

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Mailing Address: 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433, U.S.A.

Office Location: 701 18th Street, N.W.

Telephone (Area Code 202) 473-8951

Cable Address-INTBAFRAD

Fax (Area Code 202) 473-8110

From: The Secretariat

April 20, 1994
MT/94/11

Mid-Term Meeting, May 23-27, 1994
New Delhi, India

Proposal for a CGIAR Policy Toward Eastern Europe **and the Newly Independent States of the Former Soviet Union**

The attached paper proposes elements of a CGIAR policy toward the countries of Eastern Europe and the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union. It was prepared by the CGIAR Oversight Committee upon the request of the CGIAR at the 1993 International Centers Week.

Members of the Group will have the opportunity to discuss the recommendations contained in the paper and to decide whether or not to endorse such a policy.

Distribution:

CGIAR Chairman

CGIAR Members

Center Board Chairs

Center Directors

TAC Chair, TAC Members, and TAC Secretariat

PROPOSAL FOR A CGIAR POLICY TOWARD EASTERN EUROPE AND THE NEWLY INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

SUMMARY

The CGIAR Oversight Committee proposes that the CGIAR adopt a policy toward the countries in Eastern Europe and the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union with the following elements:

1. The OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) definitions for eligibility for Official Development Assistance should be followed to determine in which countries the CGIAR could, in principle, collaborate on terms applying to any "traditional" developing country.
2. The CGIAR should maintain a restrictive attitude to expansion of its activities in these countries. No activities should be carried out in a manner that infringes on the capacity of the CG centers to carry out their present mandates in the "traditional" developing countries.
3. The principle of full cost coverage should be followed for all CG activities in these countries.
4. The CG and its centers should keep an active watching brief on the region.
5. Regional representation in the CGIAR should be expanded, in consultation with FAO, to include these countries.

INTRODUCTION

The relationship the CGIAR should have with the CEECs/NIC was debated at ICW 93. The Group concluded that the Oversight Committee should look into the policy aspects of this issue and present a proposal for consideration by the CGIAR at MTM 94. The Committee has done so, and its views are contained in this report.

The new economic and political realities of the post Cold War world are affecting the CGIAR in a variety of ways. In particular, the Central and Eastern European Countries and the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union, in the following referred to as CEECs/NIS, provide the CGIAR with new challenges and opportunities. These states are already presenting CG centers with added claims on their services and expertise. Most of the centers are able and ready to contribute significantly to national, and international efforts in these countries. However, with the CG system suffering from severe financial restrictions the resources available to the IARCs do not permit them to become deeply involved.

Many CGIAR members have earmarked considerable financial resources for collaboration with the CEECs/NIS. However, these resources are in large measure administered outside the regular aid agencies responsible for support to the CGIAR. An issue to be considered by the CGIAR is to what extent CG centers should involve themselves in activities in the CEECs/NIS with funding earmarked for other than traditional development activities.

DAC CLASSIFICATIONS

The OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is responsible for classifications of developing countries used by the donor community as a basis for definitions of what constitutes Official Development Assistance (ODA).

At its High Level Meeting in December 1993 the DAC agreed to revise its list of countries receiving aid. The objective of the revision was to ensure that the list continues to provide a relevant guide to aid patterns, thus fulfilling its role as a basis for statistical information on aid and other resource flows for development purposes. The new approach to the list reflects:

- the success of the development process in a growing number of developing countries, and
- the importance of the new aid recipients referred to as the CEECs/NIS.

The revised list is titled the **DAC List of Aid Recipients** and presented in two parts. The distinction between the two parts does not reflect any difference in the quality of aid, but only the category of recipient country or territory in relation to the UN target for ODA. Part I lists developing countries categorized into Least-developed Countries (LLDCs) and other income groups based on regularly updated World Bank thresholds, including those CEECs/NIS which the DAC agreed to assimilate into this part of the list. The aid receipts of Part I countries are accounted as ODA and set against the UN target of 0.7 percent of donor GNP. Part II lists countries in transition with two sub-categories, the remaining CEECs/NIS and those "traditional" developing countries progressing from Part I of the list. The aid receipts of Part II countries and territories are not counted towards the UN target.

