approach, and is competing with UNEP. In view of this tension, we need to keep watch but we have good contacts on the 6 person secretariat of the Convention and are positioned to have influence. NGOs are now recognized and have speaking rights at the Convention and they will become increasingly important.

ii. Agreement with FAO.

It is important to conclude an agreement with FAO quickly. The NGOs will be allies. We have tried to convey to FAO that this is a universal agreement, not something only in the Centers' interests. Currently, the submission is in the hands of FAO legal staff and no substantive response has yet been received. We will continue to negotiate with FAO.

iii. TAC Stripe Study.

TAC plans to conduct a study on how the CGIAR relates to the rest of the players in genetic resources and how to further its goals. The CGIAR system spends about \$25 million annually on genetic resources and the question is, is it spending it efficiently? The study has implications for better funding. It is important that the system sends signals as a system and not as 18 individual players. The Chairman of the Committee will be discussing the study with the TAC Chairman. Currently, the text of the TAC statement is satisfactory but there are questions about the membership of the study panel. Center Directors should make inputs into the team composition and should do so immediately.

iv. MTA Study.

The Committee plans to have a draft of a Materials Transfer Agreement by the end of 1993 as a basis for further discussion. The Committee will consult further with the CDC.

v. Inter-center Working Group on Genetic Resources.

The Working Group would probably meet in February, 1994. At Puerto Rico, there was a suggestion to change its name from Plant Genetic Resources to Genetic Resources to accommodate the broader interests of the expanded system. The CDC approved the change and the implied wider mandate. The ICWG-GR will hold discussions with TAC on the implications.

vi. UNCED Follow-up on Biodiversity.

The Committee Chairman had held discussions with Stein Bie regarding a system-wide study as follow-up on biodiversity, but does not know which direction the study will take. FAO wants to know why the CG system is putting its funds into UNEP.

In discussion, questions were raised regarding FAO's trusteeship of genetic resources, noting that although the move may be well intentioned, FAO was a large organization and might not have the agility of the smaller centers and thus miss opportunities. Similarly, FAO/UN could dominate the handling of materials. It was noted in response, that there was a dispute resolution agreement which does not remove the right of centers to withdraw from the agreement at any time. It was noted that the agreement gives FAO a policy role, and that the wording of the agreement calls for FAO to consult on policy. The trusteeship agreement applies only to designated materials, and materials not designated are not covered. There is nothing in the agreement to prevent Centers from maintaining their own collections. The CDC concurred in the Committee's change of name.

## C. Sustainability and the Environment

The Chairman of the CSE, Dr. Hubert Zandstra, reported on the Committee's activities and provided a background document (Attachment 8).

i. Aenda 21 Task Force. The Task Force viewed its work in this area as a complement to on-going activities. It would await reactions by donors. Dr. Zandstra noted that UNEP is under pressure to pursue its own research activities.

ii. John Walsh's Paper "Preserving the Options". The CSE Chairman distributed a mock-up of the paper (Attachment 9) and indicated that it was intended to sharpen the focus on sustainability and the environment. He requested comments immediately. The CDC complimented the Chairman and encouraged him to proceed.

The CDC decided to approve publication of the Walsh paper with the deletion of the footnote on P.I. The CSE Chairman undertook to clear this and any other changes with Dr. Walsh.

iii. Position Paper on "Soil, Water and Nutrient Management Research". The CSE did not propose to react formally to the paper. A letter had been sent to Stein Bie and no further action was called for.

iv. IUCN General Assembly. The Chairman reported that Dr. Lenton had informed the CDC Chair that he had been invited to the IUCN General Assembly meeting proposed for Buenos Aires on January 16-24, 1994, and that he had proposed a CGIAR representation. The CDC Chair had passed on this information to the CSE which decided to participate if the meeting consisted of a symposium but not if it comprised parallel groups. If the condition is met, the Centers engaged in sustainability and the environment would be asked for materials.

v. Result of the Puerto Rico Workshop. Dr. Zandstra noted that a summary of the workshop including TAC's and the CDC's commentary will be tabled by TAC. There may be some further effort to involve NARSs through regional mechanisms informing them of the new approach but there are no plans to do so at present. The Chairman indicated that the report on the Puerto Rico Workshop written by Guido Gryseels was well written and dealt fairly with the discussions.

vi. Cross-center Global Research Programs (GRPs). There was much information available on environmental and global initiatives and it would be useful to pull it together with some analysis and disseminate it. It could be up-dated annually as a review of progress and continuing experience. A motivation is that there is currently much concern about the cost of such initiatives, a concern that is shared by TAC. The CSE Chairman indicated that funding would be needed for a workshop and for someone to pull together documents, but that the main objective was to set in motion a process over the next few years. The CDC approved the CSE undertaking this initiative.



It was also noted that there were a number of issues in Agenda 21 of interest to the CG: desertification, deforestation, sustained mountain development, marginal land sustainability, water resources, etc. It was suggested that it might be possible for Centers to develop initiatives consistent with these issues. As an example, CIFOR has been invited to a conference on mountain development, and could represent the CGIAR. ICRAF is calling a meeting of African, Andean and Himalayan interests to develop an initiative.

It was decided to make the CSE the contact point for Agenda 21 initiatives as they were formulated. The CSE will put together the relevant information and report to the CDC. It was further agreed that Dr. Sanchez would represent the CDC in contacts with UNEP.

Questions were raised as to how the CG related to Agenda 21 issues. On the issue of desertification, ICRISAT and ICRAF have drafted a project Attachment 10) which proposes a consortium approach involving ICRISAT, ICRAF, IFPRI, IFDC, IBPGR, and ICARDA. The proposal is consistent with Agenda 21 and TAC comments on MTPs and eco-regional initiatives. The project would focus on Sub-Saharan Africa, the Sahara and Southern Africa in particular.

It was noted that it was important for the CGIAR to inject itself into the picture on these issues. ICRISAT staff attended the desertification convention and made a statement on the CG's capacity in this area. Donors present congratulated ICRISAT for this action. ICRISAT has written to the Chairman of the CG proposing that the CGIAR be accredited, and is seeking its own accreditation as an inter-governmental organization. The Director General of ICRISAT requested the approval of the CDC through the CSE to represent it in this area.

vii. Electronic Conferencing for GRPs. The group discussed the need for more effective ways to use electronic conferencing in cross-center initiatives. Software exists which is not being used by Centers. The CSE proposed and the CDC agreed that the CDC authorize the CSE to develop a proposal on how to use electronic mail driven conferencing in support of cross-center initiatives. An expenditure of \$5,000-10,000 from the Joint Expense Account was approved. DGs agreed to alert relevant staff in their centers and the CSE would send information to the Centers as soon as possible.

