

Draft Minutes of the CDC Meeting  
May **22, 23** and **28,1999**  
Beijing, China

Participants:

Members: Pedro Sanchez, Chair, Director General, ICRAF  
Grant Scobie, Director General, CIAT  
Jeffrey Sayer, Director General, CIFOR,  
Timothy Reeves, Director General, CIMMYT  
Hubert Zandstra, Director General, CIP  
Adel El-Beltagy, Director General, ICARDA  
Meryl Williams, Director General, ICLARM  
Shawki Barghouti, Director General, ICRISAT  
Lukas Brader, Director General, IITA  
Hank Fitzhugh, Director General, ILRI  
Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Director General, IFPRI  
Geoffrey Hawtin, Chair, Director General, IPGRI  
Ron Cantrell, Director General, IRRRI  
Stein Bie, Director General, ISNAR  
David Seckler, Director General, IWMI  
Kanayo Nwanze, Director General, WARDA

Secretary: Jean-Pierre Jacqmotte

<u>Agenda</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>Monday May 22, 1999</u>	
1. Follow-up on the <del>older</del> Consultation on the CGIAR Strategy in Saharan Africa	3
2. <del>the</del> of the CDC <del>the</del> with the CGIAR Chair, the TAC <del>Chair</del> , <del>the</del> the CBC	4
<u>Sunday May 23, 1999</u>	
3. Meeting of the CDC with the CGIAR Chair and Executive Secretary	5
4. CDC position papers:	9
• Integrated Gene Management	9
• Global Information Systems	9
• Capacity Building	10
• Policy Research	10
• Gender in Agriculture	10
• Integrated Natural Resource Management	10
5. CDC Reaction on Position Papers prepared by Others:	11
• Finance Committee paper on future CGIAR funding	11
• Consultative Council	11

• TAC paper on future role and composition	11
• TAC/IAEG paper on the integration of both bodies	12
• GRPC paper on terms of reference and composition of the committee	12
• CGIAR Chair's paper on the establishment of a Science Partnership Committee	12
• TAC's paper on the terms of reference of the Partnerships review	12
6. Meeting of the CDC with the TAC Chair	12
7. Joint CDC-CBC Meeting	14
8. CDC meeting with Linda Spink and John Riggan (Conservation Company)	16
9. PARC and Future Harvest	17
10. CDC Meeting with the IAEG	18
11. Other Matters:	18
• AIARC	18
• FAO Commission	19
• Gender and Diversity Program	19
• CDC Liaison with the EU/EC	20
• CDC Committees Structure	20

#### Friday May 28, 1999

11. Other Matters (continued):	
• Revision of the 2000-2002 MTPs following the System Review	20
• Finance Committee financial allocation to the NGOC	20
• Farewell	20
• Next CDC Meeting	21
12. CDC report to MTM99	21

---

### Summary of Critical Dates, Decisions, and Actions Required

---

#### Critical Dates:

- CGIAR Long-term Finance Strategy Committee Meeting: August 19, 1999, Stanford, California. CDC representation: Pedro Sanchez and Hubert Zandstra.
  - CSSA Meeting of Minds II: Abidjan, September 1-3, 1999. ISNAR paper on the SSA regional associations visions and strategies: June 16, 1999.
  - INMR Workshop, Wageningen, September 1-3, Convened by Jeff Sayer.
  - Revision of Centers' 2000-2002 MTPs in the light of the System Review September 1999
  - e Next CDC meeting: Wednesday October 20 (afternoon) and Saturday October 23 (all day). No outsiders save CG Chair, CBC and TAC.
  - e Participation of CDC in the CGIAR/NAS sponsored conference on biotechnology (October 21-22): Pedro Sanchez to inquire with CGIAR Chair.
  - e **Post-ICW99** CDC retreat with the CGIAR Chair: Pedro Sanchez to inquire about CGIAR Chair's true intention and proposed dates
-

#### Decisions and **follow-up**:

- Koen Geerts' nomination as **AIARC** Trustee endorsed by the CDC. Jean-Pierre Jacqmotte to notify Maria Guerrero.
- Pedro Sanchez to follow up on the status of the DDGs Comparative Compensation Study.
- CDC Liaison **with** the **EU/EC**: Stein Bie to inform Dr. Tollens of the CDC decision to terminate the liaison arrangement and thank him for his services.
- CDC Committees Structure: to be discussed ~~at~~ the next CDC meeting.
- FC allocation to NGOC: Pedro Sanchez to communicate the CDC's reaction to the FC Chair

#### **1. Follow-up** on the Stakeholder Meeting on **the CGIAR Strategy** in **SubSaharan Africa**

On Saturday May 22, 1999, the CDC Committee on Sub-Saharan Africa (CSSA) held a Stakeholder Consultation, prepared at a "Meeting of Minds" in Nairobi on May 10-11, 1999. Two major inputs in the meeting were the SPAAR/FARA Task Force paper entitled "Vision for African Agricultural Research", and an ISNAR paper, commissioned by the CDC, entitled "A New Strategy for the CGIAR in Sub-Saharan Africa: a review of current strategies and priorities". A report of the Meeting of Minds, entitled "Towards a Strategy for the CGIAR in Sub-Saharan Africa" was made available to all participants in **MTM99**.

Hank Fitzhugh, Chair of the CSSA reported that the meeting was well attended by a cross section of the CGIAR and its partners. A separate report on this event is being prepared and will be distributed in due course.

The CDC decided to report on both meetings to the CGIAR during **MTM99**. The CSSA **will** produce a report on a CGIAR strategy in Sub-Saharan Africa for review by TAC in September and submission to the CGIAR at ICW99. A draft document will be prepared in the next three months in close collaboration with NARS and regional organizations. As the report on the "Meeting of Minds" contains significant information to allow the development of strategy, Hank Fitzhugh requested all Directors General to provide soonest their comments on possible gaps and missing major elements.

Though the principle of joint planning and monitoring of the implementation of the eventual strategy **was** accepted, the question **was** raised for consideration by the CSSA at what level this should happen, i.e., on project-by-project basis or at a more aggregate level.

