

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Mailing Address: 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433, U.S.A.
Office Location: 801 19th Street, N.W.
Telephone (Area Code 202) 473-8951
Cable Address—INTBAFRAD
Fax (Area Code 202) 334-8750

From: The Secretariat

May 4, 1992
MT/92/12

Mid-Term Meeting, May 18-22, 1992 Istanbul, Turkey

Agenda Item 9 - REGIONAL REPRESENTATION IN THE CGIAR

A Review of Regional Representation in the CGIAR

1. Attached is a copy of the report "A Review of Regional Representation in the CGIAR" (MT/92/12). It is a report of a CGIAR Secretariat Working Group on Regional Representation appointed by the Executive Secretary, CGIAR.
2. The report responds to the CGIAR consensus at the Mid-term Meeting in Berlin in 1988, that, following recommendations agreed there, Regional Representation should be reviewed again in four years time. This report presents that review for consideration by the CGIAR, and for the Group's decision on the recommendations it contains.

Distribution

CGIAR Members
Center Board Chairmen
Center Directors
TAC Chairman
TAC Members
TAC Secretariat

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

A REPORT ON REGIONAL REPRESENTATION IN THE CGIAR

CGIAR Secretariat Working Group

M.P. Collinson (Chair)

M. Kasajja

H. Palmier

S. Tata

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. HISTORY	2
3. CURRENT ADMINISTRATION OF THE REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES	2
Funding	3
Representation at CGIAR meetings	3
Visits to CGIAR centers	3
Interaction with NARS	3
Regular pre-Group meetings	3
Reporting to the CGIAR	4
4. CHANGING GLOBAL CIRCUMSTANCES; THE RATIONALE FOR EFFECTIVE REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES	4
The emerging logic of global and regional partnerships in agricultural research	4
Perceptions of Effective Regional Representatives as a threat to the style of the CGIAR	5
Emergence of new regional agricultural research organizations	6
5. FUTURE REGIONAL REPRESENTATION IN THE CGIAR	7
The Choice of Regions to be Represented	7
The Number of Representatives and their Balance across Regions.	8
6. REGIONAL CONSTITUENCIES AND REPRESENTATIVE SELECTION	9
Options for choosing and administering representatives	10
7. A PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION	11
8. CONCLUSIONS	13

1. Introduction

The CGIAR Regional Representatives (also referred to as Fixed Term Members in some documentation) are an institution that has answered the need for developing country representation at the Group level of the CGIAR for its first twenty years. They continue to provide the opportunity to bring the articulated views of developing countries to the highest decision making forum of the System.

This report responds to the request of the Group, in accepting the recommendations of a CGIAR Secretariat review of regional representation at the 1988 Mid-Term Meeting, that the subject be revisited in four years time. In 1991 the Executive Secretary appointed a Secretariat Working Group with terms of reference to review regional representation in the CGIAR.

The Group worked in consultation with the Research and Technology Development Division, FAO, which provides much of the administration for the Regional Representatives. The Working Group also consulted through a questionnaire survey, with past and current representatives as well as with other CGIAR members, their response was good. The responsibility for the conclusions in this report rest with the CGIAR Secretariat.

The orientation adopted in the report is that global and regional perspectives are changing and that the CGIAR institution of Regional Representatives can be organized to help manage emerging trends.

It should be made explicit from the outset that the real issue is not the definition of the role of the representatives. This has been agreed to at least since the Second Review of the CGIAR in 1981 and was confirmed by the Group discussion of the paper the 1988 Mid-Term Meeting. They have two roles, first; to carry information on CGIAR decisions and activities to their regions, second; to represent the needs and views of their regions in the CGIAR.

The real issue is whether the Group sees benefit in the acknowledged roles being actively and effectively pursued in its meetings. The Group's conclusions on this will help mould the future perceptions and actions of its other stakeholders; the International Agricultural Research Centers (IARCS) and the National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS). Future interactions, and indeed future stakeholder partnerships, will reflect the spirit in which the Group now handles the future of the Regional Representatives as a CGIAR institution.

Global level problems have brought a need for global solutions. The CGIAR has gained a reputation as non-bureaucratic and self disciplining, and as a "doer" amongst international organizations at this level. It is being emulated in other fields. It was created to serve the needs of developing countries and in the spirit of partnership, the Group has long sought to assure them of a role in the International Agricultural Research System beyond that of beneficiary.

This second review of regional representation in the CGIAR provides another opportunity for the Group to show its understanding of changing global dynamics, and demonstrate its continuing leadership by its decisions on the role of the developing countries in the highest level of debate on international agricultural research.

2. History

The CGIAR has evolved since the first IARCs were created in response to the need for international research in food crop production. While establishing the CGIAR in the early seventies the founding fathers perceived that a very limited number of developing countries would be able to meet the funding condition for CGIAR donor membership. Thus they sought a mechanism to allow interaction between the developing countries and the CGIAR as a donor based organization.

Mechanisms for client interaction exist in the individual IARCs. Distinguished developing countries professionals serve as Trustees of the centers and members of the External Review Panels. At the system level there is an unwritten rule that TAC should have half of its members from developing countries.

The first CGIAR meeting identified a need for representation in the two annual meetings of the Group itself. As a Co-sponsor of the CGIAR, FAO agreed that its Regional Conferences could elect countries to provide CGIAR Regional Representatives for each of its Conference Regions.

Originally the Group saw the representatives as informing their regions about the CGIAR. Latterly, particularly as a result of the Second Review of the CGIAR in 1981, the representatives have been increasingly perceived as a voice for their regions within the CGIAR. The Report of the Second Review (pp 100) saw the need for links between the CGIAR, the representatives, and the agricultural research institutions in their region.

A Progress Report on regional representation was made to International Centers Week in 1987 from the Research Development Centre of FAO which administers the representatives. A CGIAR Secretariat Paper on regional representation was brought to the 1988 Mid Term Meeting in Berlin. That paper, the last on regional representation to come to the Group, was largely accepted.

Interalia the paper proposed that the changes in administration suggested by the 1981 Second Review of the CGIAR be modified and, as modified, be given more time to show improvement. The paper suggested that the changes be further evaluated after a four year period. This was agreed by the CGIAR. This report includes that further evaluation.

3. Current Administration of the Regional Representatives

Regional Representatives to the CGIAR are elected by the FAO Regional Conferences to serve a four-year term as recommended by the FAO Director-General and endorsed by the FAO Conference and the CGIAR. While member countries are selected by the Regional Conferences, based on the endorsed criteria, the countries elected bear the responsibility for selecting a prominent research leader or scientist/administrator with substantial professional and regional experience, as the Representative. FAO guidelines ask the country selected to transmit the name of the designated individual to other countries of the region.

