

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

1818 H St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20433 U.S.A.

Telephone (Area Code 202) 334-8021

Cable Address - INTBAFRAD

From: The Secretariat

January 8, 1985

Consultative Group Meeting

November 5 - 9, 1984

Washington, D.C.

MAIN CONCLUSIONS REACHED AND DECISIONS TAKEN

1. The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) held its regular yearly meeting, International Centers Week, from November 5 - 9, 1984, in Washington, D.C. The Plenary Session took place on the first two days of the week and the Group business meeting began at 3:45 p.m. on November 6 and continued until 5:12 p.m. on November 9. The report of the Plenary Session will be circulated separately. The summary of the main conclusions reached and decisions taken at the Group meeting is attached, together with a list of the participants (see Annex 1).

2. Members of the Group can obtain a transcript of the proceedings of the meeting on microfiche from the CG Secretariat.

Attachments

Distribution

CG Members
TAC Chairman, Members and Secretariat
Center Board Chairmen
Center Directors
Other Participants
Observers

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

International Centers Week
Consultative Group Meeting
November 6-9, 1984

1. The Consultative Group Meeting was held in the International Monetary Fund's Auditorium in Washington, D.C. from 3:45 p.m. on November 6 to 5:12 p.m. on November 9, 1984. The Chairman of the Group, Mr. S. Shahid Husain, presided over the meeting.

2. Mr. Husain's opening remarks to the Group are attached as Annex II.

Report by TAC Chairman on Strategic Issues - Agenda Item 3

3. Professor Camus stated that since his last report in May, 1984 at the Rome CGIAR meeting, considerable progress has been made. The TAC Training Study is progressing well. The study team has completed its field activities and its draft final report and TAC's reactions to it will be reported to the Group in June in Tokyo. Six case studies will be presented at that time. TAC considers the findings to be highly positive. An examination of intercenter cooperation has been underway for some time. Cooperative efforts to date have been achieved at a low level of bureaucratic needs. TAC wishes to determine optimum levels and modalities of cooperation and the final report will be made to the Group at a later date. Mandates of the centers are being examined, and a report will be made on that later.

4. The Review of Priorities for the CGIAR System study has involved a number of groups in the system: the Directors General, the Board Chairmen, and selected leaders within the system. The final results of the study will be presented next fall at ICW. The scope of the Priorities study is broad, with both short term (5-10 years) and long term (some 25 years) considerations. TAC foresees shifts in research emphasis, including phasing out of some activities, and favors a long-term framework for decision making about future research needs and technology requirements. TAC then will have to estimate the costs of these requirements and finally will have to define the roles of the individual centers in achieving the priorities. Professor Camus enumerated some of the main issues and the conclusions reached so far: the center concept is reaffirmed; the commodity improvement focus is still highly relevant, though there is a question whether the centers should extend their activities beyond production; and the thrust and direction of program and regional issues may differ by center. There is an increasing need for improved technology, caused in part by a greater pressure on land and greater intensification of agriculture; agriculture is moving into increasingly difficult areas and this will lead to greater site specificity, which in turn will slow down research progress and research results. A broadening range of services and products is expected from the centers, making it necessary for the centers

to be selective in their response to needs and opportunities; centers are building up their "upstream" research capabilities in strategic and basic research; the progressive transfer of downstream functions to national systems is eventually expected to free the resources required by the centers for the upstream work; however, the continued existence of weak national agricultural research programs will limit this transfer and even place greater pressures on centers. Centers will have to maintain some level of maintenance research in order to help defend past yield gains--just how much and the appropriate division of labor with national programs will be the question; a related issue concerns the appropriate share of resources to be assigned to efforts to close the existing yield gap in countries with weak national research programs. How much attention should the international centers be placing on food quality and nutritional needs and on demands for animal feeds? In order to reconcile the need for improved technology with the system's resource base, some hard choices may be required in the strategic considerations deliberations: irrigated versus rainfed agriculture, low-potential versus high-potential lands, upstream versus downstream research, today's needs versus tomorrow's problems, priorities among regions and among commodities; for example, should cereals continue to receive 51 percent of the system's resources 25 years from now? Other considerations are optimum size of centers and long term growth of centers, and, perhaps most difficult, the question of short term priorities among commodities and related activities. TAC considers that the centers are and will continue to be responsive to change.

5. The discussion focused heavily on the role of the centers in Africa where the environment for successful implementation of research results was considered to be particularly difficult. Several donors expressed concern about how to balance needs in Africa with continuing needs in Asia, where more people live in poverty than in Africa. One speaker questioned how coordination for Africa could be achieved without losing the autonomy considered precious and central to the center concept? The upstream/downstream concepts spurred considerable discussion, with some speakers not supportive of the centers moving upstream very far, lest they lose some of their practical orientation.

6. The permanence of the centers was discussed. Most speakers agreed that there are some activities which the centers will be called upon to perform for some time, but that there are areas where the national programs can take over as they become stronger. The division of labor between international and national centers should be clarified as much as possible. Bilateral aid can be used to help national programs handle some functions, especially technology generation using research results from international and other research institutions. A speaker noted that the sum of training activities of the CG centers probably is a major factor in agricultural training in general. To assist donors who are particularly interested in training, allocations for training should be spelled out more clearly in program and budget documents. Such an approach might also elicit new sources of funds. A member from a developing country observed that science has a cultural effect on a country, and that the predisposition towards science or the lack of it by a country may determine how much attention it gives to agricultural research and its support. The

CG centers should have links both to national programs in developing countries and to institutions in developed countries. Also, the need of most developing countries for training of its scientists was stressed.

7. Most donors indicated a desire to examine the TAC Priority paper before ICW 1985. Professor Camus indicated the paper in hand was an interim document, and that TAC would report on it to the Group in June, in detail, and would try there to present TAC's long and short term considerations. In his summary, Chairman Husain stated that the Group looks forward to discussion of the preliminary conclusions of the study at the Tokyo meeting, with the final report to be given in November, 1985. The Group generally endorses the near and long term approach to the study, but has expressed its concern about the link with national systems and the respective roles of the national and international systems. TAC should examine how the centers adapt their work in circumstances where the progress of the national systems is not as rapid as could be desired. Inter-center cooperation is generally good, but the issue of food production and regional development in Africa, necessitates a separate examination of the roles of the CG centers in Africa.

Trends in the World Food Situation - Agenda Item 4

8. Dr. John Mellor, Director General of IFPRI, presented a paper prepared at the request of the Chairman of the CGIAR, Mr. Shahid Husain, on changes in the world food situation. The paper is attached as Annex III. Dr. Mellor identified three issues of particular interest for the Group and the Centers: the swing from Asia to Africa as the area of greatest concern with respect to growth in food production, the simultaneous growth in domestic agricultural production and imports that has occurred in many of the most rapidly growing developing countries, and the continued massive malnutrition and poverty in the face of major increases in food production in Asia.

9. A lively discussion ensued, in which members concentrated mainly on the analysis and conclusions of the paper. A number expressed appreciation to the Chairman for having requested Dr. Mellor to present such a paper as a means of focusing discussion on major issues the Group is designed to address.

Impact Study - Agenda Item 5

10. Dr. J. Anderson stated in his presentation, that the Impact Study does not intend to evaluate the CG system, but rather to describe what the centers have done and achieved and are doing, especially from the perspective of the intended beneficiaries in the developing world. The work itself is still in process so that a report at this time is almost premature. The paper, which had been distributed to the audience, has three major parts. The first one describes the aims of the study and the procedure for getting the necessary information (mainly through about 30 country case studies) and contains a list of about 50 people who are engaged in this task. The second part contains the preliminary conclusions and drafts of four country case studies. They have not yet been reviewed

and should therefore not be quoted. They give a widely positive picture of the centers' activities in developing countries. The third part contains some preliminary overall results.

11. A lively discussion followed the presentation. The donors expect from the centers' activities not only good research results, but considerable contributions to solve pressing problems of global poverty and food production. Since the main readers will be politicians and other decision-makers all over the world, the final version should provide ample justification for continued funding of the system. The study does not review the CG system, but will help the centers themselves to orientate the research towards the real needs of the target groups and towards efficiency and cost effectiveness. There is already abundant evidence that the centers have had an enormous impact on national agricultural research organizations, not only in big countries like Brazil and China, and that the training of numerous researchers from developing countries has generally been very successful. It will be difficult to separate clearly the impact of centers, national organizations and other programs on agricultural development. The careful selection of thirty countries for case studies will allow, however, a view of the whole range of impacts. Some concrete proposals for the format and content of the study were made. A summary of the findings of the Impact Study will be available in a monograph form at ICW in 1985. A more comprehensive book size printed version will follow. Individual consultants' reports will be published as technical papers.

Integrative Report, Part I - Agenda Item 6

12. The discussion ranged widely over the various topics covered in the report, but four items received the greatest attention. The relationship of the Group to non-member centers performing agricultural research at the international level: a number of members commented that the proliferation of outside centers dated from the earliest days of the Group. It was particularly understandable at a time when for financial reasons, the Group had ceased expanding, but when the pressures for additional activities continued. There was no question of a mass entry of such organizations, nor even of a mass review of their qualifications. There was limited interest in the possibility of some sort of second tier membership, or separate consultative body, to provide CG-like services to donors supporting non-member centers. The Group concluded that the CGIAR should first complete its strategic considerations exercise and make judgements about priorities before deciding whether any additional centers should receive Group support. There was general agreement that it was no longer practical to arrange meetings of donors to non-CGIAR centers in "free" time on the days the Group itself was meeting. Because of the sheer number of hours involved, these sessions were now intruding on the effectiveness of the CGIAR meetings themselves. As an alternative, the secretariat was requested to schedule a day or two before or after the Group meeting proper when non-member centers could convene interested donors.

13. The burden of reviews. Various statistics introduced by the Chair of the Board chairs and centers showed a heavy workload connected with the external program and management reviews. Several suggestions were made for stretching out the time between reviews, combining review activities, and otherwise reducing the burden of reviews. Professor Camus said that TAC was already engaged in thinking about ways to improve the review process. Several donors commented that the system run reviews were a very attractive, even necessary, aspect of the work of the CGIAR and in their absence, donors might be required to place an even greater burden on centers. There was a consensus that the principle of examining efficiency and effectiveness of centers should be maintained through collective action at the CGIAR level, while avoiding undue burdens on the centers. Donors were urged to refrain from making separate reviews of center activities, and to build their requirements into system reviews if possible. The TAC and other elements of the system would reconsider the time schedule for reviews, as well as their substance, and the relationship between the management and programs reviews. These were issues that might be considered in the third review of the system.

14. Restricted core. There was considerable donor comment on the portion of the report which provided data on restricted core and its impact on funding for the system and on individual centers. The general sense was that unrestricted funding was clearly desirable, but that restricted funding also had its place. While most speakers accepted the desirability of the mix, some suggested that they might have to initiate restrictions if some of the problems continued. Others suggested that a judicious combination of unrestricted and restricted funds, the latter drawn from appropriations not otherwise available for the support of the centers, was the best hope for meeting the budget needs of the system, which were not too large on any of the measures offered in the report. The direct relationship between centers and donors was a key part of the Group's structure and no move toward pooling of funds was desired. On the other hand, if the tendency mentioned in the report for donors to expect quid pro quo's from centers, such as board memberships, were to continue, there would be cause for real concern, and centers would be placed in a very difficult position. While there was no intention to seek the abolition of restricted funding, it was important that the priorities of the system should not be vitiated. The topic should be kept under review, principally in the budget and finance study.

15. World Bank funding. Donors expressed interest in data showing that World Bank funds, which were limited to not more than 25% of the budget of a center, did tend to flow more to some centers than to others. This suggested that donors other than the World Bank read the priorities somewhat differently from the collective decisions made by the Group on the recommendation of TAC. There was a need to look into this situation and its implications, but no inclination to take action until after very serious and careful consideration.

