

THE WORLD BANK GROUP ARCHIVES

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED

Folder Title: Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research [CGIAR] - Briefing Material for the Administrator for December 3-4, 1971 - World Consultative Group Meeting - OCM November 11, 1971

Folder ID: 1768312

Series: United States Agency for International Development (USAID) CGIAR files

Dates: 11/30/1971 - 11/30/1971

Fonds: Records of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

ISAD Reference Code: WB IBRD/IDA CGIAR-07

Digitized: 04/17/2023

To cite materials from this archival folder, please follow the following format:
[Descriptive name of item], [Folder Title], Folder ID [Folder ID], ISAD(G) Reference Code [Reference Code], [Each Level Label as applicable], World Bank Group Archives, Washington, D.C., United States.

The records in this folder were created or received by The World Bank in the course of its business.

The records that were created by the staff of The World Bank are subject to the Bank's copyright.

Please refer to <http://www.worldbank.org/terms-of-use-earchives> for full copyright terms of use and disclaimers.



THE WORLD BANK

Washington, D.C.

© International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / International Development Association or

The World Bank

1818 H Street NW

Washington DC 20433

Telephone: 202-473-1000

Internet: www.worldbank.org

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED

DECLASSIFIED
WBG Archives



1768312

R1999-045 Other #: 2

201308B

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research [CGIAR] - Briefing Material for
the Administrator for December 3-4, 1971 - World Consultative Group Meeting - OCM
Consultative Group Meeting - OCM November 11, 1971

STATE - A.I.D. - USIA ROUTING SLIP				DATE		
TO:	Name or Title	Organ. Symbol	Room No.	Bldg.	Initials	Date
1.						
2.	<i>Oliver</i>					
3.						
4.						
5.						
<input type="checkbox"/> Approval		<input type="checkbox"/> For Your Information		<input type="checkbox"/> Note and Return		
<input type="checkbox"/> As Requested		<input type="checkbox"/> Initial for Clearance		<input type="checkbox"/> Per Conversation		
<input type="checkbox"/> Comment		<input type="checkbox"/> Investigate		<input type="checkbox"/> Prepare Reply		
<input type="checkbox"/> File		<input type="checkbox"/> Justify		<input type="checkbox"/> See Me		
<input type="checkbox"/> For Correction		<input type="checkbox"/> Necessary Action		<input type="checkbox"/> Signature		
REMARKS OR ADDITIONAL ROUTING <div style="font-family: cursive; font-size: 1.2em;"> Meeting would have to be broader than ministers - the Policy matters are so important to go by default. - Some of the Ministers are dentists et. - </div>						
FROM: (Name and Org. Symbol)			ROOM NO. & BLDG.		PHONE NO.	
<i>M. 10</i>						

Hanscom *Kelley*
11-30-71 AGF

ACTION MEMORANDUM FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR

THRU: EXSEC

FROM: AA/TA, Joel Bernstein *JJB*

SUBJECT: December 3-4 Meeting of Consultative Group on International
Agricultural Research

Problem: To establish position, to be taken by U.S. representative at the subject meeting, on further AID financing for international agricultural research institutes.

Discussion: Since the first meeting of the Consultative Group, May 9, its Technical Advisory Committee has met twice in Rome to consider what further support for international agricultural research institutes to recommend for consideration at the second CG meeting of December 3-4, based on its own investigations and discussions with involved parties and some studies done for it. The TAC is chaired by Sir John Crawford of Australia, half of its 12 members are from LDCs, and the American member is Dr. Harrar: it is a group of experts, not representatives of countries or organizations.

The principal TAC recommendations are:

- continuing support for the four existing centers, at rising budget levels (See Table A, Attachment 1);
- starting a new livestock disease center in East Africa in 1972, plus further studies prior to recommending on a proposed companion animal production center in West Africa;
- starting a new institute in India for research on rainfed crops and farming systems in the semi-arid tropics, with particular stress on sorghums, millets and food legumes;
- supporting the transition, already begun, of an existing potato research center in Peru into an international center.