It is the responsibility of the persons designated as Regional Representatives to consult periodically with other countries of the region on research needs and priorities and ensure the views of the region are heard in the CGIAR. The representatives also report on the CGIAR decisions and activities to their respective regions. The Regional Representatives attend the annual Mid Term and the International Centers Week meetings of the CGIAR. Their attendance at these meetings is administered

by FAO through funds raised from donors by the CGIAR Secretariat. A list of current Regional Representatives is included as Annex I.

At its Mid-Term meeting of 1988 the Group instituted some measures to improve the effectiveness of the Regional Representatives to the CGIAR. Extracts from the 1981 Second Review of the CGIAR and the recommendations in the 1988 paper accepted by the Group are at Annex 2. Comments on the implementation of the 1988 recommendations follow:

Funding

Funding for the representatives has proved inadequate to allow them to visit their regions and the IARCS and therefore report to the Regional Conference in accordance with the recommendations of the FAO Conference and the CGIAR. The funding mechanism has changed. Donors used to make their pledges for regional representation at ICW. More recently funding for regional representation has been a part of the CGIAR Secretariat fund raising activities for the Special Activities Account. The Secretariat transfers funds to the appropriate FAO trust fund account where it remains until spent.

Nine donors contributing an average of \$4,305 per year each have donated approximately \$310,000 to the representation program (to the end of 1990). In terms of contributions per Representative, the donors have given about \$3,875 per Representative per year, or \$1,937 for each Representative's participation in each of the two annual CGIAR meetings. These contributions are well below the average cost of bringing a representative to a meeting, and the budget has only been balanced by some representatives not attending. Since 1983, the three donors making the largest contributions to the CGIAR have been responsible for almost half (48%) of all contributions to the representation program.

Representation at CGIAR meetings

Instead of ten persons sharing five seats grouped together at the end of the table now all representatives are seated in 'regional pairs' with the other CGIAR members. This has encouraged participation in the discussions by the representatives and has provided better interaction with other members.

Interaction with NARS and IARC visits.

Requests from the representatives to meet with NARS have not materialized due to a shortage of funds. These, as well as representatives' visits to the IARCs, are important in improving their effectiveness.

Regular pre-Group meetings

Prior to every CGIAR meeting FAO organizes a meeting for the Regional Representatives where they are briefed by TAC, the CGIAR Secretariats, and FAO, on relevant items on the agenda of the Group's meetings. The representatives need further encouragement to use the opportunity for a strategic discussion of the important issues on the agenda.

Reporting to the CGIAR

It is customary for the representatives to report to the Group on issues of relevance from the respective regions. It is important they contribute to the discussions of relevant agenda items as well as reporting to the Group.

The changes recommended by the Group as a result of the 1988 review have not been fully implemented. In particular those included in order to expose representatives to NARS and to the IARC's have been prevented by a shortage of funding. In response to questions in the survey of donors made by the Working Group there was no consensus on their future commitment to funding the Regional Representatives. Views ranged from solid commitment to an explicit expression of no plans for future funding. One donor conditioned commitment to future funding on the implementation of an "effective" representation plan. This last donor comment highlights the 'Catch 22' nature of the problem; no funding without effective representation and no effective representation without funding. The Working Group sets out a strategy for transition to solve this dilemma in section 7 of this report.

4. Changing Global Circumstances; The Rationale for Effective Regional Representation.

There is increasing acknowledgement of the need for global partnership, and indeed the CGIAR does boast some true partnerships. These include the TAC, with 50% of members from developing countries, some IARC Boards and many collaborative programs between IARCs and NARS. Well proven examples of these are the Asian Farming System Network, the CIP Potato research networks and the CIAT Bean Programs sub-regional steering committee's in Africa.

The CGIAR centers are an interface between two sets of stakeholders; the donors and the NARS of developing countries. Donor countries have many arms competing for funds and have their own domestic constituencies to satisfy. Developing country NARS are in a similar position. They must compete with other publicly funded activities for a share of the domestic budget and be perceived to be meeting the needs of farmers, their constituency. At the interface between these sets of stakeholders, the CGIAR centers plan to meet the needs of their partners within a framework of mission and goals, priorities and strategies, approved by the members of the CGIAR. Clearly, unless both sets of stakeholders are CGIAR members, the framework, and decisions taken within it can be perceived to be imposed by the donors. Given the admitted lack of a link between representatives and their regional constituencies, regional representation in the CGIAR stands the risk of being perceived as a token.

The emerging logic of global and regional partnerships in agricultural research

Emerging global issues, particularly those related to the environment and agricultural sustainability, to climate change, and to human issues of equity and migration, are bringing a new awareness of overriding interdependencies. The success of international agricultural research over the last thirty years is an endorsement of the vision of the founding fathers of the CGIAR. Its capacity to make a hands on, operational contribution to solving emerging global problems, in partnership with the developing countries, is the best testimony to its continuing relevance.

Lately also, a regional perspective has been returning to favor. Historically, after the former colonies gained their independence, there was a reaction against regional groupings as a device perceived

to have been imposed by the metropolitan powers. Interest in groupings is now being re-asserted, particularly as a convincingly logical organizing paradigm for agricultural research in developing countries.

On the demand side the effective use of human and financial resources, particularly across large numbers of small, resource poor countries, calls for regional collaboration. Africa with four, perhaps five, agro-ecological zones and over forty countries is an outstanding example. It cannot pay for, nor staff, and clearly does not need, twenty, thirty or even forty breeding programs on each of its major food crops. There is tremendous scope for rationalization.

Similarly on the supply side it is impossible for the CGIAR as a whole, as well as for the individual centers, to respond to the diverse and often particular priorities of individual countries. Obviously however the Group as a whole and the particular IARCs would be unacceptably insensitive if they failed to heed consensus on research priorities agreed across the countries of a region.

The increase in global wide issues and the awakening regional perspective offer a tremendous opportunity for effective regional representation to benefit the CGIAR. Interdependence and the hard facts of limited human and financial resources are increasing pressures for collaborative partnerships. The CGIAR ad hoc Strategy Consultation (London, February 3-5 1992.) highlighted the fact that, in this day and age, the donors need to hear the developing countries demanding the help of the IARCs. This will only prove possible if, at the CGIAR system level, ownership is shared by the two major sets of stakeholders, the donors and the agricultural research constituencies in developing countries.

The expression "serving in their own capacity" has buffered the Group from a perceived threat of formal representation. Given the way the world and the regions are changing the CGIAR needs to seriously address this as a source of unease in the Group and seize the opportunity to make partnership, a widely used word, a meaningful term in its own forum.

Perceptions of Effective Regional Representatives as a threat to the style of the CGIAR

An effective role for the Regional Representatives remains controversial. There was wide variation in the stances taken by CGIAR members in responding to the Working Group's questions on representation. Some members worry that anything verging on the official in such representation will threaten the flexible, non-confrontational tradition of business by consensus. Others point to the competition and factionalism which can emerge if the different regional perspectives ignore the global nature of the issues.

