

SDR/TAC:IAR/98/14

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**CGIAR 1999 RESEARCH AGENDA AND  
INITIAL PROPOSALS FOR 2001**

TAC SECRETARIAT

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

April 1998

17 April 1998

Dear Mr. Serageldin,

It is my pleasure to submit to you for discussion at MTM98 in Brazil TAC's report on *CGIAR 1999 Research Agenda and Initial Proposals for 2001*. You will recall that at MTM97, the Group endorsed Centre proposals and TAC recommendations on medium-term resource allocation 1998-2000. Centre medium-term plans are now three-year plans with a rolling annual horizon. The annual extensions should, in particular, reflect anticipated changes in the Centre's external environment, for example in science or alternative suppliers.

At TAC 74, the Committee considered Centre programmes and budgets for 1999 along with Centre intentions for 2001. The attached report synthesizes Centre proposals, gives an overview of the criteria used by TAC in its analysis, and provides the Committee's recommendations. The focus of TAC's work was on programmatic rather than financial analysis. For 1999, analysis featured a review of significant shifts from the 1999 plan approved at MTM97 and, for 2001, a review of new projects to ensure that these meet the minimum criteria for inclusion within the CGIAR agenda. TAC's report should be read in association with that of the CGIAR Secretariat on *The Financial Requirements of the 1999 CGIAR Research Agenda*.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the Centres for their cooperation in meeting the tight deadline resulting from the new financing arrangements. Particular thanks are also due to the staff of the TAC and CGIAR Secretariats for their valuable assistance in the work of the Committee.

We look forward to a fruitful discussion at MTM98.

Sincerely yours,

Donald L. Winkelmann  
TAC Chair

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Introduction  | 4           |
| 2. Criteria for Analysis                                 | 4           |
| 3. Synthesis of Centre Proposals and TAC's Commentary    | 5           |
| 3.1 CIAT   | 5           |
| 3.2 CIFOR  | 6           |
| 3.3 CIMMYT   | 7           |
| 3.4 CIP  | 8           |
| 3.5 ICARDA   | 9           |
| 3.6 ICLARM   | 10          |
| 3.7 ICRAF  | 10          |
| 3.8 ICRISAT  | 11          |
| 3.9 IFPRI  | 12          |
| 3.10 IIMI  | 13          |
| 3.11 IITA  | 14          |
| 3.12 ILRI  | 14          |
| 3.13 IPGRI   | 15          |
| 3.14 IRRI  | 16          |
| 3.15 ISNAR   | 17          |
| 3.16 WARDA   | 18          |
| 4. Implications of Centre Proposals for CGIAR Priorities | 19          |

# CGIAR 1999 Research Agenda and Initial Proposals for 2001

## 1. Introduction

At the Mid-Term Meeting (MTM) in May 1997 in Cairo, the Group endorsed Centre proposals and TAC recommendations on medium-term resource allocation 1998-2000. At that time, the Group also agreed that Centre Medium-Term Plans (MTPs) should be three-year plans with a rolling annual horizon. To this end, every year, centres should submit a revised plan, thus ensuring a regular update of the relatively short-term financial forecast while maintaining their longer-term research perspective. Subsequently, Centres submitted their proposed programmes and budgets for 1999, along with their intentions for 2001, for discussion at TAC 74 that took place during the last week of March 1998. This document reports on the results of TAC's deliberations at that meeting and is divided into four sections, the first being this introduction. The second section deals with the criteria used in TAC's analysis. Section three provides: (a) an overview of changes in each Centre's agenda for 1999 as compared to the 1998-2000 MTP which had been endorsed by the Group; (b) a synthesis of Centres' initial proposals for the year 2001; and (c) TAC's assessment of, and recommendation on, each Centre's proposals. Finally, the fourth section provides a brief overview of the implications of Centre proposals for CGIAR priorities, particularly with respect to undertakings, production sectors and commodities.

## 2. Criteria for Analysis

TAC's assessment of Centre proposals for 1999 and 2001 started from the formal endorsement of the Committee's recommendations on the 1998-2000 MTP process at MTM97. The Committee subsequently followed three steps. The first step was to review the Centre proposals for 1999, in particular whether new projects or activities - as compared to the 1998-2000 proposals endorsed at MTM - had been put forward. If Centre proposals were simply an implementation of what had been agreed in last year's MTP, TAC did not proceed with further analysis. On the other hand, if the proposals included new activities or projects then the Committee screened them against the criteria for support by the CGIAR. Particular importance was given to whether: the outputs of the proposed new work would consist of international public goods, outputs could directly contribute to the CGIAR goals of poverty alleviation and protection of natural resources, no satisfactory alternative sources of supply were available, that there was adequate probability of success, and comprised research or research-related activities. In addition, attention was given to shifts among Centre activities; where these were relatively large, TAC sought justification in terms of the criteria described above. Thereafter, TAC reviewed the initial proposals for the year 2001 and screened these against the criteria for CGIAR support as already specified.

The focus of TAC's work was on programmatic, rather than financial, analysis. The Committee was particularly interested in the extent to which Centre proposals could be incorporated into the CGIAR Research Agenda.

Subsequently, in order to guide bilateral negotiations between members and centres, the Committee examined the implications of Centre proposals for CGIAR resource allocation with respect to priorities as agreed by the Group at MTM97. Consideration was given to the implications of Centre proposals when aggregated for recommendations on priorities by undertaking, production sector and commodity. In doing so, TAC gave emphasis to the extent to which there was conformity to the MTM97-endorsed trend rather than to the actual number. In line with the schedule for the CGIAR's new financing arrangements, at TAC 75 in September 1998, the Committee will consider the implications of individual Centre financing plans for CGIAR priorities.