The DAC list has been essentially unchanged since the 1960s. DAC now has introduced the principle of moving countries and territories which achieve a significant measure of development progress from Part I to Part II of the list. By the end of 1995 DAC will introduce a threshold based on a composite set of objective indicators, including the appropriate level of GNP per capita, to be agreed by DAC, together with other indicators. In the meantime, the DAC donors have expressed their intention to continue or intensify the concentration of their aid in countries whose GNP per capita falls within the World Bank lending threshold (US\$ 4,715 in 1992) with some donors wishing to maintain selected and especially targeted assistance activities in countries above that threshold.

Annex 1 shows the CEECs/NIS as classified by the DAC in Part I and II respectively of the list. A total of eight countries are listed in Part I, five in Central Asia (Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan) and three in the Caucasus region (Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan). All countries listed in Part II are located in Central and Eastern Europe. Given the provisional nature of the list and pending the refinement of the methodology for classification, it is possible that some countries will be downgraded from Part II to Part I. For example, Bulgaria, Moldova and Romania had applied for Part I status but are for the time being retained in Part II.

When conditions allow, it will be necessary to include also the countries of ex-Yugoslavia (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia, Serbia/Montenegro and Macedonia) as well as Albania. These are all listed by DAC as Lower middle-income countries (LMICs) in Part I of the list but not included in Annex 1.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND RESEARCH IN THE CEECs/NIS

Agricultural Potential and Yields

The CEECs/NIS embrace a wide spectrum of levels of development, rendering generalizations difficult. Countries such as Hungary and the Czech Republic have markets, skills and institutions approaching those in the West. Other countries, such as Romania and Bulgaria and the former Soviet republics in Europe including Russia, present a broad range of high skills coupled with incomplete markets, unevenly developed institutions and uncertain legal frameworks for economic activity. The Asian countries of the former Soviet republics tend to have conditions not dissimilar to those of their developing neighbors such as China, India and Pakistan but without the stability and established institutions of these countries.

The agricultural potential of the CEECs/NIS varies from country to country but is, for the group as a whole, very substantial. Parts of Eastern Europe and Central Asia have the potential to be, indeed have formed, one of the granaries of the world. However, this potential is far from being realized. Agricultural production in the former Soviet Union is declining (Annex 2, table 1), and crop yields in the CEECs/NIS are generally far below those of major agricultural producers in the West (Annex 2, table 2).

The decline of agricultural production in these countries is due to a variety of factors of historical, political, economic and technical nature. These include inadequately developed market and transport systems, uncertainties regarding land ownership, shortfalls in farm input supply, inadequate agricultural extension systems, uncertain credit supply and widespread environmental degradation. Addressing these issues, in itself a huge task, is essential not only for the development of the individual countries in question but also for meeting global food needs.

Agricultural Research

The national agricultural research systems (NARS) in the CEECs/NIS are of variable quality and coverage. In the countries in Central and Eastern Europe the NARS are generally well established institutions with a long research tradition. In most instances these institutions now suffer the consequences of economic adjustment and budgetary stringencies resulting in low investment, decaying facilities, and an isolation from research institutions in the West. These NARS often face a generational change with many scientists approaching retirement, while it is proving difficult for them to compete for new talent with the emerging private industry and agriculture. To revitalize the NARS in the CEECs/NIS, it will be necessary to overhaul the institutional structure, improve linkages with extension services, strengthen collaboration with the growing private agricultural sector, introduce comprehensive staff training schemes and expand international contacts, not least with the CG centers.

Agricultural research in the former Soviet Union has been severely disrupted by the new political boundaries. Under the former Soviet regime agricultural research was organized under several institutional (governmental) frameworks, particularly the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences (VASKHNIL). Just prior to the collapse of that regime there were approximately 1,100 agricultural research institutions in the Soviet Union, and about half of them were affiliated with the VASKHNIL system. The research farms, experiment stations, and satellite research facilities, when added to the full scale research institutions, brought the total number of scientific facilities engaged in agricultural research to 3,300.