***Following the presentation of the progress report on the development of a CGIAR strategy in Sub-Saharan Africa on Tuesday May 25 by the CSSA Chair, an informal***

meeting of the CSSA membership took place with all African participants' in MTM99. The meeting produced a two page note entitled 'CGIAR – Focus on Africa Initiative'. The document reinforces the commitment of all participants to collaborate closely in the development of a mutually acceptable strategy, and proposes a four step action plan leading towards the production of a proposal for review by TAC and submission to the CGIAR at ICW99. The note also clarifies the respective responsibilities of the CDC/CSSA and NARS/Regional Organizations, under the general coordination of SPAAR and CSSA. The Meeting of the Minds II will take place on September 1-3, 1999, in Abidjan, for which preparatory documents will be prepared by CSSA/SPAAR.

In subsequent meetings during MTM99, both Future Harvest and TRG offered to assist the CSSA in organizing and following-up on the Meeting of Minds II.

## 2. Preparation of the CDC Meetings with the CGIAR Chair, the TAC Chair, and the CBC

Regarding the upcoming meeting with the CGIAR Chair, the CDC agreed to address four main issues:

- The change in leadership in the CGIAR, i.e. the CGIAR Chair, the TAC Chair, and the CGIAR Executive Secretary, and the need to involve the CDC in the processes;
- An urgent request to get the Finance Committee to release to the Centers \$4.5 million of World Bank funds earmarked for support of innovative proposals sanctioned by TAC; the CDC request is based on the principle that (a) unrestricted funds should not be set aside for restricted use particularly at a time of the increasing scarcity of such funds, and (b) several worthwhile undertakings embodied in the approved MTPs and annual research agenda need to be funded first;
- The apparent lack of attention for two major CGIAR processes, i.e., the MTPs and EPMRs, threatening the sense of ownership of Centers' undertakings by the CGIAR membership; and,
- The status of World Bank financial support of the CGIAR in the short and medium-term, and ways in which the CDC can help to ensure its continuity.

With regard to the meeting with the TAC Chair four items for discussion were retained:

- The process – and the lack of transparency thereof – followed by TAC to identify proposals eligible for the \$4.5 million set aside by the Finance Committee; it was apparent to the CDC members that, while TAC called upon Centers to submit proposals, it initiated direct contacts with selected Centers to push its own (or some TAC members') agenda; at the time of the meeting four initiatives were known to be actively pursued by TAC: an initiative on

---

<sup>1</sup> Aklilu Afework (AFDB), Traore Kassoum (Côte d'Ivoire), Bongiwe Njobe (South Africa), Joseph Mukibi (Uganda), Seyfu Ketema (Ethiopia, regional representative for Africa), Assetou Kanoute (ADAF, NGOC), Moise Houssou (CORAF), Keagile Molapong (SACCAR), Moustapha Tourb (SPAAR)

- water involving **ICLARM** and **IWMI**, globalization of IPR involving **ISNAR**, the economic evaluation of animal genetic resources involving **ILRI**, and production ecology involving **CIMMYT**, **CIAT**, **ILRI**, **ICRAF** and **IITA**;
- The low attention paid by the CGIAR to the MTPs and EPMRs; and,
- The staffing of the TAC Secretariat.

For the joint meeting with the CBC, the CDC agreed to have mutual briefings on the main items discussed in the respective meetings. This would be followed by a discussion on IPR (including issues related to Centers' host countries starting to set limitations on the movement of genetic materials), led by Timothy Reeves on behalf of the CDC, and on system-wide initiatives (including issues related to center autonomy vs. system undertakings), led by Wally Falcon on behalf of the CBC; possibly issues of the borderline between management and Board authority could be mentioned.

### 3. Meeting with CGIAR Chair and Executive Secretary

On behalf of the CDC, Pedro Sanchez welcomed and thanked Ismail Serageldin and Alexander von der Osten for joining the Directors General. He presented the four points for discussion mentioned above.

Ismail Serageldin thanked the CDC for their cooperation in the follow-up on the system review. He warned however that with regard to the **CGIAR in SubSaharan Africa, marginal changes would just not be acceptable\***.

With regard to **CGIAR leadership**, Ismail Serageldin confirmed that over a period of eighteen month important changes are likely to occur:

- Chairmanship: he confirmed to be a formal candidate for the UNESCO position, upon which a decision (election) will be held on November 15, 1999. He acknowledged that this and the timing were significant sources of uncertainties for the CGIAR in the immediate future.
  - If he is selected, the Bank has time until **MTM2000** to designate a new chair. In that event the model of part-time chair with a full time **CEO/vice-chair** is likely to be put into place. The **CEO/vice-chair** would be a **WB** official at the director level **with** operational linkages with the Bank through, e.g., the RDV Department. The **CEO/vice-chair** would combine functions currently assumed by the Chair and the Executive Secretary. A restructuring of the Secretariat would follow accordingly.
  - If he is not selected by UNESCO, Serageldin would remain with the **WB** for a couple of years and be in charge of the CGIAR and the Water Commission (the latter ending in March 2000). This would mean that he would assume the chairmanship of the CGIAR on a fulltime basis.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the CGIAR Chair soften his stance considerably on this issue in the plenary session of MTM99 following endorsement of the Group of the process proposed by the CSSA

- TAC Chair: Ismail Serageldin informed the CDC that the search, overseen by **Alec McCalla**, was proceeding in accordance with the process agreed by the Consultative Council. Serageldin urged the CDC to nominate candidates as an open search is 'a must' to identify the best candidates, including from among "outsiders".
- Executive Secretary: Alexander von der Osten is due to retire from the WB in October 2000. The profile of his replacement will be largely determined by the type of chair the CGIAR will have at that time.
- Finance Committee Chair: Alec McCalla is due to retire at the end of December 1999. A further extension of his contract with the WB is plausible, but any action on this will be on hold until well after ICW99.
- Replacement of Directors General: Serageldin urged the CDC members to see to it that excellence remain the foremost criterion for the selection of DGs; he also called for enlarging the searches to include candidates outside the CGIAR.