### **3. Synthesis of Centre Proposals and TAC's Commentary**

#### **3.1 CIAT**

The CIAT Board of Trustees, in December 1997, set the following guidelines for preparation by the management of the 1998-2001 MTP.

- Major shifts are not envisaged in CIAT's programmes.
- Biotechnology, genetic resources, IPM, soils, GIS and participatory research remain key scientific areas for the production of international public goods.
- Integration of research on natural resource management and germplasm improvement in ecoregional sites will be a major focus.
- Strong partnerships with NARS and research institutes in high-income countries will be crucial for taking advantage of rapidly changing advances in science.
- The need to build financial resources.

CIAT is in the final year of retrenchment and staff separations of both scientific and support staff. Indirect costs, inflated by staff termination costs, will fall from 39.7% in 1997 to 28.8% in 1999.

#### **1999**

There are no significant programmatic shifts as compared to the CIAT 1998-2000 MTP and CIAT does not propose to introduce new projects.

#### **2001**

CIAT plans to level off its financial requirements in 2000 and 2001. There is evidence that several of the projects, as planned, will contribute to meeting TAC's earlier recommendations to transfer some of its cassava germplasm enhancement work to NARS, and to seek effective

ways to integrate GIS and molecular biology in applied research areas of plant breeding and crop protection.

TAC notes that the long-term project balance shows six of 19 projects, or 32%, having a basic research orientation with no short-term production impact, while 64% have production impact goals during the MTP period.

### **TAC's Commentary**

TAC encourages CIAT's continued efforts to better integrate GIS capacity into breeding and IPM programmes, wonders if biotechnology has been adequately utilized as a tool in crop improvement, and commends CIAT for maintaining its programme thrusts in the face of major restructuring. The planned increase in momentum in the methods of participatory research and community management of watershed resource projects, in particular, indicate an emergence from restructuring with strong support for the new lines of work endorsed at MTM97.

Overall, TAC certifies that shifts from MTM97 in CIAT's project portfolio have been minor and that no new projects have been proposed.

### **3.2 CIFOR**

During the time of preparation of its MTP, CIFOR was preparing for its first EPMR, and having a clearly articulated MTP in place, it made no substantive changes in programme structure or balance.

CIFOR, with office space provided by the host country government, has had only modest capital costs, resulting in very modest depreciation. With no research stations of its own, all of its research must be collaborative. Partly resulting from infrastructure demands and partly by strategic design, its budget for partnership research is 35% of total costs.

The economic environment in which CIFOR Headquarters is located has recently experienced changes in currency values but so far the Centre has not been largely affected.

### **1999**

The 10 projects of the 1998 MTP remain largely unchanged, but CIFOR has reclassified its work on Alternatives to Slash and Burn project as a separately defined project, and has split off one portion of its biodiversity work as a distinct project, bringing its total project list to 12. Neither of these additions represents actual change in its research portfolio, but rather add clarity.

Planned growth into regions of Africa and Latin America is progressing smoothly, with new staff assignments to both areas. CIFOR indicates that its planned geographical balance for 2000 may take until 2001 to achieve the desired equality of research effort between the three regions with tropical forests.

## **2001**

The 2001 projections are a continuation of planned trends. CIFOR may revisit its priorities depending on the outcome of the just concluded first EPMR.

### **TAC's Commentary**

TAC commends CIFOR for its innovative approaches to collaboration and to the way in which research staff have been assembled from multiple partners by secondment or through research collaboration. The four staff scientists from the Government of Indonesia and the two Rockefeller Foundation postdoctorals are but two examples.

Overall, TAC certifies that no significant shifts in activities from the MTM97 endorsed MTP have occurred and that new projects incorporate work reflected in other places in the MTP, hence meet CGIAR criteria.

### **3.3 CIMMYT**

During 1999-2001, CIMMYT will continue to work on its 21 projects. TAC notes that CIMMYT's share of funding that is unrestricted has decreased from 75% in 1991-92 to 48% in 1998.

The driving force behind CIMMYT's planning is that maize and wheat will continue to dominate global food security in the near future. The Centre remains convinced that, given the growing importance of wheat for food security and poverty alleviation, particularly in urban areas, more resources should be devoted to wheat than to maize, and is enhancing its efforts to augment the availability of resources for wheat research. The budgets proposed reflect increased relative attention to wheat.

In conformation with the MTP endorsed at MTM97, the regional shares of expenditure show an increase for sub-Saharan Africa and a decrease for Latin America and the Caribbean for 1999 to 2001, while the other regions remain fairly constant in their shares. CIMMYT is intensifying efforts in China and India, and expanding into Central Asia.

CIMMYT intends to implement a new training programme on "The Principles and Practices of Sustainable Cropping Systems" during the course of the 1999-2001 planning period if financial support becomes available.

## **1999**

The workplan reflects a planned shift in emphasis towards work on germplasm enhancement and breeding. The Centre notes that funding for maize has been more readily available than that for wheat. Resource allocation to training is increased. TAC notes that no resource allocation has yet been made for work in Central Asia.

## **2001**

No new projects are planned for 2001. No major changes are expected in the relative distribution of resources over projects, regions or activities compared with 2000.

### **TAC's Commentary**

TAC notes CIMMYT's concern for the increasing demand for wheat and maize, and the role of these crops in alleviating rural and urban poverty.

Overall, TAC certifies that CIMMYT's workplan includes no significant shifts from the MTP endorsed at MTM97 and no new projects.