As the Soviet Union was dismantled this elaborate network was one of the first casualties. Following the creation of the NIS, the subordinate institutions, experiment stations and research farms were severed from their parent institutions. The former all-union institutions of the VASKHNIL system found themselves in even greater turmoil since they were part of a government structure that no longer served the purpose of the NIS. Because they were viewed as extensions of the former centralized government, and reformers were trying to distance themselves from all institutions associated with the former system, support for their preservation waned. The fate of individual institutions has varied depending on the ability of proponents for each institute to argue for and/or coerce strategic political support.

The restructuring of the institutional framework for agricultural research in the Russian federation has been a complicated process. Struggles over control of the institutional assets remaining from the Soviet regime are played out at every level of government. VASKHNIL has been merged into what was the Academy of Agricultural Sciences for the Russian republic. Other components in the institutional framework for agricultural research have been restructured as well. The Ministry of Agriculture in Russia now has some 70 affiliated research institutions, and there are 60 institutions for higher education in agricultural sciences with limited research functions.

The situation in the NIS is illustrated in Annex 3 with the case of Azerbaijan. While well staffed in comparison with many "traditional" developing countries and seemingly strong, the agricultural research system of this country is suffering severely from the disruption of its links with Moscow, in addition to a host of other factors.

CURRENT CGIAR INVOLVEMENT IN THE CEECs/NIS

The overall involvement of the CG system in research and training activities in the CEECs/NIS is limited. However, a few IARCs have long-standing relations with these countries. Several additional centers are receiving requests for cooperation from the CEECs/NIS, and some are actively considering expanding their activities in these countries.

The Center Directors' Committee has been compiling information on the IARCs' interest in the CEECs/NIS. Based on this information summaries are provided in Annex 4 of the involvement in the CEECs/NIS of those six centers that have had the most extensive past contacts with those countries. These are CIAT, CIMMYT, CIP, ICARDA, ICRISAT and IPGRI. It is evident from Annex 4 that even the level of activity in the CEECs/NIS of these six centers is modest.

A CGIAR POLICY TOWARD THE CEECs/NIS

The CEECs/NIS present the CGIAR with a number of issues on which the system to date has not developed clear decision rules. There is therefore a need for the CGIAR to agree on a policy toward this group of countries. Such a policy is proposed to have the following five principal elements.

1. Follow the DAC definitions

As stated earlier in this report, DAC has recently reviewed the CEECs/NIS and entered them in its list of countries receiving development aid. Eight of them were classified by DAC as developing and aid to these countries is counted toward the UN target (ODA), while aid to the remaining CEECs/NIS is not classified by DAC as ODA. The CGIAR

members generally adhere to the DAC definitions. Their support to the CGIAR is included in ODA, as defined by DAC, and administered by agencies responsible for their ODA.

In the case of the CEECs/NIS the DAC grouping of countries in Part I and II respectively of its list is wrought with a number of methodological difficulties. These have been recognized by DAC and will be addressed within the coming two years. It is possible that as a result of refinements of the methodology used by DAC, some CEECs/NIS will be downgraded from Part I to Part II of the list (indeed some may be upgraded).

Adhering to DAC's definitions would mean that the eight CEECs/NIS listed in Part I of DAC's list would, in principle, be eligible for collaboration with the CGIAR as would any "traditional" developing country. The CGIAR would equate these countries with any other developing country listed as such by DAC.

The CEECs/NIS listed in Part II of the list, would be free to join the CGIAR as members but would then have to satisfy the usual membership criteria (principally a minimum hard currency contribution). This is notwithstanding the fact that all of them are now members of the World Bank and recipients of Bank loans on IDA terms.

2. Maintain a Restrictive Attitude to Expansion in the CEECs/NIS

At ICW 93 there was extensive discussion of the economic difficulties that the CG system is facing. The 1994 financial forecast, based on the most recent pledges by CG donors, indicates that there would be a nominal decrease of 17 percent, in real terms 33 percent, of core funding for the 13 pre-expansion centers from 1990 to 1994. Shortfalls in the US contribution, unknown at ICW 93, will make the actual decrease even larger.

Action is now being taken by the system to address the issue of declining core funding. Pending the outcome of such efforts it would not be responsible of the CG to agree to any significant expansion of the activities of the IARCs in the CEECs/NIS. Further, no activities of the CGIAR in the CEECs/NIS should be carried out, or be seen to be carried out, in a manner that infringes on the capacity of the CG centers to carry out their present mandate in the "traditional" developing countries.