#### D. Joint TAC/CBC/CDC Committee on Priorities and Strategies

The Chairman of the Committee, Dr. Jim Ryan, reported to the CDC Attachment 11) and indicated that the two documents the Committee had been engaged in developing, "Food and Resources for the Future" and "An Experiment in Research" were now in draft form. On approaching the Secretariat for funding for publication and distribution, he had been advised there was no funding and had been referred to the PAA. Mr. Karel was negative but indicated that he would subject the documents to a consumer test. The Chairman indicated that he had called a meeting of the Oversight Committee, PAA and members of the Joint Committee to attempt to resolve the issue. He noted that the issues addressed in the "Experiment" paper were

the same as the agenda of the Oversight Committee.

Dr. Ryan indicated he would revisit the matter with the CDC in the Wrap-up Session, and may request the CDC to approve **\$12,000** to print **2,000** copies of the "Experiment" paper. The second paper may require **\$10,000**. The matter would be reviewed at the Wrap-up Session. The CDC agreed.

E. Sub-Saharan Africa Committee

Dr. Chris Bonte-Friedheim, reported on the Committee's activities (Attachment 12). He indicated that the meeting of NARSS' directors had been positive. Two persons had been selected to attend ICW to represent NARSS, and ISNAR will prepare a report on the **4** papers produced for the meeting. A further meeting has been proposed for early **1995**.

The Chairman of the Committee requested and received from the CDC a continuation of the Committee's mandate for this initiative.

F. Committee on Documentation and Information

The CDC Chairman reported the following:

- o all Centers have now received copies of the CD ROM set. The Committee is discussing how to get this project on to a self-sustaining basis;
- ISNAR has agreed to take the lead in producing the next CD ROM set;
- o the Committee has put together a group of **3** to develop a firm proposal to present to the CDC for a Conference on Information. The proposal will be ready for review by the CDC in March, **1994**.

6. SPECIAL TOPICS

A. CABI Presentation.

D.R. Laing, Director General of CAB International, outlined a proposal for fuller collaboration between CAB International and the CG Centers (Attachment 13). He noted that there was already extensive collaboration between CABI and individual Centers but that a comprehensive agreement providing broad guidelines for cooperation offered possibilities for discounts and cost savings. In discussion, it was noted that other institutions offered similar services and that any response to CABI should occur in the context of a broad look at needs and opportunities in the area. The Chairman of the Committee on Information and Documentation, Dr. Roberto Lenton, noted that his Committee had discussed the proposal and offered to have his Committee review the matter further if the CDC desired.

The CDC Chairman advised Mr. Laing that the CDC would convey its decision

to him. The group decided that the CABI request should be referred to the CDI, which would convey to CABI the CDC's interest in more cost effective ways of working and request that any CABI proposal be submitted to the CDI.

B. Trainina.

Dr. Dan Minnick presented a proposal (Attachment 14) which outlined a strategy for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of CG training through some studies and a workshop, potentially leading to a coordinating mechanism for CGIAR training. He noted the current duplication of efforts, the need for coordination, and the task facing both Centers and NARSs as the devolution of training occurs increasingly.

In the discussion, it was noted that devolution of training is increasing at a time when many Centers were downsizing training activities and NARSs were also under stress. Significant cooperation in training is occurring among Centers in Africa, but there is a need for new forms of international cooperation in training. It was noted that while more coordination was needed, the cost of involving an outside entity was not warranted.

The Chairman thanked Dr. Minnick for his presentation. The CDC took the following decisions:

- (a) to accept the offer of IRRI to invite each Center to inform IRRI of training resources to be included in a catalog and distributed to Centers. IRRI staff will identify the nature of the catalog and hence the form of contributions, and inform Training Officers;
- (b) to expand the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Documentation and Information to include training. The CDI will consider the implications of this request for its work and membership and report the results of its considerations to the CDC on how training issues might be pursued;
- (c) ISNAR and ICRAF were delegated responsibility to begin an electronic dialogue (REM) on training issues to develop an agenda and propose actions;
- (d) ISNAR will distribute the paper it has completed on the devolution of training to NARSs, with a deadline for response and will develop a final paper for consideration in New Delhi in 1994 when NARSs will be on the CG's agenda.

It was decided that the CDC Chairman would report these decisions in his statement to the Group.

C. Devolution of Trainina.

The Director General of ISNAR, Dr. Chris Bonte-Friedheim, distributed for comment the ISNAR paper on the devolution of training (Attachment 15, See reference under Training above).

#### D. CGIAR Gender Program.

The Chairman welcomed members of the CGIAR Gender Initiative staff, Mike Collinson, Deborah Merrill-Sands and Hillary Feltstein. Mr. Collinson distributed two documents: a progress report (Attachment 16) and a synopsis of comments on the program by staff of Centers who have had contact with the program (Attachment 17). He indicated that visits had been made to 7 Centers, and 2 workshops for senior managers had been held for the purposes of gathering information on issues of gender analysis and gender staffing, and for general awareness raising. The program is now interacting with 11 Centers and has 15 proposals from Centers for activities related to gender issues. At Puerto Rico the eight donors supporting the program strongly expressed their views that the program should be extended for a further two years, i.e. to mid-1996, acknowledging that two years is too short a period to achieve lasting gains at a time when managers have many other things on their minds. The donors' interest is to use the next two years to develop mechanisms to make concern and action about gender issues self-sustaining after the CGIAR sponsored program is finished. He indicated that a paper would be distributed soon giving indications as to what donors should expect to see at the Centers in terms of gender staffing activities.

The CDC warmly expressed support for the two year extension and for the focus on generating self-sustaining mechanisms. Centers have found the assistance in both gender analysis and gender staffing useful. It was noted that while the percentage of female applicants has increased, the percentage of females recruited is the key statistic. In response to the suggestion that the Eastern Block countries had substantial numbers of female scientists, it was noted that there are women scientists in the U.S., Canada and Europe who were not being reached.