### **3.4 CIP**

Overall, CIP's proposals reflect a broad continuation of its MTP. As a result of an intensive priority-setting exercise, the portfolio of 19 projects proposed in the 1998-2000 MTP was reduced to 17 through the elimination of a project on postharvest utilization of potato and another on propagation of sweet potato planting materials. This depicts a strategic shift reflecting the reduced importance of developing new potato processing technologies and from the realization that propagation of planting materials is of relatively low priority in sweet potato research. Other refinements include more emphasis on studying informal seed systems, and the link between breeding efforts and the development of seed distributions system. CIP will also give increasing emphasis to the use of biotechnological tools in its research. With respect to the regional distribution, CIP will give less emphasis to the Middle East and North Africa region because of the rapid progress of its research and the closure of its office in Egypt.

## **1999**

The changes in projects envisioned for 1999 are justified in CIP's discussion (see above).

## **2001**

While CIP has not yet formulated new projects for the year 2001, it expects that its existing projects will continue but some will have to be shifted to accommodate major breakthroughs or milestone achievements. CIP expects that the rapid advancement of biotechnological applications will have significant effects on at least four research projects. Increased capability in modelling and prediction techniques incorporating the use of GIS will lead to a strategic shift in other five projects. Finally, CIP also expects increased activities in its research on natural resources management and on the influence of major environmental events (e.g. El nino) on crop production patterns.

### **General Comment**

CIP argues that TAC has underestimated the importance of potato and sweet potato in its

assertion that the actual growth in potato production in developing countries has exceeded the FAO 2010 estimate, which was the basis for TAC's priority setting process.

### **TAC's Commentary**

TAC noted CIP's request to revisit the quantitative analysis on priorities for potato and sweet potato research. TAC recalls that in its 1997 analysis it already undertook a sensitivity analysis of FAO data for the particular situation of potato and sweet potato. However, it will investigate the extent to which there have been further updates in official databases on potato and report on its findings at TAC 75. Overall TAC certifies that shifts from the MTP for 1999 endorsed at MTM97 are justified and that the case for dropping two projects is effectively made. TAC looks forward to receiving in due course CIP's rationale for the changes implied by the Centre's expectations for 2001.

### **3.5 ICARDA**

The MTP will be implemented through a research agenda of five themes: crop germplasm enhancement, production systems management, natural resources management, socioeconomics and policy, and institutional strengthening. A total of 19 projects will be carried out under these themes. The portfolio of projects has not changed, but there are shifts in expansion in research on water resource management, restructuring of research in livestock, increase in support for socioeconomic research on natural resource management and an apparent contraction in on-station long-term agronomy trials.

#### **1999**

ICARDA's proposal for 1999 is based on the Centre's 1998-2000 MTP but relative shares were changed somewhat (see above). These changes have been justified.

#### **2001**

For the 2001 Portfolio TAC observes that there are no strategic shifts.

### **TAC's Commentary**

ICARDA has made encouraging efforts to develop a more transparent priority-setting process. The Committee also commends ICARDA for its efforts to integrate sustainability concerns in its strategic germplasm research.

Overall, TAC certifies that ICARDA's 1999 proposal has adequately justified shifts among projects and that its proposal for 2001 is a consistent extension of the MTP endorsed at MTM97.

### **3.6 ICLARM**

ICLARM's new MTP is essentially an update of its 1998-2000 plan although on a smaller scale than originally proposed. This reflects both a more modest rate of expansion as urged by TAC and current levels of support for ICLARM. In line with its 1998-2000 MTP, new activities will be launched including: (i) collaborative work on genetic improvement of carp in Asia; (ii) integrated fish and deep-water rice farming in Bangladesh and Vietnam; (iii) preparatory work on development of a new software package as part of a new project on the assessment of coastal fish stocks in Asia; (iv) evaluation and incorporation of satellite data into ICLARM's global database on coral reefs, ReefBase: and (v) assessment of biodiversity of two aquaculture species *Sarotheradon melanotheron* in West Africa and *Puntius goniotus* in Asia. ICLARM will not pursue in its originally proposed form the Systemwide Programme on Coastal Environments. It expects to initiate a smaller, more specific coastal zone initiative if seed funds can be generated. ICLARM has also made substantial progress in developing its new hub for Africa and West Asia in Egypt and initiate concurrent research programmes focused on fish health, the conservation of aquatic biodiversity and the sustainable use of inland waters of the region. At this stage, ICLARM does not propose any new specific projects to be initiated in 2001 and expects to continue its existing projects during this period.

#### **TAC's Commentary**

TAC certifies that ICLARM's proposals for 1999 and 2001 are in line with the MTM97 endorsed 1998-2000 medium-term resource allocation process.

### **3.7 ICRAF**

ICRAF's 1999-2001 MTP was formulated during the time of initial preparation for ICRAF's second EPMR. The Centre has revised downward its planned pattern of growth and has done some consolidation of its project portfolio, administratively combining several of its regional programmes. ICRAF's new headquarters facilities are now complete and are host to three other Centre projects and four collaborating partner units. Its regional programme continues to undergo modest shifts as ICRAF increases focus in the ecozones of its greatest strategic advantage.

The Centre has implemented an "activities"-based budgeting system, which allows it to track projects and activities by type, region, project, and donor. ICRAF has changed its project focus, adding Projects 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, which are respectively: Developing Choices with Farmers; Assessing Farmers' Responses; and Facilitating Adoption and Impact.

The combination of project re-organization and a changed budgeting system have resulted in some difficulty in tracking continuity of effort. The overall programme structure, which groups the 19 projects into five programme areas, is very typical of the overall structure of many of the large centres.