In addition, the TAC recommended further developmental work on proposals for:

- a world network of genetic resource centers ("gene pools"),
- research on food legumes,
- a computerized agricultural research information system,

- research on water use and management,
- research on socio-economic problems,
- vegetable production in South-East Asia (i.e., further support for the Taiwan center).

Also, it deferred consideration of livestock production in South-East Asia, protein production in Latin America, and aquaculture.

The December 3-4 Agenda (Attachment 3) focusses on the means of financing on-going and proposed new institute programs. Expression of members' interests and intentions is being solicited, particularly for 1972 budgets but also for the longer term.

The 1972-76 financing requirements estimated for the four existing centers plus the three new ones recommended by TAC are shown in Table A. They indicate that by 1974 AID is likely to reach the \$7 million financing level that we had indicated in our January 1971 statement to the organizing meeting for the CG, if we are financing then the full $\frac{1}{4}$ of costs that we had also indicated as our intent, subject to appropriate caveats.* This means that the concerned Bureaus will need to concert their views on where we go from here in the course of our FY 1974 budgeting work, seeking further guidance from you at that time, unless it appears by then that a \$7 million or greater requirement will not arise until after 1974.

For 1972, current AID funding intentions for the existing centers, plus IBRD estimates of firm financing commitments from other non-IBRD sources add up to \$12.6-12.8 million, against the estimated \$16.5 million requirement in Table A. Additional financing for the balance or other requirements not listed (e.g., CIAT or other capital costs) is in sight from:

- U.S. partial support for the proposed new centers;

*Actual January 1971 statement authorized and delivered January 14 was:

"A.I.D. is prepared in principle to provide up to 25% of the additional capital and future operating costs of the existing institutes and the two new institutes proposed (up to a maximum total contribution of \$7 million in any one year), provided that the remaining 75% is forthcoming from other sources. Specific pledges would, of course, be for individual institutes subject to our review and approval of fully developed proposals for each and to the provision by the Congress of adequate funds. The U.S. is convinced that the success of existing institutes has depended in large part on the effectiveness of the management supplied by the Foundations and our pledge is based on the assumption that additional institutes will be assured of management of comparable efficiency."

It was generally understood that the U.S. intent was to finance $\frac{1}{4}$ of center costs, if needed, subject to the stated caveats.

- probable new expressions of support on September 3 from Germany, Belgium, Sweden and Denmark and possibly some small increases in support previously indicated by the UK, Netherlands and Canada;
- IBRD indication of the availability of up to \$3 million for uncovered residuals.

In sum, there is not likely to be a shortfall problem in 1972. However, if the requirements grow as fast as estimated in 1973, there may be a problem by then. Attachment 2 shows our best current estimates of 1972 and 1973 funding requirements for AID, for which there is some flexibility between our fiscal years.

As the individual centers come up for discussion and statement of donors intent for 1972 under item 3 of the Agenda, we propose to indicate the financing intent for 1972 shown in the table in Attachment 2. (Our general caveat regarding Congressional provision of funds, shown in the footnote on page 2, still holds. It seems undesirable to stress the point in the context of this Agenda item when the purpose is to encourage other donors to come forward. As suggested below, we shall probably need to remind the CG of the content of our January 1971 statement of financing intent, including its caveats, at a later point in the Agenda.) We also intend to comment along the following lines on the proposed new centers.