The CDC commended the Executive Secretariat for the gender initiative and requested the CDC Chair to convey their appreciation for the efforts of Mike Collinson and the gender staff, both to the Executive Secretary and the CGIAR Chair.

#### 7. IDENTIFICATION OF AGENDA ITEMS FOR MEETINGS

##### A. CDC/CBC Meeting

Agenda items listed were:

1. Share items to be discussed with the CG Chairman in the working lunch;
2. Inform the CBC of the major outcomes of the Retreat;
3. The salary survey;
4. The CDC position on the balancing mechanism;
5. Spouse employment;
6. Administrative cooperation and liaison between Centers.

B. Meeting with CGIAR Chairman

The agenda items listed were:

1. Restructuring of the CGIAR system;
2. The CGIAR and UNCED;
3. **NARSS'** participation in the CGIAR;
4. Resources;
5. Thinking in the World Bank on the "donor of last resort";
6. Thinking in the Bank on the relations with the Newly Independent States;
7. Commendation for Mike Collinson and the gender initiative.

C. Meeting with the Executive Secretary

The agenda items listed were:

1. Secretariat documents on the balancing mechanism and fund mobilization;
2. Restructuring the system;
3. Topics to discuss with the Chairman;
4. Major outcomes of the CDC Retreat.

D. Meeting with World Bank President Preston

It was agreed that the purpose of discussing the agenda was not to inform the President of CDC views on issues but to tell him what the CDC would like him to give his views on from the perspective of the World Bank. The items listed were:

1. The potential impact of world events, such as the arrival of the NIS, on the work of the Bank and the Centers;
2. The future status of funding for work in Africa;
3. Views on cooperation with the Centers in projects the Bank implements;
4. Views on accessing the GEF for Center work.

E. Meeting with TAC Chairman

The agenda items listed were:

1. Impact of budget reductions on Centers;
2. Livestock Steering Committee Report;
3. Stripe review on Plant Genetic Resources;
4. Improving the review process;
5. Recommendations on the MTPs for **1994-98**;
6. Chapter 13 of TAC's Priorities and Strategies Document;

7. ~~Joint~~ TAC/CDC/CBC Committee Report on Priorities and Strategies;
8. Training;
9. Newly Independent States and the role of the CGIAR;
10. How TAC relates to the Oversight and Finance Committees.

## 8. RE-STRUCTURING OF CDC COMMITTEES

### A. CDC Committee on Priorities and Strategies

The CDC Committee on Priorities and Strategies has not met since the establishment of the TAC/CDC/CBC Joint Committee and the work of the CPS was being done in the Joint Committee. It was proposed and accepted that the CPS Committee be abolished. One of the two members of the Joint Committee will continue to chair the Joint Committee and will report its activities to the CDC.

### B. Other Actions on Committees

The Committees on the retreat and salaries had completed their task and have ceased to exist, as is the Ad Hoc Committee on Reviews. The Committee on Intellectual Property Rights will be reviewed in a year's time to see if it could be combined with the Joint CDC/TAC Committee on Genetic Resources. Beginning in 1994, committee assignments will be made at the same time as the election of the CDC Executive Committee at the October meeting. Thus, existing committees and assignments will continue until October 1994.

## 9. REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE DEPUTY DIRECTORS GENERAL

The Chairman of the Deputies, Dr. Aart van Schoonhoven, presented the report of their meeting/Attachment 18), including the following matters: policy on inter-center posting, joint appointment of staff, the gender program, sharing outreach offices, inter-center electronic communications, and collective acquisition of soft-ware. In the discussion, the following issues were noted:

Item 2. Policy on Inter-Center Posting. It was agreed that the range of differences in policy and practice between Centers made a case by case approach best.

Item 3. Joint Appointment of Staff. It was agreed that many services could be shared across Centers and that the identification of a lead center was the best approach. Other centers could then buy in. On the matter of how costs for such sharing would be calculated, DDGs were asked to develop a proposal including a cost review for presentation to the CDC.

Item 4, Gender Initiative. The DDGs reported on the usefulness of the gender initiative and noted that appropriate gender concerns were not yet a part of the CG culture.

Item 5. Sharina Outreach Offices. The CDC endorsed the DDGs' initiative to deposit copies of Centers' **MOUs** with different countries at ISNAR for the development of an electronic data-base. New Centers may be able to enter the field under the most beneficial agreement.

It was agreed at this time to call the AIARC office, the Inter-Center Office.

Item 6. Inter-Center Electronic Communications. A DDG paper on Inter-center Cooperation in Information Technology (Attachment 19) was distributed and CDC approval was sought of a DDG recommendation to establish a **4-6** person study group on the nature and type of electronic communications and cooperation between Centers.

The CDC approved the DDGs' request, noting that:

- o the study group should focus on Centers but should keep in mind a system open to NARSS;
- o the DDGs should undertake the study but relate to the Chairman of the CDI to ensure no overlap;
- o the Study Group would be chaired by the **1994** Deputies Chair, Fritz Kramer;
- o \$30,000 was authorized for expenses, and that the Chairman of the AIARC Board would be the point of contact for this funding;
- o the Study Group will begin immediately and will report back to the CDC in March, **1994**;
- o the Group will set priorities and not be over-ambitious.

Item 7, Collective Acquisition of Soft-ware. Many Centers were using the same, and often very expensive, soft-ware (e.g. SAS) for which annual license fees were payable. The CDC approved that the DDGs approach CGNET with a view to negotiating system-wide fees.

Item 8, Report on AIARC. Dr. Bonte-Friedheim indicated that ISNAR had negotiated an agreement with van Breda on disabilities and would distribute copies to Centers.

In discussion, the following matters were noted:

- o in future, the DGs intended to focus their attention on leadership, inter-center cooperation and resource mobilization and to devolve more issues to the DDGs;
- o there is a need to define more fully what is meant by inter-center collaboration and this is one of the issues the CDC will focus on;
- o the CDC wants the DDGs to identify the issues they want to work on for the next two years and the issues they want the DGs to work on;

- The DDGs need to be more entrepreneurial and the DGs and DDGs need to share agendas.