## **1999**

As ICRAF moves forward in terms of realizing its 1998-2000 MTP, a number of changes are proposed. The first is a change in the balance of activities in the humid lowlands of West Africa. From 1999, ICRAF proposes to focus its attention for humid West Africa on the domestication of indigenous trees, and scale down activities in diversification of farming systems and in capacity building. All activities will be planned and executed in the context of the Ecoregional Initiative for the Humid and Subhumid Tropics of Africa (EPHTA), where ICRAF's comparative advantage is in the area of tree domestication. In line with this move, and subject to Board approval, the position of Regional Coordinator for Humid West Africa will be closed in 2000.

In 1999, ICRAF will close the position of Deputy Director General, subject to Board approval. This position is no longer considered crucial now that ICRAF is firmly established as a research centre and has fewer plans to expand its operations into new regions or programmatic areas. Instead, the mandate of the current Finance and Administration Division may be expanded to include several of the business and partnership functions currently carried out by the Deputy Director General.

## **2001**

ICRAF's planned areas of growth for 1999 to 2001 are particularly with respect to activities on saving biodiversity and productivity research.

ICRAF hopes that its adjustment and consolidation of regional programmes and its focus on more clearly defining its project goals will aid in programme clarity.

### **TAC's Commentary**

TAC notes ICRAF's continuing rationalization in its project portfolio, its reframed regional balance, and its more effective tracking of project activity. The period of consolidation and the reassessment of growth rate are appropriate. TAC continues to urge ICRAF to further define its milestones, adding quantities and dates to those indicators as the projects evolve. This should be possible as outputs become more clearly defined. TAC looks forward to the results of the ongoing EPMP, and of any suggestions for change coming from it.

Overall, TAC certifies that ICRAF's proposals convey convincing arguments for the changes made from its MTM97 endorsed MTP.

### **3.8 ICRISAT**

ICRISAT aims to put forward a new image and will shift its focus within the semi-arid tropics (SAT). To address this effectively the natural resources programme will have greater emphasis in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). The emphasis given to field agronomy in the past will now shift to studying micro and macro environments (natural resources) where research needs to be carried out to realize the full genetic potential of ICRISAT's germplasm. The genetic

resources programme has begun to use new molecular marker tools to further characterize the mandate crops of ICRISAT held in the gene bank. ICRISAT will suggest diversification by introducing new crops to their field programmes in natural resource management. This is part of an effort to address the needs of farmers shifting from sorghum/millet to other crops.

ICRISAT will continue with its projects broadly grouped under three categories: genetic resources (9 projects), natural resources management (5 projects), and socioeconomic and policy (3 projects).

ICRISAT will reduce certain services and facilities, consolidate work in SSA, and restructure staff.

### **TAC's Commentary**

Although the emphasis of some ICRISAT projects will shift to SSA, the projected resource allocation is below the 50% recommended in the EPMR. The Centre emphasized that additional resources currently utilized at Patancheru (about 20%) are also dedicated to support research in Africa. However it is unclear how much of the work will actually be developed in Africa. It was indicated that a number of projects are restricted and have to be implemented in SSA but a clear understanding could not be reached in terms of percentage. Work in breeding will shift somewhat to SSA. There, in the near term, work in the seven SSA locations will be consolidated into two areas, resulting in a net loss of about 139 staff positions during MTP plan period. In addition a further reduction of 7 IRS and 8 research fellows is projected.

ICRISAT has been through a difficult time and the management of ICRISAT has to be commended for bringing about and continuing with the process of implementing the necessary changes.

Overall, TAC certifies that the shifts and changes in ICRISAT's proposals for 1999 and 2001 are justified in its planning document and in line with overall CGIAR criteria.

### **3.9 IFPRI**

IFPRI considers that its priorities for food policy research outlined in its 1998-2000 MTP are still valid. Therefore, the only programmatic changes in the new MTP are one case where research has been completed and two cases where exploratory research work has been proposed in response to two emerging issues. Furthermore, outreach activities will be given greater emphasis.

#### **1999 Project Portfolio**

IFPRI will undertake exploratory research related to two emerging issues which the Institute believes should now receive much higher priority than before: postharvest income generating activities and rural industrialization; and implications for agriculture of improved long-term climate forecasts. Based on this research, IFPRI will determine whether these topics should become the focus of specific projects in the form of multicountry programmes in the next

medium-term plan. IFPRI will also place increased emphasis on diversification of food and agricultural systems, including the fishery and livestock sectors (MP7).

IFPRI's project on arresting deforestation and resource degradation in the forest margins of the humid tropics (MP8) will end in 1999, one year earlier than planned. IFPRI will expand its soil fertility management work in less-favoured lands, especially in Africa and microaspects of forest margins work will be merged into the less-favoured lands programme (GRP5). Due to funding problems, IFPRI has not made much progress in its water resource allocation project (MP10) but hopes to double commitments during 1999. IFPRI assumes that its current projects with the exceptions of MP5 (rural financial policies for food security of the poor) and MP8 (see above) will simply continue through 2001. No new projects other than those mentioned above are being proposed. It should be noted also that IFPRI intends to initiate a new priority-setting exercise for the first decade of the next century.

### **TAC's Commentary**

TAC brings to the attention of the members of the Group the high priority allocated to research on water policy and on agricultural research indicators and notes with concern that to date funding has been inadequate to support these activities. IFPRI and ISNAR have now submitted revised and scaled-down proposals on work on agricultural research indicators. TAC calls the attention of the members to the need of support for these themes.

Overall, TAC certifies that the shifts in IFPRI's portfolio from the MTM97-endorsed allocations have been adequately justified and that its projects meet overall criteria for CGIAR support.

### **3.10 IIMI**

The IIMI MTP is mostly an extension of the 1998-2000 MTP although at a slightly smaller scale than originally intended. One of IIMI's 13 projects has been eliminated, i.e. *Enhancing Management of Upper Watershed for Sustainability and Productivity* even though some elements have been incorporated in other projects. The other 12 projects have been sharpened and scaled back by 15% to fit available budgets. IIMI does not expect any other major changes during 2001 and it simply expects to continue its existing projects during that year.