Third Review of the CGIAR - Agenda Item 7

16. The Chairman noted that if the Third Review was to be conducted in 1985/86 (five years after the Second Review) planning for the event would have to start well in advance. An outline of what was envisaged and its timing was distributed prior to the meeting. The Chairman emphasized that he needed to have the Group's preliminary reactions but there was no need to arrive at final conclusions at this meeting.

17. There was general agreement that the third review should focus primarily on macro issues and should be the mechanism by which the current TAC Priorities study and the Training, Impact, and Finance and Budget Studies be considered in an integrated fashion. An eminent chairperson, who would work independently, should be recruited for the review from outside the CGIAR system. If the formula used in the Second Review were to be repeated and a study team and review committee were to be appointed, the Group should be given an opportunity to consider a draft report, so as to be able to participate effectively in the review process. Primarily to allow sufficient time to digest the reports of the ongoing series of studies, the Group concluded that the timing of the review might have to slip marginally from that outlined in the background paper. The timing would be discussed again at the next meeting of the Group, and, in the meantime, members should communicate their views, particularly about issues for inclusion in the terms of reference of the review to the Secretariat.

Trustee Roles, Relationships and Responsibilities - Agenda Item 8

18. Dr. Lowell Hardin presented the paper which he authored to the Group, describing it as a set of guidelines which arose from a felt need by Trustees and by CGIAR members, and as a result of the recommendations of the Second Review of the CG in 1981. The paper had benefited from the advice of an advisory panel consisting of Drs. Crouch, Ndegwa, Solandt and Vallaeys. Dr. Hardin thanked the panel for its wisdom and its different perspectives. It had also been reviewed by the TAC Chairman and the Co-sponsors, and was submitted to a collegial review process by Board members and particularly their Chairs, and by the Directors General of the Centers. In all, the paper, in its four iterations had been reviewed by over 200 people. The purpose of the paper is to provide guidance to both new and old Trustees by defining the roles, responsibilities and relationships of the Boards within the CG system. As a result of the collegial review process, much of the information sharing that the exercise was intended to accomplish has already taken place. Several Boards already include the paper--in its preliminary draft--in their briefing book for Trustees. Two appendices are yet to come. One will contain a larger description of the CGIAR system itself. The second appendix will include a detailed procedure for appointment of the CGIAR designated Trustees.

19. All the speakers in the ensuing discussion gave the paper high praise. One speaker stated that as much attention must be accorded Trustee selection as selection of centers' top management and staff. Furthermore, considerations of disciplinary and regional and country participation on Boards needed to be carefully weighed, as also the fact that out of the 180

Trustees only 6 are women. The CG secretariat was asked to draft the paper dealing with Trustee selection and was also asked to maintain a data bank of curricula vitae that would provide assistance to the Nominating Committees when vacancies occur. Dr. Hertford, representing the Board Chairs stated that his group was carrying out a census of the total Board members to establish certain of their characteristics and, when completed, the Group would be informed of its results. One speaker commented on the maturing of the functions of the Boards and the very effective role the Boards now play in the management of the system. Dr. Hertford read a resolution of the Board Chairman which essentially paid tribute to Dr. Hardin's long and wise service on several Boards of Trustees and to the wider system. This appreciation was echoed by several speakers. The Chairman of the discussion, Dr. Bommer, recommended to the Group that the document be published and that after two or three years of being used in practice, a review committee such as the Third Review Committee, should decide whether it required updating.

Report by TAC Chairman - Agenda Item 9

20. Professor Camus reported on both TAC 34 and 35 which had taken place since the last meeting of the Group. Because they were being reported on elsewhere in the agenda, the Priorities Study and the External Programme Reviews (EPRs) of IFPRI and CIAT would not be discussed in his report. The program and budget process was examined at TAC 34 when the committee decided it preferred to concentrate on the strategic parts of the program, rather than on funding at the margin. During TAC 35, the work of the Budget and Finance Study was discussed and suggestions were made to the Study Director; TAC will continue to follow the work of this study. TAC has now reached its desired target of no more than two EPRs each year. Plans for future reviews of IBPGR, ISNAR, and ILRAD were discussed briefly. The Memorandum of Agreement between CIAT and IITA for cassava research was signed in June by the two centers. The agreement calls for collaboration in cassava research and training and provides a basis for determining regional responsibilities. TAC wished to point out that this is an excellent example of inter-center collaboration. Division of responsibilities for rice research in Africa has been partly defined by several agreements between IRRI, IITA, and WARDA and other institutions. TAC welcomes collaborative efforts, but postpones endorsement of any long term agreement because of the fluidity of the situation concerning WARDA.

21. Considerable time was then devoted to the problems affecting WARDA's operations. At TAC 34, WARDA's Program and Budget documents gave highest priority to upland rice and mangrove swamp rice. Since WARDA's EPR and External Management Review (EMR), several positive steps had been taken, including apparent agreement to an expanded and strengthened Scientific and Technical Committee (STC), assignment of senior scientists to regional research centers, and the appointment of Dr. James Johnston as Director of Research and Development for two years, while on secondment from the Rockefeller Foundation. On learning of these developments, TAC recommended a 1985 CGIAR budget of US\$ 2.8 million, within an overall WARDA budget of US\$ 9.2 million.

22. At its 35th meeting, TAC was informed of new developments at WARDA that were disturbing. Through the monitoring process agreed to at the CG May meeting in Rome, Dr. Larry Stifel visited WARDA and his report was tabled at TAC 35. Dr. Stifel was encouraged by developments in the research program. WARDA had presented an integrated research and development budget to TAC 34, twelve senior scientists had been deployed from headquarters in Monrovia to field research centers, the International Rice Testing Program had been substituted for the WARDA variety trials, the subregional coordinators were no longer to be associated with the research program and hence their costs would be met entirely by WARDA and not by the CGIAR as in the past. A troubling factor was that only about 20 percent of the administrative budget, which is provided by member states, has been paid in to date and consequently the 1984 deficit is estimated at \$800,000 to \$1.2 million. Serious delays in payment of both senior and supporting staff salaries have occurred, as well as in some other obligations, including payments to the staff retirement plan. The Executive Secretary of WARDA is placing his hopes for the center's future on a meeting of the Heads of State in December, 1984 in Lome, Togo, and is also proposing that the Heads of State meet biennially. In preparation for that meeting the Executive Secretary has prepared a new constitution for WARDA.

23. Professor Camus pointed out that the major recommendation of the External Reviews was for an expanded and strengthened Scientific and Technical Committee (STC), which would be delegated many of the responsibilities of the present Governing Council. The major responsibilities of a strengthened STC were: responsibility for preparing and approving a program of research, for professional staff recruitment and evaluation, and for financial management. The Governing Council of WARDA has expressed reservations about delegating some of its powers to a strengthened STC, and has indicated it considers the STC to be advisory only. The draft of a new constitution prepared for the Governing Council, which does not even mention the CGIAR or its relationship to WARDA, gives only an advisory role to the STC. A second condition of the reviews was strengthened leadership by eliminating the Deputy Executive Secretary's position which is now political. The new constitution retains this post and reaffirms its political nature. A third condition was that WARDA recruit internationally and pay salaries commensurate with international standards; the Deputy Executive Secretary is working on this. The fourth major condition was that WARDA improve its financial management. Recruitment of a financial controller is expected early in 1985 and a recommendation for a firm of external auditors will be made soon. The internal auditor has been recruited from within the region, which goes against the recommendations of the reviews. In summing up, Professor Camus made the following points: there has been substantial progress in integrating research and development activities at WARDA but key components of the EMR are not being addressed seriously; TAC reiterates its stand that if steps approved by the CGIAR in Rome are not adopted, WARDA's future is threatened, and considers it necessary that the Governing Council be informed of TAC's concerns; to that end, TAC will withhold its recommendation for a 1985 budget for WARDA, pending the outcome of the meeting of the Governing Council of WARDA in December.

24. In his reply, Dr. Leroux, Executive Secretary of WARDA, stated that Dr. Stifel's report which was quoted by the TAC Chairman was accurate and frank, and that WARDA remained committed to applying the EPR and EMR recommendations. He further stated that TAC's arguments are accurate and that the purpose of the reviews was to correct mistakes that may have been made.

25. Members of the Group commented on the TAC report as follows:

i) STC members recruited by the CGIAR Secretariat accepted their assignments with the understanding that the reviews' recommendations had been accepted, but they were later told that WARDA had reservations about them;

ii) WARDA forwarded a different budget to its Governing Council than was approved by the STC and TAC;

iii) An independent review by the French Government in December 1983 was in essential agreement with the CGIAR EPR and EMR;

iv) Since the May meeting of the Group, WARDA's actions seem to be directly opposite to the CGIAR's recommendations;

v) The results of the Governing Council meeting are essential inputs for donors' decisions; and

vi) WARDA is an experiment in institution-building, therefore, the Group had tried to show a combination of patience and firmness to help WARDA resolve its problems.

The Group endorsed the TAC decision and stressed the need to implement the EPR and EMR recommendations to strengthen the management of WARDA.

26. The Chairman of the Group summarized the discussion stating that WARDA's problems had been considered in the context of the need to maintain scientific excellence and to maintain financial discipline, accountability and management discipline. He noted that the Group fully accepts WARDA's political nature, but the CGIAR is wedded to the concept that the institutions it supports must maintain a minimum level of efficiency.

27. The Group decided to take the following actions:

- i) withhold a recommendation on WARDA's 1985 budget,
- ii) communicate this action to the constituents of WARDA,
- iii) arrange for a CGIAR observer to attend the Lome meetings and prepare a report on the meeting for TAC, and, finally,
- iv) consult TAC to determine the appropriate action that the Group should take after Lome.

28. The Chairman said he had urged the World Bank's West Africa Region to contact the member states regarding WARDA and stated that he will visit some of the concerned West African governments himself. He added that the decisions taken were made with a heavy heart since everyone in the Group wanted WARDA to succeed, but it appeared that only through implementing the CGIAR's recommendations would WARDA succeed.

Report by Chairman of Board Chairmen - Agenda Item 10

29. Dr. Reed Hertford, Chairman of CIAT and Chair of the Board Chairmen, reported that the Chairperson's Group had met twice since ICW 1983 and that he had attended the Group meeting in Rome in May, as well as TAC 34 in Addis. The Chairpersons completed a very intensive two days of discussions in Washington prior to the opening of ICW 1984. Dr. Hertford noted that a continuing dialogue had been established with the TAC and that the center directors and the chairpersons were working together very well. Dr. Hertford stated that the CG Chairs' group is optimistic about the future of the system, though cautiously so. The Chairs believe the health of the system depends on three things being in place--appropriate vision, mechanisms for implementing that vision and strong system components. Dr. Hertford advocated establishing fixed terms for staff and management appointments, as well as for center programs. Fixed terms need not imply lack of continuity in staff or in programs but would have the effect of pressing Boards to evaluate progress more carefully and at predetermined points in time, as also of giving Boards flexibility to respond to new opportunities as they emerged. The Chairs had indicated their willingness to improve their Boards and have them assume even heavier responsibilities.

30. Dr. Hertford announced that Prof. John Dillon, Chairman of the ICRISAT Board, was elected Chair of the Board Chairs and Dr. Lennart Kahre, Chairman of the IBPGR Board, was elected Vice Chair.