With regard to the World Bank funding of the CGIAR, Ismail Serageldin commented as follows:

- 1999 and 2000: after a threat of a cut by \$2.5 million, the contribution was barely maintained in 1999. For 2000 a reduction in the contribution by about that amount is likely. (Subsequently, it was learned that the WB DGF committee's initial position was not to impose a cut on the CGIAR.)
- Strategy: three programs (CGIAR, CGPA and Riverblindness) are currently included in the WB Development Grant Facility (DGF) together with a large number of small, short-time projects. The strategy consists in convincing the WB management to deal with these three large programs separately as they are of different nature and imply a long-term institutional commitment. The CGIAR should be ready to take a small cut in funding in the short term to obtain the change in status, which is likely to improve the funding situation over the longer term. However, this should also be seen in the context of the tense pressure put by the WB Board of Directors on the President to reduce the WB administrative budget, and pressures to act on other fronts, e.g. debt write-offs for poorer countries, which will mobilize the WB own resources as well.
- CGIAR within the WB: CDC members indicated that there is a need to articulate better the CGIAR mission and performance to develop a stronger, supportive constituency within the Bank. In his response, Serageldin referred to the Dalrymple -Anderson study that underlined the overall decrease of unrestricted funding in the CGIAR and the role of the WB to remain the provider by excellence of such funds. He urged the CDC members to present the CGIAR as a research entity, in order to avoid to be engulfed in developmental technical assistance work. There will be, of course, exceptions, particularly when a Center's mandate includes technical assistance work (such as ISNAR).
- Unconventional sources of funding: Serageldin underlined the importance for the CGIAR and the Centers to attract new sources of funding. He cited ILRI's example of linking itself with medical research in a win/win situation, as the

sector has plenty of money to fund collaborative undertakings. This could be enlarged to other parts of the private sector. Serageldin warned that neither IFAR nor Future Harvest, as foundations, would succeed in attracting significant amounts of moneys as they are operated by the wrong people, and should be run by wealthy individuals able to contribute and to attract others to do similarly. He recognized that it is easier to "sell" immediate humanitarian causes (e.g., UNICEF) than research per se, but the foundation model should nevertheless be pursued.

The CDC Chair introduced the next issue, i.e., the **allocation of earmarked WB funds**, by reminding the meeting that at ICW98 the Finance Committee (FC) had set aside \$4.5 million of WB funds to be allocated by TAC for new initiatives.

- Pedro Sanchez drew the attention of the CGIAR Chair that this raised problems of principle: new initiatives would be funded at the expense of the agreed research agenda that remains under-funded, and funds intrinsically unrestricted would become restricted. The CDC suggested that this be resolved by allocating the funds in a fully unrestricted way and proportionally among Centers, thereby increasing the Bank's matching from 11% to 12.5%.
- A CDC member added that the implementation of several systemwide and ecoregional initiatives (fully endorsed by the CGIAR) had been suspended by lack of funding.
- Another CDC member voiced his opposition to this CDC proposal as well as his view that the matching formula used for the allocation of WB funds did not make much sense, if any.
- The CGIAR Chair informed the CDC that in his view that \$4.5 million could be used either for support of the research agenda, or for supporting new initiatives. He thought that, at MTM96 in Jakarta, there had been a mutual understanding of the need for innovative project funding; this of course, he said, could be revisited. With regard to the systemic under-funding of systemwide and ecoregional undertakings, he personally had approached a number of well intentioned donors. However, in each case the issue of restricting funds was raised which conflicted with the donors' intention to provide unrestricted funds. There may be a need to review how these undertakings are being 'packaged' and explore alternative ways, in cooperation with TAC and the FC.
- A CDC member stated that restricted funding remains the best source to fund competitive projects. His understanding of the mutual agreement reached in Jakarta was to increase the Bank matching from 9% to 11%, and not to restrict WB funds. He added that experience has shown that the assumption that providing seed money from the WB contribution to systemwide undertakings would attract other donors' funds did not work in reality. He further cited the example of a proposal to finance the genebanks that TAC had rejected because it was not "new".

- Another member of the CDC shared his view that the rolling MTPs were appropriate instrument to put forward new initiatives which could be funded in an unrestricted way.
- In conclusion, the CDC Chair underlined the fact that, from the CDC point of view, the bottom line was to maximize unrestricted funding. He also referred to process issues in the allocation of the \$4.5 million which would be discussed with the TAC Chair.

The last issue raised by the CDC Chair dealt with the perception of the CDC that the CGIAR is giving **little attention to MTPs and EPMRs at MTM and ICW.**

- He conveyed the feeling that the Group dealt with these processes in a casual way in contrast with the high transaction costs borne by the Centers. He further underlined the perception that the loss of interest of the donors for these **two** central processes may have serious implications, including the loss of ownership of the CGIAR research by the membership.
- The CGIAR Chair drew the CDC's attention on the fact that every EPMR is presented at a CGIAR meeting. Some, he said, were without issues, while others flagged issues that attract attention. He urged the CDC to reflect on what the MTPs and EPMRs should convey to the donors, such as changes or unusual events, and they probably would gain from being more issue-oriented. He contrasted these **two** processes with the Center presentations at ICW which are much appreciated because they convey a lot of information. He added that the EPMR process needs to be reviewed to get them better focused, improve on a more even quality across Centers, as well as on the selection of panel members.

In closing the CGIAR Chair expressed interest to meet, in a retreat format, with the CDC around the time of ICW99 to discuss further issues raised by the System Review – though he expects the Group to come to closure with the Review at **MTM99**. He also informed the CDC of a CGIAR-NAS sponsored two-day scientific forum on biotechnology that **will** take place in Washington on October 21-22, 1999. Finally he underlined the need for the CGIAR to develop a vision for the future and implement the changes to achieve that vision.

Hubert Zandstra, in his capacity as Chair of PARC, thanked the CGIAR Chair for his active support of Future Harvest by, among others, hosting the operation at the World Bank, and participating in the presentation of the Conflict study.

