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Agenda Item 3 - Priorities for International Support to Agricultural Research. Paragraphs 2-46.

Members felt that the new TAC exercise on priorities had been very valuable and congratulated TAC on the quality of its report. On priorities in general, the Group concurred with TAC's view that first priority should be given to the programs of the existing centers, but this should not preclude running down or phasing out particular activities. There was a clear sense of the need to impose limits on the growth of existing centers, particularly those which could be regarded as having reached maturity. It was felt that priorities for new initiatives by the CGIAR in the field of factor-oriented research, plant nutrition research in particular, required further assessment by TAC. In this connection, TAC had already indicated that it gave high priority to research on soil and water management and on plant pests and diseases. It was the sense of the Group that the whole field of plant nutrients deserved thorough consideration and TAC was asked to study the priority and report its recommendations. Among the commodities, certain speakers felt agro-forestry, fisheries, coconut, oil seeds including cotton, and animals had not been given their due weight by TAC. A theme of the discussion was that the CGIAR system should be viewed as complementary to, and in support of, national research. Thus emphasis was laid on the importance of manpower development and training, and it was said that the Group should be continually open to considering alternative methods of achieving its aims, as for example, through transferring programs whenever possible to the national institutions, as well as through contracting work out. It was recognized that the problems the Group tried to address were still vast and would remain so and the CGIAR system could be expected to remain in existence for a long time to come. Many speakers felt that there was still so much to do that the activities of the Group should continue to expand, but there was, at the same, repeated emphasis on the need for frugality in a financially constrained situation. It seemed to be generally agreed that the Group did not aim to have a system which catered to every research need; rather it aimed to concentrate on a selection of high priority activities susceptible to an international approach. The success of the Group so far led most speakers to take a somewhat cautious view of abrupt change, but there was evident readiness to examine the traditional activities with a view to pruning or adding where justified. Centers themselves should prepare detailed, long-term plans for the Group's consideration. Subject to the observations summarized above, TAC's views on priorities were generally accepted as guidelines for the Group.

Agenda Item 4 - Proposals for Additions to the CGIAR Network.

A. International Vegetable Research Institute for the Tropics (IVRIT). Paragraphs 47-54.

From the beginning TAC had recognized the importance of research on tropical vegetables and after several studies and a subcommittee on the
subject had brought before the Group a specific proposal for the establishment of IVRIT. The discussion considered the species of vegetables that should be properly included, the need to see the cultivations of vegetables as part of the small farmer's whole production system, and also the role of the proposed new institute vis-à-vis that of existing institutions such as AVRDC and SEARCA. These aspects should be further elaborated by TAC before a definite decision could be taken on the merits of the proposal. There were significant questions and reservations sufficiently substantial to suggest that they be further addressed by TAC. Therefore, TAC was asked to refine its consideration of vegetable research and to report further to the Group, if possible, at its meeting in November 1979.


The Group considered TAC's report and recommendations that IFPRI be accepted for full membership in the CGIAR system, with some qualifications regarding its mandate, the location of its headquarters, and the nature of its program. IFPRI's three current sponsors strongly supported the application and one of them stated it would continue to provide financial support to it on the same scale as heretofore and in addition to its contribution to the other centers in the system. The other two members promised continued short-term support and expressed intentions to consider longer-term support if possible, but were, for legislative or constitutional reasons unable to make long-term forward commitments. IFPRI would remain small and for the foreseeable future the total budget should be of the order of $2.5 million in 1979 terms. At least one potential donor to IFPRI noted that its attitude would depend to some extent on the maintenance of support by IFPRI's current donors. There was strong but not unanimous support for the adoption of IFPRI. TAC had recommended that IFPRI should move to a developing country. Several members emphasized the importance of IFPRI's being located where the data it needed were readily available. Some also raised questions about the extra cost of operating in a less central location. The consensus was that if funds were available, IFPRI should be brought into the system. The modalities were left to be worked out; they were not thought so difficult as to warrant the establishment of a special committee to handle them. Questions that had been raised could be answered in the course of the regular program and budget review process, with the exception of the location of IFPRI's headquarters. IFPRI would be asked to prepare in time for the November CC meeting a study of location, including an analysis of the costs of moving as against staying in Washington. IFPRI's adoption, in principle, by the Group was subsequently confirmed after discussion of the financial outlook under Agenda Item 5.

C. International Fertilizer Development Center (IFDC). Paragraphs 72-81.

Members considered TAC's recommendation which emphasized the quality and value of IFDC's work and expressed the hope that further support for it would be forthcoming outside the CGIAR arrangements, but did not recommend adoption of IFDC as a member of the Group. The United States' representative stated that his agency expected to continue to support IFDC at the current level, whether or not it joined the CGIAR. He proposed that consideration of acceptance of IFDC be postponed and be reconsidered after thorough examination of the role of factor-oriented research and of plant nutrition. Although many speakers emphasized the importance of fertilizers and of research on optimizing their use, there was general agreement on the proposal to postpone a decision on IFDC.
Agenda Item 5 - Financial Outlook for 1980 and Beyond. Paragraphs 82-100.

It was explained that while in May it was too early to have precise information on net requirements of the centers or donors' likely contributions for the following year, the Secretariat's estimates showed there was certain in 1980 to be a significant gap between the two. Moreover, the trends were that the rate of annual increase in donors' contributions had decreased in recent years to about 15% with no diminution in the growth of requirements. Growth in the programs of existing centers plus price increases regularly would fully absorb this increase in resources, leaving no funds for new activities unless either the growth of existing centers were constrained or the Group increased the rate of expanding contributions.

Speakers from virtually all members of the Group addressed this issue in its various aspects. It was recognized that there was a distinction to be made between the more mature centers and those which were still growing to reach their expected full development. While speakers generally expressed their strong and continuing support for the activities of the CGIAR, many felt obliged to express caution about the prospects of returning to the high rates of annual increase in contributions achieved in earlier years. The general view was that the Group should aim for a reasonable annual increase within which increases in costs due to inflation, growth of the less mature centers and new initiatives would all have to be accommodated. It was recognized that this could only be achieved if the growth of the existing centers was constrained, particularly in years like 1980 when there would be a large gap between resources and claims.

The point was made that regardless of the availability of funds, the mature centers were already big enough to carry out their mandates and big enough to stretch the talents of their managers; they should not grow further, and as their priorities changed, their programs should change and evolve without increasing the scale of staff and real resources.

Some donors confirmed their intentions to increase their contributions in 1980 (though a major European donor said this would be conditional on increases by other major donors), but a number said that in present economic and political conditions significant increase would be difficult, or in the case of one large contributor, impossible. It was recognized that while a few new donors might join the Group, the additional resources would not be large.

The consensus therefore was that the Group should adopt a policy of no real growth in the programs of the existing established centers and in those of the developing centers once they reached maturity. So that centers, to the greatest degree practicable, could establish their own priorities to live within this policy, they were urged to draw up long-term plans. At the same time it was recognized that to get a better balance in the Group's activities as a whole, TAC should pursue the question of shifts in priorities among centers.

To implement this policy for 1980 and 1981, the two Secretariats and TAC were instructed to consider how the gap between claims and likely resources could be closed and, at the time of TAC's joint meeting with the Center Directors in Hyderabad, the Secretariats should work out with the centers the program and budget adjustments necessary to achieve balance.
The question of whether a committee of the Group would be needed to participate in this process was discussed. It was agreed that it would be left up to the Chairman of the Group to judge whether to invoke the authority already given to him (at the time of approving the recommendations of the Review Committee) to establish a Standby Committee for this purpose. If the discussions with the Center Directors in July failed to achieve the necessary budget adjustments, the Standby Committee would meet in September to prepare recommendations for the Group.

Agenda Item 6 - Concept of a CGIAR Program Committee. Paragraph 101.

The Group had before it a paper from the Secretariat on this subject and the need for a committee of some kind had frequently come up during discussion of previous agenda items. The Chairman had noted support for the proposal that, if necessary, he exercise his authority to convene an ad hoc Standby Committee of the kind recommended by the CGIAR Review Committee and as envisaged in the Secretariat's paper. Either of two circumstances might make the Committee necessary. One would be if it seemed that TAC and the Secretariat were not succeeding in achieving a reasonable balance between resources and needs for next year and therefore more drastic action were needed. Or secondly, if it turned out that the long-term implications of this principle of no real growth in mature centers raised issues that needed two-stage evaluation, but the Chairman thought it more likely that evaluation and fine-tuning of the Group's policy would take place over time and was not susceptible to being done between May and the October meeting of the CGIAR.

Agenda Item 7 - Quinquennial Review of ICRISAT. Paragraphs 102-115.

The Chairman of the quinquennial panel, Dr. Lloyd Evans, highlighted some of the conclusions reached by the review. These were mostly highly positive and stressed the many achievements that ICRISAT had already made, the quality and relevance of its programs and the ability and dedication of its staff. Of the panel's many recommendations, the vast majority had been accepted by ICRISAT's Board and management though differences of view still remained on some major recommendations. Such differences of view included the panel's reservations on ICRISAT's proposed model for its West African work and for the indefinite continuation of present work on pigeon pea. If pigeon pea work could be transferred to the Indian national program in due course, this would reflect well both on ICRISAT and the Indian program and would be a promising portent of the future. ICRISAT's Board confirmed the quality and value of the quinquennial report and the benefits they had gained from it. This had been one of the first reviews done according to revised terms of reference, and there was a sense among donors that it served their needs better than previous reviews. It had not avoided criticisms where they were felt to be justified. ICRISAT's Director noted that a long-term plan would shortly be available for all ICRISAT activities, but he did not foresee any major expansion beyond the presently planned activities.

Agenda Item 8 - Quinquennial Review of WARDA. Paragraphs 116-121.