31. One speaker suggested that since TAC was overloaded, some functions related to strategic considerations could perhaps be undertaken by the Chairpersons and believed that in any general redistribution of responsibilities, work and authority, the absorptive capacity of the Chairpersons should be carefully considered. In his concluding remarks on the discussion, Mr. Husain particularly thanked Dr. Hertford for his Chairmanship and for the work of the group. Mr. Husain stated his belief that in cooperative organizations, vision and leadership become a collective prerogative, which means that they must become a part of the commitment and intellectual curiosity and liveliness of the various parts of the system. The Chairpersons and Directors General of the Centers are a key element in this collective responsibility. They are not just the heads of their individual institutions and therefore concerned only with their respective institutions, but they are a very important part of the overall leadership and management of the system.

Report by Chairman of Center Directors - Agenda Item 11

32. Dr. Gamble, Chairman of the Center Directors, concentrated principally on outlining the many areas in which the centers are

cooperating closely with one another. At their meeting just prior to ICW 1984, the Center Directors had expressed full support for the TAC training study and TAC's Strategies/Priorities study. They had welcomed the ongoing Finance and Budget study because it introduced new ideas on the subject, and, though they had reservations about some of the concepts suggested, they had given cautious approval to the procedural changes suggested by the Study Director. They also welcomed the recent fund raising initiative by the CGIAR Secretariat. Dr. Gamble mentioned that Center Directors were examining, in conjunction with FAO, ways and means whereby there could be closer contact with lesser developed countries and the Group. Finally, he made a plea for donors to disburse their contributions to centers earlier in the year.

33. The Group welcomed Dr. Gamble's report. Discussion focused primarily on seeking ways and means of encouraging more effective participation by national research institutions in the activities of the Group. The practical difficulties were touched upon by several Group members--funding being an important issue. Several members mentioned the possibility of closer linkages with IFARD (International Federation of Agricultural Research Directors), and their recent experience in funding meetings designed to improve linkages between national research institutions and the centers. Mr. Husain thanked Dr. Gamble for his service during the past year and welcomed Dr. Trevor Williams as the new Chair of the Directors General.

Report on Finance and Budget Study - Agenda Item 12

34. The Study Director, Mr. Clifford stated that, because of time constraints, he would limit his presentation to a single issue; the resource allocation process. This process comprised the provision of continued institutional support for all centers and the fostering of research in growth areas. Quite clearly the allocation process needed streamlining given the prevailing financial environment. As to the participants in the process, the roles of the Center Boards of Trustees and the TAC were very clear: the Boards exercised responsibility over center specific management issues and the TAC provided a system-wide review of center programs. The study would confirm these roles while suggesting that the TAC review focus more on the medium and long term. The roles of the donors, as the decision-makers, and the CG secretariat, as the coordinator of the process, would remain the same.

35. The important changes in the new system would lie in the package of financial information that is provided to the donors and in the design of the reporting process itself. In response to the donors who wish to receive more pertinent information, a new summary funds request could be provided, containing the center's goals, objectives, program proposals and funding requirements, with the detailed budgets and cost allocation serving their appropriate purpose as center management documents. TAC would prepare an update of the CGIAR's priorities, based on its annual review of the programs. Finally, the CG secretariat would prepare a system-wide summary financial report.

36. The allocation process would use some new concepts. Currently the entire set of programs and budgets are reviewed by the TAC every year. As center activities have grown, this task has become extremely time-consuming and onerous. The study proposed that instead each center's program be formulated in two layers. The first would identify a set of activities which together represented the institutional requirements of each center and which after TAC's review and approval would remain fixed for five years. The second layer would annually identify proposals for changes and additions to the five year base. This technique would retain the accepted notion of annual reassessment of priorities, while simplifying the current system of budget brackets. By reviewing the base layer only every five years, it provides an opportunity for a zero-based review of every center--something that is not feasible under the current system.

37. The current system focuses excessively on setting a ceiling, while the proposed process would set a floor with the top allowed to fluctuate for each center. The floor would be quite different in nature to the current bottom of the bracket notion. Somewhat incorrectly, the bottom implies that an acceptable set of activities can be conducted at that level, whereas in reality the bottom represents a supply-driven level. The base would represent a level without which the center would be unable to undertake specific activities approved by the donors. Consequently, the donors' acceptance of the base would imply a commitment to fund that for all the centers. These proposals appeared to be acceptable to the center directors, center Boards and the TAC. The most important next question would be to formulate the criteria for establishing the base and doing so for each center. In doing so, the following principles should be applied: the base must be a realistic one, the items above the base must comprise growth points, the centers must exercise prudent judgement about the items that they include above the base and, most importantly, the donors must agree with the premise of institutional support for the base of the individual centers. The study director concluded his presentation by outlining his plans for the next twelve months culminating in the preparation of a report to the Group next November. These included the detailed design of the new process, followed by further discussions with the TAC, center directors and Boards, and the Group and consequent refinement of the proposals. It appeared likely that most of the recommendations could be implemented starting in 1986.

38. One speaker asked about the impact of these proposals on normal program shifts within the centers and another wondered whether the limitless ceiling would erode the priorities of the system to an extent that the base could become meaningless. There was support for the broad thrust of the study, especially for its potential for facilitating both reductions and growth. However, concern was expressed that levels of base funding be set only after a detailed review, with a phased change process. In response, Mr. Clifford observed that the process left room to incorporate specific proposals when considering the base and reiterated his earlier comment that the new process would only succeed if the donors accepted the idea of institutional support to all centers. In conclusion, the Chairman suggested that the study make a special effort to link the base with the overall priorities of the system, specifically when the

system decided that certain regions or commodities were of higher priority than the rest.

Special Activities Account - Agenda Item 13

39. The Executive Secretary of the CGIAR reported on the activities which had been undertaken during 1984 and called the attention of donors to those on-going activities which need additional support in 1985 and beyond, i.e. the Impact Study, and Finance and Budget Study. New activities for which funding is sought are an updated CGIAR brochure and other publications, and follow-up management and financial studies. Donors were also informed about their possibility of being linked into the data transfer network. To assist fixed-term representatives to participate in CGIAR meetings, donors have the option of sending their contributions directly to the trust fund in the FAO, or they can designate a portion of their contributions to the Special Activities Fund for that purpose. The donors once more endorsed the principles of the Special Activities Account and approved the 1985 proposed program and budget.

Integrative Report (Part II) - Agenda Item 14

40. The Executive Secretary of the CGIAR introduced the discussion of the second part of the Integrative Report devoted to 1984 finances, the stabilization mechanism, 1985 program and budget proposals and the long term financial plan for the CGIAR.

41. 1984 Finances. Estimates indicated that final funding of the core budgets of the centers amounted to about US\$ 173 million in 1984, compared with requirements of US\$ 178 million for the lower level of the bracket, as approved by the Group in November 1983. There has been a reduction in requirements in dollar terms, due mainly to lower inflation rates than originally anticipated. This reduction will hopefully result in an equilibrium between funding and requirements. In the discussion that followed, concern was voiced that several centers are experiencing real declines in programs in 1984.

42. Stabilization Mechanism. The 1984 funding of the mechanism was provided out of the 1983 World Bank carry over, together with a contribution by the Netherlands and an amount equal to unrestricted carry-overs by centers into 1984, making a total of about US\$ 4.0 million. One speaker underlined the need to finance the mechanism only with incremental funds, so as not to harm the centers' programs. No disbursements had been made from the Fund as yet in 1984--it's first year of operation. A table showing its operations will be provided to the Group at its next meeting

43. 1985 Program and Budget Proposals. The Executive Secretary of the CGIAR referred to the TAC-recommended core budget proposals, ranging from US\$ 194.0 million in required funding at the top of the bracket to US\$ 182.0 million at the bottom of the bracket. TAC recommended a top and bottom level to make it possible for donors to provide funding within the bracket. Funding below the bottom of the bracket would imply a real cut in most centers' programs. Some speakers indicated their wish that TAC in

setting bracket levels for individual centers should more strongly take into account donor preferences as they were expressed by past funding trends. The Group approved the program and budget proposals for 1985 within a bracket of funding of US\$ 194.0 million - US\$ 182.0 million.

44. Longer Term Financial Planning. The Interim Three-year Plan was maintained, pending the outcome of the TAC Strategic/Priorities Study, the Impact Study and the Finance and Budget Study. In presenting the Interim Plan, the Executive Secretary noted that these projections start from the 1985 recommended bracket, to which a 7% annual growth in contributions expressed in current dollars has been added. Several speakers voiced their support for a supply-side approach in projecting funding. The Group endorsed the Interim Three-year Plan as a guideline for future planning.

Donor Indications of Financial Support in 1985 and Funding Prospects - Agenda Item 15

45. On November 8, the donors individually pledged a certain level of financial support to the CGIAR for 1985. On November 9, the Executive Secretary of the CGIAR announced that, based on the pledges made by the donors on November 8, supplemented by estimates where firm contributions were not known, the Secretariat had calculated that total funding for the system was likely to be in the range of US\$ 179 - 181 million in 1985. Mr. Farrar stressed that there were many uncertainties in that calculation. He also announced that the approved requirements for 1985, on account of technical adjustments reflecting lower 1984 inflation of US\$ 4 million, were revised to a bracket of US\$ 178-190 million. Adding to these center requirements a minimal contribution to the stabilization mechanism of US\$ 5 million, resulted in total requirements of US\$ 183-195 million. Because the lower recommended budget level appeared to be covered, downward revision of the budgets was not necessary at this time. The TAC Chairman concurred with the view expressed by the Executive Secretary.

ICARDA External Management Review - Agenda Item 16

46. Professor James Hirst, Chairman of the EMR Panel, described the Panel's impression of management at ICARDA as very positive. Furthermore, the Panel's proposals were carefully considered by the Board and the Director General and steps were taken to implement most of them. Professor Hirst summarized the Panel's main conclusions as follows:

- i) The Board and its committees are lively and concerned about all aspects of the center's business. The geographic composition of the Board is appropriate;
- ii) The senior management encourages participation and follows an "open door" policy in relations with staff. Staff at all levels take pride in working for ICARDA;
- iii) The center should develop unified, personnel policy and consolidate personnel management responsibilities in one unit. There is also scope to improve staff training and link it with career development and appraisal;

- iv) ICARDA has introduced computers into management very effectively, particularly in the finance area. As a result, budgeting and expenditure management have improved significantly;
- v) Improved facilities are required for training and communications staff. The benefits to the CG system of having all Arabic publications contracted to ICARDA are likely to be considerable;
- vi) The management of physical plant operations needs improvement; and
- vii) Perhaps most important, ICARDA's excessive dependence on two main donors is not healthy for the center in the long run. In this regard, the EMR should give confidence to the donors and diversify support for the center.

47. The Executive Secretary, Mr. Farrar suggested to the Group that it commend ICARDA for its past achievements in the area of management improvement and encourage ICARDA's Board and management to take the necessary measures to implement the EMR's recommendations, particularly in the areas of human resource management and administrative services.

48. Dr. Mohamed Nour, Director General of ICARDA, thanked the Panel for its constructive work and emphasized that the report did not spring any surprises on the center, but usefully highlighted the areas that need strengthening. Dr. Nour focused on those constraints faced by ICARDA which make it difficult for the center to implement some of the Panel's recommendations. He gave as examples, the poor facilities for training and the scattered nature of the administrative structure at headquarters. He reported that the center has initiated action to improve the management of the physical plant complex.

49. In response to questions, Dr. Nour stressed that special projects do not create an insurmountable administrative burden and that ICARDA welcomes even more specially funded projects, provided these further the accomplishment of ICARDA's goals in the region. On overhead charges, Dr. Nour noted that the allocations to special projects are fair. The members commended the Panel for its work and ICARDA for its excellent progress. Two points were made during the discussion: (1) for reasons of force majeure the ICARDA EPR and EMR were separated in time, but as a rule, it is desirable to hold EMRs and EPRs always together; (2) the CGIAR should seriously look at the possibility of organizing management training programs for key scientific and administrative staff.