These are real fears, yet, at the opposite extreme, other members see a need for effective representation of the agricultural research constituencies in developing countries in CGIAR decision making. They articulate a preference for a client driven CGIAR System responding to developing country needs. Among a widening number of members the imposition of donor driven programs on developing countries is seen as undesirable.

The responses of past and current Regional Representatives also reflect their preferences for a demand driven CGIAR. All strongly accepted their dual responsibilities; conveying the views of the CGIAR to the regions and the views of their region to the CGIAR. Their positions range from a solitary Representative perceiving himself as a messenger of the CGIAR to the region to most seeing themselves

representing their regions in the CGIAR. The representatives consider interactions with regional groups working to coordinate agricultural research as vital to both functions.

Three factors question whether effective representation necessarily brings confrontation to CGIAR business.

- Donor members are clearly "official", they represent their country positions, yet, to date, the Group has been effectively managed by consensus.
- Developing country CGIAR members sit in the meetings and express their views from the perspective of beneficiaries not donors. This has not so far detracted from the informality and flexibility of the proceedings.
- Increasingly, the same donors in other fora (SPAAR and the EEC are collective examples, the World Bank, France, USAID in their bilateral aid programs, are individual examples) are moving to a regional perspective in agricultural research.

Reflecting on the first point it is clear that the composition of CGIAR delegations are changing. New personalities make up an increasing proportion of CGIAR membership. The old style dynamics of 'the club' are less evident. The role of the Centers in supporting NARS is a recent example of a contentious issue on which consensus has proved elusive. The composition of the Group is changing, effective representation of the developing country agricultural research constituency may be a help in managing the new dynamics.

In another dimension the recent efforts to expose the CGIAR Expansion and Priorities Papers to regional groupings of national agricultural research systems have been laudable but ad hoc efforts. Effective representation of regions in the CGIAR would provide a routine process for consultation on such key issues.

Emergence of new regional agricultural research organizations

There is a worldwide upsurge of new regionally oriented entities in agricultural research to help meet the new global challenges and to fill regional needs. In Asia one such body is APAARI, the Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions, with fourteen member countries. In the Middle East and North Africa is AARINENA, the Association of Agricultural Research Institutions in the Near East and North Africa with 16 member governments and another is the Arab Organization for Agricultural Development (AOAD) with 21 member governments. In Africa the Southern African Center for Cooperation in Agricultural Research and Training (SACCAR), the Institut du Sahel (CILSS/INSAH), and Conference des Responsables de la Recherche Agronomique (CORAF) in West and Central Africa have this goal. In Latin America it is IICA, with CARDI in the Caribbean. Some regional research organizations are listed in Annex 3. Many of these institutions are new and relatively fragile, several are still searching for their role among a profusion of donor and country initiatives in agricultural research.

These regionally related agricultural research organizations operate at the pleasure of their constituent countries. They are coordinating and collaborative organizations. Association with the CGIAR would be a source of strength for them, and some could form appropriate constituencies for regional representation in the Group. The fact that a regional emphasis and the young regional organizations also attracted mention at the CGIAR ad hoc Strategy Consultation in London in February emphasizes the

growing importance of the issue. This report offers the CGIAR another opportunity to demonstrate its leadership in international institutional innovation of which it is itself an outstanding example.

5. Future Regional Representation in the CGIAR

This section discusses which developing country regions need representation and why. It also examines the balance in numbers of representatives from qualifying regions.

The Choice of Regions to be Represented

Regional representation was intended as a voice in the Group for developing countries which were not CGIAR members. The aim was to bring representation to the highest level of decision making in the CGIAR for non member, client countries. It is the view of the Working Group that for regions to be eligible for a Regional Representative first, they should be 'developing countries' or second, they should perceive themselves, and be considered by the CGIAR, as direct clients of IARC activities in international agricultural research.

It seems clear to the Working Group that the FAO European Region does not meet these conditions. The region is composed of developed countries, none of which are seen as CGIAR clients. The two countries now representing this Region in the Group are Israel and Poland. Neither are classified as developing countries by the CGIAR's Cosponsors; FAO, the World Bank or UNDP. The economic indicators for Israel are extremely high. Poland, although now a borrowing country under the World Bank rules, does not perceive itself as a direct client of the CGIAR.

While it is appreciated that Poland and Eastern Europe in general are going through massive political and economic changes, providing a representative is not in the intended spirit of regional representation as a CGIAR institution. For example the report (July 1990) of the Polish/EEC/World Bank Task Force commissioned by the Polish Government to formulate a strategy for agriculture identifies a sophisticated farm sector:

"... Poland has a good technical knowledge base, and substantial number of farmers, particularly younger ones, are well educated. Crop husbandry is sound,...yield increases have been high over the past ten years....Animal husbandry is basically sound, and veterinary standards are high...It is, thus, clear that the agri-business sector is critical to the development of Polish agriculture, ...and that the roots of the present agricultural crisis are to be found there, rather than on the farms themselves."

At the same time it is clear that many developed countries, including CGIAR donor members are indirect beneficiaries from CGIAR research. Australia for example has evaluated the annual returns from access to CIMMYT wheat germplasm as over 100 times the value of its annual contributions to CIMMYT. The products of the system are a public good for use by all and some southern and eastern European countries no doubt already benefit in this way.

The Working Group hopes that the attractions of association with the CGIAR will stimulate countries of eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States to join as donor members. Agriculture science is strong throughout the region and the IARCs are already beginning to benefit from an expanded pool of competent scientists interested in working for resource poor farmers in the

developing countries. Finally, given the evolution of the EEC and its membership of the CGIAR, several southern European countries have representation through that mechanism.

In the light of these considerations the Working Group **recommends** that no further Regional Representatives are sought from the FAO European Region.¹ The CGIAR might wish to ask FAO to use its good offices to inform members of the European Regional Conference that, following a revision of the criteria for nominating Regional Representatives, the European Region will lapse from representation in the CGIAR. Representation should continue for Africa south of the Sahara, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Near East and North Africa in the spirit and intent of the CGIAR institution of regional representation.

The Number of Representatives and their Balance across Regions.

As established at the first CGIAR meeting in May 1971, for a trial basis, the Regional Representative mechanism should have brought one representative from one selected country to CGIAR meetings.

"In practice, the FAO regions found it difficult, for political reasons, to select only one representative country each, so at the second meeting of the Group in December 1971 the FAO sent forward the names of two countries instead of one for each developing region..."^[2]

This was immediately rebalanced by the artifice that each pair of representatives should have a single seat/voice on any particular issue and could rotate at their discretion.

Given the current financial problems inhibiting effective support of representatives the Working Group **recommends** that a total of eight be retained. This will provide a saving of 20% in budget requirements by a reduction from ten in the numbers attending meetings.