The Chairman of the panel, Dr. Hussein Idris, introduced the report. He pointed out that the CGIAR had been supporting the coordinated trials, and the panel recommended CGIAR involvement to a limited extent with
special projects. The panel concluded that WARDA should develop a long-term plan to be presented to its donors, so that WARDA's financing could have a more secure basis. TAC had reviewed the report and agreed with the panel's recommendations.


Items under this heading had been covered during discussion of other agenda items.

Agenda Item 10 - Other Business


The Chairman of the ISNAR Committee, Mr. Mathieson, reported on progress made since the last CGIAR meeting. The Committee had met in February in Geneva and again two days earlier on May 2 in Paris. An Executing Agency (the German Agency for Technical Cooperation, GTZ) had been appointed. The Committee had decided that the most appropriate location for ISNAR's headquarters would be in the Netherlands and informal discussions with the Dutch government had started. A draft Charter had been prepared following closely the guidelines in the Task Force Report. During the May meeting the nucleus of a Board of Trustees had been selected by vote. It had been decided that the size of the first Board should be 15 members of whom two would be ex officio, a representative appointed by the host country and the Director of ISNAR. FAO had made it clear that while they wished to be represented at meetings of the ISNAR Board, they did not wish to occupy a reserved seat on the Board. The Chairman of the group of Center Directors would participate as an observer in Board meetings and the Director of ISNAR would be a member of the Directors' group. In addition to the names listed in paragraph 123, five alternates were also selected to fill positions, should any of the chosen 10 be unable to serve. There would be an informal meeting of the ISNAR Board on September 27 and 28. The ISNAR Committee would meet again immediately before Centers Week in Washington on October 26.

Agenda Item 11 - Time and Place of Next Meeting. Paragraphs 124-125.

International Centers Week will be held in Washington starting on Monday, October 29, and continuing through the Consultative Group meeting which will end on the afternoon of Friday, November 2.
1. The Chairman, Mr. Warren C. Baum, welcomed members to the 16th meeting of the CGIAR. After some discussion of the most appropriate order for items on the Agenda, it was adopted without change.

Item 3 - Priorities for International Support to Agricultural Research

2. The Chairman of TAC, Dr. Ralph Cummings, reminded members that the paper before them was the third on the subject of priorities. The 1976 Review of the CGIAR system had recommended a period of consolidation during which new initiatives would not be encouraged. However, TAC was free to consider new activities for support. He referred to the considerable input which had gone into the preparation of the paper, including previous reports of TAC and of the Consultative Group, reports of working groups, of Quinquennial Review panels, a background paper by IFPRI, and technical reports from the international centers, from FAO and from other organizations. He felt that members recognized that the role of the institutes was changing and the system sought a strengthening of national programs and better application of the results of international research through national programs. Hence, the new international service for national agricultural research was being established, even during the period of consolidation. He hoped that members would agree with TAC's recommendation that for the time being the twelve activities already accepted by the Group would get the first claim on Group resources. However, not all parts of the current activities would necessarily have the same priority and it would be necessary to continue to reassess the need for continuing some parts of these programs.

3. TAC had given increasing attention to improving the income and standard of living of the poorest sectors of society in developing countries. Although TAC had previously given most emphasis to commodities, they also considered factors of production and the steps needed to create the economic, social and institutional framework for the application of improved technology and their transfer to the farmers' fields.

4. Cereals clearly had to be given a very high priority, since they provided such a high proportion of the calorie and protein requirements of the basic diets of the people in developing countries. The highest priority should be given to rice, wheat, maize, sorghum and millet. Among the roots and tubers, cassava and potatoes would rate the first priority and the sweet potato and yams the second. While most important in some countries, pulses varied in importance from one part of the world to another. TAC felt that vegetables deserved a very high priority and noted considerable deficiencies
in research on tropical vegetables. Oil seeds, too, were important and TAC rated groundnuts and soya beans most highly. Also high on the list was aquaculture, particularly research on plankton herbiverous and omnivorous species.

5. During the ensuing discussion, many members expressed their appreciation of what they regarded as a most useful and well prepared document.

6. A speaker, commending TAC's treatment of commodities, felt that the paper's discussion of factor-oriented research was somewhat less satisfactory. He regretted the implication that the CGIAR was seen by some as taking on everything that needed international agricultural research. The Group could not undertake to support everything and so its special role needed further definition.

7. Dr. Cummings noted that this new version of the priority paper gave a more comprehensive assessment of requirements for factor-oriented research than earlier versions of the paper. He recognized, however, that the Group's traditional concentration on commodities had left something of a gap.

8. Another speaker regretted lack of reference to the day when the CGIAR or some of the activities it supported might be wound up as having achieved their purpose. Future papers might address the question of how existing programs within the international centers could best be transferred to national programs. He noted that the CC system competed to some extent with national programs for funds and for skilled manpower, and the lack of competent qualified scientists was becoming a serious constraint.

9. Dr. Cummings pointed out that centers were increasingly providing material to those national programs that had the capacity to make use of it. He too regretted the competition for competent manpower, but noted that there were pressures in both directions. People in developing countries sought opportunities to enlarge their horizons beyond their own countries and there were obvious financial incentives.

10. A speaker pointed out that the population of the world would rise to six billion in twenty years' time and would create an enormous increase in the requirement for food. He doubted therefore whether the CGIAR system could go out of business very soon. Also, countries varied enormously in their research capacity. He hoped that TAC would follow up on its own observation that inadequate resources were being given to manpower and training. He noted that the paper recommended continued concentration on food which itself ruled out a large number of things which might otherwise interest the Group.

11. A speaker drew attention to the fact there were many possibilities for future additions to the CGIAR system. He hoped that when examining priorities this could be done at least in part by reference to the needs identified by the developing countries themselves. Choices should be made on the basis of the economic realities of food production in the developing countries and should also embrace social and cultural considerations.
12. A speaker stressed the importance of sorghum and millet, particularly in marginal areas on the fringes of deserts. Relatively little work had been done on these crops in the developed countries, and he felt that research activity on them should be strengthened. He saw ISNAR as having a particularly important role within the system.

13. The representative of an agency heavily involved in agricultural development projects reported that his analysis showed that fertilizer and water were the two most important factors contributing to the increases in yield in recent years, and they both deserved high priority. He felt that securing adequate nutrition for the poorest income groups would be one of the major issues continuing to confront members of the Group. He endorsed the proposal to do more work on vegetables, but he felt that work on coconuts should be given a higher priority than suggested in the paper.

14. The representative of a developing country re-emphasized the importance of training. His own country, which was relatively well off for trained manpower compared to others, had researched its needs for scientific manpower and concluded that the numbers needed to be multiplied by five over the next six years.

15. A speaker who noted that there had been much talk about the need to limit demands in view of slackening growth in resources and that the Group's consolidation period was not coming to an end, felt that not enough thought had been given to the possibility of expanding the resource base of the CGIAR. There should be an effort to bring in more donors, perhaps among the developing countries themselves.

16. Another speaker felt there should be a wider consideration of the needs of the target groups, among which he listed stability, family well-being and security. He felt that this led to attaching more importance to socio-economic research. The centers were already doing such research, but he did not find much reference to it in the TAC paper.

17. Another speaker, noting the importance that TAC had attached to aquaculture, pointed out that in his view fisheries had a much larger potential and should have been included among the first priority items. For example, small and medium-scale fishermen depended on traditional skills and their productivity could be increased by better technology. Secondly, post-harvest technology should be developed for fish, much of which was at present being wasted.

18. A speaker pointed out that some of the parts of the CGIAR system had been inherited from the past and the system itself did not necessarily conform to a consistent framework of priorities. Despite resource constraints, he was pleased that TAC had been careful to envisage new developments, specifically factor-oriented research in the broad sense.

19. A number of speakers felt that there should be increased involvement of the developing countries in the running of the CGIAR system. They emphasised the need to transfer responsibilities for certain aspects of research to national systems. One speaker felt that this should have been a starting point for consideration by TAC of the future development of the system.
20. Noting that the developing countries were not alone in benefiting from the work of the international system, a speaker felt that it was now time to consider the future nature and structure of a global system embracing all existing institutions regardless of their specific nature. He felt that the ten-year anniversary of the system would be an appropriate time for a look at the future. Turning to specifics he felt that more emphasis should have been given to nutrition and living standards, and as for commodities, to food legumes and to oil seed crops including cotton. He also felt that the role of animals in the total agricultural system had not received enough emphasis nor had some aspects of factor-oriented research.

21. A speaker, agreeing with those who felt that more resources should be provided for international agricultural research, felt it was up to the donors to find the means of doing so, perhaps by shifting funds within donor agencies in the direction of international agricultural research.

22. A speaker felt that the TAC paper should have a wide readership. He urged that Boards of Trustees should study it carefully and use it for guidelines when allocating the resources of their center. As to the substance of the paper, he felt that agro-forestry had not been given the priority he thought it deserved.

23. A number of speakers noted that the question of priorities had to be seen in relation to the financial outlook. Several also felt that the Group should be open to the possibility of discontinuing, pruning or phasing out certain activities which were currently being supported, partly in order to make resources available for new activities which might have a higher priority.

24. A speaker pointed out that the Group might wish to become involved in a number of crops which required rather small research programs. These he felt could well be contracted out if there were a suitable mechanism for funding. As a model of this kind of arrangement, he mentioned the Tropical Diseases Research Program of W.H.O. As for factor-oriented research, he felt that one possible alternative was to introduce it into existing centers rather than creating new ones.

25. Implicit in much of the discussion was the feeling that more thought should be given to alternative means of achieving the CGIAR's objectives than the structure which had existed so far.

26. Dr. Cummings agreed with this view but pointed out that the approach adopted through the international centers had been highly productive and was in fact extendable into other areas. It was worthy of strong support. However, TAC would continue to seek better approaches where appropriate.