3. Follow the Principle of Full Cost Coverage

A restrictive attitude does not mean that activities by CG centers in the CEECs/NIS would be excluded. Exceptions are principally of two kinds and in both instances follow the principle of full cost coverage, i.e. all direct and indirect costs should be covered and there must be no deviation from the existing mandate of the IARC concerned.

First, some centers have included activities relating to the CEECs/NIS in their approved MTPs. One example is ICARDA which already has a scientist-to-scientist relationship with countries in this group. Another is IPGRI which has built into its MTP a program for Europe, including several CEECs/NIS, recognizing the genetic resource as a global resource, not one defined by income levels or other criteria. Second, several centers are

being invited to participate in activities in the CEECs/NIS to be funded from the resources earmarked by donors for these countries that fall outside DAC's ODA definition. Centers may participate in such activities on a restricted project basis, provided that all direct and indirect costs are covered and that there is not prejudice to their approved MTPs.

4. Keep a Watching Brief on the CEECs/NIS

The situation in the CEECs/NIS is fluid in several respects. Many of these countries are important contributors to global food supplies and have the potential to play a much more significant role in that regard. However, their political, economic, social and institutional systems are undergoing comprehensive change. The classification by DAC of some of them as developing is provisional and may be revised. With time the financial situation facing the CGIAR may improve allowing for a more active involvement by the IARCs in the CEECs/NIS. Besides, there may be increasing opportunities for the centers to derive revenue from restricted projects from non-ODA resources, as outlined above.

For all of these reasons, it would be advisable for the CGIAR to maintain an active watching brief on developments in the CEECs/NIS. This would be particularly important for those centers that already are developing their contacts with these countries. At the system level such a watching brief would likely entail an open attitude to deliberations on policy matters with representatives from the CEECs/NIS. It would also mean that these countries should be included in future CGIAR priority setting exercises by TAC. At the center level it should involve principally monitoring of research output with a level of ambition to be determined by each individual center. At both levels it should include the possibility of extending invitations to research administrators and scientists from the CEECs/NIS to participate in fully funded conferences, training courses and other gatherings organized by CG centers. Such meetings are of great value for scientists from the CEECs/NIS to establish contacts with IARCs and break their isolation.

5. Expand the CEECs/NIS Representation in the CG

At present the only representation of the CEECs/NIS in the CGIAR is under the heading "Europe" where currently representative sit from the Czech Republic and Israel respectively. This is an outdated order in need of revision. Since western Europe is already very adequately represented in the CGIAR, the heading should be revised to refer explicitly to the CEECs/NIS. This would allow this group of 21 countries to have two permanent seats for representatives at CG meetings.

This would raise the issue of where Israel should be represented. One way might be to add Israel to the CEECs/NIS group of countries. Another and perhaps more appropriate way would be to define a new group covering the Mediterranean region (North Africa and the Middle East) for representation in the CG. This would mean a net addition of one region of countries and two seats at CG meetings. Arguably, this would be a reasonable consequence of the creation of the new group of countries that the CEECs/NIS represent.

In any event, the issue of regional representation would need to be resolved jointly with the FAO, which is responsible for the selection of the regional representatives, in the overall context of the future of the fixed term representation at CG meetings.

In addition, the participation of representatives from the CEECs/NIS on center boards should be encouraged within the usual criteria for board member selection.

REFERENCES

- Development Assistance Committee (DAC), 1993. **Review of the DAC List and ODA Definition: Agreed Outcome.** Note by the Secretariat ref DCD/DAC(93)27/REV3, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.
- Holderbaum, James: **Agricultural Institutions and their Relevance for the Future**, in Strauss, Michael S. and Thomson, Sandra M.B. (eds), 1993. **Science, Agriculture, and Environment in the Former Soviet Union**, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C.
- World Bank, 1992. **Food and Agricultural Policy Reforms in the Former USSR - An Agenda for the Transition**, the World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- World Bank, 1993. **Azerbaijan - From Crisis to Sustained Growth**, World Bank Country Study, the World Bank, Washington, D.C.