The Working Group examined the question of representation for the four remaining regions and used three criteria to assess an appropriate balance.

- The more the countries of a region are represented by donor members, and the more these dominate the region, the less the region needs non-member representation. Asia has four countries, India, China, Korea, and Philippines as donor members, LAC has Brazil and Mexico, Africa has Nigeria and WANA has Saudi Arabia.
- The Working Group judged the greatest need for the IARCs, in a range of roles and with the most countries, to be in Africa. It saw the least need, and that largely in a global role, in Asia.

¹ Notwithstanding this recommendation the Working Group can foresee the need to consider the new nations of the CIS as warranting representation as their position in UN organizations evolves.

² Partners against Hunger, Chap.3, p.62

- The Working Group judged that the current level of CGIAR investment in a region was a justified way of weighting representation. This is heaviest in Africa and Asia and lowest by far in WANA.

It is to be hoped that an increasing number of developing countries will feel there is a benefit to CGIAR membership. The assessment of the Working Group was that an increase in Regional Representatives may be justified for Africa south of the Sahara. The region has large numbers of countries using CGIAR products, there are limited possibilities for African countries to afford CGIAR membership and there is heavy CGIAR investment in Africa, particularly in research support. Despite this the Working Group is not recommending a change from the current two representatives per FAO Region at this time. It believes the implementation of the eco-regional concept, using regional centers as an interface between countries and the rest of the CGIAR System, may be particularly helpful to NARS South of the Sahara.

6. Regional Constituencies and Representative Selection

This section considers which regional constituencies should underpin representation in the CGIAR and then sets out options for the identification, selection and administration of representatives. It contains the central message of this review; the need for an effective link from the CGIAR to the research constituency in each region.

The Working Group must again draw attention to the need for transnational consensus. Internationality gives the CGIAR its comparative advantage and neither the Group nor the Centers can respond well to the particular needs of individual countries. For representation to be effective it will be important for groups of countries to agree common themes for CGIAR meetings.

The FAO Regional Conferences at which the countries to provide CGIAR Regional Representatives are selected, are ministerial level meetings at which research leaders may or may not be part of the country delegations participating. There is clear value to the CGIAR having a regular place on the agenda in such high level fora, though currently the only substantive aspect of the agenda item is the selection of two countries to represent the region in the CGIAR.

In responding to the Working Group's survey, past and current representatives conceded there was very little recognition from governments and national research leaders of their role and of its potential for influencing CGIAR affairs. At the same time a high proportion of donors responding expressed the belief that the involvement of the NARS in representation should be an important component of any process.

The Working Group recognizes that the wider definition of national agricultural research systems includes the private sector and the universities, as well as the publicly funded and managed national agricultural research services. Following the lead from donor members and from past and present representatives, the Working Group has taken the view that the government supported NARS of non-member developing countries are the appropriate regional constituencies for representation in the CGIAR. At the discretion of the countries concerned they could involve the wider research system by designating scientists or managers from the Universities or the private sector, so long as the individual concerned is widely accepted as well qualified to represent the region in the CGIAR. Similarly where a formally

constituted regional research organization has the confidence of the NARS in its region there is a logical case for it to provide representation.

In all four regions national directors of government agricultural research services meet regularly to conduct business of common interest. In 1990 and 1991 such meetings assisted the CGIAR greatly by including TAC Expansion and Priorities papers on their agendas at relatively short notice. The simplest and most effective way to link the CGIAR with the NARS as its regional constituencies is to have a regular CGIAR item on the agenda of regional meetings of national directors once each year. The Regional Representative would attend these meetings each year and might be supported by CGIAR or Center staff for business items of particular significance to the region and the CGIAR alike. Such meetings would also provide the opportunity to select a new representative as terms expired.

The Working Group recommends that the Regional Representatives attendance at yearly meetings of national research directors in each region is the basic arrangement for linking NARS constituencies with the CGIAR decision making process at the Group level. Importantly, because such meetings are only exceptionally held throughout the four main continental regions, the Working Group also recommends that each of the eight representatives relates to a discrete sub-regional constituency which has a seat at CGIAR meetings.

As was noted earlier in the paper there is growing support from donors and from some developing countries for research to be organized regionally. There is a growing number of regional research organizations with roles in supporting, and sometimes coordinating, national research. Each of the four regions has one or more organizations supporting agricultural research. Africa South of the Sahara has several regional organizations though none cover the continent as a whole. The IARCS and the CGIAR already work closely with several of these regional organizations and the CGIAR expects to work increasingly closely with others as they gain in strength.

The Working Group has not thoroughly analyzed the standing and capacity of the existing regional research coordinating organizations and cannot recommend at this time whether any would be appropriate as a channel for CGIAR Regional Representation. With a few exceptions, and the Southern African Centre for Cooperation in Agricultural Research (SACCAR) in Southern Africa, the Inter American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) in Latin America, and the Conference des Responsables de la Recherche Agronomique (CORAF) in West and Central Africa, are three of these, it is not clear to the Working Group which of these organizations have the confidence of the NARS in their regions.

If the principal recommendations of this review are accepted by the CGIAR, the Working Group recommend the NARS constituencies of each region are consulted on the principles of, and process for, Regional Representation. The discussion should include a possible role for existing regional coordinating organizations as links between the CGIAR and the NARS of the region.

Options for choosing and administering representatives

Better NARS contact was one recommendation of the 1988 review. It has not been implemented due to a shortage of funding. As we have noted, the persistent funding gap demonstrates a continuing lack of confidence among donors. In the light of the fact that many donors have consistently and emphatically stressed the importance of a partnership relation with the NARS, and some have urged a stronger voice for NARS in planning the international research agenda, the Working Group concludes that CGIAR

members do support the institution and its role, though they stress the need for improvements in the existing process for the selection and administration of the representatives to increase their partnership in the system. The responses of members to the survey questionnaire support this conclusion.

There needs to be healthy interaction between the CGIAR Regional Representatives and the NARS of their region. The Working Group saw the FAO Biennial Regional Conference as an accepted forum which brings political credibility to the choice of CGIAR Representatives. The Research and Technology Development Division is well equipped to manage the CGIAR agenda item at the FAO Regional Conferences and this has clearly been a valuable service for the CGIAR. The Working Group has sought options to improve linkages with the NARS and the wider regional research constituency to strengthen the process founded on the election of a representative country at the FAO Biennial Regional Conference. In many ways it is the designation of the individual to be the CGIAR Representative which is the key step in the process. The points which follow address the designation and regional consultation issues.