27. The representative of a major donor reaffirmed that his agency took an optimistic view of the future of the CGIAR and locked to expansion and growth. Many people from outside the system had commented favorably on the relative efficiency of the CG system in terms of allocating resources to agricultural development, and the Group was one of the more remarkable organizational arrangements for an international effort on the problems of development. He too supported the proposal that LDCs become more involved in the management of the CGIAR. He added his voice to those of previous speakers
who had stressed the importance of agro-forestry and aquaculture and fisheries. While he agreed with the basic criteria in the priorities paper, he could not agree with the assignment of only second priority to research on fertilizers in the plant nutrition category. He felt that the paper's own priorities would suggest that work on fertilizer should rate very high. Much needed to be done to improve the efficiency of nutrients and he noted one expert opinion that between 50 and 75% of nitrogen applied to rice paddies was lost and not absorbed by the plant. This represented very expensive waste for the farmer. It seemed that the potential for making a significant breakthrough in production through improved efficiency of fertilizer use could be very great. As for equity considerations, systems could be developed to make fertilizer available to the smallest of the small farmers. He urged the Group to accord higher priority to fertilizer, not only with reference to the impending application of IFDC to become a member of the Group, but also in the context of the work of the existing centers.

28. Another speaker urged that TAC should prepare a further report on the subject of plant nutrients generally. Such a report should distinguish between technical questions and the institutional questions such as the application of IFDC. Plant nutrients did not only comprise chemical fertilizers, but also organic fertilizer, compost, animal and human waste, and biological fixation of nitrogen. He felt that a thorough examination of the whole plant nutrient question would lead the Group to pay much more attention to it.

29. Another speaker, noting that a lot of research was done outside the CGIAR system which was nevertheless relevant to the work of the centers, felt it important to ensure that the activities the Group financed were complementary to those they did not. Some of the research areas identified as gaps by TAC were in fact the subject of internationally funded research outside of the CGIAR. As examples, he mentioned labor intensive technology, post-harvest research and pest control, and noted that expertise was already available outside the CGIAR which could be tapped on a contract basis. He felt that the recognition of the importance of key production factors in agricultural development and food production did not necessarily imply that research on these factors was equally important nor that such research should be carried out at an international level, and in particular supported by the CGIAR.

30. The Chairman summarized the discussion so far which had been primarily confined to the first four chapters of the priorities paper, which dealt with the overall priorities for international support to agricultural research in LDCs. TAC could take great encouragement from the very favorable response which the paper had received. Preparing it had been a very difficult task and TAC had succeeded excellently and had served the Group well. It would also be valuable to others outside the Group. He noted an interest in a longer time frame than that provided by the paper. This might perhaps be achieved by the next review committee exercise if the Group decided to undertake one. Initial suggestions that perhaps the Group might work itself out of business had, during discussion, been modified to support the examination of individual programs to ensure that they were still relevant and necessary, with the possibility that some at least might be phased out. Major efforts should be made to transfer programs as rapidly as possible to national systems and international research should be clearly seen as complementary to and supportive of national programs and in no way competitive with them. Even so the
Group would stay in business and would indeed expand for some time to come, given the nature of the problems it addressed. The complementary relationship implied that the international centers should avoid hiring away the best staff from the national programs, and also that training should be a key element in the programs of the centers and particularly in the program of ISNAR. He detected general agreement that social and economic issues and the role of the small farmer deserved more attention in future. There was a strong feeling of the need to involve developing countries more closely in the work of the Group, and he noted with satisfaction the contribution that their representatives were making to the present meeting. If the Group was successful in attracting developing countries in as donor members, this would ensure a permanent place for them in the Group's deliberations. He felt that the discussion so far should not be seen as calling for modification to the TAC paper but rather could serve as a supplement or addition to it. The study of priorities was continually evolving and the record of the meeting would serve as an expression of the Group's current views rather than a blueprint for a major revision of the TAC paper.

31. Members of the Group then turned to consideration of Chapter V of the TAC paper which addressed the question of priorities for allocation of the Consultative Group's resources.

32. Dr. Cummings said that TAC had looked first at the requirements of the centers already supported, recognizing that there may be need for some internal adjustment within and among these centers. TAC had then gone on to examine some 18 or 20 different proposals for possible new initiatives. Five areas of relatively high priority had been identified. These were tropical vegetable research, water management research, pest and disease management, physiology and ecology, food policy research, and aquaculture. TAC was not attempting to bring forward at the moment proposals on all of these, but it did have what it regarded as a sound and workable proposal for research on tropical vegetables.

33. The Chairman, in inviting discussion of Chapter V of the TAC paper, suggested that members address two main themes: the first was the top priority given to the existing activities of the system, but with two possible qualifications -- one, consideration of limits to the growth of existing centers and second, a shift in priorities of the centers or elimination of some activities. The second was the order in which gaps in the system might be filled. He noted the feeling in the earlier discussion that factor-oriented research had not been given the full consideration that it deserved, and that members had asked for papers on plant nutrients, water management, and plant pests and diseases.

34. A speaker expressed the hope that the Center Directors and representatives of developing countries could be closely involved in the current subject for discussion. He felt that the discussion should not be confined to the centers within the system but should look at the whole agricultural research picture in broad perspective. He supported those who hoped to see more contracting out and his own agency was already helping to support a large number of scientists in developing countries through this means. His agency had prepared a document on the average salary in every country in which it was supporting projects and this could be made available to members if they wished. The cost of a scientist in a developing country was about
one-quarter of that of an equivalent scientist at an international center. He hoped that TAC could suggest ways in which economies could be effected through subcontracting.

35. Another speaker, agreeing that a continuation or strengthening of existing programs should come before consideration of new initiatives, noted that there should be conditions on limiting growth and identifying the point at which a center could be considered mature. There was still the need to readjust priorities and specific programs in each existing center and he noted cases where serious consideration should be given to transferring programs to national systems or to advanced institutions.

36. A speaker took issue with the conclusion that livestock was being oversupported. In fact, nothing was being done about livestock in Asia, which had the largest numbers. He hoped TAC would re-examine the livestock question.

37. There was a request from the floor that TAC make a study as soon as possible on the potential of fisheries in developing countries.

38. Another speaker stressed the importance of placing limits on the existing centers which had reached some degree of maturity. He saw this as a most significant outcome from TAC's deliberations. TAC had also recommended that various centers submit forward plans for the next four or five years. He strongly endorsed both proposals. Like a number of other speakers, he did not think it correct that everything the existing centers were currently doing should necessarily have the first claim on resources. Elements of the existing programs should be carefully examined and might turn out to be of lower priority than activities not currently supported by the CGIAR.

39. A speaker mentioned that TAC's consideration of priorities was limited by two circumstances. One was that there was an existing system already in place and the other was a limitation on available resources. He too emphasized that it was important to distinguish between looking at the CGIAR system and the complete system of international agricultural research as a whole. Through pragmatic selection, the present range of research covered by the CGIAR system, though far from complete, fitted the major needs of the developing countries. If the Group were to seek to attain the ideal of a complete and perfect system of research, it had a long way to go. He favored a middle course.

40. Another speaker warned against seeing research programs only in financial terms. It was important to take account of the quality of individual research programs. The Group had a responsibility to avoid insecurity and to maintain the long-term stability of the system. At the same time other initiatives should be considered and one should also examine alternative ways of doing the research that was at present being done within the system.

41. Summarizing the discussions up to this point, the Chairman felt there was a measure of agreement on the following elements. First, that existing programs should have in principle a higher priority than new
activities, but that two important qualifications were: one, an expression of concern at the rate at which existing programs even of well established centers were expanding, apparently indefinitely, which created a desire on the part of the Group to see limits placed on the growth of existing activities. This suggested that the centers should be instructed through the Secretariat to put the recommendations already before them into effect and prepare long-term plans to form the basis for an initial decision on their part. Such long-term plans would begin by defining their objectives and the limits to their growth. The Group would look for a decision on how to apply such limits to the existing centers. Furthermore, it seemed generally agreed that there were clearly activities within the existing centers which were less important than others and there seemed to be a case for phasing some down and for putting smaller resources into others. It had been emphasized that no program had so far been identified which should be completely eliminated and that it seemed an unwise step to take. TAC should be encouraged to open a dialogue with those centers where there seemed to be a case for some reductions so that resources could be invested in other activities or other centers.

42. It was recognized that the CGIAR did not constitute an ideal, perfect or complete system, although it had come a very long way from the initial acquisition of four ongoing activities which had outstripped the resources available from their then sponsors. Since resources were limited, consideration for adoption of new activities would have to be limited to the first of TAC's priorities. TAC had listed five, but discussion at the current meeting had added a sixth, plant nutrients, which together with water management, plant pests and diseases, were factor-oriented and these three would need more study before they are brought before the Group for decisions on priorities. In at least two of these fields, proposals were being developed and TAC might be asked to put them in larger framework so as to develop specific recommendations. As for plant nutrients, he felt the Group had reached the conclusion that it did not yet have adequate information to determine the priority of fertilizers in general or of IFDC in particular.

43. In connection with the priority recommended by TAC for research on plant pests and diseases, he drew the attention of the Group to the fact that ICIPE had formally applied for admission to the CGIAR system. A letter from the Acting Chairman of ICIPE had been received recently in full awareness that the current meeting would not be able to consider ICIPE specifically, but it should be regarded as a formal applicant for membership. As with plant nutrients, he felt the Group had a need for better understanding of the overall role of plant, pest and disease physiology and ecology before being able to reach any judgments on priorities in that field of research.

44. In response to a question, Dr. Cummings said that TAC had a paper on aquaculture but not fisheries on its agenda for consideration at its next meeting in July. It was premature to speculate on what recommendations TAC might make in this general field.