COUNTRIES IN EASTERN EUROPE AND THE FORMER USSR ON THE DAC LIST OF AID RECIPIENTS (PER DECEMBER 1993)

Part I: Developing Countries and Territories (Official Development Assistance)

	<u>No. of Countries</u>
(i) LDCs:	0
(ii) Other LICs (per capita GNP USDb75 in 1992):	
Tajikistan	1
(iii) LMICs (per capita GNP USD676 - 2 695 in 1992):	
Armenia	
Kyrgyzstan	
Georgia	
Uzbekistan	
Azerbaijan	
Turkmenistan	
Kazakhstan	7
Total, Part I:	8

Part II: Advanced Countries and Territories (Other Official Aid for Development)

Lithuania	
Ukraine	
Latvia	
Moldova	
Slovak Republic	
Poland	
Czech Republic	
Russia	
Estonia	
Belarus	
Hungary	
Romania	
Bulgaria	
Total, Part II	13

GRAIN PRODUCTION IN THE FORMER USSR, 1976-91

Year	Area (mill ha)	Yield (tons/ha)	Production (mill tons)
1976-80 average	127.9	1.60	206.9
1981-85 average	121.4	1.49	180.3
1986-89 average	114.7	1.80	206.9
1990-91 average	108.8	1.89	205.0
1986	116.5	1.80	210.1
1987	115.2	1.83	211.4
1988	114.9	1.70	195.1
1989	112.3	1.88	210.9
1990	109.5	2.15	235.0
1991	108.0	1.62	175.0

Note: Yield and production figures are based on July-November harvest of winter and spring grain crops.

Source: World Bank, 1992; as derived from Goskomstat USSR data.

**CROP YIELDS IN THE FORMER USSR AND IN SELECTED COUNTRIES,
1988-1990 AVERAGE (TONS PER HECTARE)**

Country	Cereals	Wheat	Roots and Tubers	Potatoes	Sugar Beets
Former USSR	1.9	2.0	11.0	11.0	26.7
Argentina	2.3	1.9	31.4	23.6	-
Canada	2.2	1.8	25.0	24.8	37.8
France	6.0	6.3	31.4	32.2	64.5
Germany					
Eastern part	4.4	4.9	30.3	36.1	27.1
Western part	5.7	6.6	28.0	26.1	53.9
Poland	3.1	3.8	19.0	18.9	35.4
Romania	3.1	3.4	11.0	10.7	17.6
United States	4.3	2.4	31.1	32.2	43.7

- Not available

Note: Three-year average for 1988-90.

Source: World Bank, 1992; as derived from FAO Agricultural Yearbook, various years, and Goskomstat USSR data.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AND RESEARCH IN AZERBAIJAN

A national system of agricultural extension, as commonly understood outside the former Soviet Union (FSU), does not exist in Azerbaijan. However, the system of central planning, resource allocation and delivery orders to farms has provided a mechanism for some 1,800 agronomists and engineers posted at the rayon level to impart instructions on varieties and practices to farm managers. Identifying, adapting, and developing new technology appropriate for Azerbaijan's agriculture are the responsibility of 13 scientific research institutions under the Ministry, the Agricultural Academy in Gendje, and, two of them, under Azerbaijan's Academy of Sciences. The various institutions also have a network of field stations that test innovations at the local level. The work of these stations is complemented by local verification studies or special projects contracted out to interested farms. Preliminary estimates indicate that some 2,000 scientists are working in the system, approximately 300 of who have Ph.D. or are Ph.D. candidates, and the remainder have M.Sc. degrees. Technological innovations produced in the system and approved by a technical committee of the Ministry are transferred as instructions to the various farms. Scientists are expected to work with farms on particular problems and in testing and adapting new technology.

The impressive, but also possibly oversized, research system faces three major problems. First, it has historically been dominated by the scientific leadership located in Moscow. Second, the system is isolated from the world of science and technology outside the FSU and former Easter block. Contacts with scientists outside those countries and the exchange of literature remain minimal. Third, the incentives for enhancing production is geared to promoting expert and creative problem-solving. Under the previous regime, agricultural research eschewed links with the world community of science and technology – that is, with foreign research centers, data sources, or even personal relations between individual scientists. Moreover, the connection among the agricultural research, farm production, and domestic and international markets was absent. Thus the use of modern agricultural technology has lagged behind. Past increases in production were obtained primarily by area increases, with yields remaining noticeably constant over the past 15 years.