IIMI prepared a special report for TAC regarding its difficult funding situation, noting that it has the smallest share (38%) of any CGIAR Centre with respect to the proportion of its unrestricted funding.

### **TAC's Commentary**

Overall, TAC certifies that the modest shifts in IIMI's portfolio have been adequately justified and that no new projects have been proposed. The Committee recalls the high priority allocated to research on water management issues and expresses concern about the limited support that IIMI has received for its proposed activities. TAC shares the concern about the low portion of funding IIMI receives as unrestricted, which compels the scientific staff to

spend disproportionate amounts of their time on project preparation and fund raising. TAC urges the members of the Group to give serious consideration to these issues and to take the necessary steps to ensure that IIMI's research proposals can be implemented.

### **3.11 IITA**

IITA's plans for 1999-2001 remain virtually unchanged compared with those endorsed in the 1998-2000 Medium-Term Plan. The Centre proposes to maintain the current set of 17 projects and two Systemwide and ecoregional activities for 1999. No shifts in emphasis are presently envisaged for these projects.

#### **2001**

A further strengthening of research on sustainable resource management within the framework of ecoregional activities is foreseen for 2001. However, this will depend largely on the mobilization of additional unrestricted core and/or targeted funding. Accordingly a reduction in the number of projects may be considered over time.

#### **TAC's Commentary**

The Committee notes that despite minor adjustments IITA aims to maintain a well-balanced research for the humid and sub-humid tropics of sub-Saharan Africa. That IITA plays a leadership role in parasitic weed initiatives is appropriate. TAC notes that good progress has been made in the elaboration of milestones. As suggested by TAC 73, the project on technology transfer for Malawi has been treated as a non-agenda project.

Overall, TAC certifies that shifts from the IITA plan endorsed at MTM97 have been modest and that no projects are envisioned in the proposals presented.

### **3.12 ILRI**

ILRI's plans for 1999-2001 remain essentially the same as those endorsed in the 1998-2000 MTP by the CGIAR. Over this period the Centre envisages a continuation of its present 20 projects and of the Systemwide Livestock Programme. No new projects are included.

#### **1999**

An increase is planned for the work on smallholder dairying, on diagnostic tools for disease control, and on crop-livestock systems in the highlands of SSA and Asia, as a result of prospective increases in project funding. No significant decreases are proposed in project activities. The regional distribution of resources remains close to the original plan, but TAC notes that ILRI has made progress in defining the nature of its research work in Asia.

## **2001**

ILRI's 2001 proposal includes an increase in work on policy, system analysis and impact assessment in the area of disease control; emphasis will shift from laboratory based work to the field including field testing of a multicomponent vaccine for tick-borne diseases. No further shift is proposed in the regional distribution of ILRI's activities.

### **TAC's Commentary**

Overall, TAC certifies that shifts from the ILRI plan endorsed at MTM97 have been adequately justified for 1999 and 2001.

### **3.13 IPGRI**

IPGRI's project portfolio is based on 20 projects subdivided into three main areas: plant genetic resources, the musa programme, and the CGIAR genetic resources programme. The research agenda will not change significantly in 1999. TAC observes that IPGRI is attempting to consolidate and hence a number of activities will be reduced in size, postponed or eliminated. An example of this is the on-farm conservation research.

## **1999**

The slight increase in the 1999 research agenda in comparison with the 1998-2000 approved MTP resides in the new activities in Eastern Europe which features the expansion in the forest genetic resources and research on wild relatives of crops. The start of work on the genetic resources of coffee and INIBAP's work on musa in Africa will be delayed to late 1999 until sources of funding, presently under negotiation, are secured.

## **2001**

TAC notes that IPGRI's 2001 project portfolio will seek further expansion of the work in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, research on wild relatives, expansion in economics and impact assessment, as well as inclusion of IPM research in the INIBAP programme.

### **TAC's Commentary**

IPGRI's proposals reflect the Institute's positive response to responsibilities bestowed on it by the international community, particularly its role as convener of the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme. TAC certifies that the shifts in IPGRI's budget are adequately justified and that new projects fit CGIAR criteria.

### **3.14 IRRI**

IRRI's work from 1999 to 2001 focuses on generating technologies and management practices to produce more rice per unit area, with less water and with less pressure on the natural resource base, and to maintain rice as an attractive crop for future generations of farmers. There are no significant departures from IRRI's 1998-2000 MTP.

IRRI has used a planning horizon of six years. The research agenda 1999 to 2001 is a continuation of activities to accomplish the outputs of the perspective plan for 1998-2003. IRRI's Research Agenda during the MTP consists of 31 projects to be implemented under seven programmes.

IRRI is proposing modest changes in the focus of research within a few projects in light of evolving external circumstances in Asia and also significant scientific advancement such as genetic marker and marker aided selection for abiotic constraints, farmer participatory breeding approaches, technology for direct seeding, etc. However, these changes do not substantially alter the relative allocation of resources by activity.

Specific changes in project focus in 1999 include:

- Establishing a network for disseminating hybrid rice technology (IR1).
- Enhancing use of marker-aided selection for genetic improvement of rice for rainfed ecosystems (RL3, UR1, FP2).
- Increasing activity in East and Southern Africa (in collaboration with WARDA) to capture the spillover of emerging rainfed technologies for Africa and to meet the growing demand for rice in Africa from production within the region (IM1).
- Developing (more slowly) ecoregional sites as IRRI focuses on implementing the Ecoregional Initiative at the two sites (Vietnam and Thailand).
- Reducing activities in production system research, particularly in the uplands (UR1) and the rainfed lowlands (RL3) as more of this research is conducted by NARS partners in the rainfed and upland consortia.
- Reducing the measurement of methane emission from rice systems in the region, but with a continued focus on options to reduce methane and enhance yield.
- Reducing support to INGER monitoring tours while incorporating the main outputs of delivering genetic diversity to all members, safely, in the non-restricted budget of IRRI.