50. Mr. Husain concluded the session by commending ICARDA for establishing and developing its center in particularly difficult circumstances. He encouraged the members to broaden their support for ICARDA's core budget and cautioned ICARDA about excessive reliance on special projects, which may divert the center's attention from the strategic research needs of the region.

IFPRI External Program and Management Reviews - Agenda Item 17

The External Programme Review

51. Dr. Lloyd Evans, in presenting the findings of the External Program Review (EPR) Panel to the Group, briefly summarized the content of IFPRI's four programs and the principal conclusions of the Panel. He indicated that the Food and Nutrition Policy work was coherent and directed squarely at the "precise objective" of reducing malnutrition and poverty, but that far too large a proportion of that work was funded by special projects, a result of inadequate donor support for IFPRI. In the Production Policy and Development Strategies area the Panel believed that somewhat more research on fertilizer policies was warranted, as well as a greater emphasis on a broader "development strategies" view of the food policy problem. International Trade research had made a significant contribution to enhanced world food security policies and these studies were recognized as of the highest quality and central to IFPRI's mandate. Work in the Trends area, however, should shift more towards concentration on developing methodologies that would help nations (especially African) to improve their food data systems. Dr. Evans indicated that the Panel had found an overall coherence and structure in IFPRI's program that was, however, combined with individual initiative and freedom to pursue research problems judged to be of importance. The center had identified its clientele appropriately and was working effectively with them. The Center had taken the Panel's recommendations and suggestions under careful consideration. The Panel particularly urged the Group to provide enough additional financial support to increase IFPRI's core staff from 17 to 21 senior professional researchers.

52. The TAC Chairman reported TAC's concurrence with the recommendations of the EPR Panel, including the need for an increase in the size of the IFPRI core senior professional staff. TAC believes that the additional staff are essential if the Center is to make its needed contribution in Africa and to maintain its high priority activities elsewhere. Professor Camus concluded that the role of IFPRI in the CGIAR system was now well established.

53. The IFPRI Board Chairman, Dr. S.R. Sen, and Dr. de Zeeuw, Chairman of the Board's Development Committee, indicated that the Board had responded favorably to the review, stressed the need for full donor support for the financial needs of the center, and cited the contributions to IFPRI of three of the developing country members of the Group: India, Philippines and Brazil.

54. The Group made the following observations on the report and on IFPRI's work:

i) A fundamental function of IFPRI is to help convince policy makers of the value and the return on investment in agricultural research of the type conducted by the CGIAR centers. Successful implementation of well designed policies could change the whole character of a country's agricultural production and easily justify the work of the whole Group. Careful consideration should be given to the possibility of IFPRI's making

somewhat more formal efforts to increase the capacity for policy analysis in developing countries;

ii) Increased emphasis on Africa should not prejudice the research on Asia;

iii) The issue of whether IFPRI should continue research in the Trends area was still a question for some donors, and it affected their willingness to provide additional funding; there should be a minimum of overlap and a maximum of complementarity between IFPRI's work and that of other institutions engaged in similar work; the overlap with ISNAR on research is obvious and should be reconciled. The potential for interaction with economists at other centers and among the staff of the Cosponsors should be exploited whenever mutually beneficial. A regular meeting with FAO policy researchers to discuss plans for research could be useful;

iv) Donors would observe how IFPRI responded to the EPR's recommendation that it broaden the center's economic perspective into property rights and tenure issues;

v) The high proportion of special project funding might serve the very useful purpose in IFPRI's case of creating flexibility for program changes as needed; and

vi) IFPRI was commended on its interaction with the national research programmers.

55. Dr. Mellor responded on behalf of IFPRI to the comments. He stressed the center's positive attitude to the recommendations and pointed out IFPRI's extensive interaction with other food policy research groups. Dr. Mellor reported that IFPRI has less than 25 percent of the social scientists in the CG system and repeated that the Center has an absolute ceiling beyond which it will not grow. Even while there is an increase in the research work in Africa, there will be a lag between that and its impact on food output.

56. Mr. Husain summarized the discussion, stating the Group's broad endorsement of the EPR report. He supported the concern of donors about the avoidance of overlap between IFPRI and other organizations, with, moreover, the need for substantial complementarity and interchange, not only of data, but of analysis and research programs. Finally, the Chairman recognized that IFPRI must pay explicit attention to the design of the research so as to have an impact on methods of analysis in developing countries.

The External Management Review

57. Dr. Michael Arnold, Chairman of the External Management Review (EMR) Panel, stated that the Panel's main conclusions were that IFPRI is a well managed institute, that its staff are highly motivated, and that it has a highly creative working environment. The Panel also concluded that there was need to strengthen IFPRI's management particularly in two areas.

First, there should be a gradual move towards a more systematic approach to communication, coordination and the definition of responsibilities. In the Panel's opinion this can be achieved by introduction of performance appraisal reviews covering all levels of staff, arranging for training for staff in managerial positions, establishing a procedure for maintaining an overview of the problems of research assistants, introducing greater visibility and consultation in the methods used for recruiting senior staff, reinstating the post of deputy director, and turning the present informal Director's Advisory Committee into a more formal committee dealing primarily with research appointments and promotions. Second, three aspects of financial management need improvement: cash flow, the budgetary process, and the allocation of overhead costs to special projects. In his presentation, Dr. Arnold focused only on IFPRI's cash flow problem. He noted that in order to prevent the relatively large shortfalls of cash that occur at certain times of the year, the Institute needs to take more active steps to build up its cash reserves. This problem also needs to be recognized by the donor community.

58. The Executive Secretary of the CGIAR pointed out that the IFPRI EMR had effectively fulfilled its two main purposes, namely informing the donors on the management effectiveness of the center and helping to improve management at the center by making a series of suggestions. Thus, he suggested to the Group that the EMR requires no specific action other than commendation of the Board and management of IFPRI for their achievements in building a well-managed institute. He also reported that, the Secretariat, at the suggestion of TAC, met and agreed with to use the World Bank's financing facility more flexibly than in the past in order to help IFPRI overcome its short term liquidity problems. In return, IFPRI will share with the Secretariat its financial plans and the actions it intends to take to build up working capital.

59. IFPRI's Board Chariman, Dr. S.R. Sen, noted that the Board found both reviews outstanding, thorough and constructive. At its meeting in February 1985, the Board will consider how best to implement some of the recommendations. Dr. de Zeeuw, Chairman of the Development Committee of the Board, commented specifically on the EMR. He noted that the Board has instructed the Director General to report on implementation of all the EMR recommendations that do not require added finances. He also urged the donors to implement TAC's recommendation of raising IFPRI's 1985 core budget by US\$ 900,000, in order to: i) achieve the minimum size of 20 core senior research positions and ii) lower the percentage of special project funding to the required 25 percent.

60. The Chairman concluded the discussion, which was almost entirely on program issues, by noting that the report provides considerable guidance to IFPRI's management about its future course of action and that the Group endorses the recommendations of the EMR. Mr. Husain commended the panel for its work.

CGIAR Public Relations Activities - Agenda Item 18

61. In recent years the centers, CGIAR secretariat and many CG members have become more active in trying to reach important constituents with information about the work and accomplishments of the CG system. This is a reflection of the system's maturity as much as of the current economic environment. In the Second Review of the CGIAR three years ago, the Group asked the CG secretariat to intensify public relations activities on behalf of the CGIAR. The secretariat felt it would be useful to have a Group discussion during ICW of some of the issues it has since identified in working together with centers and donors in this area. A paper on the subject was circulated prior to Centers Week as Agenda Item 18. However, because the Group spent more time on the EPR and EMR discussions than expected, discussion of public relations activities had to be postponed.

CIAT External Program and Management Reviews - Agenda Item 19

The External Program Review

62. Dr. Fred Hutchinson, Chairman of the EPR Panel noted that all the recommendations of the 1977 Quinquennial Review had been implemented some time ago, save that for improvements in the distribution of responsibilities for cassava research between CIAT and IITA. However, the very recent CIAT/IITA cassava agreement was welcomed by the Panel. The impact of CIAT's rice research has been widespread and impressive, accounting for more than US\$ 850 million increased annual production in Latin America. Forty varieties of beans have been released and new cassava varieties have been distributed to ten countries, but it is too early to assess their production impact. New pasture cultivars have been released and are beginning to be planted. The Seed Unit is unique and useful, and CIAT should explore the possibility of it becoming semi-autonomous to enable it to attract industrial funds and to prevent its non-research activities from interfering with CIAT's research programs. The training program receives high marks from the national programs and is much appreciated. CIAT's long term plan was characterized as a good one and well understood by the center. CIAT has made hard choices over the years, having closed down programs in swine and beef production, and small farm cropping systems and having moved from irrigated to upland rice. The Panel pointed out that the outreach program, a recent development, is heavily dependent on extra-core funding.

63. The cassava program is in a period of uncertainty because of questions about the long-term demand for cassava as a human food; cassava's long-term demand prospects as an animal feed need to be assessed before CIAT's future plans in cassava research can be finalized. Two major forces affect the market potential for cassava: (i) new production technology that may affect both costs and returns or production, and (ii) increasing external debt of some countries which may create new demand for indigenous products like cassava. CIAT will undertake a market study for cassava based on country-by-country studies using some outside help. CIAT will also collaborate with IFPRI in its studies of cassava and will continue to develop improved technology for cassava. The bean program was praised by the EPR panel for attempting to develop low-input technology for

resource-poor farmers, but the panel cautioned that CIAT should place more emphasis in the future on increasing the yield potential of beans. CIAT envisages increased activities in Asia and Africa. Dr. Hutchinson closed by stating that it had been seven years since the last quinquennial review; he saw no evidence that the period was too long and suggested that review periods of perhaps 8 to 10 years might be suitable. As a result of the EPR, CIAT will now revise its long term plan, which will be presented to the full Board in May, 1985.

64. Dr. Camus noted that TAC considered CIAT to be a very successful and productive center that has made a strong effort to sharpen its program focus. CIAT's major quantifiable impact has been in irrigated rice but that of beans and tropical pastures is increasing. Impact in cassava has been less spectacular and difficult to quantify, for that reason TAC endorsed the Panel's recommendation that a study of the demand for cassava be undertaken to help guide CIAT in its future planning.

65. The discussion centered on several points: (i) the pending decentralization of CIAT in order to expand its outreach program was supported, although some speakers expressed concern about any efforts to move activities out of Latin America; (ii) the impact of the rice program was acknowledged and is clearly appreciated; (iii) some doubt was expressed by a few speakers concerning the recommendation to make the Seed Unit a semi-autonomous organization, one speaker called for a longer term look at the future role of the Seed Unit, including its role in research, training, and technical assistance; (iv) in general, the expanded bean program in Africa was supported. CIAT responded that decentralization does not include just the outposting of staff, but also includes using a breeding strategy that takes advantage of other locations where researchers can both contribute and benefit from shared responsibilities. CIAT is still learning how to handle decentralization, which complicates management. The center is attempting to respond to these difficulties by: (i) stationing CIAT staff in strong national programs, (ii) making sure each outposted scientist is part of a scientific team at headquarters, and (iii) sharing administrative costs with other institutions, including other CG centers where possible. The Chairman of the Board of Trustees stated that EPRs and EMRs are held too frequently, and called for greater responsibility to be given to the Boards of Trustees in handling internal reviews.