Countries selected to provide a CGIAR Regional Representative by the biennial FAO Regional Conference are expected to adhere to the FAO guidelines in their own selection of an individual as Representative. (See Annex 4.) *Inter alia* these suggest that countries designate 'research directors who are well versed in the agricultural research needs and programs of the region'. It is also important that representatives, once designated, initiate the inclusion of CGIAR matters on the agenda of an upcoming regional meeting of research directors, either through direct contact with the NARS directors of the region or through the regional research organization where appropriate.

Beyond this, in the course of the routinely held regional meetings NARS directors should consult on the countries and individuals who should represent the constituency in the CGIAR in future. They can then pass their nominee(s) to the Research and Technology Development Division of FAO which organizes this agenda item at the FAO Regional Conference. This will allow the regional constituency of NARS Directors the opportunity to identify the countries to provide next the CGIAR Representative. It would exploit their collective knowledge of individuals who would effectively represent the interests of the region. Such an addition would reinforce the informal process by which candidate countries willing to undertake the CGIAR Representation role, are identified prior to the FAO Regional Conference.

The Working Group is not making a recommendation on this proposed strengthening of process. It suggests that any recommendation awaits discussion with the NARS of each region on the designation of constituencies and the selection and administration of the Regional Representatives.

7. A Plan for Implementation.

Discussion has distinguished three important steps in the process for selection of Regional Representatives and linkages with the NARS making up their regional constituency:

- identification of the country to provide the CGIAR Regional Representative by election at the FAO Regional Conference.
- designation of a national in the elected country to be the CGIAR Representative.
- interaction of the designated Representative with the national research systems of the region.

The Working Group has suggested completing the circle from these steps. The two keys to effective representation in the view of the Working Group are the designation of the particular individual and linkage with NARS of the region. Regional meetings of NARS directors, though informal, offer a vehicle to bring NARS directors into the designation process, and to identify individuals, and thus countries which would be candidates for election to the FAO Regional Conference. Such meetings also offer a vehicle for NARS directors to agree on themes of importance to the region to be brought to the attention of the CGIAR through the Representative.

Two factors carry the process for improving the administration of the Regional Representatives beyond the completion of this paper.

First, the members, including the current and past representatives, emphasized that final decisions on arrangements should depend on consultation with national research systems. It is an emphasis clearly consistent with the spirit of the Regional Representative as a CGIAR institution. Second, is the chicken and egg situation on funding and process.

The Working Group recommends that a CGIAR Task Force consults with the national directors of government agricultural research services in non-member countries in the course of routine meetings in their regions over the next year. The terms of reference for the Task Force should cover the following:

- To raise the awareness of the NARS directors of the role of Regional Representatives to the CGIAR and the potential impact of effective representation.
- To identify appropriate constituencies for each region
- To discuss the arrangements proposed for the identification of countries as candidates to the FAO Regional Conference.
- To discuss how regional meetings of NARS directors called for other purposes offer a practical opportunity to discuss CGIAR matters and to brief representatives.
- To recommend a scheme of selection and administration which meets as many constituency preferences as is practical.

The Working Group has identified three options for a Task Force to consult with NARS and reconcile their views on improving the linkage between CGIAR Regional Representatives and their constituency.

- A Task Force made up of two donor members of the CGIAR and an FAO representative, joined by the current representatives in their respective regions. The Task Force would be supported by the CGIAR Secretariat.
- The CGIAR Secretariat Working Group formed to write this report continues to operate as a Task Force.
- The Research and Technology Development Division of FAO which currently administers the representatives on behalf of the CGIAR, mounts a Task Force.

If the recommendation for a Task Force is approved in principle then guidance is requested on its composition.

A trial period will seek to convince members that the modifications do in fact improve the process, that NARS based constituency representation can work effectively in the CGIAR, and that the new process merits full funding. The funding required for representatives to attend a CGIAR meeting is around U\$ 40,000. Two CGIAR and one regional meeting a year implies an annual budget of \$ 100,000.

FAO Regional Conferences operate on a two year schedule with the next round of meetings in 1994. Those meetings will give FAO the opportunity to introduce its own constituents to the changes in process. This allows time for the Task Force, if approved, to conclude discussions with the NARS in each Region.

8. Conclusions

The Working Group concludes that the roles of the Regional Representatives are well formulated. It concludes that only regions with a high proportion of non-member developing countries which are intended as direct beneficiaries of CGIAR products warrant representation. It identifies the key to effective regional representation as a close link between the representative and a relevant constituency in his region. The Working Group has made the following **recommendations** to achieve this:

1. The CGIAR will not seek the appointment of any more Regional Representatives from the FAO European Region.
2. A total of eight Regional Representatives should sit in the CGIAR meetings in future, each representing a sub-region.
3. Attendance of the Regional Representatives at yearly meetings of national agricultural research directors should be the link between NARS constituencies in eight sub-regions with the decision making process of the CGIAR.
4. A CGIAR Task Force will pursue the operational details of the changes by discussion with NARS in each region.

The Working Group sees this review of regional representation as particularly timely. Five parallel trends reinforce the need for more effective NARS representation in the CGIAR. First, the increased regional emphasis in the way the CGIAR sets its priorities. Second, the need to mobilize the ecoregional concept approved by the CGIAR for effective research on natural resource management. Both these will benefit from a permanent channel from the Group to constituencies of regional NARS. Third, the growing recognition among developing countries and donors alike, that regionally organized research is a cost effective way to use the limited financial and human resources of the developing countries. Fourth, an important number of donors believe the CGIAR should be more demand driven in formulating its policies and priorities. Fifth, finally, and perhaps most importantly both now and in the future, CGIAR members seek strong and continuing reassurance from the developing countries that they benefit from, appreciate and support international agricultural research in the CGIAR Centers.

ANNEX 1

Current Regional Representatives to the CGIAR

AFRICA - Mauritius & Morocco

J. Robert Antoine, Director
Regional Sugarcane Training Center
c/o M.S.I.R.I.
Le Reduit, Mauritius

Telex 996-4477
Phone (230) 4547024
Fax (230) 4541971

Term expires
1992

Dr. M. Faraj Hocein, Director
Institut National de la Recherche
Agronomique
Avenue de la Victoire
B.P. 415
Rabat, Morocco

Phone (212-7) 70049/70955
Fax (212-7) 770049

Term expires
1992

ASIA & PACIFIC - India & Samoa

Dr. G.C. Srivastava
Joint Secretary
Department of Agricultural
Research and Education
Ministry of Agriculture
Indian Council of Agricultural
Research
Krishi Bhavan
Dr. Rajendra Prasad Road
New Delhi 110001, India

Telex 03162249 ICAR IN
Phone 384450

Term expires
1992

Mr. Tupuola Tavita
Director of Agriculture, Fisheries
and Forestry
Ministry of Agriculture
Apia, Western Samoa

Phone 22822/827

Term expires
1994

LATIN AMERICA & THE CARIBBEAN - Brazil & Trinidad/Tobago

Dr. Murilo Xavier Flores, President
Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa
Agropecuaria (EMBRAPA)
Caixa Postal 04.0315
70770 Brasilia, D.F. Brazil