Following on the meeting with the CGIAR Chair, the CDC members exchanged views on its outcome as follows:

- The CDC will follow-up with the FC on the \$4.5 million earmarked funds<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> This was done the same day by a presentation on behalf of the CDC by Pedro Sanchez, following the interaction of the CDC with the TAC Chair



- The CDC discussed the procedure to deal with "dissenting views" in its midst; it was decided that reservations or disagreements with a majority view of the CDC membership should be aired in closed sessions, and not in the presence of others. It was deemed indispensable that the CDC speaks with one voice, albeit with nuances (unanimity vs. majority vs. consensus) when necessary.
- The new position of CEO/vice-chairman – if adequately staffed – was considered to have the potential of strengthening the CGIAR within the WB. On the other hand, it holds the risk of leading towards greater centralization of authority to, e.g., implement the recommendations of the System Review. In this matter the position of the WB President was deemed crucial, particularly because of Strong's easy access to him and the perception that Strong is insisting on having key recommendations implemented.
- From his opening statement, it was perceived that with regard to Sub-Saharan Africa in particular, the CGIAR Chair wants to discuss the restructuring of the CGIAR entities active in the region. He was quoted to have said that "the CDC should initiate such restructuring, if not it will be imposed on them". The CDC consequently urged the CSSA to prepare a presentation to the CGIAR during MTM99 that focuses strongly on functions in contrast to structures under the motto that "mergers are less effective than strategic alliances". The emphasis should be put on inclusiveness, partnerships, and a coordination committee.

#### 4. CDC position papers

An outcome of the January 1999 Consultative Council's meeting was that the CDC had been assigned seven areas<sup>4</sup> identified by the System Review for reflection on improving the scientific performance of the CGIAR. These were allocated among Directors General at and following the CDC retreat of The Hague in late January. All papers had been circulated among DGs for comments, and three of them had been submitted for review to TAC in March 1999. These three papers – dealing respectively with Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM), Gender, and Policy Research – had been circulated to the Group together with a commentary prepared by TAC.

At the CDC meeting in Beijing, each of the papers was reviewed as needed and their presentation to the Group during MTM99 discussed and organized.

- Timothy Reeves presented a revised paper on Integrated Gene Management which reflected the comments received from his colleagues. A few additional suggestions were made regarding the WOS (Wholly owned subsidiary) feasibility study, the TAC study on plant breeding, and the funding of the IP audits. Following this discussion the paper was finalized and distributed to the Group.
- Stein Bie presented a paper on Global Information Systems which emphasized the lack of central capability and of comparative advantage of the CGIAR to

<sup>4</sup> These are: Integrated Gene Management, Integrated Natural Resource Management; Gender in Agriculture, Policy Research, Global Information Systems, CGIAR Strategy in Sub-Saharan Africa, Capacity Building.

undertake the initiative suggested by the System Review. However, it accepted that the IARCs should improve on the quality of their databases and it announced that, through IVDN, these and other databases would be made **more** accessible to NARS. In this framework a CDC member raised the issue of private commercial firms asking for access to Centers' databases and the possibility to levy a fee for such services.

- Stein Bie also presented a paper on Capacity Building that very much welcomed the System Review recommendation to intensify IARCs' efforts in this area at the level reached prior to TAC's decision to reduce it. In this context it **was** mentioned that the feedback of the SSA NARS and regional organizations should be taken into account as they expect to develop capacity building to render the NARS more effective in research and well beyond including, e.g., in the public awareness area.
- Pedro Sanchez presented the paper on Policy Research. During its discussion it **was** flagged that IFPRI's networks contribute actively to the implementation of the proposed strategy, while it **was** acknowledged that the concept of policy research **was** much broader than economic research, and the need to link policy with technological research. Since IFPRI's capacity to respond to requests for assistance is limited – which led at least one other Center, i.e. ICRAF, to set up its own policy research unit – a task force consisting of Per Pinstrup-Andersen and Hubert Zandstra offered to look into how IARCs could better interact in this area.
- With regard to the paper on Gender in Agriculture, it **was** agreed that while the preparation of the paper **was** led by Pedro Sanchez, the presentation of it would be made by Grant Scobie. The paper gave an overview of the gender staffing in the CGIAR, and of the gender analysis within the systemwide PRGA program. The paper announced the review of the PRGA which should be available shortly, and gave the two major thrusts of the action program: (a) the identification and analysis of women's changing demand for agricultural technology, and (b) the promotion of empowerment of rural women through participation in technology development and information exchange.
- Jeffrey Sayer presented briefly the paper on Integrated Natural Resource Management. The view **was** shared that the statement of the NGOC on this issue did not have much substance<sup>5</sup>. It **was** recommended to downplay somewhat the importance of the ecoregional approach which, experience shows, is a valid concept but difficult to translate into operational terms, including funding-wise. It **was** suggested that further work in this area should build on work by others, including the Henzel and NGOC studies, as this approach is more likely to attract donor funding. A few case studies on impact would be helpful. The CDC **was** informed that a NRM workshop will be held in Wageningen on September 3-5, with Ted Henzel, outsiders, Hans Gregersen, members of the NGOC, and IARC representatives.

---

<sup>5</sup> In this context it was mentioned that some misunderstanding/miscommunication between the NGOC and the CDC had not allowed the latter to be represented at a NGOC meeting on NRM held in China shortly before MTM99.

## 5. CDC Reaction on **Position** Papers prepared by Others

In advance of the meeting, a number of Directors General were asked to review a number of critical proposals prepared by others and guide the CDC in taking a position on these as they will be discussed during MTM99.

- Hubert Zandstra commented on the paper prepared by the Finance Committee on long term funding and financial practices. He announced that the FC Chair, Alec McCalla, had called a meeting where both he, as PARC Chair, and Pedro Sanchez, as CDC Chair, were invited together with Wally Falcon, the CBC Chair. The expectation was that a task force would be set up to prepare the long-term funding strategy for the CGIAR in a participatory way. CDC members commented that the fundraising foundation, cryptically described in the FC paper, seemed quite different from the foundation concept described in a paper produced by PARC. It was suggested that Hubert Zandstra try to meet with the CGIAR Chair before the meeting called by the FC Chair. Also, it was commented, the relationship WB-CGIAR, besides the Secretariat, merits to be looked into as there are clear signs that the CGIAR is being used to push specific personal agendas.
- Pedro Sanchez commented on the CGIAR Chair's proposal to maintain the Consultative Council (CC) and recommended its endorsement by the CDC. The strong representation of IARCs (up to four) through the CDC and CBC at the first meeting of the CC proved to be quite effective for the IARCs to convey their messages and to be heard in such a smaller setting. The current proposal would maintain both the IARCs representation and the size of the CC, with some adjustments in the representation of other stakeholder groups. Since membership on the CC would be for two years, the "institutional memory" function of the CC would be preserved. The CDC agreed to be represented by its past and current Chairs.
- Per Pinstrup-Andersen commented on the TAC proposal regarding its future role and composition. The proposal essentially represents a status quo with regard to TAC's composition of about 12 members – in line with the CC recommendation of a membership of 10-15 members—supported by five teams of about three experts each. This is in contrast with the System Review proposal to have a small core TAC and a number of specialized panels. It was suggested that CDC may prefer the System Review recommended structure, based on the model of the National Academy of Science. Pleading in favor of such a structure are the CDC vested interest in having a strong TAC, and the practical impossibility of having all disciplines and areas of expertise duly represented in a larger TAC, even with specialized teams. It was acknowledged that as long as TAC is expected to fulfill a role in science as well as fulfilling bureaucratic functions, its composition and structure would be hybrid. However, it was CDC conviction that TAC needs to shift away from the latter to focus strongly on the former. This, it was thought, should include a review of the EPMR process, its goals, and the role of TAC in the process. Also the CDC felt the need for TAC to review its role