## 10. REPORTS OF MEETINGS BETWEEN THE CDC AND OTHER PARTIES

### A. CDC/CBC Meeting

The Meeting was jointly chaired by Dr. John Dillon, CBC Chair, and Dr. Nasrat Fadda, CDC Chair.

i. Spouse employment. This is an issue of importance to staff and the Centers need to be proactive in approaching it. The message needs to be conveyed to staff that Centers are actively concerned about the issue.

ii. Cooperation between Centers. This is recognized as important and a number of the activities and initiatives already underway were noted, e.g. sharing facilities and staff, the CDI and DDG initiatives on information, the CD Rom initiative and the steps to compile all Center publications, etc. It was suggested that the AIARC office could be the repository for Center personnel and other manuals. ISNAR will continue to collect copies of MOUs with NARS. It was noted that AIARC replaced the functions IIE had performed, not those of the Secretariat. Board manuals, for instance, have been kept and would continue to be kept by the Secretariat. The AIARC Office could be developed to perform other functions but the key was that it was intended to bring efficiencies and savings. Other functions will be discussed with the CDC as they develop.

iii. Matrix management. The committee working on the integration of ILRAD and ILCA and developing a livestock policy has run into many questions on who will make the rules and how will they work. Donors, NARSs, centers, etc. will all have to be involved in the ecoregional programs and questions exist on how the elements will fit regarding convening centers, collaborating centers, who will mobilize bilateral funds, who will handle them, etc. Basically, the issue is, who does what?

It was noted that this exercise did not apply only to the livestock centers but also to the crop centers. Crop center input into livestock policy will have to be accompanied by livestock input into crop policy. The Livestock Report has implications for the crop centers and their resources. The prevailing idea seems to be that a consortium model would be used but there are many issues that require attention regarding how it would work.

### iv. Executive Secretariat Papers

a. Balancing Mechanism. The CDC reported that its members discussed their preference for the second option - "up front and gap filling" - with the Finance Committee and found the latter undecided and open. It is aware of the impact of the funding declines and is now looking at options for 1995. It seems clear that the



balancing mechanism will be diminished, if not eliminated, and the CG system will move more onto a market basis. A key question is to what degree and how will it remain a system.

b. Fund Mobilization. This paper was seen as offering a useful analysis of the situation and as giving some helpful material in our approaches to donors. But it falls short of proposing ways of actually raising funding levels. It was noted that finding new donors is a long term process while the system needs funds in the short term. We have to consider finding new pockets of the same donors. One big problem is that the CG is seen as only being concerned with agriculture. If Centers can work together and present a new image to existing donors which shows they can develop new concepts and deal effectively with agriculture and such matters as Agenda 21 issues, new funding could be available. This work must be done with the political establishment. It was agreed it would potentially be demoralizing to begin to talk now about radical reductions of the system's funding. There are a number of efforts going on now through the Oversight and Finance Committees, PARC, etc. We need to pull these together to ensure the efforts are mutually reinforcing.

In this regard, the CDC is proposing to combine its Public Awareness and Resource Mobilization Committee with the Executive Committee of the Public Awareness Association. The suggestion is to combine the two in one of two ways, either by amplifying the CDC Committee or by creating a new committee where a number of groups would be represented, such as the Oversight and Finance Committees, the CDC, donors and professionals in public awareness and resource mobilization, including outside experts.

v. Salary Survey. The CDC Chairman reported on the salary survey and its main finding that Center salaries were in the middle of the range with its comparators. He indicated the intended distribution of the survey, which includes the CBC, and noted that it will be marked "draft" and "confidential".

#### B. Meeting with the Executive Secretary

The meeting focussed primarily around the decline in resources. The Executive Secretary made the following comments:

- o the projected figure for core for **1994** is **\$225** million, down from **\$234** in **1993**; on the complementary side it looks better - **\$77**, up from **\$71**, for a total of **\$302**, down from **\$304**;
- o TAC has met with the Finance Committee on utilization; there is recognition of the need for adjustments and for working out who among the Oversight and Finance Committees and TAC has responsibility for what;
- on mobilization there are many initiatives underway - the Secretariat, PARC, PAA, Finance Committee, etc. Resources are being shifted, e.g. in the Secretariat, and coordination is needed; new sources and

modalities are being sought, eg: the GEF, multi-year donor commitments, etc. The funding crunch is not a short-term phenomenon;

- o for the 13 pre-expansion centers, the funding has gone down from \$237 million to \$192 between 1990 and 1994, a decrease of 19% in nominal and 35% in real terms;
- o considerable aggressiveness is being demonstrated:
  - o the Finance Committee has been formed with regard to sources;
  - o the Oversight Committee is reviewing the Blue Ribbon Panel idea;
  - o consultants are being used on the formulation and implementation of a fund mobilization strategy;
  - o the Finance Committee is working on private sector donors;
- o the Secretary is cautiously optimistic. Better messages are being prepared, the South is adopting the CG and talking to donors: and more steps are planned once the Finance Committee and the Secretariat come together.
- o the funding decline does not reflect dissatisfaction with the system but of the world-wide economic situation, competition for funds, etc.;
- o there is no idea of giving the Bank discretion in allocating its funds, but it will move away from the prior heavy emphasis as donor of last resort;
- o approaches to donors have to be appropriate in the context of each country. Sometimes it is through the political channels, sometimes other ways. Our knowledge of each country needs to be shared. The meeting with the Bank's Executive Directors is important for they talk to their Ministers of Finance. This is one way of reaching the South;
- o we are moving towards a more decentralized system, more of a loose association of centers which come together for certain things. Thematic approaches will become more important;
- o the Secretary agrees that many people do not understand the concept of core, and believes that if we move away from it we must do so thoughtfully.