IRRI also proposes the following modifications in the focus of its research for 2001:

- Strengthening research on improving eating quality of rice in collaboration with the NARS of major exporting countries, i.e., Thailand, Vietnam, Pakistan, and India (CE1, IR1, RL3).
- Initiating a yield-gap study involving successful farmers to gain insights about constraints to productivity growth from their wealth of experience.

- Analysing the impact of the economic slowdown in Asia on public investment on agriculture and its impact on comparative advantage in rice cultivation (CE5).
- Increasing emphasis on the delivery of knowledge-intensive technologies, particularly on nutrient and pest management, for faster impact (IR2, IR5, IM2).
- Developing an increased capacity in bioinformatics that links genome sequence information to phenotype performance, which will provide functional genomic information to rice scientists.

## **TAC's Commentary**

TAC certifies that the shifts envisioned from the IRRI portfolio of work endorsed at MTM97 are adequately justified and, where new work is contemplated, is in accord with CGIAR criteria.

### **3.15 ISNAR**

At TAC 72, in the light of the recommendations of the External Review, TAC endorsed ISNAR's MTP for the first year of its operation and requested a revised version for the year 1999 and beyond, upon completion of ISNAR's strategic planning process. ISNAR subsequently prepared a new strategic plan and a new MTP 1999-2001. It is to be recalled that the main recommendations of the EPMP were that ISNAR define its niche, move more towards the research-based end of the service spectrum, move up in the capacity building ladder, and reformulate its strategy. TAC further urged ISNAR to develop a more systematic approach to priority setting that also attempted to more directly link ISNAR's outputs and activities to CGIAR goals. The Committee also requested ISNAR to carefully consider the nature of its research, opportunities for alliances and collaboration with other CGIAR Centres and with FAO. TAC urged that ISNAR ensure stronger coherence in its research agenda and that mechanisms are in place to monitor quality in all areas of its work.

### **Changes in ISNAR's Portfolio**

The MTP 1999-2001 reflects ISNAR's revised strategy that gives greater focus to proactive research and outreach activities. ISNAR will undertake proactive research on four thrusts: (i) globalization and its implications for agricultural research; (ii) governance and management of institutional change; (iii) new technologies for agricultural research; (iv) agriculture and the environment. It will also seek to develop the multipliers of its knowledge through a network of associates and strategic allies. ISNAR proposes to conduct its research through 18 projects which are categorized under three overall headings: proactive research, maintaining core competencies, and outreach/capacity building. Most of these projects are amplifications of the earlier projects, while some are new. ISNAR now labels itself as a knowledge organization and especially a major part of its outreach activities will be in association with ISNAR associates. Strategic alliances are also proposed in the research activities.

Annex two of ISNAR's MTP provides more detailed information on its approach to priority setting and impact evaluation. The approach is essentially qualitative and the process both hierarchical and iterative. In order to assist in making operation decisions, ISNAR has

formulated a set of impact criteria, institutional criteria and science criteria. Finally, it should be noted that ISNAR's MTP is based on a stable level of funding.

### **TAC's Commentary**

TAC is grateful to the Director General of ISNAR, Dr. Stein Bie, for his clear presentation of the ISNAR proposals. The Committee considers ISNAR's 1999-2001 MTP to be broadly in line with CGIAR goals, priorities and strategies. The Committee is supportive of the broad vision outlined in the MTP, which has resulted from the development of a revised strategy by ISNAR, following the recommendations of the EPMR.

- TAC notes the similarity of the proposed ISNAR niche with the mission and goals of ISNAR as formulated in its revised 1989 Constitution. ISNAR's proposals are thoughtful and provide an adequate basis on which it can plan its work. The four proposed thrusts for proactive research are appropriate and worthy of strong support.
- TAC notes, however, that the proposed thrusts are very broad and that more specific themes and issues, which will be subject of ISNAR's research activities, will need to be identified.
- The Committee also considers that ISNAR's new approach, which gives much more emphasis to proactive research, will require a change both in project portfolio and in mix of staff and skills. In this regard, TAC hopes that the management of ISNAR will make rapid progress in implementing the necessary changes. Most of the current projects are an amplification or continuation of earlier projects. The Committee also notes the limited skills in management research ISNAR has available even though the Centre is developing collaborations to help address the issues involved. TAC concurs with the concept of a programme of ISNAR associates that will enhance in-house capacity but notes that it cannot be considered as a substitute for improving the core skill mix of the Institute's staff.

TAC is encouraged by the progress ISNAR has made, particularly in developing a framework for its research, and emphasizes that the challenge now is to initiate the necessary changes to help the Institute implement that vision. The Committee would like to be kept informed about progress made in the transition and expects ISNAR to report on the implementation of changes at TAC 76 in March 1999. Finally, TAC reiterates its comments made on the IFPRI MTP with respect to the joint IFPRI/ISNAR agricultural research indicators project. It recalls the high priority assigned to this project and calls upon the members of the Group to provide strong support.

Overall, TAC believes that the 1999-2001 MTP presented by ISNAR is consistent with CGIAR goals and criteria, and that it fits well within the aggregate portfolio of work endorsed by the Group at MTM97.

### **3.16 WARDA**

WARDA's existing portfolio of 19 projects is continuing as an extension of its 1998-2000

lowland rice ecosystems, are being extended beyond their planned phase-down dates in response to either donor demand or the need for extra time to meet the projects' original objectives.