External Management Review

66. The Chairman of the EMR Panel, Dr. Omond Solandt, noted that the Panel conducted a detailed examination of management at CIAT and that its overall view is very satisfactory. The center's response shows that CIAT has accepted the Panel's suggestions and has a clear notion of how they will implement them. Dr. Solandt's presentation focused primarily on generalizations from the CIAT EMR that have a wider relevance to the system. First, he noted that the most important feature of the EMRs is the interaction between the reviewers and the center Board and staff, which leads to a common understanding of problems and possible ways of solving them. Perhaps the report to the Group should eliminate the excessive detail of EMRs to date. As in the private sector, the Group could be given a "short" report and the center the full report. Second, he argued that

the reviews should aim at generating organizations that are self-policing and self-correcting. Third, the CG system should look at the possibility of organizing a staff college offering short courses in management, aimed particularly at the scientists who are on their way up to management positions and covering management problems commonly faced in the system. This should be closely tied to a career planning and development system for the CGIAR as a whole. Fourth, there is a great deal to be gained from increased interaction between the centers. CIAT, for example, has a totally interdisciplinary approach to organizing research teams, which has proven to be quite effective. This might be applicable in other centers as well.

67. The Executive Secretary noted that the Secretariat intends to look at the EMRs conducted to date, in order to evaluate the collective experience and reach cross-system conclusions. Dr. Solandt's suggestions will be among the issues covered in this study, which should be ready by ICW 1985. In conducting the study, the Secretariat will draw on the experiences of EMR panel chairmen as well as on the Boards and management of the centers reviewed. He added that, on management training, the Secretariat is discussing the needs with the center directors and the board chairmen. He cautioned, however, that there is a certain danger in doing too many things at the system level. Thus, care should be exercised in initiating new activities so as not to move towards excessive centralization.

68. Dr. Reed Hertford, Chair of the CIAT Board, noted that the Board pays considerable attention to frugal and efficient management at CIAT, as demonstrated by vertical program cuts at times of budget stringency during the past few years. He also pointed out that one of the distinguishing features of the international center system is the ratio it maintains between senior scientific staff and support staff (about 70 percent of budget going to senior staff salaries), which contributes to higher productivity in research. By comparison, some developing and developed country research institutions which spend as much as 90 percent of their budget on senior staff salaries suffer from low productivity. The lesson is that the CGIAR system should continue to provide adequate support to its senior scientists. Dr. John Dillon, Chairman of the Audit Committee of the Board, commented specifically on the EMR. He noted that the committee welcomed the constructive criticism in the report and that the Board's response to the review is entirely positive.

69. The members of the Group commended the panel for its excellent review and made the following observations:

- i) The distillation and synthesis of experiences acquired and recommendations made during the various management reviews would be much welcomed by the Group;
- ii) In-house training programs may help improve understanding between scientific and administrative staff;

- iii) Future reviews should give greater attention to issues related to management of decentralized operations of centers;
- iv) Similarly, the system should have some means of addressing cost-effectiveness questions in the centers. Can this be done under the present system of separate program and management reviews? TAC and the CGIAR Secretariat should jointly look into this question; and
- v) Overhead charges for special projects should be adequate and core funding should not, de facto, help support special projects.

70. Chairman Husain in his summary noted that in general, the Group endorses the EPR and EMR recommendations. The Group also supports maintaining an emphasis on producing beans and cassava relevant to small farmers, and the outreach program on beans in Africa. Mr. Husain expressed the Group's appreciation to both Panels.

Future Meetings - Agenda Item 20

71. The Group approved the dates of future meetings--and related events--as follows:

<u>1985</u>	mid year	June 6-8	25th Anniversary Celebrations at IRRI, Los Banos, Philippines
		June 9	(Day free for travel from the Philippines to Japan)
		June 10-11	Seminar in Tokyo and visit to Tsukuba
		June 12-14	Mid-year meeting of the Group in Tokyo
	ICW	October 28 - November 1	Washington, D.C.
<u>1986</u>	mid year	May 21-23	Ottawa
	ICW	November 3-7	Washington, D.C.
<u>1987</u>	mid year	May 20-22	Paris
	ICW	October 26-30	Washington, D.C.

Other Business - Agenda Item 21

72. Mr. Husain paid tribute to Messrs. Bill Mashler and Monty Yudelman, the representatives for many years of two Cosponsors, the UNDP and World Bank, respectively, who were both retiring. Their services to the system had gone substantially beyond the normal call of duty. The members of the Group unanimously adopted resolutions to this effect.

73. The representative of Mexico, Dr. Jesus Moncada de la Fuente, expressed his Government's recognition to Bob Havener, whose resignation as Director General of CIMMYT was announced, for the extraordinary accomplishments he made possible at CIMMYT.

Chairman's Closing Remarks - Agenda Item 22

74. In his concluding remarks, Mr. Husain noted the fundamental responsibility of the center Board Chairpersons and the Directors General to define the overall priorities of the system and to relate their own tasks to these priorities. In pursuit of this objective, Mr. Husain had discussed with the center directors how they could help resolve the single most difficult issue in development and food production which is the situation in Africa today. The Center Directors have agreed to meet early in the new year to examine their own role in Africa and also to make an important contribution to the overall examination of the priorities of the system. Referring to the decision taken on WARDA, Mr. Husain stated that he would ensure that the member states of WARDA were advised of the issues relating to that organization and that the CG would try to work with those states to sort out the problems. Prior to the next meeting, work would be continued on strategic/priority issues, budgetary procedures and related questions, and the issue of the frequency and the nature of the reviews of the components of the system. Mr. Husain emphasized his concern that the agenda for the meetings should be improved by consolidating a number of administrative issues and thereby creating more room for substantive questions.

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

International Centers Week

November 5 - 9, 1984

List of Participants

Chairman

Mr. S. Shahid Husain
Vice President, Operations Policy
World Bank
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTERS

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)

Dr. Reed Hertford
Chairman
Board of Trustees

Dr. John L. Nickel
Director General

Dr. Fritz Kramer

Dr. Gustavo A. Nores

Dr. Douglas R. Laing

Dr. Aart van Schoonhoven

Dr. Andrew Urquhart

Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT)

Dr. Virgilio Barco
Chairman

Dr. Robert D. Havener
Director General

Dr. Clive James

Mr. Chris Dowsell

Mr. Richard L. Clifford

Mr. William A. C. Mathieson

Mr. R. P. Cantrell

Mr. Yoel Efron

Centro Internacional de la Papa (CIP)

Dr. Jack W. Meagher
Chairman

Dr. Richard L. Sawyer
Director General

Dr. Kenneth Brown

Dr. Jose Valle Riestra

Dr. Flavio Couto

Mr. Manuel Pina, Jr.

Mr. Douglas Horton

International Board for Plant Genetic Resources (IBPGR)

Dr. Lennart Kahre
Chairman

Dr. J. Trevor Williams
Executive Secretary

Dr. N. Murthi Anishetty

Dr. Christopher G. D. Chapman

Mr. William Ellis Davies

International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)

Dr. Andreas Papasolomontos
Chairman

Dr. Mohamed A. Nour
Director General

Dr. Peter R. Goldsworthy

Dr. Geoffrey Hawtin

Mr. Edward Sayegh

International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)

Dr. John L. Dillon
Chairman

Dr. Leslie Swindale
Director General

Dr. Curtis R. Jackson

Dr. J. S. Kanwar

Mr. S. P. Ambrose

Dr. Joseph Kabore

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

Dr. Samar R. Sen
Chairman

Dr. John W. Mellor
Director

Mrs. Loraine Halsey

International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)

Dr. John J. McKelvey, Jr.
Chairman

Dr. Ermond H. Hartmans
Director General

Mr. Jan Eric Haakansson

Dr. J.W. Pendleton

Dr. Robert C. McGinnis

Dr. William M. Steele

Dr. H. Ishikura

Mr. George F. Wilson

International Livestock Center for Africa (ILCA)

Dr. Robert E. McDowell
Chairman

Dr. Peter J. Brumby
Director General

Dr. Koen Geerts

Dr. Ahmed H. Thabit

International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases (ILRAD)

Dr. W. R. Pritchard
Chairman

Dr. A. Ross Gray
Director General

Dr. John J. Doyle

Dr. P. Roger Rowe

Dr. K. F. Wells

International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)

Dr. Kenzo Hemmi
Chairman

Dr. M. S. Swaminathan
Director General

Dr. Dennis Greenland
Deputy Director General

Mr. Paul A. Cooper

Dr. J. Ritchie Cowan

Mr. Tom Hargrove

Ms. Edith B. Yalong

International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR)

Dr. Robert K. Cunningham
Chairman

Dr. William K. Gamble
Director General

Dr. Rudolph B. Contant

Dr. Eduardo Trigo

Dr. Kenneth R. M. Anthony

Ms. Alicia Mina

Mrs. Louise A. Ogden

West Africa Rice Development Association (WARDA)

Dr. Hyacinthe Leroux
Executive Secretary

Mr. Alieu M. B. Jagne

Dr. James E. Johnston

Mrs. Victoria J. Cooper

DELEGATIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP

African Development Bank

Mr. K.S.M. Nyahe
Deputy Director
Agriculture Department
Abidjan, Ivory Coast

Argentina

Dr. Manuel Otero
Agriculture Counsellor
Embassy of Argentina
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Asian Development Bank

Dr. Kunio Takase
Director, Irrigation and
Rural Development Department
Manila, Philippines

Australia

Professor James R. McWilliam
Director-General
Australian Centre for International
Agricultural Research (ACIAR)
Canberra City, Canberra
Australia

Dr. Rodney C. Hills
Head, Research for Development
Section
ADAB

Dr. James G. Ryan
Deputy Director
ACIAR

Belgium

Mr. Jean-Dominique D'hayere
Secrétaire d'administration
Administration Générale de la
Coopération au Développement
Brussels, Belgium

Dr. J. Ronchaine
Agriculture Attache
Embassy of Belgium
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Brazil

Dr. Eliseu R. A. Alves
President, EMBRAPA
Brasília, Brazil

Dr. Flavio Couto
Head of Vegetable National
Research Center
EMBRAPA

Canada

Ms. Carolyn McAskie
Acting Director General
Multilateral Technical
Cooperation Division
Canadian International Development
Agency (CIDA)
Hull, Quebec, Canada

Dr. Greg Spendjian
Senior Programme Officer
Multilateral Technical Cooperation
Division, CIDA

Dr. Gerard J. Ouellette
Director, Agriculture Sector, CIDA

Peoples Republic of China

Prof. Assoc. Fei Kaiwei
Deputy Director of Administrative
Office in charge of Foreign Affairs
Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences
Beijing, Peoples Republic of China

Mr. Huang Yong Ning
Agriculture Secretary
Embassy, Peoples Republic of China
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Commission of the European Communities (EEC)

Dr. Gunter Gruner
Head of Division (Agriculture)
Directorate-General for Development
Brussels, Belgium

Mr. Marc Pierini

Denmark

Mr. Fin Norman-Christensen
Head of Section, DANIDA
Copenhagen, Denmark

Mr. Claus Wintop
First Secretary
Embassy of Denmark
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Finland

Mr. Matti Jaskari
Counselor, Development Cooperation
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Helsinki, Finland

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Prof. Dieter F.R. Bommer
Assistant Director General
Rome, Italy

Dr. Bjorn Sigurbjornsson
Director, Joint FAO/IAEA Division
Rome, Italy

Ford Foundation

Dr. Norman R. Collins
Program Officer-in-Charge
Rural Poverty & Resources Program
New York, U.S.A.

Ms. Susan Sechler
Consultant to Ford Foundation
New York, U.S.A.

Dr. Roberto L. Lenton
Program Officer
New York, U.S.A.

Dr. Ralph W. Cummings
Consultant
Raleigh, North Carolina, U.S.A.