C. Meeting with CGIAR Chairman.

The CDC Chairman welcomed the CGIAR Chairman and referred to the agenda items outlined in their earlier communications. The CGIAR Chairman made the following comments:

- o on succession: the President of the Bank has responded positively to the CGIAR's proposal that the appointee be a senior person, that continuity is important and that a consultative process be used. The nominee had

- been presented to the Oversight Committee and was now being presented to the CDC/CBC. With their approval, which was given, the nomination would be reported favorably to the President. There will be 2 months overlap between the current Chairman and his successor.
- o on the appointment of the TAC Chairman: a similar consultative process is being initiated to replace the TAC Chairman at the end of **1994**. The Oversight Committee is responsible for stating the terms of reference for both TAC and its Chairman. The process will wait until it had done that. If it is necessary to appoint a temporary Chairman for a short time, that would be done.
  - o the terms of reference of the Oversight and Finance Committees have been written but it ~~is~~ important to see how they will converge. He does not believe agricultural research would get its former share of funds, even if the same amounts were available. Aid is being given for new things, needs and demands. The CG needs to justify support for agricultural research, something it has not done in the past. The consequences of under-investment in agricultural research and development are not well understood. It will be the task of the Oversight Committee to provide a basis for increasing support;
  - o the World Bank is trying to help people to understand development issues, hence the dinner with the Executive Directors. Mr. Preston thinks the CG is doing a good job but will probably, in his meeting with the CDC, mention that the current funding shortfall is not a short-term thing;
  - o donors are raising hard questions about the efficiency of resource use in the system. It is necessary to demonstrate both efficiency and that what we say about the importance of research is true;
  - o the link between the TAC report and UNCED needs to be made clear.
  - o the matter of NARSs' participation in the system will be discussed next week.
  - o while countries need to be informed of the consequences of disinvestment in agriculture, the CG must prepare for continued short-falls. He will ask the CG to authorize TAC to prepare a proposal for early next year which would provide options at different funding levels;
  - o it is appropriate to face Agenda **21** issues head-on, but this must be done strategically at the political level, at large conferences, and so forth. For instance, the GEF talks about biodiversity and we must learn to make the link to the CG's strengths. The CG needs to demonstrate its focus on basic research where its comparative advantage lies, and let others do development work;

- the world is concerned about the environment and the message on the importance of agricultural research is not getting through. It is obscured by talk of trade issues, excess food, etc. We have to show we are concerned with all aspects of biodiversity, and that we now have answers to some of the problems created by the Green Revolution.

#### D. CDC/CBC/TAC Meeting.

The CDC Chair invited the TAC Chair to preside over the joint meeting. New members of CDC, CBC and TAC were introduced. A discussion of items on the agenda followed:

(a) Impact of budget reductions on Centers: In response to donor requests for hard information on the impact of budget reductions, Dr. McCalla attempted to get information from all Centers, but the information either came in such different forms or did not come at all so that an aggregate summary was precluded. It will probably be possible to give a comprehensive picture in absolute or percentage terms from data at the Executive Secretariat. He will also give anecdotal data on programs being cut or reduced. It is a difficult thing to try to assess reduction in outputs in the time-frame involved. If requested by the donors he will give a picture reflecting: (a) percentage real reductions in staff; (b) short-term responses, e.g. running down reserves; and (c) reductions in growth rates. He noted that training and outreach services, and administration had suffered the worst cuts, training because it could be re-instated more easily.

(b) Livestock Steering Committee Report: TAC Chairman referred to the decision in principle taken at Puerto Rico to move towards a global CGIAR institute for livestock, composed of elements of ILRAD and ILCA, and introduced Ms. L. de Vaccaro, Chairperson of the Steering Committee, to speak on the Committee's report which has been presented to the donors. Ms. de Vaccaro indicated that the thrust of the strategy is to look at the animal, not as an end in itself, but as a component of a production system and to see its impact on other components and on the resources which support the system. The emphasis should be on ruminants in a mixed production system, and on integrated, multi-disciplinary research to give a holistic approach, and an inter-dependent balance of ecoregional activities. The implementation strategy will have two prongs: the first is to coordinate and integrate the on-going activities of Centers which have activities going on related to livestock; and the second is to set up as quickly as possible the new Center because the Steering Committee is convinced it will have major importance for the CG-system. It believes that the strategic planning process should take a global look with CG and other centers at possibilities for research so it could assess the relative importance of different areas and the relative weight of candidate topics within those areas. This is the start towards building a system-wide strategy for livestock research. The committee will try to get the guidelines of the strategy on paper so that the old boards of the two institutions will be able to comment on them. It is hoped the new board will be underway by January, 1995.

Dr. Ross Gray, noted that the fresh look at strategy should go beyond ILRAD and ILCA, and that the TAC study should be a part of that. On resource allocation, it would be helpful to know what people had in mind in terms of allocations to global livestock research and ecoregional activities, and what balance. As a first step in a restructuring process, this should include the crop centers also.

ILCA's Board expressed concern about the loss of momentum and suggested the new Board be installed in May, **1994**. It was noted that it is not possible to decide a priori the balance between global and ecoregional activities.

(c) Stripe Review on Plant Genetic Resources: TAC Chairman indicated that his Committee intended to act quickly on this. He called on Sir Ralph Riley to comment. Sir Ralph stated that the system spent **10%** of its funding on genetic resources and there was a need to look at PGR responsibilities in the system in a holistic manner. TAC has agreed and set up the stripe study. The Working Group on PGR has participated in defining the TORs for the study.

It was noted that there will be an NGO representative on the Study team. The Study is planned for completion by May, **1994**, which will give the system a position and therefore more influence in biodiversity matters. It was suggested that fish and livestock might be included and that the matter of trusteeship was important. The Working Group has been asked for input into the TORs for the Study in the next **72** hours. It was indicated that it was hoped that the Study would present options for the management of plant genetic resources. Since IPR included many legal issues, it was being excluded, as the Study dealt primarily with technical concerns.

The Chairman acknowledged that images were important with regard to genetic resources and that we needed to convey to the world that we were involved in more than collections of a few food crops. He proposed that the TAC study be titled a study in genetic resources, and that we will identify at the beginning of the study that we are involved in genetic resources in both the plant and animal kingdoms and that there are on-going activities also in the animal, fish and forestry area. The study will indicate that these are not the focus of the study but that they are within the purview of the CGIAR. The present study is only a step, at this point in time, paying particular attention to our plant genetic resources, but there are parallel activities in which we participate dealing with the other areas. The proposal for a Stripe Study was accepted.

(d) Improving the review process: Dr. McCalla indicated that while reviews were expensive and time-consuming, they minimized individual donor reviews and were essential to the integrity of the system. Jock Anderson, Chairman of the ICARDA Review Panel was asked to comment on his views on improving the review process which were included in Chapter 5 of the ICARDA Review Report. The ICARDA review involved:

- i. fewer people (5)
- ii. less time for the main phase (about **2** weeks);

- iii. a survey of NARSs, run by TAC staff, in an attempt to get a better picture of liaison, coordination and input with NARS;
- iv. a formal survey of research staff;
- v. targeted consultants;
- vi. involvement by staff from the two Secretariats;
- vii. close integration of program and management issues;
- viii. consideration of the trade-offs in seeking efficiency.