Telex 391-611524/612074
Phone (55-61) 273-6215
(55-61) 272-4241
(55-61) 272-4009
Fax (55-61) 3471041

Term expires
1992

Dr. Thomas Carr
 Director of Research
 CARONI (1975) Ltd.
 Caroni Research Station
 Waterloo Road
 Carapichaima
 Trinidad and Tobago

Phone (1-809) 673-0027

Term expires
 1992
 (ext. to 1994)

NEAR EAST & NORTH AFRICA - Jordan & Tunisia

Mr. Salah Juma
 P. O. Box 925047
 Amman, Jordan

Phone (962-6) 665001

Term expires
 1992

Prof. Abderrazak Daaloul, Director
 Institut National de Recherche
 Agronomique de Tunisie
 43, Avenue Charles Nicolle
 Tunis, Tunisia

Phone (216-1) 230024

Term expires
 1992
 (ext. to 1994)

SOUTHERN & EASTERN EUROPE - Poland & Israel

Prof. Augustyn Wos, Director
 Institute of Agricultural
 and Food Economics
 skr. poczt. 984 Swietokrzyska 20
 00-002 Warsaw, Poland

Telex 867-814597/8 or 813685
 Phone (48-22) 276189
 Fax (48-22) 266117

Term expires
 1992

Dr. Joseph Shalhevet, Director
 The Israel Academy of Sciences
 and Humanities
 Liaison Office
 Unit 5-9 Fourth Floor
 W. Wing Offices
 Jian Guomenwai Da Jie ?
 Chaoyang District
 Beijing 10004
 Peoples Republic of China

Telex 716-22439 JGHBJ CN PRC
 Phone (86-1) 5002233
 Ext. 2127/2125
 Fax (86-1) 5002971/5019331

Term expires
 1992

ANNEX 2 (a)

Extract from the Second Review of the CGIAR, 1981

Involvement at the CGIAR Level

8.6 The Consultative Group includes ten member countries elected through the biannual Regional Conferences of FAO. Two countries are elected from each of the five regions. The countries then nominate individuals, either research administrators or senior scientists, to attend meetings as their representatives, but the understanding in the CGIAR is that only one person from each region acts as spokesman on any particular issue. Election is for two years, with the possibility of re-election. Attendance of these regional representatives has not been very good and only three were present at the CGIAR meeting in 1980.

8.7 CGIAR membership includes additional representation from individual developing countries by reason of their participation as donors. There were three such members in 1980, recently increased to five, with the possibility of some further increases in the future.

8.8 As far as the service units of the Group are concerned, half of the members of the Technical Advisory Committee come from the developing countries and half from industrialized countries. Currently, neither of the two Secretariats includes staff members from the developing countries, but the existing staff, though small in number, have wide international experience.

8.9 Interviews with individuals revealed a range of opinions concerning the relative importance of participation by the developing countries in such CGIAR activities as Centers Week. However, recommendations drafted in the three Regional Symposia, as well as at the Bellagio Conference in 1977,¹ stressed the usefulness of maintaining this participation in the Group's deliberations. Dissatisfaction with the present method of participation was expressed, and explained mainly by the lack of briefing and commitment of those attending Centers Week. Recommendations to improve this participation were:

- (i) that appropriate mechanisms should be developed for information about the System and the Agenda of Centers' Week;
- (ii) that the mechanism for selecting representatives should be improved in order that those selected would be interested in and knowledgeable of the System;
- (iii) that a mechanism should be developed whereby scientists and administrators of each region could deliberate and provide an informal briefing to their representatives; and
- (iv) that the CGIAR should support the cost of the participation of developing country representatives.

¹ "Potentials of cooperation among Agricultural Research Systems." Conference held at Bellagio from October 17-21, 1977.

8.10 We have already established the principles of operation under which the System may legitimately justify its non-political character. Provided these principles are followed, the effectiveness of developing country participants in the deliberations of the Group need not be as much related to their numerical strength, manner of selection, or their strong association with specific governments, as to the extent to which they are well-informed and effective in debates.

8.11 Furthermore, the weight of representation required at the Group level is also related to the type of management model followed. In a model where most of the control is decentralized, decisions in the central body are less important from the point of view of developing countries, particularly as the central function of the Group is mainly concerned with funding. It is then more important for developing countries to be strongly represented on Boards of Trustees, Programme Committees, etc., where they can effectively influence policies that affect them more directly. It would appear, therefore, that the greater the extent to which the mechanisms for policy-making are centralized, the greater the need for developing country participation within the Group.

8.12 Given that the general spirit of the recommendations in this report is directed towards keeping a decentralized system of management and operating principles that are compatible with the non-political nature of the System, it follows that the present spirit of representation by developing countries in the Group does not need to be changed. However, this argument does not negate the need to ensure that qualified, articulate and well-informed representatives of developing countries have opportunities for interacting with donors and others in the process by which policy decisions are made. This participation is healthy for the operation of the System as a whole and constitutes an effective mechanism for the development of a clear understanding of the System on the part of the professional community in the developing countries.

8.13 Against this general background, the Committee considers that concentrated effort should be made to strengthen the present method of representation before any new methods are tried. The present mechanisms could be strengthened if the following action were taken:

- (i) the CGIAR Secretariat and TAC should establish, in collaboration with FAO, mechanisms by which individuals who participate in meetings of the Group could be better informed about the System;
- (ii) FAO should seek ways of increasing the continuity of attendance of those individuals chosen as representatives;
- (iii) FAO regional meetings should provide opportunities for more extensive discussion of subjects that are relevant to the briefing of the representatives; and
- (iv) the Group should ensure that funding is provided to enable the representatives to attend meetings of the CGIAR.

ANNEX 2 (b)

Extract from paper to CGIAR at Mid-Term 1988

Regional Representation to the CGIAR

Steps to Improve the Present System

Action has been taken on many of the points suggested in the Second Review, such as the extension of the term to four years, informing the appointing government specifically about the types of individuals wanted, using the FAO regional conferences as occasions to inform the participants about the work of the CGIAR, and encouraging the governments to include the representatives to the Group in their delegations to the FAO regional conferences. The representatives now meet regularly together and with representatives of the responsible FAO office and the CGIAR secretariat prior to each meeting of the Group to go over the agenda and other matters of interest, reports on their work are distributed to the Group, and more importantly they report back to the members of the regional conference on the work of the CGIAR. Funding is provided for their travel to Group meetings, with visits to centers included en route.

In considering further improvements, it is important not to have unrealistic expectations about the amount of time and effort that can be put into CGIAR business by individuals who are in most cases in management positions in their own national research systems or related agencies. The demands placed upon them should mesh with their full time jobs, or at least make efficient use of the time they can spare from such jobs.