France

Mr. Louis Caudron
Chef du Departement, Recherche
en Cooperation pour le Developpement
Ministere de la Recherche et de la
Technologie
Paris, France

Mr. Guy Vallaeys
President de la Commission
Francaise de la Recherche
Agricole Internationale
Paris, France

Mr. Guy Perrin de Brichambaut
Conseiller Technique
au Service des Relations Internationales
Ministere de l'Agriculture
Paris, France

Mme. Odile Pomarede-Jouanneau
Chargee de Mission, Departement
Recherche en Cooperation pour le
Developpement
Ministere de la Recherche et de la
Technologie
Paris, France

Mr. Alain Ruellan
Directeur General de l'Office de la
Recherche Scientifique et Technique
Outre-Mer (ORSTOM)
Paris, France

Federal Republic of Germany

Dr. Thomas Schurig
Head, Agriculture & Rural Development
Federal Ministry of Economic Coop.
Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany

Dr. Gerhard V. Gloey
Head, Research, Planning and
Coordination
Federal Ministry of Agriculture
Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany

Dr. Ulrich von Poschinger-Camphausen
Executive Secretary
German Council for Tropical
and Subtropical Agricultural
Research (ATSAF)
Braunschweig, Federal Republic of
Germany

Professor Heinrich C. Weltzien
University of Bonn
Department of Plant Pathology
Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany

Dr. Erhard Kruesken
Director, Food and Agriculture
Development Centre
German Foundation for International
Development
Feldafing, Federal Republic of
Germany

Dr. Klaus Lampe
Head, Department of Agriculture
German Agency for Technical
Cooperation (GTZ)
Eschborn, Federal Republic of
Germany

Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)

Mr. Luis F. Jaramillo
Manager, Project Analysis Department
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Dr. John A. Pino
Advisor, Agricultural Sciences
Agricultural and Forestry Development
Division

Mr. Charles Skeete
Senior Advisor, Plans and
Programs Department

Mr. Lucino Barraza
Chief, Agriculture and Livestock
Development Division

Mr. Frank Maresca
Chief, Division I
Technical Cooperation

Mr. Yigal Harpaz
Officer, Technical Cooperation Division
Economic & Social Development Department

Dr. Enrique Ampuero

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)

Mr. Donald C. Pickering
Deputy Director, Agriculture and
Rural Development Department
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Dr. John K. Coulter
Agricultural Research Adviser

International Development Research Centre (IDRC)

Mr. Joseph H. Hulse
Vice President, Research Programs
Ottawa, Canada

Dr. Andrew D. R. Ker
Senior Program Officer
Crops & Cropping Systems

Dr. Hubert G. Zandstra
Director, Agriculture, Food and
Nutrition Sciences

Mr. Barry Nestel
Consultant to the IDRC

Mr. Robert Auger
Secretary and General Counsel

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

Dr. Abbas Kesseba
Senior Technical Advisor
Project Management Department
Rome, Italy

Ireland

Mr. J. Frank Cogan
Counsellor (Bilateral Aid)
Development Cooperation Division
Department of Foreign Affairs
Dublin, Ireland

Italy

Mr. Carlo Calia, Counselor
Dipartimento per la Cooperazione
allo Sviluppo
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Rome, Italy

Mr. Giorgio Radicati
Counsellor
Embassy of Italy
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Japan

Mr. Takashi Ueda
Multilateral Cooperation Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Tokyo, Japan

Mr. Y. Sato
Minister
Embassy of Japan

Mr. Kenichiro Sasae
First Secretary
Embassy of Japan
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Mexico

Dr. Jesus Moncada de la Fuente
Secretario Ejecutivo,
Consejo Directivo de la Investigacion
Agricola, Pecuaria y Forestal
Secretaria Agricultura y Recursos
Hidraulicos
Mexico City, Mexico

Netherlands

Dr. J. Bos
Director, Research and Education
Programme
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
The Hague, The Netherlands

Dr. Dick de Zeeuw
Director, Agricultural
Research
Ministry of Agriculture and
Fisheries

Ir. Kees Soels
Head, Section for Research
and Technology
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Dr. Jaap J. Hardon
Senior Research Officer
Ministry of Agriculture

New Zealand

Dr. Douglas E. Wright
Assistant Director
Agricultural Research Division
Ministry of Agriculture & Fish
Wellington, New Zealand

Nigeria

Mr. Dominic E. Iyamabo
Coordinating Director of Science
and Technology
Federal Ministry of Education,
Science and Technology
Lagos, Nigeria

Norway

Professor Arnor Njoes
Rector
Agricultural University of Norway
Aas, Norway

OPEC Fund

Dr. Awni S. Al-Ani
Assistant Director General
Technical & Economic Services
Vienna, Austria

Philippines

Dr. Emil Javier
Minister for Science
National Science and Technology
Authority
Manila, Philippines

Dr. Edgardo C. Quisumbing
Director, Agriculture Research
Office
Ministry of Agriculture
Manila, Philippines

Rockefeller Foundation

Dr. Alva A. App
Director, Agricultural Sciences
New York, U.S.A.

Saudi Arabia

Mr. Mohammad A.M. Al-Shawi
Alternate Executive Director
to the World Bank
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Mr. A. Farooq
Advisor to the Executive Director
World Bank
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Spain

Mr. F. Javier Garcia-Ramos
Asesor Tecnich
Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones
Agrarias (INIA)
Madrid, Spain

Mr. Rafael Cavestany
Agricultural Counsellor
Embassy of Spain
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Sweden

Dr. Bo Bengtsson
Director General
Swedish Agency for Research
Cooperation with Developing
Countries (SAREC)
Stockholm, Sweden

Mr. Harald Sandberg
First Secretary
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Stockholm, Sweden

Switzerland

Dr. Rolf Wilhelm
Deputy Director
Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC)
Bern, Switzerland

Mr. Paul Egger
Agricultural Adviser, (SDC)
Bern, Switzerland

United Kingdom

Mr. W. Hobman
Head of Department
Natural Resources Division
Overseas Development Administration
London, England

Dr. J.C. Davies
Deputy Chief
Natural Resources Adviser
Overseas Development
Administration

Mr. Andrew T. Wilson
Chief
Natural Resources Adviser
Overseas Development Administration

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Mr. William T. Mashler
Assistant Administrator and
Senior Director
Division for Global and Interregional
Projects
New York, U.S.A.

Dr. K. N. Satyapal
Principal Program Officer
Division for Global and
Interregional Projects

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Prof. Reuben J. Olembo
Director
Environmental Management
Nairobi, Kenya

United States

Dr. Nyle C. Brady
Senior Assistant Administrator for
Science and Technology
Bureau of Science & Technology
USAID, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Dr. Anson Bertrand
Director, Office of Agriculture
Bureau of Science & Technology

Dr. John Eriksson
Deputy Assistant Administrator for
Research
Bureau of Science & Technology

Dr. Dana Dalrymple
Agricultural Economist, USAID

Dr. Robert Bertram
Agricultural Research Specialist
USAID

Dr. John Robins
Agency Director for Food and
Agriculture
USAID

Representing Africa (Tanzania and Senegal)

Dr. Jonah N. R. Kasembe
Director General
Tanzania Agricultural Research
Organization (TARO)
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Dr. Mactar Toure
Directeur des Recherches
Agricoles et Agro-Industrielles
Dakar, Senegal

Representing Asia and Far East (Indonesia/Pakistan)

Dr. Amir Muhammed
Chairman, Pakistan Agricultural
Research Council
Islamabad, Pakistan

Mr. Zaffarullah Khan
Pakistan Agricultural Counsellor
Pakistan Embassy
Washington, D.C.

Representing Latin America Region (Colombia/Cuba)

Dr. Fernando Gomez
Gerente General
Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario
Cali, Colombia

Representing Southern and Eastern European Region (Greece/Romania)

Representing Near East Region (Iraq/Libya)

Dr. Saad E. Moomen
Director General
Agricultural Research Center
Tripoli, Libya

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Asian Vegetable Research and Development Center (AVRDC)

Mr. Pao-Chi Ma
Chairman

Dr. G. Wilbur Selleck
Director General

International Board for Soil Research and Management (IBSRAM)

Dr. C. Frederick Bentley
Chairman
Board of Trustees

ICRPE

Professor K. Prewitt
Chairman

Professor Thomas R. Odhiambo
Director

Mr. Semei Nyanzi

Miss Mary H. Bugembe

International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management (ICLARM)

Dr. Roy I. Jackson
Chairman

Dr. Richard A. Neal
Director General

Dr. James A. Storer

International Course for Development Oriented Research in Agriculture (ICRA)

Dr. Marius Wessel
Director of Studies
Wageningen, the Netherlands

International Council for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF)

Dr. Bjorn Lundgren
Director
Nairobi, Kenya

Dr. Louis Navarro

Dr. Jeff Burley

Professor Gelia Castillo

International Fertilizer Development Center (IFDC)

Dr. John Hannah
Chairman

Dr. Donald L. McCune
Managing Director

Mr. Paul Stangel

International Irrigation Management Institute (IIMI)

Dr. Thomas Wickham
Director General
Colombo and Kandy, Sri Lanka

INTSOY International Institute

Dr. Harold E. Kauffman
Director

CIAT Management Review

Dr. Omond Solandt
Ontario, Canada

IBPGR External Program and Management Review

Dr. W.E. Tossell
Guelph, Ontario, Canada

ICARDA External Management Review

Professor John M. Hirst
Long Ashton Research Centre
Bristol England

ICRISAT External Program Review

Dr. Carl C. Thomsen
Copenhagen, Denmark

IFPRI External Management Review

Dr. Michael H. Arnold
Deputy Director, Plant Breeding
Institute,
Cambridge, England

IFPRI External Program Review

Dr. Lloyd T. Evans
CSIRO Division of Plant Industry
Canberra City, Australia

Impact Study

Dr. Jock Anderson
Director
Impact Study

International Network for Improvement of Bananas & Plantains (INIBAP)

Mr. Edmond de Langhe
Chairman
Steering Committee

Dr. R. Villeda
Honduras

Dr. M. Contreras
Honduras

TAC Training Study

Professor Hugh Bunting
Reading, England

WARDA Management Review

Dr. Laurence Stifel
Rockefeller Foundation
New York, U.S.A.

OBSERVERS

Visitors and Consultants

Dr. Lowell Hardin
Consultant, CGIAR Secretariat
Purdue University
W. Lafayette, Indiana

Ms. Mary E. Horne
Consultant
IBRD

Dr. Werner Treitz
Deputy Director
Technical Center for Agricultural
and Rural Cooperation
Wageningen, The Netherlands

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

Dr. Guy Camus
Chairman
Paris, France

Dr. Eduardo Alvarez-Luna
Mexico, D.F., Mexico

Dr. M. Yousaf Chaudhri
Islamabad, Pakistan

Dr. Ola Heide
Canberra City, Australia

Dr. Emil O. Javier
Laguna, Philippines

Dr. Guillermo E. Joandet
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Alexander McCalla
Davis, California, U.S.A.

Dr. Jos Mortelmans
Antwerpen, Belgium

Dr. Akira Tanaka
Sapporo, Japan

Dr. Winfried von Urff
Freising-Weihenstephan
Federal Republic of Germany

Dr. E. T. York, Jr.
Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A.