It was noted that there are three categories of issues which have to be dealt with:

- i. trade-offs: between independence, completeness and costs, involving size, expense, consultants, new blood, Secretariat staff, scope;
- ii. new instruments and mechanisms;
- iii. NARSs inputs, field visits, inter-center studies, inter-center duplication, possibly bringing together NARSs to discuss.

The TAC Chairman indicated he was aware of the trade-offs involved but would be pleased to consider the internally managed external review process. It is clear more experimentation is needed and will continue, though the new ideas may not have gelled in time for the up-coming reviews - IIMI in **1994**, and CIAT, CIP, IITA and a roots and tubers stripe review in **1995**. The report of the Inter-center Working Group on Reviews is now available and will be distributed.

(e) TAC Priorities and strategies study on MTPs 1994-98: Dr. McCalla outlined the process whereby TAC had positioned itself to look simultaneously at the plans of all **18** centers rather than sequentially. The supply constraint used for the MTPs was flat-real using **1992** dollars which led to what is called the **\$270** million vector. Recent news makes it clear the level of support is somewhat below this. It is important that the CG review the product of that process, now that the CG has for the first time an overview of the complete system. The value of this process and its participatory nature should not be lost sight of under short-term budgetary stringencies. In US parlance, we now have the "authorization" and have to ~~look~~ to the "appropriation" process. TAC was asked by the CG to set a planning target of **\$270**, and then indicate what it would propose at the **\$280** level or vector and at **10%** less or the **\$240** vector. TAC has proposed that sustained levels of funding (i.e. the current level) would require more than budgetary solutions, but rather a series of studies and analyses leading to long-term changes in the way the system is structured and how it does business. This view is reflected in the MTP document and in Chapter **13** of the Priorities and Strategies paper. Both documents raise the possibility of "system programs" which have implications for how the system does business.

In the discussion of the MTP paper and Chapter **13**, the following matters were noted:

- **3-4** years at current levels would be regarded as sustained, long-term funding decline; TAC would only look at structural adjustment if

requested by the CG;

- o in terms of TAC's role in adjudicating the process of responding to ecoregional and global opportunities, TAC's responsibility is to look at a Center's entire program. It does not pay as much attention to complementary activities which are liable to change significantly over 4-5 years as to core, which do not, but it does make sure that the complementary activities are consistent with the mission and mandate of the center;
- the evolution of programs led by convening centers could take different channels: they could emerge as a sequence of events beginning with an exploratory stage leading to a major proposal with the expectation of additional funding. Such an effort would probably go far before TAC got involved. If CG core funds were to be sought, TAC would need to be involved in the formulation of the proposal itself. TAC will continue to look at annual plans to ensure their consistency with the 5 year plans. Such plans could come before TAC through this channel. TAC has not dealt with inter-center proposals for core funding before, and guidance from the donors will be needed.
- in terms of new system-wide initiatives, the donors have not yet asked TAC to look at the many questions involved, including the relative priority of three initiatives. The mechanisms for "parking" funding to support them, who will have responsibility for the money and program, how they can be evaluated. TAC has not been advised by the donors as to whether this is a good idea.
- o the degree of shift in TAC's priorities following Agenda **21** may seem modest, but in fact, constitutes more than a doubling of allocations to natural resource management research as compared with **1992**. These issues have to be defined from the bottom up and TAC will not proceed far before that happens. TAC has encouraged both the Oversight and Finance Committees to take a broad look at the issues.
- o training is important and has to be looked at as a delivery mechanism: the primary intent in the documents was to look at research. However, training is mentioned in Chapters 1-12 even though it does not occur in Chapter 13;
- o TAC shares Centers' concerns on funding for new initiatives but can give no assurance of improvements in funding;
- o TAC acknowledged that there is little reference in Chapter 13 to PGR;
- o TAC prefers one mechanism for **1994** allocations but the Finance Committee prefers another. TAC has made the point that structural adjustments take time to have effect and cannot be expected to reduce

expenditure levels immediately. TAC wants to have a mechanism so the system will be able to avoid the position it has been in for 2 years;

- o the roles of the Oversight and Finance Committees and their relationships to TAC have yet to be clarified;
- o TAC will submit proposals for structural adjustment to the CG at the Mid-year Meeting in 1994 if it is requested to do so by the Group..

f. Trainina: TAC was informed that responsibilities on the CDC for training have been passed to the Committee on Documentation and Information. It was suggested that a Stripe Review on training would be welcomed by many. TAC feels that a look at information is still an important issue. The Chairman of CDI, Dr. R. Lenton, indicated that discussions with the relevant TAC person had already begun with regard to looking at information in the system.

g. Newly Independent States (NIS): TAC was advised that the Centers are willing to provide assistance to the NIS but have received no encouragement from donors. It was noted that there are extensive collections of genetic resources in Eastern Europe that are endangered unless funding is forthcoming. A program has been established with Eastern Europe and Russia supported by a trust fund at the Secretariat for the purpose of channeling funds for genetic resources. A network on genetic resources with Eastern and Western Europe has been operating for some time. Recently, a ministerial council requested the establishment of a forest genetic resources network. This is expected to be in place next year. These countries do have some money and are looking for contacts, training and advice. It was agreed that the CG has much to offer to the NIS.

h. Joint TAC/CDC/CBC Committee on Priorities and Strategies: The Chairman of the Joint Committee, Dr. Jim Ryan, outlined the process whereby the two documents - An Experiment in Research and Food and Resources for the Future - had been produced. It was hoped that their current status and procedures would lead to agreement by the end of ICW for their publication. The view was expressed that we have to think in terms of sets of documents and that we still need one document which can be put on people's desks to explain what the system is about. The Joint Committee will now tackle its second mandate, to begin to position the system for the next round of priority assessment;

i. TAC and Oversight and Finance Committee Relationships: this item was dealt with under an earlier topic with the TAC Chairman's statement that these relationships were still emerging;



j. TAC Meetings: the TAC Chairman requested the views of the CBC and the CDC on whether, at a future time, they wished to return to the separate CBC/TAC and CDC/TAC meetings of former years. TAC is shifting to 2 meetings each year, both to be held 2-2.5 months before CGIAR meetings. This will begin in **1995**, with **1994** remaining as scheduled. In **1995** meetings will probably be held in March and late July or early August, with both meetings being held at international centers. This will mean that the entire TAC will not be present at ICW so the current format for the TAC/CDC/CBC meeting will not be available. The TAC/CDC meeting in March, **1994** will be held on March 21. The TAC/CBC/CDC meeting will be held at ICW in **1994**.

k. Closure of the Meeting: the Chairman closed the meeting among expressions of gratification on its usefulness.