in the area of scientific audit of IARCs work, which cannot be performed by a small TAC alone even with 12 members. Therefore the CDC expressed its preference for a TAC of up to six members with panels, following the NAS model.<sup>6</sup>

- Per Pinstруп-Andersen also commented on the TAC/IAEG proposals to merge the two bodies involved in evaluation and impact assessment. Two models had been proposed by respectively TAC and the IAEG, differing mainly in the degree of autonomy with which the ex post evaluation would be performed. It was suggested that the CDC may prefer the IAEG proposed model, mainly because it would allow to attract true experts on IA, and at the same time ensure a broader distribution of areas of expertise.
- Geoffrey Hawtin commented on the proposed terms of reference and composition of the GRPC (Genetic Resources Policy Committee). He informed the CDC that, based on informal contacts with CGIAR stakeholders, there was a broad agreement that the CGIAR needs the GRPC, and that the terms-of-reference were considered to be acceptable. It was suggested that the CDC, if asked, endorse them also. There might be some controversy about the composition of the GRPC as some preferred a small membership, nominated by the GRPC Chair, while others thought that the committee should be larger – as proposed – to be inclusive and representative.
- Stein Bie commented on the CGIAR Chair's proposal to establish a Science Partnership Committee. He suggested that this might result in overlap/conflicts with TAC to the extent TAC will focus more strongly on science than is currently the case. If the Group were to opt for a smaller TAC, then such a committee might be appropriate. However, the establishment of such a committee may be resented by the NARS who would consider it as an elitist group.
- Stein Bie also commented on the proposed terms of reference for a partnership review by TAC. while his first suggestion was for the CDC to accept the TOR as proposed, CDC members suggested that the issue at hand needed a more analytical approach and they questioned whether TAC was best placed to perform the task. As, according to the CDC, TAC needs to concentrate much more on science, the consensus within the CDC was that the review should be led by others, including outsiders, possibly from the private sector.

## 6. Meeting of the CDC with the TAC Chair

On behalf of the CDC, Pedro Sanchez welcomed Donald Winkelmann, TAC Chair, Shellemiah Keya, Executive Secretary of TAC, and Timothy Kelley, Senior Agricultural Officer.

Pedro Sanchez introduced the three issues the CDC wanted to discuss with the TAC Chair, i.e.,

---

<sup>6</sup> It was later learned that the CDC was prepared to propose an in-depth review of TAC and its mandate, a suggestion which was not accepted by the CGIAR Chair. In view of this position, the CDC felt that at this juncture it should not insist on its position but take it up with the next TAC Chair and possibly the new CGIAR Chair.

- the \$4.5 million earmarked by the FC for allocation by TAC which goes against the principle of optimizing unrestricted funding for the IARCs, and the process of allocation of which seems to serve TAC's needs rather than those of the Centers or the system as a whole;
- the MTP and EPMP status and process; and,
- the TAC Secretariat staffing.

Starting with the TAC Secretariat staffing, Don Winkelmann informed the CDC that Timothy Kelley, formerly with ICRISAT, had joined the Secretariat in the social scientist slot. Ms. Sirka Irninen (Finland) would join the Secretariat on July 1, 1999, in the biological science slot. He added that Ms. Irninen was quite familiar with the CGIAR having worked for CIMMYT's wheat program, and having had African exposure. He added that at this juncture no further ~~staff~~ recruitment was contemplated, as TAC will call on consultants for assistance in specific areas of expertise.

With regard to the \$4.5 million question, the TAC Chair said that this had been an initiative of the FC, imposed on TAC, and that TAC would resist any attempt to repeat this process in the future, mainly because it has proven to be too time consuming. He reminded the CDC that the intent of the FC was to prod for opportunities for better inter-center collaboration.

He recognized that the process which had been followed should not be repeated, and that setting a deadline of May 1<sup>st</sup> was neither realistic nor practical.

He refuted the CDC's suspicion that these funds were being targeted towards activities of sole interest to TAC. He cited the example of the IPR study aiming at analyzing trends of IP developments in various areas and their long term implications for the CGIAR, that would serve well the system and the IARCs. This view was supported by some CDC members.

The TAC Chair added that some portion of the \$4.5 million reserve was definitely earmarked and could not be freed up considering the significant cost already borne by the Centers and the TAC Secretariat.

He agreed, however, that the effective management of innovation in research should use the MTP and similar mechanisms as vehicles.

A CDC member shared his view that the emphasis put on new inter-center activities was mainly aimed at pleasing donors. In the mean time, however, existing such activities remained seriously under-funded. It might appear somewhat naïve to believe that starting new activities would lead to attracting new moneys.

The TAC Chair emphasized that, even if this is true, there is no guarantee for continuing support of such new initiatives. However, if they seem to work out well, they should be folded into the Centers' MTPs.

Another CDC member drew the attention of the TAC Chair on the lack of argumentation for the rejection of proposals submitted by Centers that hurt Center management and staff alike.

The TAC Chair explained that a total of about 20 proposals had been submitted by the Centers. In TAC's mind these were to be one-time deals, while some Centers interpreted them to be the first phase of a longer term undertaking. He added that TAC is receiving signals from Centers that they do not have the time to develop new, innovative proposals in the framework of the existing mechanism such as the MTPs and EPMRs. However, he stated, the CDC should feel free to call on a "higher authority" to undo the decision to set aside funds for this purpose.

A CDC member added that for some Centers the set-aside funds were the second best solution to attract quasi-unrestricted funds.