Project milestones have been reviewed, with most remaining essentially unchanged. Partnership arrangements have remained largely unchanged.

## **1999**

The four inter-related programme thrusts for project management will continue. Project milestones have been reviewed and updated. The work in East and South Africa is progressing under IRRI leadership with WARDA support. IRRI has indicated to TAC that it considers the collaborative arrangement to be firmly in place. Construction of a training facility is scheduled for late 1998 and 1999. In general, project work will be continued as in the 1998-2000 MTP.

## **2001**

WARDA's budget is projected to grow from 1997 to 2001; its current project portfolio will serve as a framework, with little change.

### **TAC's Commentary**

TAC considers that WARDA should continue to work towards greater overhead recovery from donors. While a significant portion of international staff are assigned from collaborating agencies, adding significantly to WARDA capacity, it should seek to recover full cost of this maintenance and support wherever possible. It is recognised that most of this work is a part of WARDA's MTP agenda.

TAC certifies that the WARDA proposals for 1999 and for 2001 do not depart significantly from the MTP endorsed by the Group at MTM97.

## **4. Implications of Centre Proposals for CGIAR Priorities**

After studying individual Centre proposals, TAC looked at the implications of these proposals when aggregated for CGIAR priorities, in particular by undertaking, commodity, and production sector.

Table 1 provides an overview of the proposed allocation of resources by undertaking and activity for the period 1999-2001 and compares it with estimates of actual spending in 1997, proposed spending in 1998, and the MTM97-endorsed proportions for 2000. Overall, the Committee is pleased to note that there is considerable congruence between the profile endorsed and Centre proposals. It should be noted, however, that the CGIAR is still under-investing slightly in activities for increasing productivity, in particular in germplasm improvement. TAC cautions the members of the Group and the Centres against further

reducing investment in this activity. The Committee would also like to point out that investment in areas such as documentation, publications and training for professional development, are somewhat against the trend endorsed by the Group at MTM97.

With respect to sectors and commodities (Table 2), TAC notes that work on fish and forestry is proceeding towards the 2000 targets endorsed by the Group at MTM97, but livestock remains below the trend projected while, as a compensating category, the 1999 proposals will lead to crops being relatively oversubscribed. TAC is more concerned, however, about projected shortfalls in investment in water management and regrets that the current classification system does not allow for a quantification.

With respect to crop commodities, TAC notes that the centre proposals for bananas/plantains, cassava, coconut, groundnut, and yam imply levels well below those endorsed at MTM97 and not evidently on trend towards those levels. At the same time, a number of crops are relatively well above the trend line towards the Group-endorsed 2000 levels, including barley, cowpea, maize, potato (but see Section 3, CIP), and wheat. TAC emphasizes that the latter are above the relative levels endorsed in 1997. In absolute terms, TAC applauds Centre efforts to gain additional support for such research.

TAC will revisit these themes in its ICW98 presentation to the Finance Committee and to the Group. TAC's intent here is to simply call to members' attention the outcomes of this early analysis in the hope that the information will be useful as bilateral negotiations with centres emerge.

**Table 1: CGIAR Research Agenda - By Activity, 1997-2001**  
(percentage distribution)

|  | 1997<br>(actual) | 1998<br>(est.) | 1999<br>(proposal) | 2000<br>(plan) | 2001<br>(plan) | CGIAR<br>endorsed |
|--|------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| <b>Increasing Productivity</b>                   | <b>40%</b>       | <b>37%</b>     | <b>37%</b>         | <b>37%</b>     | <b>36%</b>     | <b>39%</b>        |
| <i>of which:</i>                                 |                  |                |                    |                |                |                   |
| Germplasm Enhancement & Breeding                 | 19%              | 18%            | 18%                | 18%            | 17%            | 20%               |
| Production Systems Development & Management      | 20%              | 19%            | 19%                | 19%            | 19%            | 19%               |
| <b>Protecting the Environment</b>                | <b>17%</b>       | <b>18%</b>     | <b>19%</b>         | <b>19%</b>     | <b>19%</b>     | <b>18%</b>        |
| <b>Saving Biodiversity</b>                       | <b>11%</b>       | <b>11%</b>     | <b>11%</b>         | <b>11%</b>     | <b>12%</b>     | <b>11%</b>        |
| <b>Improving Policies</b>                        | <b>11%</b>       | <b>12%</b>     | <b>12%</b>         | <b>12%</b>     | <b>12%</b>     | <b>12%</b>        |
| <b>Strengthening NARS</b>                        | <b>21%</b>       | <b>22%</b>     | <b>21%</b>         | <b>21%</b>     | <b>21%</b>     | <b>20%</b>        |
| <i>of which:</i>                                 |                  |                |                    |                |                |                   |
| Training & Professional Development              | 7%               | 8%             | 8%                 | 8%             | 8%             | 9%                |
| Documentation, Publications, Info. Dissemination | 7%               | 7%             | 7%                 | 6%             | 7%             | 5%                |
| Organization & Management Counselling            | 3%               | 3%             | 3%                 | 3%             | 3%             | 3%                |
| Networks   | 4%               | 4%             | 4%                 | 4%             | 4%             | 3%                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     | <b>100%</b>      | <b>100%</b>    | <b>100%</b>        | <b>100%</b>    | <b>100%</b>    | <b>100%</b>       |