## 11. ELECTION OF CDC EXECUTIVES FOR 1995-6

The Chairman gave a brief background on the history of the succession to the CDC chair, indicating that it followed chronological order on the basis of the date of joining the Group. He proposed that in view of possible turnover amongst Center Directors in the near future, he was in favour of an earlier suggestion by Dr. Larry Stifel, that two Chairpersons be selected for ~~two~~ years rather than the usual one. On the above basis and with Dr. Nores already elected Chairman for **1994**, Dr. Chris Bonte-Friedheim would be the chair for **1995**, and Dr. Lukas Brader for **1996**. The nominations were approved by acclamation.

## 12. OTHER BUSINESS

### A. EDI (German Speaking Country) Initiative

Center Directors who have been involved in the EDI Initiative to disseminate information on the system reported favorably on activities to date relative to the governments of Germany, Austria and Switzerland, and indicated that the involvement of the entire CG system would be advantageous. Interested Directors were invited to lunch with Directors Lampe and Winkelmann for further information.

### B. Outplacement Services for Down-sizing Centers

It was noted that in the process of Center down-sizing a number of international staff were facing difficulties finding new placements. It was noted that the World Bank and other large organizations offered placement services, and Centers could avail themselves of professional outplacement services. Dr. Winkelmann offered to approach the CGIAR Secretariat and the World Bank to see what services may be available for Center staff, and the offer was accepted.

### C. Salary Status

The group provided the following information on the freezing of international salaries:

~~6 Centers froze salaries in 1993;~~  
6 Centers may freeze salaries in 1994;  
5 Centers intend to freeze salaries in 1995.

D. Multi-center Liaison Office

The group considered briefly the need for multi-center liaison offices in localities where a number of Centers were operating but had no facility. The ICARDA Cairo office and CIMMYT's Ankara ~~Office~~ were cited as examples. The group decided the idea should be pursued and referred it to the Deputy Director General's for consideration.

E. Recognition of the CGIAR Chairman

The CDC decided that in view of the intense personal interest in the CGIAR system shown by the outgoing Chairman, and his effort in visiting every Center during his term, it would present him with a commemorative plaque at the close of the CGIAR meetings. The CDC Chair was asked to develop the text and select the format.

F. Meetings with World Bank Staff on Africa

Dr. Winkelmann reported conversations with Ken Cleaver of the World Bank on increasing cooperation between the Centers and the Bank in Africa. It was thought that each 2-3 years, Bank staff working in Africa could meet with Centers working in Africa on Bank policies and other matters affecting Center work. Mr. Cleaver has sent a message to Michel Petit to follow-up. The group decided to extend the mandate of the Sub-Saharan Africa Sub-committee so it could represent the CDC in this matter. It was suggested that the same concept should be followed with other regions.

G. Next Meeting of the CDC

The CDC decided to return to its prior arrangement of holding its mid-year meeting in association with the summer TAC meeting, a practice that had lapsed for two years - 1992 because of the CDC/NARS consultations in Nairobi, and 1993, when 11 MTPs were discussed at Puerto Rico. The next TAC summer meeting will be held at WARDA and, because of other functions concurrently taking place, there was a problem in accommodating all participants. In view of this, the CDC will advance its meeting with TAC in 1994 to the latter's March Meeting scheduled for March 21-27 in Rome. March 21-22 was proposed as the date for the CDC meeting. The CDC Chair will contact TAC to arrange suitable times for joint meetings.

It was noted that the Center Directors as a group were not normally invited to the CG Mid-year meetings unless they had business before the meeting.

## WRAP-UP MEETING, October 29, 1993

### 1. OPENING THE MEETING

The Chairman opened the meeting and established its agenda.

### 2. IIE UPDATE

The CDC Chairman reported that following informal contacts, the president and vice-president of IIE had met Drs. Stifel and Fadda. IIE admits mistakes and wishes to reach settlement ~~out~~ of court. Its strategy seems to be guided by legal advice which will position it to make insurance claims and its insurers are already involved. IIE will review its records and get back to AIARC before the end of the year. If its proposal for a settlement is not satisfactory, another meeting will be scheduled. In the meantime, AIARC will continue to prepare its legal brief so litigation can proceed without delay if needed. IIE has been informed that AIARC is continuing this preparation. The CDC endorsed the report by the Chairman.

### 3. RELATIONS WITH NIS

The World Bank does not appear to be inclined to support research in the NIS at this time. It was decided that the one-page statements submitted by Centers outlining what their Centers can do in the NIS if called upon, should be forwarded by the CDC Chairman to all the donors. Centers which had not submitted statements or wished to update earlier submissions were encouraged to do so.

Dr. Fadda was asked to continue to handle this matter and prepare the information received for dispatch by the new CDC Chair.

### 4. PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES

The Stripe Study Group has worked out a consultation process under which it will contact the Centers and a wide range of NARS and other bodies. It wishes to set up a meeting with the ICWGGR, probably in early February 1994, and to meet with the Joint CDC/TAC Committee in March (see Section 10 below). The CDC will have the opportunity to review the report at its March meeting in preparation for its dialogue with TAC. It was decided that the Centers should be informed electronically on the process of the study, and to take a decision on further CDC action once it became apparent what direction the Study Group was taking.

There was a discussion on whether the IPR and ICWG-GR Committees should be merged, but it was agreed that the two should retain their independent identities for the time being.

## 5. PARC

The Chairman of PARC reported that the Oversight Committee had reacted positively to the CDC proposal relative to the bodies working on public awareness and had appointed ~~two~~ people to participate as necessary. Informal word from the Finance Committee indicates that it will also assent to the proposal. Once the Executive Committee of the PAA has made its position known, PARC Chairman will follow-up with regard to the ~~two~~ options the CDC approved, i.e. enlarging the PARC to include wider representation or keeping PARC as it is, and establishing relations with the other interested parties.