The most important challenges for the national agricultural system will be to (i) strengthen the accountability of linkages among scientific institutions and the agricultural community, including agribusiness; (ii) rationalize and integrate the various, currently scattered research organizations with the Academy at Gendje; (iii) link scientists and such agricultural science institutions as the Academy with the world of science by modernizing libraries and providing real-time electronic networking with world scientists, libraries, and databases; and (iv) promote an active international exchange and cooperative research program, twinning institutions and scientists, organizing sabbatical exchanges, and supporting the work of specialized international research institutions.

Source: World Bank, 1993

INVOLVEMENT OF IARCS IN THE CEECs/NIS

The Center Directors' Committee has collected information from the IARCs on their past involvement and future plans in the CEECs/NIS. Some centers reported on fairly comprehensive activities in these countries, while others merely submitted a few lines on future intentions. Information had been submitted by the following centers: CIAT, CIMMYT, CIP, ICARDA, ICRAF, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IIMI, IITA, ILCA, ILRAD, IRRI, ISNAR, IPGRI.

Those centers reporting the most extensive past involvement in the CEECs/NIS included CIAT, CIMMYT, CIP, ICARDA, ICRISAT and IPGRI. Summaries of the activities of these centers are provided below.

- (i) **CIAT** supplies germplasm for beans, both dry and snap types, to several countries in Eastern Europe and has had reciprocal visits with scientists from these countries. CIAT is working on a project proposal to strengthen its links with the NARS in Eastern Europe.
- (ii) **CIMMYT** has in the last 20 years received merely four wheat improvement trainees and six visiting scientists from the USSR. However, contacts with the NIS have picked up in recent years with several exchanges of scientists. Lately wheat nurseries and seed have been supplied from the CIMMYT program in Turkey to several NIS.
- (iii) **CIP** is catalyzing the formation of a potato research information and training network involving the following countries: Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovak Republic, Poland, Slovenia and Estonia. The initiative started in July 1993 on a network basis and is being expanded with the help of a consultant. CIP has also had exchanges of germplasm and information with Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and the former Soviet Union.
- (iv) The Mediterranean-type environment covered by **ICARDA's** mandate also extends to some CEECs/NIS in the south of the former Soviet Union: Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. ICARDA's contacts with some of these countries was in 1990 formalized in a memorandum of cooperation with the former Soviet Union. Activities have included joint collection missions, germplasm exchange, hosting of visiting scientists, and a limited amount of joint crop-improvement research. ICARDA expects a growing demand for its services in these countries and is well placed to respond positively at the technical level. Its work in eastern Turkey, Iran and Pakistan is of immediate relevance.
- (v) **ICRISAT** in 1990 signed a memorandum of understanding with the former USSR regarding collaboration in the improvement of four of its mandate crops – sorghum, chickpea, pigeonpea and groundnut – and the development of improved farming systems. ICRISAT agreed to provide consultants, opportunities for cooperative research and training for Soviet scientists, scientific literature and germplasm. During 1990-93 ICRISAT supplied germplasm accessions of sorghum, pearl millet, chickpea and pigeonpea to CEECs/NIS and received in return germplasm accessions for its genebank. Cooperative research activities between ICRISAT and a Russian institute are in progress with a focus on collaborative hybridization of early-maturing sorghum and large-grained elite lines. ICRISAT has also had exchanges of scientists with Russia and Uzbekistan.

- (vi) **IPGRI** has collaborated with East European countries for the past 10 years within the framework of the European Cooperative Program for Crop Genetic Resources Network (ECP/GR), for which **IPGRI** has provided the secretariat and coordinator since 1983. All Eastern and most Western European countries are now members of this program. There are in Eastern Europe, including Russia, several valuable genetic resource collections that are now at risk because of political instability and financial cutbacks. **IPGRI** and **FAO** in 1992 organized a mission to survey these collections, and **IPGRI** is coordinating a program of support to them.