African Livestock. AID supports strongly the recommendations of the report of the International Livestock Task Force to the TAC for a single, comprehensive African Center (with appropriate disease and production sub-centers) to integrate animal production, disease and marketing aspects in a vertical systems approach to the basic goals of increased meat consumption and increased rural income, rather than the TAC recommendation to proceed with the animal disease center portion of this proposal while deferring action on a separate production center until more studies are made of present research activities. This position is explained in a memorandum to you from AA/AFR (Attachment 4), with which I agree fully. The position also reflects the consensus of various discussions in the Bellagio context, at which AID pointed out that extensive experience with livestock development problems in the LDCs indicated clearly the essentiality of an integrated vertical approach. The Rockefeller Foundation has just reaffirmed its agreement on this, and I believe that the Ford Foundation has a similar view. So does the UK. The TAC proposal apparently was engineered as a stalling tactic by the French member, reflecting concern that an international center in West Africa would undermine the exclusive French hold on research in the French speaking countries. If the proposed livestock and production Centers were to start separately, it would be difficult to get them back together, and an unbalanced and wasteful research program would be likely. We are trying to bring the French along on some basis, and have some hopes of succeeding, but do not want to allow them to hinder action on a production center if several donors are ready to proceed. In this regard, AFR is prepared to commit \$500,000 to match a like commitment by Rockefeller for start up funds for an integrated center. We hope that others will join..

Upland Crops. We propose to indicate full support, and willingness to participate in financing on the basis indicated in our general statement of intent last January. This is based on a strong consensus in AID and outside circles expert on LDC agriculture that development of suitable crops with higher and more dependable yields for the unirrigated semi-arid zones of the tropics is the most important action needed to benefit the largest portion of the rural peoples by-passed thus far by the "Green Revolution", with its focus on irrigated agriculture. This is the only one of the seven centers under consideration for which there has been no prior AID programming, and the appropriate Bureau to manage this new center has not been determined. We plan to confer further with NESR on this and then make a proposal.

Potatoes. We propose to endorse the strong TAC recommendation that this new international center be embraced by the CG and its support widened and regularized, and to indicate our willingness to continue to support it on the basis of our general statement of intent last January. Cooperation to date among USAID/Peru, the University of North Carolina, the Rockefeller Foundation Potato Project in Mexico and several Peruvian institutions has converted a bilateral aid project into the frame of an international center in Peru. The latter has made a tentative start with interim support from TAB and Rockefeller, and Netherlands, Germany and the UK have now proposed some support. Others are interested. Potato research has a high priority, since potatoes rank with sorghums (after only rice and wheat) as a major worldwide source of calories, they have extremely high calorie yield per acre and high quality protein content that probably can be increased substantially via research, and there is rapidly growing interest and optimism regarding the possibilities of expanding their production in the tropics on the basis of good research programs.

Probably under Agenda item 7, if not sooner, the CG meeting will discuss the following concern put forward by IBRD, and pressed particularly by the Foundations on behalf of the Centers.

"The experience of the research Centers and of the foundations which so far have been their chief support makes it clear that continuity of support, and the ability to count on long-range financing, are highly important for the successful operation of the Centers. Length of commitment is particularly crucial in the case of new centers, where four or five years may be required to create a fully effective staff and put the necessary infrastructure of buildings and equipment in place.

It would be of great advantage if as many Consultative Group members as possible could find some way to indicate at Group meetings the extent of the financing they likely would be able to offer not

merely in the year immediately following but also in the second year following, at least. If in one year, the Consultative Group confirmed its support of the programs and budgets for the following year and tentatively approved the plans for the year after that, a good deal more firmness could be given to the underpinning of each center's action program."

The general forward commitment made by the U.S. at the January 1971 organizing meeting of the CG should provide much of what is sought above, as far as our support is concerned. If needed in the CG discussion on this point, it is proposed to remind the CG of this statement of long term intent, and that we are also prepared to consider for the future some procedure for tentative indication of financing intent for one year beyond the year immediately ahead if this would really provide additional help for the Centers' planning.

Regarding the six proposals on which the TAC is expected to report that it has recommended further work to bring them to a point at which action may be recommended, our current views are these.