1. Funding has been available in the past several years from the special activities account, but quite a lot of special effort has been necessary to get the money. A more stable source of funding is clearly desirable. Donor members of the Group should consider whether they wish to provide the funds on a regular basis, in which case they should enter this item as a normal requirement to be funded each year. It might be more efficient to try to find a single donor, or perhaps two or three, which could assume this responsibility. If the Group wishes, the CG Secretariat could seek a continuing source for the required funds which are estimated to be \$100,000 to \$120,000 per year for the range of activities presently financed.

2. To implement the concept that ten persons share five seats, the representatives have been grouped together at the end of the table during Group meetings. This places them at a considerable disadvantage in participating in the business. As an experiment, their seats at the Berlin meeting will be placed in alphabetical order among the donors. If successful, this change could be continued.

3. Additional selective travel might be arranged, such as one visit to a TAC meeting, possibly during the second year of the four year term. Centers are already encouraged to invite the nearby representatives to appropriate center occasions, and this might be expanded, within the limits of times available to the representatives, particularly when leaders from other national systems will be present.

4. It is not yet clear whether the regional conferences of the FAO can become effective for interaction between the representatives and the leaders of other national systems in the region, or their political or bureaucratic superiors. A good deal of such interaction may be possible by seizing opportunities afforded by meetings for other purposes. A greater effort could be made by the CG

Secretariat, the FAO, donors and the regional representatives themselves to watch for such opportunities, and to take advantage of them.

5. Given that the representatives have limited time, and that the degree of developing country interest varies considerably among issues discussed in the Group, the regular pre-Group meeting discussions might be used to look ahead to items on future agendas and assign responsibilities by agreement to individual representatives with a special interest. Representatives could select issues of relevance to their own work, to ease the task of preparing to take a role in the discussion.

6. The Group might invite the representatives to act as its conscience on the issue of consultation with national systems, and to point actively to needs for and opportunities for such consultation.

7. Reports to the group need not be frequent: one per year should be adequate. Rather than go over issues already discussed in the Group, they might concentrate on activities of the representatives to report to their constituents, and feed-back they obtain. These reports might be supplemented by an annual analytical discussion of progress from the Research Development Center of FAO.

8. The issue has been raised whether it is appropriate for center board members to serve as regional representatives. The concern expressed is that they may use their positions to express interests of centers rather than developing countries. There may be some validity to the concern, but since board members sometimes occupy donor seats in the CGIAR, it does not seem appropriate to bar them from regional representative seats.

Supplemental Actions

1. There may be occasions where discussion of a particular topic in the Group would benefit from a substantial input from informed representatives of developing countries, but that input requires a specialized background which might not be available among the regional representatives or TAC members or perhaps requires more preparation than can be expected without advance arrangements,. In such cases, the CG Secretariat might arrange for the participation of appropriate individuals as consultants to the CGIAR. In practice, this is already done on some occasions, for example through participation of a number of developing country experts in the discussions of gender issues at ICW87.

2. The Group can continue to seek developing country donor members. Progress is likely to be slow in obtaining new commitments of funds at a time of debt crisis when even the richer developing countries are very short of foreign exchange. While no broad effort to establish mechanisms for collective membership for developing countries seems called for, the Group should be prepared to consider any such arrangements that are proposed.

3. There is scope for more assiduous consultation with developing country institutions in the course of preparing center and group strategies and other major positions. Perhaps equally important is the need to reflect the content of such consultations in bringing the final recommendations to the Group, particularly where there are substantial differences between some of the opinions expressed and the recommendation for Group approval.

4. While there has been recognition for some time of the importance of informing the public in developing countries about the work of the centers and its importance for their welfare, not very much has been done along these lines. A strategy for more effective communication with public in developing

countries might be worked out, including a role for the regional representatives, if they have the inclination to participate.

5. In drawing up lists for participation in the expanded system meetings during Centers Week, if the Group approves such an approach, special consideration could be given to organizations such as IFARD and IICA which can contribute to the consultative process insights into the viewpoints in the developing countries.

Conclusions

The following points are offered for the Group's consideration in an effort to provide a framework for decision-making:

1. Instead of continuing to discuss whether some better mechanism is available, it is suggested that the Group give the proposals of the Second Review as amplified and modified above, a reasonable chance. After four years, which should be long enough for the measures to have their full effect, the situation should be evaluated.
2. Generally, the measures to strengthen the existing system and to supplement it by related actions as listed above and modified during the Group's discussion should be tried during the four year period, together with such additional steps as experience suggests.
3. More stable funding should be obtained either by authorizing the CG Secretariat to include support for the regional representatives as a regular item in the annual budget for contributions by donors, or alternatively requesting the Secretariat to seek continuing contributions from a limited number of donors.

ANNEX 3

REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS

1. AFRICA (South of the Sahara)

1.1 CILSS (Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought in the Sahel) Comite Permanent Interetats de Lutte Contre la Secheresse dans le Sahel

Founded 1973, CILSS is made up of representatives of 9 African countries in the Sahel that are affected by devastating droughts. Purpose is to combat the drought and desertification in the Sahel through long term strategies which involve progressive educational, hydraulic, environmental, and settlement programs.

Biennial meeting of heads of state - next 1992.

INSAH (Institut du Sahel)

INSAH was established 1977 by CILSS member states for coordinating, promoting, and harmonizing agricultural research in the Sahel. Its mandate also includes the collection, analysis and dissemination of scientific and technical information, and the training of research scientists and technicians.

1.2 CORAF (Conference for Representatives of Agricultural Research in Africa)

Created during the Third Franco-African Seminar on Agricultural Research held in Abidjan from March 23-27, 1987. Every year CORAF brings together representatives of agricultural research, generally directors of national institutes of the member countries: Benin, Burkina-Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, France, Congo, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Togo, Zaire. The conference also welcomes new members.

1.3 IGADD (Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development)

IGADD was created 1986 by the heads of state as a regional body to coordinate efforts to combat drought and desertification, and to encourage economic development. The member states include: Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda. Because of the central role played by agriculture in the economic development of the region and the effects of drought and desertification on agriculture, the fields of agricultural research training and extension were identified as areas for special attention.

1.4 SACCAR (Southern African Center for Cooperation in Agricultural Research)

Founded in 1984 SACCAR is a regional, non-profit research support organization funded initially by CIDA and IDRC of Canada, USAID, Italy and SAREC of Sweden. SACCAR has its roots in the formation of the Southern African Development Coordination Conference (SADCC).

SACCAR was established with the following objectives:

- to promote cooperation in agricultural research among the national agricultural research systems of the SADCC member states;
- to generate new technology through agricultural research;
- to coordinate SADCC regional agricultural research projects and programs;
- to facilitate the exchange of information on new and old technologies among the SADCC national agricultural research systems;
- to promote the development of the human capital necessary to man the national agricultural research systems.