45. A speaker emphasized that fisheries would involve very different types of research and technology from that in which the CGIAR had been involved up to now. He made reference to the Fisheries Department of FAO, whose work in his view made it unnecessary for the CGIAR to accord fisheries a high priority. Fish culture on the other hand was a totally different activity and he noted that the People's Republic of China had valuable technologies to offer.
46. Dr. Cummings sketched the steps that would be taken to follow up on the priorities exercise. The priorities paper had been circulated for comment to the Center Directors. At the summer meeting of TAC in July in Hyderabad, there would be meetings with Center Directors at which programs and budgets would be discussed individually. The priorities paper would also be discussed in a joint session of TAC and the Center Directors. Each center was also being asked to provide a forward planning paper.

Item 4 - Proposals for Additions to the CGIAR Network

A. International Vegetable Research Institute for the Tropics (IVRIT)

47. Dr. Cummings stressed that from the very beginning of TAC in 1971, the importance of improving vegetable production particularly for the tropical zones of Asia and the Far East had been seen as an important research gap. It had originally been hoped that AVRDC would be able to fill this gap. However, despite the high quality of its programs, circumstances had made it impossible for it to receive CGIAR support. TAC had sponsored two field missions to examine vegetables, and two years ago it set up an ad hoc committee of its own membership which had now produced specific recommendations. It was proposed that a small international center be created at a low altitude tropical site in the Asian region with an international staff of about 16 senior scientists. It was felt that technology of vegetable production would be highly transferable within tropical regions. Earlier proposals which had been considered were for pilot projects in several areas but TAC felt this might lead to a proliferation of institutes beyond the capacity of the Group to support. A certain minimum research capacity was needed at headquarters in order to form the basis of a training program. In developing this proposal TAC had put high emphasis on developing a cooperative network with institutes in nations other than the host country. TAC was unanimous in giving high priority to vegetables and had a strong majority in favor of the specific proposal that was currently before the Group.

48. The Chairman noted that the discussion on the vegetable proposals and the other proposed additions to the system were provisional prior to the review of the financial situation.

49. A speaker pointed to the very large number of different species of vegetables and to the difficulty in making choices. He felt that resources should be concentrated on, say, five or six, rather than the 15 species proposed by TAC. Only two of the 15 priority species identified by TAC were being researched at AVRDC. AVRDC had achieved much, but because of its location and political considerations, had not been able to perform all the tasks expected of an international center, including training and outreach. It was important to see how the current efforts of AVRDC on tomato and Chinese cabbage could be incorporated into the program of IVRIT. IVRIT could take responsibility for all international vegetable research and contract with AVRDC for research on tomato and Chinese cabbage. Alternatively, tomato and Chinese cabbage could be left to AVRDC. His agency's concern was to make best use of resources that were already available albeit in a difficult situation. He confirmed that in his view an increased international effort on vegetable research was both necessary and timely. Recognizing that resources were scarce, he hoped and expected that the resources needed for IVRIT would be found. This view was strongly supported by the representative of one of the Co-sponsors.
50. A speaker emphasized that particularly among low-income producers and consumers, vegetables were not produced in mono-culture, but commonly in gardens containing sometimes dozens of species as well as small livestock. Any new vegetable center, therefore, should be very much concerned with small-scale farming systems.

51. A speaker felt that it was neither possible nor necessary to take a decision on the vegetable proposal at the current meeting. Much more further preparation was needed, particularly with regard to work being done in the People's Republic of China which TAC had not directly examined.

52. A speaker sought assurance that the CG funding for research on vegetables should be used to benefit first and foremost the local population, and perhaps the poorest groups among that population, rather than to benefit producers for export. A member of the TAC vegetable subcommittee noted that with the exception of tomatoes, which could be an export crop, the list of vegetables proposed were unlikely to be appealing to consumers in the developed countries.

53. A speaker, noting that further preparation was needed before the vegetable proposal could be seriously considered by the Group, pointed out that the Southeast Asian Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture (SEARCA) had anticipated this and had negotiated with AVRDC to set up a cooperative activity with AVRDC in the Philippines. This would take care of some of the gaps in AVRDC's activities which had been identified, such as training and outreach. Secondly, a very small office in the Philippines would develop a network of vegetable programs in Asia through developing national vegetable research programs.

54. In summing up, the Chairman admitted to some difficulty in detecting a clear consensus, but concluded that whereas most donors agreed on high priority for vegetable research, a significant number of them still had significant questions or reservations about the merits of the specific proposal. These reservations were not so minor as to be dealt with by deciding to establish the center and then disposing of them in the course of implementing the decision. They were more fundamental and therefore TAC should be asked to bring a more refined proposal back to the Group, presumably for the meeting in November 1979, if time permitted. He noted that any conclusion at this stage of the discussions could only be provisional pending review of the financial situation but he doubted whether that review would result in any more positive conclusion with regard to vegetables. He noted that the adoption of any new activity could well be at the expense of ongoing programs.

B. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

55. The Chairman drew the members' attention to the report of the TAC mission which had examined IFPRI, and to TAC's conclusions and recommendations. Members also had a copy of the response of IFPRI's Board of Trustees to the TAC recommendations. TAC recommended that the Group consider favorably the enlargement of the system to include IFPRI appropriately modified.

56. Dr. Cummings outlined the steps that TAC had taken in order to arrive at its recommendations. With limited qualifications with respect to the mandate, the location of IFPRI's headquarters, and the nature of its program, TAC was recommending inclusion of IFPRI within the CGIAR system.
57. A representative of one of IFPRI's three current sponsors reminded the Group of the Institute's history. It had been started as a result of a TAC initiative in 1974, though the Group at that time had preferred to defer accepting IFPRI as a member pending various outcomes of the World Food Conference. However, the three donors had decided to support the establishment of the Institute which now had over three years of experience and had produced research results. IFPRI's sponsors were very satisfied with the way in which it had developed and felt that it had successfully demonstrated the contribution it could make. It had an important role for the developing countries, for the international centers, and for the CGIAR system as a whole. While he noted that there had been much discussion of the possibility of accomplishing research objectives without setting up centers, in this case it seemed clear to him that there was no alternative to having an independent professional center of the IFPRI type. IFPRI fitted well with the activities going on elsewhere and had excellent working relationships with FAO and with organizations concerned with food and agriculture policy, both in developing and developed countries.

58. The three sponsors currently provided $1.5 million a year and had undertaken to do so through 1980, when their five-year commitment would end. IFPRI's budget was currently about $2 million and the other income around $200,000, so IFPRI was coping with this small gap by holding back its research program and recruitment. The budget for 1980 ought to be $2.5 million, which would carry IFPRI to its full staffing of 25 senior professionals. The Board and the Director were agreed that IFPRI should reach that level and stay there. There was no intention of further expansion. Hence, the $2.5 million budget for 1980 would grow only with inflation and possibly other unavoidable changes in price structure. In other words, limits to IFPRI's growth had already been established. Though he could not speak for organizations other than his own, it was clear to him that the three donors expected to continue to be interested in and to support IFPRI. The Ford Foundation would expect to continue the level of support provided up to now. He estimated that the additional financial requirements to be provided by the other members of the Group would be something less than $1 million in 1980, growing modestly thereafter but for the next several years should not exceed around $2.5 million. He stressed on behalf of IFPRI's three donors that they strongly recommended the membership of IFPRI and believed its work was particularly important if biologically-based research were to be effectively used in the interests of the developing countries and particularly their poorest inhabitants through supporting the evolution of agricultural and food policy competence in the developing countries. He emphasized that, as far as the Ford Foundation was concerned, their contribution to IFPRI would be in addition to their planned contributions to the other CGIAR activities.

59. The other two donors to IFPRI confirmed their support of the Institute and agreement with the previous speaker, though for legislative or constitutional reasons they were unable at the meeting to give firm indications as to the level of their financial support for the future, or to say whether any such support would be wholly additional to their contributions to the CGIAR for other purposes.

60. The representative of a major European donor stressed that his government appreciated the quality of IFPRI's work and felt that it would
be a logical addition to the CGIAR system. However, his government looked for some kind of assurance that the three present donors would continue their support for IFPRI, at least at the present level in real terms. He felt that this assurance had been given, at least in the case of two donors and, if correct, this would be satisfactory. He appreciated the difficulty of making formal assurances at the present time.

61. The representative of a developing country, in strongly endorsing IFPRI's application, noted the following points: first, TAC had made a thorough study and recommended favorable action. Secondly, the present donors had indicated their willingness to continue their support. Thirdly, IFPRI was seen in Asia as a vital missing link in the activities supported by the CGIAR. IFPRI's recommendations would carry much greater weight if it was seen as a genuinely international organization and part of the international community. He noted that half the members of IFPRI's Board came from developing countries, as did 16 of its 21 professional staff members. The research studies completed by IFPRI so far had served the Third World very well and in Asia at least these studies had provided useful guidelines for agricultural development policies. IFPRI could be extremely helpful to the CGIAR itself in coping with some of the difficult choices that lay ahead.

62. A speaker, adding his endorsement of IFPRI's application, had some reservations about the recommendation that IFPRI should move from Washington. He did not feel that there were any grounds for the fear that IFPRI's present location should make it appear to be dominated by the World Bank or other institutions located there. He suggested that if IFPRI should move from Washington, it should not necessarily be prohibited from moving to another developed country.

63. A speaker drew attention to what seemed to him to be some internal contradictions in the TAC paper on the question of the degree to which IFPRI should provide research services to others as distinct from concentrating on a program of its own. He felt that further clarification of IFPRI's precise role and mandate would be desirable. Another speaker felt that part of the answer to such questions lay in the distinction between IFPRI's core activities and those other tasks which were taken on as special projects in response to specific requests.