- Some suitable means of strengthening research on water management is highly desirable, but as yet no adequate proposal has been developed. Since further work to define needs is proceeding at TAC's behest and is in competent Canadian and U.S. hands, we do not propose to comment.
- We plan to encourage further internationalization of the vegetable center in Taiwan, trying to bring this in as a member of the group of CG endorsed and supported centers. There may be resistance to this.
- We are skeptical about the comparative cost/effectiveness of the proposals for building a computerized agricultural research information system at FAO for the near future, believing that contracting for such services with already established computerized systems that have such data (e.g., Brookings) or other less ambitious alternatives for a reference center may be more sensible for now. We plan to propose, in lieu of the TAC proposal for a pilot project to test user requirements and potential usage of the proposed computerized system at FAO, that the TAC designate a sub-committee or panel to look into alternative ways of meeting the need for dissemination of research information so that it could consider the alternatives before deciding which one to pursue.
- We propose to reserve comment on proposals regarding a world network of genetic resource centers, further steps regarding research on food legumes, and research on socio-economic problems pending further work by sub-committees as indicated in the TAC report.

We do not expect that any additional U.S. financing requirement will be suggested by the discussion of Agenda item 6 on financing for feasibility studies. This would not preclude a situation in which we or other donors had a special interest in and wished to finance or help finance a particular study that would be considered by TAC.

The anticipated CG discussion of future methods of operations involves primarily the proper interrelating of the work of the TAC, Consultative Group and the individual Centers. Except for one point, it involves no matters of policy concern to us, and will be worked out more-or-less to the satisfaction of the interrelated organizations.

The one point of concern is the establishment of some reasonable basis for donor assurance that the Center budgets are tightly constructed from a cost efficiency point of view, as distinguished from the validity of the kinds of activities undertaken and the levels of activity. While the U.S. has some means of looking into this kind of question directly, this is not practicable for the whole group of donors. The present structure of Center Boards and the CG/TAC apparatus should be adequate to assure good program content. However, since the Boards and TAC are primarily technically oriented and do not represent donors, and given the proliferation of Centers and donors, it has seemed to me that the CG needs some centralized means to monitor Center budgets and operations to keep the water out. The IBRD has also felt this. If this is well done with continuity of personnel, it would help the U.S. as well as other donors. After some discussion of alternatives between IBRD and Foundation staff and myself, we have agreed that the best scheme would be for the Bank to take on the responsibility for this surveillance/guidance vis-a-vis the Centers and to report its findings to the CG (i.e., to the donors). We expect this to be proposed to the CG and will support it. We are all concerned to meet this need in a way that will avoid any subverting of the policy responsibility of the individual Boards for their respective Centers.

Recommendations.

That the U.S. respond to the request, under Agenda item 3, for a statement of intent regarding financing of Centers for 1972 by indicating the amounts shown in Attachment 2.

APPROVAL: _____

DISAPPROVAL: _____

DATE: _____

That the U.S. remind the CG of its January 1971 statement to the CG of longer term financing intent (footnote on page 2), as needed to meet the requirements of the discussion of Agenda items 4 or 7.

APPROVAL: _____

DISAPPROVAL: _____

DATE: _____

Clearances:

AFR
NESA
LA
SA/EAD
PPC

TABLE A

INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTERS

1972-1976 ESTIMATED FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS*
(in \$million)

	1972			1973			1974			1975			1976		
	Core	Capital	Total	Core	Capital	Total	Core	Capital	Total	Core	Capital	Total	Core	Capital	Total
LAT	2.8	n.a.	2.8(a)	3.3	0.5	3.8	3.7	0.3	4.0	4.2	0.2	4.4	4.6	0.2	4.8
EMMYT	3.7	1.3	5.0	4.2	0.4	4.6	4.5	0.3	4.8	4.8	0.2	5.0	5.1	0.5	5.6
ITA	3.2	0.6(b)	3.8	3.7	0.3	4.0	4.2	0.2	4.4	4.7	0.3	5.0	5.1	0.4	5.5
RRI	2.6	0.4	3.0	2.7	0.3	3.0	2.9	0.3	3.2	3.1	0.4	3.5	3.3	0.5	3.8
Livestock (Africa)(c)	Start up Costs		1.0	1.6	3.0	4.6	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.4	1.0	3.4	3.0	1.0	4.0
Plant breeds (India)			0.5	1.0	3.0	4.0	1.6	5.0	6.6	1.9	2.0	3.9	2.5	1.0	3.5
Potatoes (Peru)			0.4	1.0	-	1.0	1.2	0.1	1.3	1.3	-	1.3	1.3	0.1	1.4
TOTAL	13.7	2.3(a)	16.5(a)	17.5	7.5	25.0	20.1	8.2	28.3	22.4	4.1	26.5	24.9	3.7	28.6