1.5 SAFGRAD (Semi-Arid Food Grain Research and Development)

The current SAFGRAD project known as JP-31, a multi-donor research effort to promote food grain production in the semi-arid sub-Saharan Africa came into being 1977, following a 1976 Resolution of the OAU Council of Ministers to respond to the severe droughts of the 1970s.

From 1987, the project activities under SAFGRAD-II were completely transformed into the development of networks. In effect, SAFGRAD-II provided substantial resources to IITA and ICRISAT as well as to a regional unit of OAU/STRC (referred to as the SAFGRAD Coordination Office, SCO) to set up four regional crop networks.

2. ASIA & THE PACIFIC

2.1 APAARI (Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions)

Established 1990. Presently there are 14 members: Bangladesh, China, Fiji, India, Malaysia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Western Samoa. Each country is represented by its top agricultural research body.

The objectives of the Association are:

- promote the exchange of scientific and technical knowhow and information in agriculture;
- encourage the establishment of appropriate cooperative research and training programs in accordance with identified regional, bilateral or national needs and priorities;
- assist in strengthening of research organizational and management capability of member institutions; and

strengthen cross-linkages between national, regional and international research centers and organizations, including universities, through involvement in jointly-planned research and training programs.

2.2 ASEAN-COFAF (Association of South East Asian Nations - Committee on Food, Agriculture and Forestry)

ASEAN was founded 1967 and has 6 members: Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. COFAF operates under the auspices of ASEAN and aims to:

- strengthen cooperation among member nations in order to develop food, agriculture, and forestry sectors;
- study and review the situation in these sectors;
- promote the exchange of information.

Annual meeting.

3. LATIN AMERICA & THE CARIBBEAN

3.1 CARDI (Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute)

Founded 1975 by the member states of the Caribbean Community. Conducts agricultural research and development programs addressing common problems in the region. Strives to increase agricultural diversification, improve productivity of basic food crops and animal production, lower costs and increase profitability of farm production, and expand products for utilization in agro-industries. Facilitates cooperation among members in agricultural matters; promotes application of new technologies to all aspects of agricultural production. Provides technical assistance and training to small-scale farmers; plans to operate agricultural information service. Sponsors graduate educational programs and workshops, seminars, and short courses for agricultural personnel.

3.2 IICA (Interamerican Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture)

Founded 1942 as a specialized agricultural agency of the Organization of American States to promote economic and social development through teaching, research, technical assistance, and communication in the field of agriculture and rural life. Members are countries of North, Central, South America and the Caribbeans. Promotes training of professionals in plant and animal sciences, rural economics and social science, communications, and extension services; works to improve local institutions; provides technical assistance. Maintains national offices in the United States, Canada, the Caribbean, and all Central and South American countries. Executes projects for organizations such as the Inter-American Development Bank, the European Community, Agricultural Cooperative Development International, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Bank, the Kellogg Foundation, and USAID.

Biennial general assembly. Also holds semiannual board of ministers meeting.

4. WEST ASIA & NORTH AFRICA

4.1 AARINENA (Association of Agricultural Research Institutions in the Near East and North Africa)

Established in 1983 under the auspices of FAO, ICARDA and ISNAR. The Association consists of 16 member countries: Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, and Yemen. AARINENA has agreed on mechanisms of collaboration on areas such as international and regional cooperation, training, networking, research organization and management and information systems.

~~5. Khartoum.~~

~~5.1~~ AOAD (Arab Organization for Agricultural Development)

Founded: 1972. Members: 21. Staff: 26. Languages: Arabic, English, French. MULTINATIONAL. Representatives of Arab states. Advocates a unified and self-sufficient agriculture for the Arab world. Objectives are to: create and develop agricultural ties between Arab countries; develop natural and human resources in the agricultural sector; increase agricultural productivity by introducing scientific methods into production. Maintains Arab Center for Agricultural Documentation and Information which houses a 14,000 volume library of books, pamphlets, and periodicals on agriculture.

Annex 4

Extract from FAO Document NERC/92/5

TWENTY-FIRST FAO REGIONAL CONFERENCE FOR THE NEAR EAST

Teheran, Islamic Republic of Iran, 17-21 May 1992

REPRESENTATION OF THE REGION IN THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH (CGIAR)

Representation of the Region on the CGIAR

In order to facilitate adequate representation of the developing countries on the CGIAR, the FAO Conference agreed in 1971 that each region should elect two representatives to serve for a two-year period. This function was entrusted to the FAO Regional Conferences, which in turn endorsed the Director-General's proposal that countries should be elected for a term of normally four years. The present situation concerning representation in the various regions is shown below:

Africa:	Morocco and Mauritius
Asia and the Pacific:	India and Western Samoa
Latin America:	Brazil and Trinidad & Tobago
Near East:	Jordan and Tunisia
Southern and Eastern Europe:	Israel and Poland

Criteria for Selection of Member Countries and Their Responsibilities

The following criteria for the selection of member countries to serve as the Regional Representatives and the responsibilities of this office have been endorsed by the Regional Conference. They are equally valid for all regions.

- (i) The country should express interest in representing the region on the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research and should be willing to take the responsibility for representing all the countries in the region and for meeting some of the expenses of such representation.
- (ii) The country should have a reasonably effective national agricultural research system with cooperative links to other such systems and to international institutions and organizations.
- (iii) The country should designate as the steward of its regional representation a prominent research leader and scientist/administrator with substantial professional experience.

His/her qualifications for the role of Regional Representative should be transmitted to the member countries of the region.

- (iv) It will be the responsibility of the persons designated by the elected countries to consult periodically with other countries of the region on research needs and priorities so as to ensure adequate representation of the views of the region in the CGIAR.

Effectiveness of Representation

The Director-General of FAO considers it essential that Member States in developing regions should have adequate and effective representation on the CGIAR. Member countries elected to represent the region are urged therefore to designate research directors who are well-versed in the agricultural research needs and programmes of the region. Once the individual is designated he/she should participate in all meetings of the CGIAR for the entire term of office. In this regard, each FAO Regional Conference reserves the right to terminate the representation of its member country which fails, for one reason or another, to ensure participation in two successive meetings of the CGIAR.

Member countries elected to represent the region are also urged to support their designated representatives in efforts to become aware of and keep current on the problems and priorities in the region and on the scope for assistance through international research. Such support could be given for example by including the representatives in delegations attending major relevant regional meetings. The designated representatives should be encouraged to consult with leaders of selected national research systems in their region to facilitate the input of national views to the CGIAR and feedback from the Group to member countries. FAO will be pleased to offer any assistance that will help strengthening the liaison between the CGIAR and the region. It is ready to assist Member Governments in the selection of an eminently suitable national to represent the region in the CGIAR.