On the issue of the apparent lack of interest of the Group for the MTPs and EPMRs, the TAC Chair stated that he shared the view of the CGIAR Chair in that these are not the most effective means to convey exciting messages and information to the Group. He said to be open for suggestions on how to improve on these processes, and would be glad to set up a joint task force with the CDC to examine alternatives. He added that TAC does not control the time (or timing) allowed at CGIAR meetings for discussion by the Group of these items.

## 7. Joint CDC-CBC Meeting

The CBC Chair welcomed the CBC and summarized the main points of discussion in the CDC:

- the issues related to the succession of the CGIAR Chair, TAC Chair, and Executive Secretary;
- the principle and procedure of the \$4.5 million set-aside World Bank funds;
- the downgrading of the MTP and EPMR in the planning and evaluation process, and the agreement of the CGIAR and TAC Chairs that new ways have to be found to make them more relevant to donors;
- the composition of TAC with a CDC preferred membership of up to six members and panels, following the NAS model; and
- the IGM discussions demonstrating how Centers move towards greater integration of their activities.

In turn, Wally Falcon, the CBC Chair, highlighted the discussions within the CBC, some of which with the CGIAR Chair:

- the CBC supports the continuance of the Consultative Council, while it would like to see a reduction in the number/membership of committees;

- the CBC has questions regarding the role and makeup of the NGOC;
- it discussed the trends in the Centers' research agenda towards downstream research (attracting restricted funding) rather than towards upstream research (mainly funded in an unrestricted way); linked to this, is the issue of overhead recovery on restricted funded projects;
- with regard to TAC, the CBC discussed its size and the need for a vision vs. operational involvement, including in resource allocation; the CBC is of the opinion that that a task force should be established to rewrite TAC's charter;
- it noted that the terminator gene issue **was** discussed at the WTO without a scientific input<sup>7</sup>;
- the CBC discussed the Board-Center management relationship. It emphasized the need to minimize tensions on the **board/management** divide. With regard to the evaluation of DGs' performance, the CBC concluded that the best models are based on preset goals, while the pros and cons of formal vs. informal evaluations, and of bonuses were discussed. The CBC attempted to define the divide along the lines of the functions vested in the Board such as the audit, the hiring of the DG, the consultation on the hiring of the **second-in-command** at the Center, and compensation policies. It also emphasized the need to brief new trustees on the agreed divide, and have a clear policy on back-door interactions between Board members and Center **staff**;
- the CBC further discussed the status of systemwide undertakings and came to the conclusion that the formula does not work. It has become a tenet in the CGIAR that **inter-center** collaboration is the best way to operate and delivers high payoffs. However, the funding structure has not been adapted accordingly, and causes high competition among Centers, in part healthy, but also potentially becoming unhealthy. These undertakings have essentially been imposed from the top down and involve too many actors. In the final analysis, the Center Boards still need to exercise full control over Centers' activities.

The presentations by the respective Chairs was followed by a lively discussion on the following major points:

- CGIAR strategy in Sub-Saharan Africa: it was emphasized that, in contrast with the System Review which focuses on structure, the CDC approaches the issue from a functional perspective. Since the total CGIAR effort in Sub-Saharan Africa – estimated at some \$100 million per year – represents about 10% of the total research effort in the region, the CGIAR has no alternative than to build on visions and strategies developed within the region and to operate through effective partnership arrangements with the NARS of the region. This was the purpose of the Nairobi "Meeting of Minds", followed by the Stakeholder Consultation, about which the CDC will report to the Group during MTM, and

---

<sup>7</sup> In this regard it should be noted a first draft of a CDC statement on this issue was prepared and handed over to the CGIAR Chair.

announce the delivery of a strategy, mutually acceptable to the CDC and the African NARS and regional associations, by ICW99.

- The attention of the CBC **was** drawn on Center host countries' attempts to limit the movement of genetic materials. This trend, it **was** said, is worsening and is likely to set precedents, possibly leading to a snowball **effect**. In that light a strong CGIAR statement on the Undertaking and in support of the **CGIAR-FAO** agreement is extremely important. It was agreed that the CBC would further reflect on this issue.
- The mission and composition of TAC were discussed in view of the relatively strong views held by the CBC – calling for a comprehensive review of TAC's mission and writing of a new charter – and the CDC -calling for a small core TAC with panels, following the **NAS** structure. The question **was** raised how to proceed with these comments during **MTM99**. It **was** suggested that if the concept of a new charter would be considered to be acceptable, then the question of **composition/structure** need not to be raised. However, if it were not, then the issue of **composition/structure** might be raised. The CBC Chair offered to sound the CGIAR Chair out on these approaches.
- It was flagged that the PSC, in its report, calls for the Centers to proceed with the inventory/audit of **IP**. It **was** reported that some six Centers had started this operation, while the others are preparing them.
- With regard to the systemwide and ecoregional undertakings, it **was** said that, while the CBC Will present a preliminary report on the issue at **MTM99**, further work should await the Henzel report on the ecoregional programs. In this framework it **was** mentioned that though approved, these activities remain significantly under-funded. **Also** it was said that the INRM approach would be ecoregional in nature.

#### 8. CDC meeting with Linda Spink and John Riggan (Conservation Company)

Linda Spink confirmed the Ford Foundation support to the Gender and Diversity, the Organization Change program and the Marketing program.

With regard to the Organization Change program, Ms. Spink described its goal as enhancing the Centers' capacity to come up with innovative responses to critical changes in the research environment; examples given were redefining the CGIAR's role in Sub-Saharan Africa, or changes in technology. Among the objectives of first year of the program she mentioned:

- building on work, supported by the Ford Foundation, on team building and alliances;
- broader experimentation and capacity development to establish and sustain collaborative **alliances**;
- information and technology leading to improved knowledge management; and,
- support to the CDC in its growing leadership role.



She suggested that a group of DGs act as an advisory group to provide overall guidance, to ensure accountability, quality of the program, responsiveness to Centers' needs, and equity in the assistance offered to the Centers.

John Riggan emphasized that his work with the Centers complements Ms Spinks' work in offering advice to Centers on strategic marketing, on **networking** and outreach efforts, and on initiating a collaboration between the Rockefeller and Ford foundations to attract the interest for the CGIAR from other foundations.