(a) Excludes capital requirements for CIAT for which no firm figures available.

(b) Excludes over-run (\$700,000) on construction costs.

(c) Arbitrarily doubled all IBRD figures for E. Africa portion of livestock center (animal disease research), on basis AID and Rockefeller Foundation intent to press for simultaneous development production and disease components of an overall center in East and West Africa. Costs may not build up as fast as shown in 1973.

This is a slightly adapted version of the table of estimated requirements distributed by the IBRD for the Dec. 3-4 meeting. It does not provide for new programs that may be introduced at existing centers, or for additional centers that have been suggested and might be recommended later. Significant new initiatives of the latter type beyond those in the table do not seem likely in the next year or two, but future TAC recommendations are uncertain.

1972-73 FINANCING BY AID FOR INTERNATIONAL CENTERS

Estimated AID financing for 1972 and 1973 is as follows. 1972 estimates are based on actual Bureau budgeting (except for the new upland crops center in India), and reflect some transitional considerations in moving towards a 25% formula within the broadened CG participation. 1973 provisional estimates merely project 25% of core and capital budgets.

	(\$ millions)	
	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>
CIAT (LA)	.720 <u>1/</u>	.950
CIMMYT (TAB)	.925 <u>2/</u>	1.150
IITA (AFR)	1.030 <u>3/</u>	1.000
IRRI (EA)	.750 <u>4/</u>	.750
African Livestock (AFR)	.500 <u>5/</u>	1.150
Upland Crops (NESA or TAB)	.125 <u>6/</u>	1.000
Potatoes (TAB)	<u>.100</u> <u>7/</u>	<u>.250</u>
TOTAL	4.150	6.250

1/ Former "full partner" share with foundations. About 25% core budget.

2/ Estimate is increase from former \$750,000 share and is 25% core budget: may need to consider later increasing contribution further towards full $\frac{1}{4}$ share of \$1,250,000 for core and capital budget, depending on financing forthcoming from other sources and possible reduction capital budget.

3/ \$750,000 "full partnership" share with Foundations and Canada plus \$280,000 capital contribution previously agreed.

4/ Former "full partnership" share: also 25% budget.

5/ AFR proposed sharing with Rockefeller Foundation of start up costs.

6/ Assumed $\frac{1}{4}$ U.S. share on start up costs, if goes ahead and expected interest several organizations. No present AID budget for this item.

7/ Proposed U.S. share on start up costs.

Second Meeting

December 3, (and, if necessary, December 4) 1971

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Adoption of Agenda
2. Presentation of the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) by the Chairman of the Committee
3. Discussion and Statements of Intention regarding financing for 1972 of the programs recommended by TAC:
 - a) International Center of Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)
 - b) International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT)
 - c) International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
 - d) International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)
 - e) Animal Disease Laboratory
 - f) International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-arid Tropics (ICRISAT)
 - g) International Potato Center (subject to review by TAC)
4. Review of Five-Year Financial Requirements projected for programs recommended by TAC
5. Review of other programs under study and their possible financial requirements
6. Financing for feasibility studies
7. Discussion of Future Method of Operations and 1972 Schedule of Meetings of Consultative Group and TAC.
8. Other business
9. Press Communique

STATE - A.I.D. - USIA ROUTING SLIP				DATE <i>12/30/71</i>		
TO:	Name or Title	Organ. Symbol	Room No.	Bldg.	Initials	Date
1.						
2.	<i>Gomer J. Kelley</i>				<i>OK</i>	
3.	<i>TR J/ACF</i>					
4.	<i>circulate to ACF - professional staff</i>					
5.						