64. Another speaker noted that TAC itself had drawn attention to this potential conflict. IFPRI's Board had agreed with TAC that the Institute, in cooperating with other organizations, should be careful to preserve its character as an independent organization and avoid over-commitment to servicing others.

65. In answer to a question, the Chairman stated that if the Group decided favorably on IFPRI's application, it would not be necessary to take any further action to examine it. IFPRI's program would be subjected to the same annual review process as the other international centers and any questions arising could be raised as part of that process. In the case of an organization that already existed, such as this, it would not be necessary to set up a committee of the Group to implement the decision to add it to the CGIAR system.
66. A speaker urged that if IFPRI were adopted by the CGIAR, three members of its Board should be designated by the CGIAR under arrangements to be worked out, a view which was supported by another speaker who felt that IFPRI's Board had already accepted this as an appropriate concept for the future. It was recognized that IFPRI's Board and Charter would probably have to be revised to reflect its international status as part of the CGIAR system.

67. On behalf of Africa, a speaker endorsed TAC's recommendation with the hope that this would not create an additional financial burden. He hoped that IFPRI, in cooperation with ISNAR, would find ways to help developing countries design proper socio-economic research programs, as well as correct national food policies. He urged IFPRI to strengthen links with FAO and with the World Bank. He hoped IFPRI would train people from developing countries in the techniques that it was using. He hoped that the recommendation that IFPRI be located in a developing country be given serious consideration.

68. The representative of the United States endorsed the application by IFPRI and stated his agency would be prepared to make a financial contribution starting in 1980, the amount of which had yet to be worked out. He urged that before any decision was made about changing the location of IFPRI, a study be made of the costs of doing so.

69. The Chairman reminded the Group that TAC recommended that IFPRI should, with all deliberate speed, move to a developing country and this recommendation had been accepted by IFPRI's Board if it should be the wish of the Group and provided that there was adequate time for an orderly transfer.

70. Another speaker warned that in spite of what had been said about the small size of IFPRI's staff, he feared there would be inevitable pressures for IFPRI's expansion. He felt there should be informal agreement covering questions such as the scope of the program, any expected expansion and the financial implications thereof, and views on the future site of the headquarters.

71. The Chairman noted very strong but not unanimous support for the inclusion of IFPRI into the system, pending further review and confirmation after discussion of the financial situation. He felt that other questions which had been raised could be answered in the course of the regular program and budget review process, with the exception of the location issue. He felt that this could best be tackled by asking IFPRI to prepare a study in some detail of the location question, including cost of any such transfer and to put it before the Group at its November meeting.

C. International Fertilizer Development Center (IFDC)

72. The Chairman reminded members that at the last meeting of the CGIAR, the United States had asked the Group to consider the adoption of IFDC into the system. TAC had examined the question and concluded that this would not be appropriate, although the value of IFDC's work was recognized and individual CGIAR members, in addition to the U.S., were urged to support it outside of the CGIAR arrangements. TAC's conclusions were based on their judgment of priorities for the CGIAR as distinct from priorities generally.
73. Dr. Cummings noted that TAC had been asked to address the rationale and justification for including factor-oriented research within the CGIAR system. They were also being asked to examine the whole question of plant nutrition, which might be the subject of a separate paper. TAC had followed the same procedure with IFDC as with IFPRI. A distinction was drawn between the merits of the Institute in its own right as against its priority for specific inclusion in the CGIAR system. It was necessary also to distinguish between the importance of fertilizers as an input and the importance of research on fertilizers. TAC had appreciated the high quality and the importance of IFDC's work, but felt that it fulfilled a function which was similar in principle to tropical agricultural research organizations established and financed by national governments without making any claim on the CGIAR. TAC felt that IFDC worked in a field in which the U.S. would be uniquely able to make a significant contribution. If IFDC were included in the CGIAR system for direct support, it would make it more difficult to deny support to a number of other organizations which, like IFDC, were established and funded by donor governments. Much of IFDC's assistance to individual developing countries might be provided on a reimbursable contract basis. A number of such arrangements were already in effect. TAC was aware that even a small improvement in the efficiency of fertilizer use could make a large contribution to improving returns on investment in agricultural production in developing countries. IFDC was already providing staff to help international centers or national governments in this area, but most of the responsibility for studies on crop responses to fertilizers and the comparative evaluation of alternative fertilizer products would lie with other organizations. IFDC's unique strength lay in chemical engineering and fertilizer process technology, and TAC certainly did not underrate the importance and value of this work. To obtain practical results from this work, IFDC had to work through industry and processes developed would have to be attractive for industrial applications before they could benefit the farmer.

74. Speaking for USAID, Mr. Babb reviewed the history of IFDC's development. The question of plant nutrient research had been raised a number of years ago in TAC. In addition to chemical fertilizer, the recycling of organic fertilizers and biological fixation and other issues connected with plant nutrition were reviewed, and TAC decided at that time to recommend approval only of work on chemical fertilizers, deferring the other subjects as being covered by FAO and others. IFDC was established against the background of a world fertilizer crisis, a situation which no longer prevailed. Nevertheless, fertilizers in agricultural development in the LDCs would remain a serious problem in the future. Fertilizers were likely to increase in price and the considerable potential benefits of increased fertilizer efficiency had already been noted. The United States, with the encouragement of TAC and of the CGIAR, financed the creation of IFDC at Muscle Shoals, with the understanding that it become an international center, though there was no assurance at that time that IFDC would become a member of the CGIAR. However, this was USAID's expectation, then as now. USAID was currently contributing $4 million a year to IFDC for the core budget and there were about $2 million worth of projected contributions from contracts provided by other donors.

75. He proposed that consideration of the acceptance by the CGIAR of IFDC be postponed and reconsidered after thorough examination of the plant nutrition issue and a thorough analysis of factor-oriented research. The United States expected to continue support for IFDC at $4 million per year
in 1979 dollars, whether or not it joined the CGIAR. The United States' support for the CGIAR was 25% of total CGIAR requirements; its continuing support for the IFDC would be in addition to this 25%. The U.S. did not expect to increase the level of its support for IFDC, but members of the Group should note that adoption of IFDC would not require major contributions from any of the others in the immediate future in order to maintain the level of excellent work currently done at IFDC. The IFDC question and the financial implications of it were only part of a broader consideration of whether the Group should be involved in the questions of plant nutrition and factor research. Some research of this kind did not fit easily with the traditional pattern of an international center, but research on chemical and industrial technology of chemical fertilizers did fit the pattern quite neatly. IFDC had established important working relationships with the other centers, and this would continue and expand. Bringing IFDC into the Group would enhance this. He had noted the suggestion that a stripe review be done of plant nutrition, including chemical fertilizers, biological nitrogen fixation, and organic fertilizers. This could also consider where IFDC could fit into the total picture. His own agency was keeping an open mind on this question, but would be responsive to any suggestion that a broad program of plant nutrition research should include IFDC as part of it.

76. A speaker emphasized that particularly in Asia, chemical fertilizers and water were the most important inputs that developing countries had to consider. He felt it incongruous to place very heavy emphasis on food crops on the one hand, but to give fertilizers a low priority on the other, since the two were so closely related. He noted that adoption of IFDC would be unlikely to create a heavy, new financial burden and such adoption would probably help IFDC in its search for additional funds to supplement those from the United States. He mentioned that the Philippines, not at that time a contributing member of the CGIAR, had been providing support directly to IFDC and the services provided had been very useful.

77. A speaker recalled two objections to IFDC's adoption. One was that it was in a developed country, and the other was some apprehension that its work would be of most benefit to the transnational fertilizer corporations. On the first point he wondered whether it would become a rule in the CGIAR that organizations located in developed countries should not be supported. He felt consideration of the second point should await a careful study of the whole plant nutrition question.

78. The Chairman emphasized that it was not a policy of the CGIAR only to support institutes located in developing countries, and he quoted the example of ISNAR which would be located in the Netherlands. Dr. Cummings said that TAC found no fault with the location of IFDC.

79. Mr. Mashler reminded members that UNDP has sponsored research on nitrogen fixation in four centers and this support was currently running at a level of about $8 million. He recognized that IFDC had continued to play an important role in this work despite its location. He too felt that serious consideration be given to the inclusion of IFDC in the CGIAR but that decision should be postponed pending further study.

80. A number of speakers emphasized the importance of fertilizers and one drew attention to their wide use of various small-scale farmers. However,
many speakers supported the proposal that the whole question of fertilizers and plant nutrient be studied further before the Group could reach any firm decision. A particular problem arose with the investment cost of fertilizer plants, but the plans for such investments had been already made for several years ahead. IFDC could make valuable contributions in the fields of efficiency of fertilizer use, and also on the exploitation of lower-grade phosphate.

81. Summarizing the discussion, the Chairman had found a small number of members in favor of admitting IFDC now at the present time, a larger but still small number in favor of accepting TAC's recommendation that IFDC's request be rejected, and a larger group which he felt made up a majority and expressed a consensus view that the Group should agree to the USAID proposal to postpone consideration of IFDC's application until the Group had considered new studies by TAC on factor-oriented research and the role of plant nutrient research. This view was quite consistent with TAC's recommendation that the Group encourage bilateral support on a continuing or expanding basis for the work of IFDC, which was clearly seen as having high value. Since this consensus view did not lead to additional financial commitments for the time being, it need not be subject to review after consideration of the financial situation.