## 9. PARC and Future Harvest

As several Directors General had participated in the PARC meeting held on Friday May 20, Barbara Rose summarized the recent developments in Future Harvest by flagging:

- the effectiveness of Future Harvest in contributing to a better understanding of the role of investments in agricultural research; others use increasingly the Future Harvest logo as a manifestation of their support of the undertaking;
- the Conflict study has raised quite some attention (including from the CGIAR Chair) and benefited from broad international press coverage, including in a few cases with a national focus;
- this led to disseminating handouts to opinion makers, who responded positively, e.g., Stanford International Security Center, Bryan Atwood, Jimmy Carter (who signed an op-ed piece that will be published soon);
- the Future Harvest website carries up-to-date stories on agricultural research, drawing on Centers' materials (including press releases), and more stories are always welcomed attractive to the website audience consisting mostly of researchers and students;
- Future Harvest is starting to approach sources of funding to support its operations, with an expected positive spillover effect for the Centers in the longer term;
- Future Harvest will start to focus more strongly on the countries of the South, starting in Africa, and to that effect it will collaborate with Meeting of Minds II and has established a link with GFAR with which it will collaborate for the Dresden 2000 meeting.

Referring to a PARC task force (which he chaired) paper on a CGIAR resource mobilization strategy, Tiff Harris presented a first draft of a possible Future-Harvest-based central structure aiming at linking closely public awareness and resource mobilization, and leading to identifying specific roles and functions for the many actors active in these fields.

In summing up Hubert Zandstra emphasized the tremendous work accomplished by Future Harvest in a short period of time, and suggested that, through the FC working group on the CGIAR future financing, he conveys PARC's views on PA and RM, and

the structuring thereof. A meeting of the Long-term Finance Strategy Committee has been scheduled for August 19, 1999, in California.

## **10. CDC Meeting with the IAEG**

Hans Gregersen, Chair, and Guido Gryseels, Executive Secretary of the IAEG, joined the CDC.

Hans Gregersen provided the CDC with an overview of the activities in which the IAEG currently is involved. The presentation provided a brief overview of the longer published IAEG report on activities presented to the Group at MTM99. Following the brief presentation, Hans Gregersen requested suggestions on activities and linkages from the CDC. A brief discussion followed dealing with opportunities to link the IAEG's future evaluation of the environmental impacts to work being done by others and the need to make sure that this study was comprehensive enough, yet focused so that concrete information can be obtained.

Since discussion had to be kept very short in order to accommodate the full schedule of the CDC, the Chair of the IAEG urged the DGs who did not have an opportunity to speak to send further comments to the IAEG.

## **11. Other Matters**

### **AIARC**

As AIARC Board Chair, Lukas Brader reported that the AIARC Board had met in April.

He informed the CDC that the review of the pension plan is proceeding and a report should reach the Directors General soon.

He emphasized the need to strengthen the communication between AIARC, its board and the IARCs.

He reported that no progress had been made on the comparative compensation study by lack of action by the DDGs. This, apparently, is due to confusion and Pedro Sanchez accepted to follow-up on this item.

The Board has a vacancy with the departure of Koenraad Kramer, and it would be preferable to fill it by someone with a background in law. Lukas Brader announced that Koen Geerts had been nominated and requested the CDC to endorse this choice, which it did unanimously.

Lukas Brader also announced that he would step down as AIARC Board Chair at year's end.

A CDC member conveyed his view that as of late there has been a notable improvement in the relationship with IARC.

### FAO Commission

Geoffrey Hawtin reported on the status of the re-negotiation of the International Undertaking. While some progress was made at the last negotiating session in April, it was going very slowly.

He informed the CDC that, given the trends in some countries towards restricting the movement of designated germplasm, there is a need for a strong statement from the IARCs in support of the agreements signed with FAO. Cary Fowler would follow up with the members of the CDC and CBC and get their comments/clearance on such a statement.

Geoffrey Hawtin further suggested that it might now be timely for the CDC Subcommittee on IPR to call a high-level inter-centre meeting to discuss further the CGIAR Guiding Principles on IPR. In particular such a meeting is needed to decide on the definitions of the terms 'germplasm and related information', as contained in the agreements with FAO, as well as deciding on how the Centres should define the minimum action or 'genetic distance' required before a recipient of designated germplasm would be allowed to take out IPR.

Tim Reeves announced that a booklet containing the Guiding Principles on IPR, and related IPR statements and positions, had been produced by CIMMYT on behalf of the CGIAR and was available to the participants in MTM99.

### Gender and Diversity Program

Meryl Williams, in her capacity of Chair of the Advisory Board of the Gender and Diversity Program, reported on recent developments of the program.

She informed the CDC that the Advisory Board would meet during MTM99 in Beijing.

A Program Leader – Vicky Wild – had been recruited (and was attending MTM99) from among a list of over 200 candidates – some from IARCs – and a short list of four. To that effect the Steering Committee had developed a battery of explicit selection criteria which had proven to be quite effective. Ms. Wild will take on her function on June 1, 1999. She will lead the transition from the former to the new program.

With regard to funding of the program Meryl Williams referred to the \$200,000 allocation by the CDC, which are or will be complemented by donations from a number of CGIAR members such as the Ford Foundation, Denmark, Norway, France, and

USAID. A meeting of the member support group for the program was scheduled during MTM99.

Meryl Williams informed the CDC that **two** priority items for the program will be the legal protection of spouses in case of separation, divorce or death, and the feasibility of establishing a CGIAR Ombudsman position to address grievances.

#### CDC Liaison with the EU/EC

The general feeling among CDC members was that the current arrangement with Dr. Tollens was not longer **effective**. In the mean time, Salah Brahimi of the CGIAR Secretariat, had fulfilled that role more **effectively**, and sees Dr. Tollens as a liability rather than an asset in the contacts with the EU/EC.

Stein Bie, as Director General of ISNAR, was asked to contact Dr. Tollens and explain to him that his services will no longer be needed.<sup>8</sup>

All Directors General were urged to establish contacts with the new EC representative, Mr. Michel Lucas, present at MTM99.

#### CDC Committees Structure

In view of recent development since the System Review, the CDC Chair requested the CDC members to reflect on the future structure of the CDC committees. This will be put on the agenda of the next CDC meeting.