Approval	For Your Information	Note and Return
As Requested	Initial for Clearance	Per Conversation
Comment	Investigate	Prepare Reply
File	Justify	See Me
For Correction	Necessary Action	Signature

REMARKS OR ADDITIONAL ROUTING

As you'll note, I decided to recast this report in order to:

- focus more on specific outcomes of interest to AID officials*
- cover the process adequately, also being inhibited by the Administrator's probable desire to know less than we & the Regimes need for the record.*

The information to the Administrator is simply a transmittal note.

FROM: (Name and Org. Symbol) <i>J. Bernstein</i>	ROOM NO. & BLDG.	PHONE NO. <i>28614</i>
---	------------------	---------------------------

ATTACHMENT 1

11-30-71

Nov 30 5 36 PM '71

ACTION MEMORANDUM FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR
EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

THRU: EXSEC

FROM: AA/TA, Joel Bernstein 

SUBJECT: December 3-4 Meeting of Consultative Group on International
Agricultural Research

Problem: To establish position, to be taken by U.S. representative at the subject meeting, on further AID financing for international agricultural research institutes.

Discussion: Since the first meeting of the Consultative Group, May 9, its Technical Advisory Committee has met twice in Rome to consider what further support for international agricultural research institutes to recommend for consideration at the second CG meeting of December 3-4, based on its own investigations and discussions with involved parties and some studies done for it. The TAC is chaired by Sir John Crawford of Australia, half of its 12 members are from LDCs, and the American member is Dr. Harrar: it is a group of experts, not representatives of countries or organizations.

The principal TAC recommendations are:

- continuing support for the four existing centers, at rising budget levels (See Table A, Attachment 1);
- starting a new livestock disease center in East Africa in 1972, plus further studies prior to recommending on a proposed companion animal production center in West Africa;
- starting a new institute in India for research on rainfed crops and farming systems in the semi-arid tropics, with particular stress on sorghums, millets and food legumes;
- supporting the transition, already begun, of an existing potato research center in Peru into an international center.

In addition, the TAC recommended further developmental work on proposals for:

- a world network of genetic resource centers ("gene pools"),
- research on food legumes,
- a computerized agricultural research information system,

- research on water use and management,
- research on socio-economic problems,
- vegetable production in South-East Asia (i.e., further support for the Taiwan center).

Also, it deferred consideration of livestock production in South-East Asia, protein production in Latin America, and aquaculture.

The December 3-4 Agenda (Attachment 3) focusses on the means of financing on-going and proposed new institute programs. Expression of members' interests and intentions is being solicited, particularly for 1972 budgets but also for the longer term.

The 1972-76 financing requirements estimated for the four existing centers plus the three new ones recommended by TAC are shown in Table A. They indicate that by 1974 AID is likely to reach the \$7 million financing level that we had indicated in our January 1971 statement to the organizing meeting for the CG, if we are financing then the full $\frac{1}{4}$ of costs that we had also indicated as our intent, subject to appropriate caveats.* This means that the concerned Bureaus will need to concert their views on where we go from here in the course of our FY 1974 budgeting work, seeking further guidance from you at that time, unless it appears by then that a \$7 million or greater requirement will not arise until after 1974.

For 1972, current AID funding intentions for the existing centers, plus IBRD estimates of firm financing commitments from other non-IBRD sources add up to \$12.6-12.8 million, against the estimated \$16.5 million requirement in Table A. Additional financing for the balance or other requirements not listed (e.g., CIAT or other capital costs) is in sight from:

- U.S. partial support for the proposed new centers;

*Actual January 1971 statement authorized and delivered January 14 was:

"A.I.D. is prepared in principle to provide up to 25% of the additional capital and future operating costs of the existing institutes and the two new institutes proposed (up to a maximum total contribution of \$7 million in any one year), provided that the remaining 75% is forthcoming from other sources. Specific pledges would, of course, be for individual institutes subject to our review and approval of fully developed proposals for each and to the provision by the Congress of adequate funds. The U.S. is convinced that the success of existing institutes has depended in large part on the effectiveness of the management supplied by the Foundations and our pledge is based on the assumption that additional institutes will be assured of management of comparable efficiency."