Source: CGIAR Secretariat



**Table 2: 1997-2001 Agenda Investments by Sector and Commodity**  
(in US\$ million and percentages)

|                      | Selected Years |                  | (% of Total Sector/Commodity Investment) |              |                  |              |              |                           | 1999 - TAC<br>Congruence <sup>2/</sup> |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|--|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|--|
|                      | 1997<br>actual | 1999<br>proposal | 1997<br>actual                           | 1998<br>est. | 1999<br>proposal | 2000<br>plan | 2001<br>plan | TAC<br>Rec. <sup>1/</sup> |  |
| <b>Crops</b>         |                |                  |  |              |                  |              |              |                           |  |
| Banana/Plantain      | 8.7            | 10.4             | 3%                                       | 3%           | <b>3.2%</b>      | 3%           | 3%           | <b>3.9%</b>               | --                                     |
| Barley               | 5.2            | 5.3              | 2%                                       | 2%           | <b>1.7%</b>      | 2%           | 2%           | <b>1.2%</b>               | +                                      |
| Bean                 | 15.3           | 14.3             | 6%                                       | 5%           | <b>4.4%</b>      | 4%           | 4%           | <b>4.6%</b>               | -                                      |
| Cassava              | 14.7           | 15.6             | 5%                                       | 5%           | <b>4.8%</b>      | 5%           | 5%           | <b>5.7%</b>               | --                                     |
| Chickpea             | 5.2            | 5.4              | 2%                                       | 2%           | <b>1.7%</b>      | 2%           | 2%           | <b>2.2%</b>               | --                                     |
| Coconut              | 0.8            | 1.0              | 0%                                       | 0%           | <b>0.3%</b>      | 0%           | 0%           | <b>0.8%</b>               | --                                     |
| Cowpea               | 5.4            | 6.3              | 2%                                       | 2%           | <b>1.9%</b>      | 2%           | 2%           | <b>1.1%</b>               | ++                                     |
| Groundnut            | 6.2            | 6.6              | 2%                                       | 2%           | <b>2.0%</b>      | 2%           | 2%           | <b>2.8%</b>               | --                                     |
| Legume (soya)        | 2.0            | 3.0              | 1%                                       | 1%           | <b>0.9%</b>      | 1%           | 1%           | <b>0.5%</b>               | +                                      |
| Lentils              | 3.6            | 3.7              | 1%                                       | 1%           | <b>1.1%</b>      | 1%           | 1%           | <b>0.8%</b>               | +                                      |
| Maize                | 21.3           | 27.3             | 8%                                       | 8%           | <b>8.4%</b>      | 8%           | 8%           | <b>7.1%</b>               | +++                                    |
| Millet               | 6.9            | 7.0              | 2%                                       | 2%           | <b>2.2%</b>      | 2%           | 2%           | <b>2.5%</b>               | -                                      |
| Pigeonpea            | 2.0            | 2.3              | 1%                                       | 1%           | <b>0.7%</b>      | 1%           | 1%           | <b>0.8%</b>               | -                                      |
| Potato               | 17.1           | 17.8             | 6%                                       | 5%           | <b>5.5%</b>      | 6%           | 6%           | <b>4.5%</b>               | +++                                    |
| Rice                 | 43.4           | 52.6             | 16%                                      | 16%          | <b>16.3%</b>     | 16%          | 16%          | <b>15.9%</b>              | +                                      |
| Root/Tuber           | 1.6            | 1.6              | 1%                                       | 1%           | <b>0.5%</b>      | 1%           | 1%           |                           | ++                                     |
| Sorghum              | 8.3            | 7.2              | 3%                                       | 2%           | <b>2.2%</b>      | 2%           | 2%           | <b>2.1%</b>               | -                                      |
| Sweetpotato          | 6.0            | 6.2              | 2%                                       | 2%           | <b>1.9%</b>      | 2%           | 2%           | <b>1.8%</b>               | +                                      |
| Wheat                | 22.4           | 26.2             | 8%                                       | 8%           | <b>8.1%</b>      | 8%           | 8%           | <b>6.6%</b>               | +++                                    |
| Yam                  | 2.4            | 2.8              | 1%                                       | 1%           | <b>0.9%</b>      | 1%           | 1%           | <b>1.4%</b>               | --                                     |
| <b>Total Crops</b>   | <b>198.2</b>   | <b>222.7</b>     | <b>71%</b>                               | <b>70%</b>   | <b>69%</b>       | <b>68%</b>   | <b>67%</b>   | <b>66%</b>                | <b>++++</b>                            |
| <b>Fish</b>          | <b>8.5</b>     | <b>14.5</b>      | <b>3%</b>                                | <b>4%</b>    | <b>4%</b>        | <b>5%</b>    | <b>5%</b>    | <b>5%</b>                 | -                                      |
| <b>Livestock</b>     | <b>39.1</b>    | <b>47.5</b>      | <b>14%</b>                               | <b>14%</b>   | <b>15%</b>       | <b>15%</b>   | <b>15%</b>   | <b>17%</b>                | ----                                   |
| <b>Trees</b>         | <b>31.5</b>    | <b>38.9</b>      | <b>11%</b>                               | <b>11%</b>   | <b>12%</b>       | <b>12%</b>   | <b>13%</b>   | <b>12%</b>                | -                                      |
| <b>Total Sectors</b> | <b>277.3</b>   | <b>323.4</b>     | <b>100%</b>                              | <b>100%</b>  | <b>100%</b>      | <b>100%</b>  | <b>100%</b>  | <b>100%</b>               |  |

<sup>1/</sup> CGIAR Priorities and Strategies for Resource Allocation During 1998-2000, MTM 1997 (Doc - SDR/TAC:1AR/96/6.2).

<sup>2/</sup> Variances: one "+" or one "-" is up to US\$ 1.5 m; two is \$1.5 to \$3 m; three is \$3 to \$ 6 m; four is more than \$ 6 m.

Source: CGIAR Secretariat