#### Revision of the 2000-2002 MTPs

At the suggestion of the CDC Chair, Directors General were encouraged to present revisions to the their Centers' **2000-2002 MTPs**, as a consequence of the System Review, by September 1999 when they will be reviewed by TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat.

#### FC Allocation of Funds to the NGOC

On behalf of the CDC, Pedro Sanchez will approach the FC Chair and convey to him the Directors General's surprise about the generous allocation to the NGOC out of World Bank funds, primarily aimed at supporting research.

#### Farewell

As this meeting **was** the last one Grant Scobie and Shawki Barghouti would attend, at the opportunity of a dinner and in his report to the CGIAR, the CDC Chair thanked

---

<sup>8</sup> By letter of June 18, 1999, Dr. Tollens **acknowledged** Stein Bie's letter of June 11, 1999, and graciously accepted the CDC decision.

both for their significant contributions to the CGIAR, as Directors General of their ~~respective~~ Centers as well as members of ~~the~~ CDC. He wished them both the very best in their new assignments and hoped that they ~~would~~ continue to support the ~~cause of~~ the CGIAR.

#### Next CDC Meeting

In view ~~of~~ the CIAR Chair's initiative to convene a conference on biotechnology on October 21-22, 1999 – the participation ~~of~~ DGs in which needs to be clarified by the CDC Chair – the CDC agreed to meet in Washington on Wednesday October 20 afternoon, and on Saturday October 23 all day.

### **12. CDC Report to MTM99**

Attached is the CDC Chair report to the CGIAR – prepared in collaboration with the CDC membership – which was tabled at MTM99, and summarized by Pedro Sanchez in the final plenary session of the meeting.

**Center Directors' Committee Report to MTM99**  
**Beijing, China**  
**May 28, 1999**

**CDC work: A very active period since ICW98**

- The CDC has responded to the challenge of the Consultative Council to develop innovative science proposals. This involvement reinforces that the Centres are now truly accepted as full partners, and are listened to. The CDC looks forward to continuing to contribute actively in the deliberations of the Group.
- Intensive interactions – both at meetings (post-ICW98 in Washington, The Hague, Rome, Nairobi, and Beijing) and by e-mail – among the DGs resulted in the delivery of seven statements in response to the System Review's recommendations. These were presented to the Group at MTM99, some after review by TAC. It is also a reflection of the CDC's true intention to work more as a team – within the CGIAR.
- The reports on Policy and Management Sciences, Gender, Global Information Systems, and Capacity Building came to closure at this MTM.
- The reports on Integrated Natural Resource Management and Integrated Gene Management signify major progress, which will come to closure at ICW99. Pending issues on INRM will be resolved at a workshop in Wageningen on September 3-5, 1999, and issues related to intellectual property rights within INRM will be finalized at ICW99, although we see these as continually evolving issues.
- The Committee on Sub-Saharan Africa convened a highly successful "Meeting of Minds" in Nairobi, May 10-12, which resulted for the first time in the development of a shared vision between African research leaders and Centre representatives on the role of the CGIAR in Africa. This was followed by a lively stakeholder consultation here in Beijing, which lent further impetus to the consultative process with African organizations to develop a mutually acceptable strategy for the CGIAR in Sub-Saharan Africa. Intensive consultations will take place during the next three months. "Meeting of Minds II" will be held in Africa during the week of August 30-September 3 to finalize the strategy and present it to TAC later in that month, and to ICW99 for final approval.
- PARC is a vibrant and dynamic committee led by the CDC, but highly representative of the CGIAR through its membership. Future Harvest, a product of PARC, has made significant progress. Its study on Agriculture and Conflict has been well received both within and outside the CGIAR community, beginning to erode the perception that the CGIAR is a best kept secret in the international community. A PARC commissioned paper on Resource Mobilization has been regarded as a valuable input to the Finance Committee for the development of a

future funding strategy. This paper responds to the need for a single integrated capability for public awareness and resource mobilization as suggested by the System Review.

- The Committee on Information has made good progress in launching a program to facilitate NARS access to databases and other sources of information relevant to researchers.

## Issues to the Group

- The CDC notes the on-going renegotiation of the International Undertaking by the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. Given the important implications of this for the Centres, the CDC plans to strengthen its contribution to the negotiation process to help ensure that the CGIAR's mission is taken fully into account. In the mean time the Centres remain committed to continuing to make the germplasm available without restriction, and the CDC has issued a statement to this effect, jointly with the CBC.
- The CDC strongly endorses systemwide, or better said multi-center activities and endorses the preliminary analysis of the CBC presented at the meeting by Wally Falcon. The CDC feels that the un-funded portion of these activities within the agreed agenda should be filled first, before consideration is given to new multi-center initiatives as suggested by TAC. The CDC wishes to reiterate that there are always new initiatives in Centres' annual rolling MTPs and these should be the focus for any additional resourcing that is available.
- Out of the World Bank funds still available to the Finance Committee for 1999, the CDC feels that the equivalent of 1% of the aggregate budget (or about \$3.5 million) should be kept in reserve. It suggests that the balance, including the \$4.5 million earmarked for TAC initiatives, be distributed proportionally as unrestricted funds to the Centres, thus increasing the percentage of World Bank matching funds.
- The CDC is concerned about the diminished attention given to two main processes in the CGIAR system, i.e., the Medium-Term Plans (MTPs) and the quinquennial External Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs). Neither of these critical areas appears to attract sufficient attention from the membership with such crowded meeting agenda these days. This, potentially, weakens the ownership of the Centres by the Group. The CDC is looking forward to participating in the TAC/IAEG working group on this and related assessment issues, to assure the proper delivery of these key products or propose new ones.
- The CDC calls on the membership to minimize restrictions on their funding. The current trend towards a higher ratio of restricted funding is alarming for the Centres.

- The CDC strongly supports the call from the CGIAR Chair and the Finance Committee to the Group to have a clear systemwide policy on indirect cost recovery of restricted funds within the agreed agenda, a policy agreed by all members.

## Farewell

The CDC would like to acknowledge the contributions of two departing members, not only as Directors General of their respective Centres, but also as highly valuable members of the CDC. Grant Scobie and Shawki Barghouti will remain good friends of the CGIAR and we are sure they will spread the good word in the respective organizations they will be joining in the near future.