It was generally understood that the U.S. intent was to finance $\frac{1}{4}$ of center costs, if needed, subject to the stated caveats.

- probable new expressions of support on September 3 from Germany, Belgium, Sweden and Denmark and possibly some small increases in support previously indicated by the UK, Netherlands and Canada;
- IBRD indication of the availability of up to \$3 million for uncovered residuals.

In sum, there is not likely to be a shortfall problem in 1972. However, if the requirements grow as fast as estimated in 1973, there may be a problem by then. Attachment 2 shows our best current estimates of 1972 and 1973 funding requirements for AID, for which there is some flexibility between our fiscal years.

As the individual centers come up for discussion and statement of donors intent for 1972 under item 3 of the Agenda, we propose to indicate the financing intent for 1972 shown in the table in Attachment 2. (Our general caveat regarding Congressional provision of funds, shown in the footnote on page 2, still holds. It seems undesirable to stress the point in the context of this Agenda item when the purpose is to encourage other donors to come forward. As suggested below, we shall probably need to remind the CG of the content of our January 1971 statement of financing intent, including its caveats, at a later point in the Agenda.) We also intend to comment along the following lines on the proposed new centers.

African Livestock. AID supports strongly the recommendations of the report of the International Livestock Task Force to the TAC for a single, comprehensive African Center (with appropriate disease and production sub-centers) to integrate animal production, disease and marketing aspects in a vertical systems approach to the basic goals of increased meat consumption and increased rural income, rather than the TAC recommendation to proceed with the animal disease center portion of this proposal while deferring action on a separate production center until more studies are made of present research activities. This position is explained in a memorandum to you from AA/AFR (Attachment 4), with which I agree fully. The position also reflects the consensus of various discussions in the Bellagio context, at which AID pointed out that extensive experience with livestock development problems in the LDCs indicated clearly the essentiality of an integrated vertical approach. The Rockefeller Foundation has just reaffirmed its agreement on this, and I believe that the Ford Foundation has a similar view. So does the UK. The TAC proposal apparently was engineered as a stalling tactic by the French member, reflecting concern that an international center in West Africa would undermine the exclusive French hold on research in the French speaking countries. If the proposed livestock and production Centers were to start separately, it would be difficult to get them back together, and an unbalanced and wasteful research program would be likely. We are trying to bring the French along on some basis, and have some hopes of succeeding, but do not want to allow them to hinder action on a production center if several donors are ready to proceed. In this regard, AFR is prepared to commit \$500,000 to match a like commitment by Rockefeller for start up funds for an integrated center. We hope that others will join..

Upland Crops. We propose to indicate full support, and willingness to participate in financing on the basis indicated in our general statement of intent last January. This is based on a strong consensus in AID and outside circles expert on LDC agriculture that development of suitable crops with higher and more dependable yields for the unirrigated semi-arid zones of the tropics is the most important action needed to benefit the largest portion of the rural peoples by-passed thus far by the "Green Revolution", with its focus on irrigated agriculture. This is the only one of the seven centers under consideration for which there has been no prior AID programming, and the appropriate Bureau to manage this new center has not been determined. We plan to confer further with NESR on this and then make a proposal.