TAC SECRETARIAT

Mr. Alexander von der Osten
Executive Secretary
Rome, Italy

Dr. Patricia Roberts-Pichette
Deputy Executive Secretary

Mr. L. H. J. Ochtman
Senior Agricultural Research
Officer

Dr. Karl O. Herz
Senior Agricultural Research
Officer

Miss Marioara Lantini
Secretary

Miss Poula Dionori
Secretary

CGIAR SECRETARIAT

Mr. Curtis Farrar
Executive Secretary

Mr. Peter Greening
Deputy Executive Secretary

Dr. Donald L. Plucknett
Scientific Adviser

Dr. Robert W. Herdt
Scientific Adviser

Mr. Ravindra Tadvalkar
Senior Financial Officer

Mrs. Doreen E. Calvo
Senior Program Officer

Dr. Selcuk Ozgediz
Management Adviser

Dr. Rudolf Binsack
Consultant

Mrs. Hennie Deboeck-De Zutter
Financial Officer

Ms. Olivia Vent
Information Officer

Ms. Lenore Beacham
Administrative Assistant

Mrs. Monica M. Stillwell
Staff Assistant

Mrs. Bel V. Liboro
Staff Assistant

Mrs. Noemie P. Del Marr
Staff Assistant

Secretary's Department, World Bank

Mr. Gerard T. Rice
Rapporteur

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

1818 H St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20433 U.S.A.

Telephone (Area Code 202) 334-8021

Cable Address - INTBAFRAD

OPENING ADDRESS BY MR. SHAHID HUSAIN

CHAIRMAN OF THE CGIAR
INTERNATIONAL CENTERS WEEK
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1984,

"LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, GOOD AFTERNOON. ALL OF YOU KNOW THAT I SHALL BE COMPLETING MY FIRST YEAR AS CHAIRMAN OF THE CGIAR AT THE END OF 1984. I MADE NO SECRET AT THE TIME OF MY DEEP PLEASURE AT ASSUMING THE OFFICE. I APPRECIATED THEN, AS I DO NOW, THAT I WAS BECOMING CHAIRMAN OF AN IMMENSELY SUCCESSFUL SYSTEM WHICH HAD GROWN IN 12 YEARS FROM 4 CENTERS AND FUNDING OF \$20 MILLION TO 13 CENTERS AND FUNDING OF OVER \$180 MILLION. BUT GROWTH IS NOT THE ONLY MEASURE OF THE SYSTEM'S SUCCESS. THE WORLD'S MOST EMINENT PRIZE-GIVING BODIES HAVE PUBLICLY RECOGNIZED THAT INCREASED FOOD PRODUCTION IN MANY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES OWES MUCH TO THE EFFORTS OF THE CGIAR CENTERS. HOWEVER, WE MUST BE MINDFUL OF THE LESSONS OF HISTORY; THAT IS, GROWTH NECESSARILY LEADS TO STRESSES AND STRAINS IN THE FABRIC OF A SYSTEM, AND SUCCESS CAN FREQUENTLY TAKE US TO A COMFORTABLE PLATEAU IN WHICH STRIVING MAY BE TEMPERED BY COMPLACENCY.

THE CGIAR COMPRISES SEVERAL COMPONENTS; AND, IT FALLS TO ME TO ATTEMPT TO COLLATE THE MULTIPLE OPINIONS ABOUT THE SYSTEM THAT HAVE BEEN SHARED WITH ME DURING THE PAST YEAR.

I SEE AMPLE EVIDENCE THAT THE GROUP HAS BEGUN A PROCESS OF REASSESSMENT WITH THE IMPACT STUDY, THE STRATEGIC ISSUES STUDY, THE FINANCE AND BUDGET STUDY AND AN EXAMINATION OF THE ROLES, RELATIONSHIPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF TRUSTEES.

THE QUESTION THAT THIS SYSTEM SHOULD BE ABLE TO ADDRESS AND ANSWER, IS: WHAT IS THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES? TO WHAT EXTENT, ONCE WE HAVE DEFINED THAT ROLE, DOES THE CGIAR ATTAIN THOSE OBJECTIVES? I RECOGNIZE THAT WE ARE GOING BACK TO FUNDAMENTALS. BUT: IS IT NOT PERHAPS TIME THAT WE DID SO? I BELIEVE THAT I MAY BE STRIKING A RESPONSIVE CHORD IN THIS GROUP IF I SUGGEST THAT THIS COULD WELL BE THE APPROPRIATE TIME FOR A REASSESSMENT OF OUR OBJECTIVES AND OUR PROCEDURES.

I NOTE THE SHUDDER THAT GOES THROUGH THIS AUDIENCE--AND PARTICULARLY THE CENTER DIRECTORS WHO ARE PRESENT--AT THE MERE THOUGHT OF ANOTHER REVIEW. I AGREE THAT THERE ARE MANY OPPORTUNITIES FOR INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES WITHIN THE SYSTEM, BUT THESE ARE ALL TOO OFTEN UNDERTAKEN IN ISOLATION FROM ONE ANOTHER. I WELCOME THE FACT THAT RECENTLY THERE HAS BEGUN A COMPARISON OF MANDATES AND AN ATTEMPT TO ADJUST RESPONSIBILITIES WHERE THESE OVERLAP. BUT HAS THERE, IN FACT, BEEN AN ANALYSIS OF THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES OF THE INSTITUTIONS? HAVE THE LESSONS OF EFFICIENCY OBTAINED IN ONE INSTITUTION BEEN TRANSPLANTED WHERE RELEVANT TO OTHER

INSTITUTIONS IN THE SYSTEM? HAVE THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR CARRYING OUT REVIEWS BEEN PREPARED TO DOFF THEIR GLOVES AND FACE THE CONSEQUENCES OF UNPALATABLE RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT MANDATES, ABOUT THE QUALITY OF RESEARCH, ABOUT FOCUS AND OBJECTIVES, AND ABOUT IMPACT, WHERE RELEVANT, ON NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS? HAS ANYBODY IN THE SYSTEM BEEN WILLING TO FACE YOU, THE DONORS, AND EXAMINE CRITICALLY THE IMPACT OF RESTRICTED CORE, SPECIAL PROJECTS, BILATERAL REVIEW PROCESSES, ETC. ON THE EFFICIENCY OF THE CENTERS? HAS THERE BEEN SUFFICIENT CREATIVE THINKING WITHIN THE SYSTEM TO EXAMINE THE TERRIBLY DIFFICULT QUESTIONS OF LONGER-TERM FUNDING - WITHOUT WHICH NO CENTER CAN OPERATE EFFICIENTLY, GIVEN THE LONG TERM NATURE OF RESEARCH?

WE DO, I BELIEVE, NEED TO BE MORE RIGOROUS IN SOME OF THE WAYS WE DO BUSINESS. HUMAN BEINGS AND THE SYSTEMS THEY CREATE TEND TO BE WEIGHED DOWN WITH THE IMMEDIATE AND THE URGENT, AT THE HIGH COST OF ANALYSIS ABOUT LONGER TERM PRIORITIES. WITH THIS IN MIND I EXAMINED THE AGENDA FOR THE MAY MEETING AND THE DRAFT AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING WITH SOME CONCERN. MY REACTION WAS THAT WE APPEARED TO BE CONCENTRATING ON HOUSEKEEPING, WITH A DISCUSSION MORE OF WHAT WE ARE DOING, RATHER THAN WHY WE ARE DOING THEM. LET ME STRESS THAT I DO NOT BELITTLE HOUSEKEEPING MATTERS; THEY ARE IMPORTANT AND SHOULD PLAY A ROLE, BUT NOT AN ALL-CONSUMING ROLE IN OUR DEBATES.

I AM SURE WE CAN AGREE ON THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION I
POSED EARLIER -- WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE CGIAR IN THE
DEVELOPING WORLD? THE ANSWER MUST BE: TO PROVIDE THE
INTELLECTUAL LEADERSHIP TO ASSIST NATIONAL PROGRAMMES IN
RAISING FOOD PRODUCTION IN COUNTRIES WHERE HUNDREDS AND
MILLIONS LIVE IN POVERTY AND HUNGER. THE RAISON D'ETRE OF
THIS SYSTEM IS SCIENTIFIC CREATIVITY, INTELLECTUAL
EXCELLENCE, AND AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NEEDS OF THE
INSTITUTIONS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES WHICH DEPEND UPON THE
CGIAR FOR BASIC INPUTS. ONLY IF WE CREATE AN APPROPRIATE
FRAMEWORK WHEREBY THIS SYSTEM CAN CONTINUE TO ATTRACT THE
BEST SCIENTIFIC MINDS, AND ONLY IF WE -- AS THE EXECUTIVE
BODY IN THIS SYSTEM -- CLEARLY DEFINE OBJECTIVES FOR THE
FUTURE, CAN WE HOPE TO PROVIDE THAT INTELLECTUAL LEADERSHIP
IN INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

THE AGENDA DETERMINES THE LEVEL OF DISCUSSION DURING
THE DELIBERATIVE PROCESS. I HAVE THEREFORE TAKEN IT UPON
MYSELF -- AS YOU WILL HAVE NOTICED -- TO MAKE SOME MODEST
CHANGES IN THE FORMAT OF THIS MEETING. WHAT I HAVE TRIED TO
DO, IS TO FOCUS THE FIRST DAY AND A HALF OF THE AGENDA ON
THE MOST CRITICAL SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES THAT FACE THE SYSTEM
NOW. YOU WILL NOTE THAT THE FIRST ITEM WILL BE A REPORT BY
PROFESSOR CAMUS ON THE STUDY OF STRATEGIC ISSUES BEING
PREPARED BY TAC. THIS WILL BE FOLLOWED BY A PRESENTATION BY
DR. MELLOR OF IFPRI ON THE CHANGING WORLD FOOD SITUATION.
LET ME IMMEDIATELY REASSURE THE DONORS THAT IN THIS FORUM,

FOOD WILL NOT BECOME A POLITICAL SLOGAN. WE ARE SIMPLY ATTEMPTING TO EXPLORE SOME OF THE MAJOR CHANGES IN THE FOOD SITUATION AS OBJECTIVELY AS POSSIBLE. THE PURPOSE HERE OBVIOUSLY IS TO PROVIDE A FOCUS FOR CGIAR DISCUSSIONS AND TO ENABLE US TO BEGIN THINKING OF REFINING OBJECTIVES WHERE NECESSARY.

WE SHALL THEN TURN TO THE IMPACT STUDY WHERE WE WILL BE GIVEN A PRELIMINARY PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS TO DATE BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE STUDY. IT IS, IN FACT, THIS STUDY WHICH TO ME SIGNALS THE DESIRE OF THE DONORS FOR AN ANALYTICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE WORK OF THE SYSTEM. THE IMPACT STUDY SHOULD PROVIDE US WITH A PLATFORM FROM WHICH TO TAKE OUR BEARINGS AND EVENTUALLY, WHEN NEED BE, CHANGE SOME OF OUR DIRECTIONS. OUR WORK HAS NO JUSTIFICATION IF WE ARE BEING PROGRESSIVE AND CREATIVE AND MAKING TREMENDOUS SCIENTIFIC BREAKTHROUGHS, BUT ARE UNABLE TO COMMUNICATE THESE TO OUR PARTNERS IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD.

THE INTEGRATIVE REPORT WILL DEAL WITH THE QUESTION OF THE TYPES OF DONOR FINANCING, AND WILL LOOK AT THE TROUBLESOME ISSUE OF THE MANY FLEDGLING AND EVEN ESTABLISHED CENTERS OR PROGRAMS WHICH ARE KNOCKING AT OUR DOOR FOR ADMISSION OR CLAIMING OUR ATTENTION ON THE PERIPHERY OF THIS MEETING. I USE THE WORD 'TROUBLESOME' NOT BECAUSE THEY ARE TROUBLESOME, BUT BECAUSE OF THE INEVITABLE QUESTIONS OF CONSCIENCE AS TO WHETHER SOME OF THESE CENTERS MIGHT NOT BE,

IN FACT, AS RELEVANT TO THE OBJECTIVES OF THE CGIAR AS SOME OF THE CENTERS THAT ALREADY ARE WITHIN OUR FOLD.