Item 5 - Financial Outlook for 1980 and Beyond

82. The Chairman reminded members that the possibility of a shortfall in funding for the following year had frequently been raised in the past. As it had turned out, however, resources and claims had more or less been brought into line through a combination of over-estimating expenditures and the addition of new donors. He drew attention to the Secretariat paper on the financial outlook for 1980 and thereafter, and a memorandum which updated the figures on the basis of more recent information. The figures would continue to change. It looked as though the existing activities taken altogether would be short of some $10-12 million in 1980. Therefore, there seemed to be three basic alternatives: to defer adding new activities until funds became available, or to provide the additional funds needed to adopt one or more activities promptly, or to add new activities and cut back on some present ones. If the Group was confident that its priorities were right and its operations were efficient, it would naturally hope that the solution would come in the form of more real resources, some perhaps from new members but the larger part from present donors. He hoped members of the Group would provide guidance for the Secretariats and for TAC so that they could act in the best interests of the individual centers and of the system as a whole to solve the problem of shortfunding. However, it should be recognized that the autonomous bilateral relationship between each donor and each center placed a limit on what the Secretariats could achieve. He asked the Group to consider whether the Secretariats and TAC should work with the centers over the next month or so to reduce the aggregate of their request for funds in 1980, and if so to what level, in what respects, and with how explicit a mandate from the Group. The Group should also consider whether some definite limit should be placed on the growth of the existing centers. This led to the broader question of the extent to which the Group wanted or could accommodate more conscious management or whether the sum of donor preferences and center initiatives should be accepted as the ultimate determinant of the Group's priorities. The overriding concern should be for the long-term stability of the system with reasoned and mutually acceptable decisions about funding being reached by the Group and by the centers.
The Executive Secretary, Mr. Lejeune, sketched the process by which the Secretariat reviewed the centers' budgets each year. Whereas the rate of increase in the supply of funds had begun to slow down, the requirements of the existing centers continued to grow to the point where they could absorb any additional resources which the Group might conceivably raise, leaving no room for anything else. The issue therefore reduced to whether the Group wished to see the programs of the existing centers constrained, first so as to fit within the expected supply of resources, and second so as to provide a surplus sufficient to accommodate anything new the Group might wish to add. If the Secretariat's estimate was correct that between $114-116 million would be available for 1980 and if the aggregate of the centers' requirements could be reduced to under $120 million, then the small gap remaining could probably be readily manageable. This, however, would limit the real growth of a number of centers. Mr. Lejeune added that the problem would be largely resolved if the Group would increase its contributions in 1980 to about $120-125 million, a rate of increase no larger than prevailed in earlier years.

A speaker reiterated a point he had made at a number of previous meetings, that it was timely for the Group to impose limits on the growth of the so-called mature centers. He did not think this was necessarily connected with the question of whether to take in new additions to the system. The mature centers were big enough to carry out the mandates they had been given and big enough to stretch the talent of extraordinary capable managers. He hoped the Group would conclude that the mature centers should cease to grow in real terms, and that real growth for the other centers should be subject to very careful review. However, the Group should avoid any arbitrary and rigid policy. He suggested that one way to handle the matter would be to ask the Chairman to appoint a small ad hoc budget subcommittee to review budgets in September leading to recommendations at the November meeting.

A speaker noting that it was by no means certain that his agency would be able to increase its cash contribution to the CGIAR over its present level for next year, felt that the problems now confronting the Group underlined the indispensable role of the Secretariat and TAC as the ongoing and continuous parts of the system which best could suggest the adjustments needed between the supply of funds and requirements of centers, both of which were subject to constant change. However, Boards of Trustees were ultimately responsible for determining what the budgets should be and CGIAR members were not able to dictate what the program should be although clearly they had a strong influence through funding. He urged members of the Group to give the Secretariat the freest mandate possible in this task of matching supply with demand. This, however, did not mean an explicit mandate to the Secretariat to apply one of the three options in the paper.

Another speaker mentioned that his agency's contributions to the CGIAR had grown very rapidly and this was causing concern within the agency. The centers were seen as being in competition with other activities for his agency's funds and this had created an impression that the centers were somewhat opulent and grew because funds were available rather than because expansion was necessary. Although centers had prudently not taken undue advantage of the availability of funds, nevertheless he noted that although the deficit for 1980 had been foreseen for some time, the centers were now presenting budgets that showed an average increase of 25 percent, ranging from 2 percent in one case to 50 percent in another. He emphasized that the decision for the Group was what growth rate should be allowed to the present mature centers, whether or not new activities should be added.
87. The representative of Switzerland stressed the need to generate additional funds for the system by on one hand maintaining reasonable annual increases of contributions from existing donors, and on the other hand by bringing in new donors. Without being able to give a firm commitment as yet, he was pleased to say that the Swiss contribution for 1980 would represent an increase over 1979 of about 20 percent, or for unrestricted contributions to core budgets only, an increase of about 5 percent. This would include a contribution to ISNAR. He felt that the CG system should remain flexible and open to changes which could include additions if required. He was pleased that the discussions so far had led to the view that existing programs and established centers might have to compete under changing priorities with new proposals under consideration, and the Group should not hesitate to limit or restrict traditional programs in favor of new activities which might fill important gaps. Even with modest overall growth in the total resources of the system, the Group should be allowed to add new activities from time to time. He wondered whether it would be possible to make money available by applying economy measures to some of the existing programs.

88. Noting that other speakers had also stressed the need for economy, the Chairman pointed out that placing limits on the growth of the existing centers would force them to make economy measures themselves and they were in the best position to know how this could be done.

89. A representative of Sweden referred to the proposal that the membership of the Group should be enlarged by more members from developing countries. He had thought that they would contribute their knowledge and expertise rather than funds, but he felt that the Secretariat was taking every possible step to obtain new contributions. In the short run, however, he felt that one should not expect too much. He stated that the Swedish contribution was likely to remain stable for the coming one or two years in real terms. Increases for inflation could be accommodated, but one could not expect anything like the rate of growth that had characterized the Consultative Group in the past. If the same was true of other donors, then clearly the Group faced a period where caution and perhaps no real growth in major existing activities would be necessary. This led his delegation to a preference for the third option indicated in the Secretariat paper, i.e. some pruning of existing activities after close examination with the possibility of adding new things either in the form of new institutions or additions to existing ones. He stressed that his delegation would not like to see across the board or wholesale reduction over all activities; thorough study was necessary to make sure that individual institutes were treated equitably. Institutes should develop machinery for improving their long-term planning and should exercise more financial restraint. He recommended a practice similar to that in his own administration where organizations prepared their most optimistic budget backed up by alternative budgets, one based on no real growth and another on a specified real reduction in resources. This was in itself a useful exercise in setting priorities.

90. A representative of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that his government, being aware of the importance of the world food situation, intended to increase its contribution. However, it would find it hard to defend that position in Parliament if most other members of the Group were not able to do likewise. He supported the proposal to establish a committee to assist the Secretariat in the analysis of budgets.
91. The representative of Canada emphasized his government's difficult financial situation at the present time and concluded that there would be no increase in the Canadian contribution, at least for 1980, and possibly for a number of years thereafter. It was even possible to envisage a decrease in the actual dollar figure of funds made available. This was due to a general budget squeeze. Moreover, the whole multilateral system was coming under increasing criticism in Canada, as was the proliferation of international multilateral institutions. For the foreseeable future therefore, the Canadian position would have to be very conservative with regard to generating of new funds and of the establishment of new centers. As one of the CGIAR's leading donors, his agency was coming under considerable scrutiny and criticism for being too financially exposed. Some of the support for proposed new activities that had been expressed during the meeting seemed unrealistic in view of what had been said about the financial limits that the system faced. The Group would lose credibility at least with his own government if it seemed too ready to adopt new activities at a time when resources were clearly going to be short. Several questions should be addressed in considering new centers. First, the Group should know in considerable detail where almost all of the new funding was going to come from. It should be made clear whether there were incremental earmarked contributions coming from any particular donor. Then there was the question of savings from other programs which could be applied to new ones, but the Group did not yet have adequate information to know what kind of real savings might be made. Thirdly, he felt it would be wrong to have an excessively high percentage of any center's funding coming from so-called donors of last resort.

92. The Deputy Executive Secretary, Mr. Ritchie, clarified the assumptions that the Secretariat had made in producing its estimates of the supply of funds. He felt, in view of what had been said during the current discussion, that these estimates may have been somewhat over-optimistic in coming out with an increase in total contributions of 14 or 15 percent. He urged donors to provide the Secretariat with their latest estimates of likely future contributions.

93. The Chairman added that in addition to the Philippines, firm indications had been received that the OPEC Special Fund would become a donor member as from 1980. Their Board had approved the membership, but the amount of their contribution had not yet been determined. Efforts to find new donors were increasingly difficult, and beyond the OPEC Special Fund, there were few prospects for significant contributions.

94. The representative of the Inter-American Development Bank drew attention to the Secretariat's estimate of his organization's contribution for 1980 of the equivalent of $7 million for core budgets. The IDB's contribution was subject to the availability of social progress trust funds from which sources for the CGIAR had come up to now. An analysis of the activities of the Latin American centers was currently being done by IDB staff. Contributions to the centers could be financed through the IDB's fund for special operations. However, in that case, specific project proposals would have to be prepared by the centers in line with the IDB's technical cooperation procedures and in such cases the amounts were likely to be smaller and have stricter technical requirements.
95. A number of speakers supported the proposal to establish a committee to allocate funds and one of them stressed that the proposal was firmly based on the assumption of a decision that there be a strict rule of no real growth. Some centers he felt were big enough in scientific and managerial terms and should be brought to a limit. However, the limit should be a responsible one that did not merely reflect reaction to short-term financial situations.

96. A representative of Norway stated that his government was considering increasing its contribution to the CGIAR system and also intended to earmark funds for the establishment of ISNAR. He agreed with others that it was self-evident that the continued growth of 20 to 25 percent in existing centers could not continue, and restrictions were necessary.

97. A representative of the Netherlands stated that he could not definitely foresee a real growth in his government's contributions and it was possible that this contribution might not be increased by more than 10 percent.

98. A speaker pointed to the danger of centers growing through a proliferation of special projects which tended to find their way into core budgets often at much higher cost.