The Chairman of PARC noted that the proposal to restructure the Committee should not be forced, and that if the Executive Committee of PAA wished to continue as a separate body, then PARC should continue its own existence and find ways to relate to the Executive Committee of PAA and the Oversight and Finance Committees. The disbursement of any CDC funds should wait until the decisions are made relative to the structure of these committees for the future.

The Executive Committee of the PAA plans to ask a German fund-raising firm to prepare at no cost a strategy proposal that would involve a trial implementation period of 6 months costing no more than \$25,000. A sub-committee of the Executive Committee would review the proposal. The Executive Committee anticipates that this activity will be funded from the CDC contribution. The PARC Chairman will report on these issues at the next meeting.

## 6. JOINT TAC/CDC/CBC COMMITTEE ON PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES

The CPS Chairman reported that following a meeting of the Joint Committee with representatives of the Executive Secretariat, the Oversight Committee and PARC present, the ~~two~~ documents (Food and Resources for the Future and An Experiment in Research) will be published at the Secretariat's expense after a quick review by nominees of the PAA. The Secretariat will use Food for the Future as a basis for a new version of the orange brochure it published earlier in the year. The CDC approved the payment of \$6,000 to ICRISAT from the Joint Expenses Account to cover costs it incurred up to this point which the Secretariat, because of Bank procurement procedures, cannot cover. The distribution of the two documents will be discussed with the Secretariat. The Centers will get a supply. Machine-readable copies of the text of the Experiment document will be sent to CIMMYT and CIP.

The Joint Committee will meet with TAC on the next round of priority assessment to begin in 1994. TAC is eager to get CDC input early as the need for this was one of the lessons learned from the first round. The Committee will keep the CDC involved to see what kind of involvement it seeks in the next round.

## 7. COST ANALYSIS STUDY

It was decided to ask the Finance Committee for the terms of reference for the study "of the cost structure of the Centers" the Committee plans to consider, to ascertain what is involved and how the Centers could respond.

## 8. STAFF SALARY COMPENSATION STUDY

One copy of the study will be sent to each Center for copying and distribution to the Board Chair and others as needed.

## 9. ASSESSMENT OF AIARC

While there were some ripples at the beginning, the overall performance of AIARC is rated as being good. It is viewed as being already better than IIE.

## 10. SCHEDULE AND AGENDA FOR MARCH, 1994 MEETING IN ROME

### A. Schedule

The schedule agreed upon is as follows:

March 19-20	CDI: to plan workshop on information
March 19 am	Committee on Intellectual Property Rights
March 20 am	Joint Committee on Priorities and Strategies
March 20 am	PARC
March 20 pm	CSE: Sustainability and the Environment
March 21	CDC: as long as necessary
March 22	Joint meeting with TAC

### B. Agenda

TAC has identified three items for discussion in the TAC/CDC meeting:

- (a) the study on plant genetic resources;
- (b) structural adjustment of the Centers;
- (c) update on the implications of the financial outlook for 1994;

The agenda for the CDC meeting will include:

- (a) one hour early in the day with the Executive Secretary;
- (b) two hours with Michel Petit as representative of the Finance Committee or with the whole Committee;
- (c) one hour for PARC;
- (d) meeting with TAC;
- (e) streamlining CDC business. It was proposed that the incoming Chairman of the CDC prepare a brief proposal as a point of departure.

It was noted that Mr. van den Berg had requested a meeting on methodologies for cross-center initiatives for natural resource management research. The CSE will be the link to the Centers and the Chairman will follow-up and report to the CDC. Van den Berg will provide funding, as will the Ford Foundation.

## 11. EVALUATION OF THE RETREAT

The assessment of the Retreat was summarized:

yes	it was useful;
no	it could not have been done without a facilitator;
yes	the methodology could be used again for special situations but not for routine business meetings.

The following comments were made:

- no facilitator will be used for regular meetings, but a facilitator could be used for discussions on special topics and occasions;
- neither having a DG as facilitator or having both process and substantive chairmen was seen as feasible;
- the CDC has to keep its focus on the three issues identified in the Retreat as its special agenda and its discussions have to be related to those topics. Perhaps, formulating an objective in advance relative to the topic under discussion would help focus the discussion;
- items delegated by CDC to Center staff need to be specific to the person and the function. In some cases the chosen official may not be the DDG;
- not all Centers need to be involved in every issue the CDC acts upon.

## 12. COMMENTS ON ICW

The following comments were made on ICW:

- in **1992**, it was the unexpected drop in funding that was especially hurtful, The lesson learned has prompted the Executive Secretary to be more guarded this year in making funding projections;
- the fact that the membership of the Oversight and Finance Committees consists of donors is fortunate and may lead to a renewed sense of ownership of the system by donors;
- the value of TAC will be reinforced by recent events and its response to them;
- on 1994 funding: the Bank's first contribution will consist of 7.5% of the

figure on P.36 of the 1AC report "Review and Approval of Center Medium Term Plans **1994-98**". This is roughly 50% of the maximum authorized Bank's contribution and will come in January **1994**. There is no clear sign on how the remaining 50% for gap filling will be allocated - this will be made known in New Delhi. There are now no upper or lower limits on what any Center can raise from other sources;

- on 1995: TAC will begin work on structural adjustment immediately and discuss its work with the CDC in March, **1994**. It will not wait until the forthcoming stripe reviews are done, and, in fact, some of them may not occur., The TAC Chairman has indicated that he wants CDC input on the structural adjustment discussion. TAC's role in this discussion is yet to be clarified. The CDC should have information on discussions on structural adjustment and respond to it in time, but it would be unproductive for the CDC to discuss internally as a body how structural adjustment might be applied to any of its members;
- on core and complimentary funding: there is much confusion over the concept of core and complementary funding, and it might be useful for the CDC to come up with a clarifying statement. There should be a clear boundary between core and complementary funding but it will and should be a moving line. M. Petit is interested in modifying core so that the Bank can put its \$40 million into it. Perhaps Centers could submit to Petit a list of activities with their dollar value they feel could be moved. It is unclear, however, whether there is a constituency in the Bank for so allocating the **\$40** million.

### 13. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Members thanked the Chairman for his work during the year and especially noted his efforts in establishing AIARC. The Chairman passed the gavel to the incoming Chairman, Dr. Nores, who declared the meeting closed.