AFTER THAT, I SHALL BE ASKING YOU TO CONSIDER THE TIMELINESS OF A THIRD REVIEW OF THE CGIAR. I BELIEVE THIS THIRD REVIEW SHOULD BE A MACRO-REVIEW OF THE SYSTEM, NOT ANOTHER EXAMINATION OF THE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OR IMPACT OF THE CENTERS. GIVEN THE IMMENSE AMOUNT OF WORK ALREADY DONE, THE FUNCTION OF A THIRD REVIEW SHOULD BE TO ABSORB THE FINDINGS OF THE MANY RECENT, RELEVANT AND INTER-RELATED STUDIES THAT ALREADY EXIST, TO HELP US BETTER TO UNDERSTAND THE WORKINGS OF THE SYSTEM AS A WHOLE. THIS THIRD REVIEW SHOULD, I BELIEVE, ALSO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE LONG TERM PLANS THAT SO MANY OF THE INTERNATIONAL CENTERS HAVE PREPARED, AND WHICH DO NOT SEEM TO HAVE RECEIVED THE ATTENTION THAT THEY MERIT. IF AND WHEN WE AGREE ON A THIRD REVIEW, WE SHOULD APPOINT AN INDEPENDENT CHAIRMAN FOR IT, AND I BELIEVE THAT THAT PERSON SHOULD BE INTERNATIONALLY KNOWN AND VERY EMINENT.

THE FIRST PART OF THE AGENDA WILL END WITH THE RESULTS OF DR. HARDIN'S THOUGHTFUL PAPER ON THE ROLES, RELATIONSHIPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES, WHICH IS A DIRECT OUTCOME OF THE SECOND REVIEW OF THE SYSTEM. THIS PAPER WILL PROVIDE US WITH INTERESTING AND IMPORTANT INSIGHTS INTO THE ROLE OF THE BOARDS IN OUR SYSTEM.

I MYSELF WOULD LIKE TO SEE RATHER MORE RADICAL CHANGES THAN HAVE ALREADY BEEN INTRODUCED IN THE STRUCTURE OF THIS MEETING. FOR EXAMPLE, I WOULD LIKE THERE TO BE MORE SCIENTIFIC INPUT AND DISCUSSION IN OUR MEETINGS AND I WILL SUGGEST SOME POSSIBLE WAYS OF ACHIEVING THIS. COULD WE NOT ALLOCATE A HALF-DAY -- OR ONE-AND-A-HALF DAYS -- EITHER DURING INTERNATIONAL CENTERS WEEK OR PRIOR TO IT, FOR PRESENTATIONS BY SCIENTISTS INVITED FROM WITHIN THE DONOR COMMUNITY, FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, AND FROM THE CENTERS, TO PRESENT PAPERS THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THE WORK OF THIS GROUP? WE ARE NOT AN ACADEMIC BODY; WE ARE A POLICY-MAKING AND AN EXECUTIVE BODY. THEREFORE, THE PURPOSE OF THE SEMINARS OR SYMPOSIA SHOULD BE TO INFORM OURSELVES ON SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF CG ACTIVITIES THAT ARE CRITICAL TO THE OBJECTIVES OF THE SYSTEM, AND THAT REQUIRE DECISIONS ABOUT CHANGES TO ADDRESS THESE OBJECTIVES APPROPRIATELY. IT IS NOT FOR US TO DISCUSS NOW THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES AND ORGANIZATION OF SUCH MEETINGS - THAT CAN BE DELEGATED TO SMALLER WORKING GROUPS. BUT I DO WANT TO DISCUSS THE PRINCIPLE WITH YOU. OBVIOUSLY, IT IS IMPRACTICAL TO ATTEMPT TO RECAST OUR NEXT MEETINGS IMMEDIATELY, BUT I BELIEVE WE SHOULD BE MOVING TOWARDS A GREATER CONCENTRATION OF OUR TIME ON SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS. I WELCOME YOUR SUGGESTIONS.

ANOTHER CONCERN IS THAT THE SIZE OF OUR GROUP MAY BE FORCING US INTO A SYSTEM OF DELIVERY OF SPEECHES RATHER THAN THE MORE PRODUCTIVE PROCESSES OF DEBATE AND DISCUSSION.

WHAT ACTIONS COULD LEAD TO MORE STIMULATING DISCUSSION AND TO A GREATER PARTICIPATION BY MORE MEMBERS OF THE GROUP? AGAIN, I WELCOME YOUR REACTIONS -- BOTH FORMALLY AND INFORMALLY DURING THE COURSE OF THIS MEETING.

TURNING TO THE CENTERS, WHICH ARE AFTER ALL THE HEART OF OUR SYSTEM, DO THE DONORS FEEL THAT THE PRESENTATIONS MADE BY THE CENTERS IN THE FIRST TWO DAYS OF INTERNATIONAL CENTERS WEEK ARE THE MOST APPROPRIATE WAY OF INCREASING THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SYSTEM? SHOULD WE PERHAPS ASK A GROUP OF CENTERS TO JOIN TOGETHER TO DISCUSS A CERTAIN THEME, A PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES, OR THEIR OPERATIONS IN A GEOGRAPHIC REGION, EACH SPEAKING FROM THEIR OWN PERSPECTIVE? HOW WOULD THE DIRECTORS GENERAL REACT TO THIS PROPOSAL?

WE MUST ALSO CONSIDER THE ARRANGEMENTS MADE FOR PERIPHERAL MEETINGS DURING OUR CG MEETINGS. THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL CENTERS' WEEK IS THAT IT GATHERS ALL THE PARTS OF OUR SYSTEM TOGETHER AT ONE TIME, AND THE INTERCHANGE OF OPINION IN CORRIDORS, IN THE EVENINGS, AT COFFEE AND LUNCH BREAKS, IS JUST AS IMPORTANT AS THE SUBSTANCE OF THE MEETING. THE PRESENCE OF NON-CG CENTERS WHOSE MANDATES AND OBJECTIVES ARE EXTREMELY WORTHWHILE DOES MAKE, HOWEVER, INCREASING DEMANDS ON THE TIME OF PARTICIPANTS. SHOULD WE CONTINUE LIKE THIS? WOULD IT PERHAPS NOT BE MORE APPROPRIATE TO THINK IN TERMS OF

SCHEDULING A DAY OR TWO PRIOR TO THE OPENING OF INTERNATIONAL CENTERS WEEK FOR MEETINGS OF THESE NON-CG CENTERS, WHICH WOULD CLEAR THE DECK DURING THE WEEK FOR THE INFORMAL CONTACTS THAT DONORS AND CENTERS OBVIOUSLY WELCOME.

BEFORE I HAND OVER TO PROFESSOR CAMUS AND BEFORE I END THIS SERIES OF REFLECTIONS, I WILL PLACE BEFORE YOU THE QUESTIONS THAT I HAVE SINGLED OUT DURING THE COURSE OF MY FIRST TERM AS BEING PERHAPS THE MOST CRITICAL THAT WE FACE. THEY ARE ISSUES THAT CANNOT BE RESOLVED IMMEDIATELY, BUT THEY ARE QUESTIONS THAT WE MUST CERTAINLY KEEP IN MIND, AND THAT MAYBE WE SHOULD DISCUSS DURING THIS MEETING AT APPROPRIATE TIMES, AND IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE.

PERHAPS THE MOST DIFFICULT ISSUE THAT UNDERLINES OUR QUESTION ABOUT THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD IS -- WHAT, IN FACT, SHOULD BE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTERS AND THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SYSTEMS. WHAT SHOULD BE THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CENTERS IN THOSE AREAS OF THE WORLD WHERE NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ARE VERY STRONG, AND CONVERSELY, WHERE THOSE INSTITUTIONS ARE EITHER VERY WEAK, OR VIRTUALLY NONEXISTENT? IN BOTH THESE CASES, I BELIEVE THAT EACH OF OUR CENTERS WOULD RESPOND DIFFERENTLY. THE QUESTION IS ALSO BEING PARTIALLY ADDRESSED BY THE IMPACT STUDY. PERHAPS THE

ANSWER IS LOCATION-SPECIFIC, BUT WE DO NOTE THAT COUNTRIES IN WHICH CENTERS ARE ESTABLISHED PROBABLY BENEFIT CONSIDERABLY FROM THE PRESENCE OF SUCH CENTERS, WHILE CONVERSELY COUNTRIES WHERE THE CENTERS HAVE FEW PROGRAMS, PROBABLY BENEFIT LEAST. IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE WORK OF THE CENTERS IN LESS DEVELOPED AREAS OF THE WORLD, WHERE THEIR PRESENCE IS LESS WELL ESTABLISHED, WOULD IT BE FEASIBLE TO THINK IN TERMS OF REGIONAL MECHANISMS WHICH CARRY OUT RESEARCH IN RESPONSE TO THE NEEDS OF A GROUP OF COUNTRIES WITH SIMILAR ECOLOGIES AND FARMING SYSTEMS? IF SO, DO WE HAVE A ROLE TO PLAY IN HELPING DONORS TO CREATE SUCH REGIONAL SUBCENTERS?

I WILL RETURN TO A QUESTION THAT I HAVE RAISED BEFORE -- AND I AM SENSITIVE TO THE REACTIONS OF THE CENTERS -- HAVE WE BEEN SUFFICIENTLY ANALYTICAL ABOUT THE MANDATES OF SOME OF THE CENTERS? SHOULD THESE MANDATES HAVE BEEN REFINED OR MODIFIED, BECAUSE OF THE PASSAGE OF TIME? WHAT SHOULD BE THE LIFE OF A RESEARCH PROGRAM AT A PARTICULAR CENTER FOR A PARTICULAR SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITY? AT WHAT POINT SHOULD THE SYSTEM DECIDE THAT THE RESEARCH COSTS ARE BEYOND THOSE THAT THIS SYSTEM CAN BEAR? WHAT SHOULD BE THE CUTOFF POINT FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES, HOW SHOULD THAT CUTOFF POINT BE DECIDED, AND WHO SHOULD DECIDE IT?

LASTLY, AS A RESULT OF MY ADMIRATION FOR THE DIRECTORS GENERAL OF OUR CENTERS, I WANT TO ASK -- HOW CAN WE REDUCE

THE WEIGHT OF THE MULTIPLE RESPONSIBILITIES THAT THESE MANAGERS SHOULDER? SHOULD WE NOT BE ADDRESSING THE QUESTION OF HOW WE CAN STREAMLINE OUR PROCEDURES IN THE INTERESTS OF THE CENTERS? UNDOUBTEDLY HERE I AM PARTLY TREADING ON THE DELICATE GROUND OF DONOR REQUIREMENTS VIS-A-VIS THE CENTERS. MAY I SAY THAT HAVING BEEN A MEMBER OF A DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTION FOR MOST OF MY PROFESSIONAL CAREER, I FULLY UNDERSTAND THE INTERNAL DEMANDS OF AUDITORS IN DONOR COUNTRIES AND THE CONCERNS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY IN DONOR COUNTRIES, BUT I ALSO HAVE TO WEIGH THE IMPACT OF THESE DEMANDS ON THE DEDICATED AND CAPABLE MANAGERS OF OUR CENTERS, AND I FEEL THAT WE SHOULD IN DUE COURSE EXAMINE WAYS IN WHICH WE CAN EASE THEIR BURDEN.

I HAVE LAID BEFORE YOU A LITANY OF QUESTIONS. THE FACT THAT I AM PREPARED TO SHARE THESE QUESTIONS WITH YOU IS AN INDICATION OF MY DEEP CONFIDENCE IN THE SYSTEM AND MY ENORMOUS RESPECT FOR THE QUALITY OF THE PEOPLE WHO MAKE UP THE SYSTEM. I LOOK FORWARD TO HAVING YOUR REACTIONS DURING THE COURSE OF THIS MEETING.

I WILL NOW CALL UPON PROFESSOR CAMUS TO TELL US ABOUT TAC'S IMPORTANT STRATEGIC ISSUES STUDY.