99. The Chairman, summarizing the discussion, pointed out that the financial outlook ahead was clearly no more encouraging than the estimates in the Secretariat's paper. He urged all donors to consider their positions in the light of the requirements and of the priorities paper. It would be unfortunate if a government willing to provide additional funds could not do so because of the reluctance of others. He felt the consensus was that the Group should accept as a principle the doctrine of no real growth of existing established centers and of the growing centers as soon as they reach the point of maturity. It was important to achieve shifts in priorities among and within centers to achieve a better balance in the activities of the Group as a whole. TAC should pursue this question with the centers. The priority of such things as triticale, barley, livestock and so on should be seriously considered without necessarily expecting any immediate drastic changes. It seemed that requirements for 1980 exceeded resources by something around $10 million. The Secretariat had made specific suggestions to produce a more manageable situation through a number of technical adjustments. No objections had been raised to these and he interpreted that as an instruction to TAC and the Secretariat to proceed through the July meeting to try to balance requirements and resources through such types of adjustments discussed in the meeting. This might or might not require the application of the principle of no real growth. At the same time the Group should immediately begin a more systematic assessment of the implications of the no-growth principle, but this process should start at the centers, who should be asked immediately to institute long-term planning. Beyond that, TAC and the Secretariat should consider the extent to which the no-growth principle could be applied in the context of the budgets for the next year or two and the possible shifts in priorities. There was support for the proposal that he exercise his authority to convene an ad hoc Standby Committee, should it be necessary. He would do so under one of two circumstances. One would be if it appeared that the efforts of TAC and the Secretariat to achieve balance for next year were not succeeding and therefore more drastic action was needed. In this case the recommendations of a smaller group would be needed to guide the decision of the CGIAR in October. The second circumstance would be if it turned out
that the analysis of the long-term implications of the no-growth principle had raised issues that needed evaluation in two steps. He thought the second less likely because the application of the principle would need fine tuning and could not be consummated between May and October.

100. Summarizing the implications of the discussion of finance for the proposals for new additions to the system, the Chairman confirmed the Group's decision that TAC should do more work on vegetables and bring to the Group a more developed proposal that responded to a number of suggestions and questions that had been raised by members of the Group. Similarly, the decision to postpone consideration of the IFDC pending a study of factor-oriented research and of plant nutrients in general had not been affected by the discussion of the financial outlook. The present donors to IFPRI had confirmed that the additional amount required for that Institute in 1980 would be $1 million at the most, and that at least one of these donors intended to maintain his contribution to IFPRI in addition to his regular contribution to the CGIAR as a whole. The other two donors, however, expressed some reservation. IFPRI's donors had stated that they did not expect the overall budget of IFPRI to go beyond $2.5 million in 1979 terms, which indicated the upper limit of the commitment the Group was taking on. As the amount was small and within the customary margin of error of the estimates, he did not see any reason to reconsider the decision on IFPRI in the light of the discussion of finances. There being no dissent from this view, he formally welcomed IFPRI to the CGIAR.

Item 6 - Concept of a CGIAR Program Committee

101. This question had been considered in detail during the course of the discussion of the financial situation. Summarizing the consensus emerging from that discussion, the Chairman recorded that it had been decided that an ad hoc Standby Committee would be convened at the request of the Chairman if it appeared that there were such issues with respect to the aggregate 1980 budget or the application of the policy of constraint as it would need some kind of intermediate discussion before the October meeting. He did not detect support for the view that the Group as a matter of principle needed a permanent "program" committee. There was no strong sentiment in favor of the immediate establishment of such a program committee at the present time, but it was an option that the Group should consider at any time when it might prove helpful. There was no dissent nor further discussion of this proposition.

Item 7 - Quinquennial Review of ICRISAT

102. The Chairman stressed the importance of quinquennial reviews organized by TAC as an essential part of donors' mechanisms for internal review and for mobilization of support for the system. He outlined the procedure that these reviews followed. While the ultimate responsibility for acting on the advice from a quinquennial review rested with each Board of Trustees, members of the Group wished and also had a duty to guide the Board by expressing their reactions to the review and possibly reaching a consensus on its main conclusions.

103. Dr. Lloyd Evans, the Chairman of the ICRISAT quinquennial panel, introduced his summary of the review. The review team had been genuinely impressed by the very strong start that ICRISAT had made despite difficult logistics. It had an excellent staff with a strong sense of commitment to
ICRISAT's goals. There was a very rare degree of interdisciplinary collaboration which few institutes could match. There was evidence of great foresight in the planning of the center and its work, and the Board and the first Director deserved great credit. ICRISAT was now at an important stage in its development. Moving into the new buildings would give an opportunity to consolidate activities, but as it approached maturity it would be faced with a range of substantial new problems, and the deployment of its human and other resources over the next few years would be critical to its ultimate impact. The review panel had interacted very effectively with the staff and management of ICRISAT and ICRISAT itself had been most helpful and cooperative throughout. They had the opportunity to comment on all parts of the panel's draft report. The panel had accepted corrections, but only some of the suggestions. He had learned that ICRISAT had decided to accept about 105 of the 126 recommendations that the panel had made, though differences of view on several major recommendations still remained. ICRISAT had an important, comprehensive, thoughtful but very complex mandate, which embraced crop improvement with five mandate crops, as well as a major geographical zone with whole farming systems in that zone and with socio-economic aspects of agriculture. The panel was concerned by some lack of congruence between some elements of the mandate, for example, between the distribution of some of the mandate crops and of the semi-arid tropics as currently defined. For example, chick-pea and millet, two of the mandate crops, were widely grown beyond the semi-arid tropics. The Director firmly believed that the mandate was workable in spite of these problems, and given the fact that ICRISAT had a global mandate for the five crops. The panel considered that ICRISAT would face a number of problems of resource allocation when resources became less abundant.

There had been agreement between the panel and ICRISAT on the issue of local versus wide adaptation. The review panel had not visited the South American semi-arid tropics, but the next quinquennial review of ICRISAT should certainly do so. The panel had concluded that a far higher proportion of ICRISAT's effort should be focused in future on the African semi-arid tropics, and considered that core positions should be provided for this purpose. Some of this could be achieved by transferring resources from Hyderabad, as for example in anthropology and economics. The panel had rather strong reservations about ICRISAT's proposed model for its African work, that of two multidisciplinary centers. The panel had proposed a mobile network model which provided for greater flexibility. It had suggested that core funds should not be provided for the African program until the Board had reconsidered long-term plans for African work.

He drew attention to the panel's recommendation on pigeon pea. It had assumed that a long-term objective of the CGIAR system was to withdraw from those areas of work wherever the development of the national system made that possible. India was very strong in agricultural research and produced 93 percent of the total world crop of pigeon pea. It already had a substantial and increasing research effort on this crop. Pigeon pea, however, was not a major crop by world standards, total production being less than 2 million tons, compared for example with soya beans at 68 million, though admittedly statistics were not wholly reliable. ICRISAT had made several substantial advances in the breeding of this crop, which could be followed up by the All-India Coordinated Pulse Program. ICRISAT should continue work on pigeon pea in the farming systems program as it provided interesting opportunities for mixed cropping,
but the panel recommended that ICRISAT should open discussions with the Indian Council of Agricultural Research with the view to handing over the breeding work. One member of the panel, Professor Harlan, dissented from this recommendation, as had ICRISAT itself, feeling that perhaps it was premature. However, he noted that ICRISAT's own economists had indicated that too high a proportion of present resources were being devoted to pulses, compared to cereals and groundnuts, which suggested some redistribution from the pulse program. Put in positive terms, the panel still felt pigeon pea breeding in India represented a feasible case for the withdrawal by an international agricultural research center in recognition of the strength of the relevant national program, in this case that of India. They saw this as an encouraging portent for the future and a matter for congratulation, both to India and to ICRISAT.

106. Dr. Cummings summarized TAC's discussion of the quinquennial panel's report. The review of ICRISAT and that of WARDA were the first two that had been carried out under the enlarged and revised terms of reference to which he invited the Group's reactions. TAC and he personally congratulated the panel on a very thorough and competent review. The demands on the panel and on ICRISAT's staff had been so heavy that there had been less time than everyone wished for professional interaction between panel members and ICRISAT staff. TAC endorsed the report of the panel and recommended that it be forwarded to the CGIAR for consideration at the current meeting. This was a departure from previous practice in that the report had only received one review by TAC instead of two as in the past. TAC did not feel unduly concerned about the lack of complete coincidence between the geographical definition of the semi-arid tropics and the distribution of the specific mandate crops.

107. While endorsing the panel's recommendation that ICRISAT open discussions with the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and the All-India Coordinated Program for pulse improvement on pigeon pea, TAC recommended that attention be given to the funding aspects of this transfer and to the international exchange of genetic material which should continue to be assured through ICRISAT facilities. TAC would wish to be kept informed of the progress of these discussions. TAC supported the recommendation that African work should receive greater relative emphasis, but the form of organization and method of operation should have further study based on long-term plans prior to commitment to fixed substations. TAC agreed with the panel that ICRISAT should give low priority to the employment of scientists who would mainly consult with other agencies and governments in developing research plans for using ICRISAT technology. TAC was very pleased with the panel's high opinion of the quality and morale of ICRISAT's staff and the vigor and relevance of its program.

108. In answer to questions from the floor, Dr. Evans confirmed that the panel had been aware of work elsewhere in the world on striga. He felt that ICRISAT was following an excellent approach and regretted that the report did not fully reflect this view. The panel had been much concerned with other millets. ICRISAT's original mandate had referred simply to "millet." It had later become more specific and reverted to pearl millet, which is the dominant one. The panel had urged ICRISAT to continue to accept the degree of responsibility for the collection and maintenance of genetic resources of the other millets and to work them in wherever possible into farming systems work. The panel hoped that ICRISAT would work on the other millets and he felt that it had agreed to a limited program already. The panel had been aware of the cooperative program with ICIPE, but had not had the opportunity to explore it in detail. ICRISAT was generating very interesting information on nutrition in relation to village-level studies. More data was needed and perhaps this provided opportunities for subcontracting to Indian organizations.
109. Dr. Swindale, the Director of ICRISAT, summarized the comments of the Board of Governors. The Board had found the exercise of the review and its report genuinely helpful and beneficial to ICRISAT and was truly grateful to the panel. There were some items with which the Board did not agree, but that did not reduce the overall benefit that ICRISAT had received from the review. The Board had, in accordance with the report's recommendation, considered and adopted a long-term plan for ICRISAT's African program at its last meeting, including both core research and special projects. This long-term plan was being finalized and would be brought to TAC at the meeting in July 1979. The Board believed that the quinquennial review report would serve as a guide in the future development of ICRISAT. The Board was unanimous that pigeon pea should remain a mandate crop of ICRISAT. It was an exceedingly important crop in the nutrition of the poorest people, so many of whom lived in India. It was also an important subsistence crop which did not show up in the statistics in many other parts of the world particularly in Africa. Relinquishing the mandate would not be in the interests of the people ICRISAT was trying to serve. However, the Board would be willing to consider involving the strongest national program in crop improvement work. The Board had decided that ICRISAT should concentrate on pearl millet as being by far the most important millet crop within the semi-arid tropics, but was prepared to accept the recommendations of the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources that it become a primary body for the germ plasm resources of the other minor millets, including eleusine. In being a major germ plasm repository for minor millets, ICRISAT would necessarily have to do a certain amount of work on them.

110. The representative of a major donor felt that the report of the ICRISAT panel was an excellent one and satisfied the need perceived by donors to have more critical reviews. He noted the need for a long-term plan for the African program and he hoped that it would be made generally available to donors. He felt that greater emphasis on African work was fully justified, given the weakness of most African national research programs and the very difficult environment. He felt the panel's proposed model for Africa was convincing, but networks had dangers in that it could lead to proliferation of gap-filling research, which was not yet ICRISAT's purpose. While India's position as the dominant producer of pigeon pea seemed to support the integration of pigeon pea breeding into ICAR's 1 program, on the other hand the crop could have considerable potential for the semi-arid areas, particularly in Africa. Whatever decision was finally taken, ICRISAT should certainly maintain the germ plasm collection. His own government's experience with farming systems work in India led him to believe that the introduction of a number of simple innovations in a step-by-step approach was likely to win the confidence of the farmers and be more effective than a complete systems approach.

111. Responding to the question on farming systems, Dr. Evans pointed out that the panel had not intended to duplicate work that had been done by the stripe review. They had been impressed by ICRISAT's work on intercropping systems and its biology and this was one reason why it had felt that pigeon pea work could be done under the farming systems program in the intercropping context.

112. A speaker, supporting the recommendation that more emphasis be given to Africa, warned against the location of an activity in a particular country

---

1/ Indian Council of Agricultural Research.
leading to overconcentration on national problems of the country concerned. Experts located in a particular country should be supported by the necessary infrastructure. It should not be a charge on the host country. He emphasized the importance of fertilizers in the semi-arid environment. He stressed the importance of coordination with the activities of others, particularly the CILSS 1/ Secretariat and SAFGRAD 2/. He felt that a more appropriate location for groundnut work would be in West Africa as opposed to the panel's recommendation.

113. A speaker emphasized that the parts of India where pigeon pea is important contained some of the world's poorest people for whom pigeon pea was an important source of protein. Perhaps, since ICRISAT's foundation, Indian organizations had begun to allocate sufficient resources to serve the needs of this crop for India. If so, the question of the potential value of pigeon pea in Africa and in tropical America still remained. The characteristics of pigeon pea suggested that most advances would take place through genetic and management changes calling for a close working relationship between disciplines. ICRISAT should already be working closely with other institutions. The fact that India had been chosen as the location for ICRISAT's headquarters did not in any way reduce ICRISAT's responsibility to the sorghum and millet-growing regions of Africa. It had the same responsibility to develop a core program in Africa as it did in India though this did not imply that they should be the same or equal.

114. A speaker, endorsing the panel's recommendations for greater emphasis to Africa, urged increased effort in training programs for scientists in the national programs.

115. In answer to a question, Dr. Swindale said that he hoped to provide the Group during the next few months with a long-term plan, not only for Africa but for ICRISAT as a whole. However, he did not expect in the foreseeable future that core programs would be enlarged beyond the present two major locations, so members of the Group already had a reasonably good indication of the direction in which ICRISAT was going.

Item 8 - Quinquennial Review of WARDA

116. Dr. Hussein Idris, Chairman of the panel, made a brief introduction of the report. He pointed out that the CGIAR had been supporting the coordinated trials since 1973 and that these were now done in 15 countries. More than 150 national technicians had been trained. The special research projects, though not presently funded by CGIAR, cooperated closely with the coordinated trials program and the panel had recommended that the WARDA core budget provide the funding for the team leader of each project. The panel also endorsed the appointment of three additional scientific staff at WARDA's headquarters. It had suggested that there be no further expansion of the coordinated trials; eventually these might become the responsibility of the national programs.

117. The panel had recommended that WARDA develop a five-year program which could be presented to its donors, so that WARDA's financing could have a more secure basis.

1/ CILSS - Interstate Committee for the Control of Drought in the Sahel.

2/ SAFGRAD - Semi-Arid Food Grain Research and Development.
118. Dr. Cummings stated that the TAC had reviewed the report of the panel. It recognized the precarious nature of WARDA's financial support and supported the panel's recommendation for a long-term plan and a meeting of WARDA donors to discuss this. TAC had expressed the view that the national programs should, over time, assume a larger share of the coordinated trials program. TAC had agreed that CGIAR support for the regional research projects was consistent with the aims of the Group, but suggested that this support be limited to the funding of the program leaders. TAC was also concerned about the number of programs involved in rice research in West Africa and intended to give this further study.

119. In the discussion that followed, one member queried the quality of the coordinated trials, and the value of the yield data given in the panel's report. He suggested that more information was needed on how these trials might be phased out of CGIAR support into national program support. Dr. Idris replied that the panel had summarized a large number of scientific reports and from these, from inspection of the trials and from the experience of other panel members with WARDA over the past few years, he was confident about the quality of the trials.

120. Several speakers stated that they firmly supported the concept of WARDA and welcomed the review panel's endorsement of continued support. They would favor CGIAR involvement with special research projects, but wished to ensure that the present coordinated trials program had adequate funds and scientific resources.

121. Mr. Coulibaly thanked Dr. Idris and his team for their work. He recognized that the team had had to travel and operate under difficult conditions, but these were the conditions under which WARDA also worked. The preparation for a donors' meeting under the sponsorship of the African Development Bank was in progress and he expected that the meeting would proceed as planned.

Item 9 - TAC Chairman's Report on 21st TAC Meeting

122. The subjects coming before TAC at its 21st meeting had all been covered in preceding items of business and there was, therefore, no further discussion.

Item 10 - Other Business

A. ISNAR Progress Report

123. The Chairman of the ISNAR Committee, Mr. Mathieson, reported on progress towards establishment of the new service. The Committee had held two meetings so far in 1979, in Geneva in February and on May 2 in Paris. At the February meeting it had been decided to appoint the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) as the executing agency. The Committee had also decided that it might be more appropriate to consider locating the headquarters of ISNAR in the Netherlands and had asked GTZ to make informal contact with the Dutch government to see whether this was feasible. GTZ had also been asked to prepare a draft Charter with a mandate as close as possible to that suggested in the report of the Task Force. The Committee had confirmed the recommendation that the Board should consist of 15 members, of whom two would be ex officio, i.e. a representative appointed by the host country and the Director
of ISNAR. Ten initial members of the Board had been selected at the May meeting to be deemed as appointed by the Consultative Group at this initial stage of ISNAR’s development. FAO had made it clear that although they had been offered a prescribed seat on the Board, they would prefer to be regularly invited to be represented so that they could have flexibility in deciding who should participate in the particular discussions. Similarly the Chairman of the group of Center Directors should be invited to participate in ISNAR Board meetings as an observer. From the more than 120 names that had been put forward as candidates for the Board of ISNAR, a small subcommittee under his chairmanship had used a short list of 30 names which had been distributed on a ballot paper characterized by experience and by geographical region. By a process of secret balloting with one vote per eligible delegation, the following 10 names had been selected, given in alphabetical order: Dr. Kazi Badruddoza of Bangladesh, Dr. Gelia Castillo of the Philippines, Mr. Luis Crouch of the Dominican Republic, Dr. Robert Cunningham of the United Kingdom, Dr. Jacques Diouf of Senegal, Dr. Lowell Hardin of the Ford Foundation, Dr. Jaap Hardon of the Netherlands, Dr. Ishmael Muriithi of Kenya, Dr. Vernon Ruttan of the United States, and Dr. Werner Treitz of the Federal Republic of Germany. A list of five alternates was selected by the same process in the event that any of the above was unable to serve. It was proposed to have an informal meeting of members of the Board on September 27 and 28. Encouraging progress had been made in discussions between GTZ and the representative of the government of the Netherlands, but a number of details regarding ISNAR's establishment in the Netherlands had still to be examined further and resolved. The draft Charter had been further examined by the Committee and some refinements suggested. The Committee will meet again immediately before Centers Week in Washington at the end of October.

Item 11 - Time and Place of Next Meeting

124. International Centers Week would be held in Washington starting on Monday, October 29, and continuing through the Consultative Group meeting which would end on the afternoon of Friday, November 2. The Group would decide at that time whether it would be necessary to hold two CGIAR meetings during 1980.

125. The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.
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