Potatoes. We propose to endorse the strong TAC recommendation that this new international center be embraced by the CG and its support widened and regularized, and to indicate our willingness to continue to support it on the basis of our general statement of intent last January. Cooperation to date among USAID/Peru, the University of North Carolina, the Rockefeller Foundation Potato Project in Mexico and several Peruvian institutions has converted a bilateral aid project into the frame of an international center in Peru. The latter has made a tentative start with interim support from TAB and Rockefeller, and Netherlands, Germany and the UK have now proposed some support. Others are interested. Potato research has a high priority, since potatoes rank with sorghums (after only rice and wheat) as a major worldwide source of calories, they have extremely high calorie yield per acre and high quality protein content that probably can be increased substantially via research, and there is rapidly growing interest and optimism regarding the possibilities of expanding their production in the tropics on the basis of good research programs.

Probably under Agenda item 7, if not sooner, the CG meeting will discuss the following concern put forward by IBRD, and pressed particularly by the Foundations on behalf of the Centers.

"The experience of the research Centers and of the foundations which so far have been their chief support makes it clear that continuity of support, and the ability to count on long-range financing, are highly important for the successful operation of the Centers. Length of commitment is particularly crucial in the case of new centers, where four or five years may be required to create a fully effective staff and put the necessary infrastructure of buildings and equipment in place.

It would be of great advantage if as many Consultative Group members as possible could find some way to indicate at Group meetings the extent of the financing they likely would be able to offer not

merely in the year immediately following but also in the second year following, at least. If in one year, the Consultative Group confirmed its support of the programs and budgets for the following year and tentatively approved the plans for the year after that, a good deal more firmness could be given to the underpinning of each center's action program."

The general forward commitment made by the U.S. at the January 1971 organizing meeting of the CG should provide much of what is sought above, as far as our support is concerned. If needed in the CG discussion on this point, it is proposed to remind the CG of this statement of long term intent, and that we are also prepared to consider for the future some procedure for tentative indication of financing intent for one year beyond the year immediately ahead if this would really provide additional help for the Centers' planning.

Regarding the six proposals on which the TAC is expected to report that it has recommended further work to bring them to a point at which action may be recommended, our current views are these.

- Some suitable means of strengthening research on water management is highly desirable, but as yet no adequate proposal has been developed. Since further work to define needs is proceeding at TAC's behest and is in competent Canadian and U.S. hands, we do not propose to comment.
- We plan to encourage further internationalization of the vegetable center in Taiwan, trying to bring this in as a member of the group of CG endorsed and supported centers. There may be resistance to this.
- We are skeptical about the comparative cost/effectiveness of the proposals for building a computerized agricultural research information system at FAO for the near future, believing that contracting for such services with already established computerized systems that have such data (e.g., Brookings) or other less ambitious alternatives for a reference center may be more sensible for now. We plan to propose, in lieu of the TAC proposal for a pilot project to test user requirements and potential usage of the proposed computerized system at FAO, that the TAC designate a sub-committee or panel to look into alternative ways of meeting the need for dissemination of research information so that it could consider the alternatives before deciding which one to pursue.
- We propose to reserve comment on proposals regarding a world network of genetic resource centers, further steps regarding research on food legumes, and research on socio-economic problems pending further work by sub-committees as indicated in the TAC report.

We do not expect that any additional U.S. financing requirement will be suggested by the discussion of Agenda item 6 on financing for feasibility studies. This would not preclude a situation in which we or other donors had a special interest in and wished to finance or help finance a particular study that would be considered by TAC.

The anticipated CG discussion of future methods of operations involves primarily the proper interrelating of the work of the TAC, Consultative Group and the individual Centers. Except for one point, it involves no matters of policy concern to us, and will be worked out more-or-less to the satisfaction of the interrelated organizations.

The one point of concern is the establishment of some reasonable basis for donor assurance that the Center budgets are tightly constructed from a cost efficiency point of view, as distinguished from the validity of the kinds of activities undertaken and the levels of activity. While the U.S. has some means of looking into this kind of question directly, this is not practicable for the whole group of donors. The present structure of Center Boards and the CG/TAC apparatus should be adequate to assure good program content. However, since the Boards and TAC are primarily technically oriented and do not represent donors; and given the proliferation of Centers and donors, it has seemed to me that the CG needs some centralized means to monitor Center budgets and operations to keep the water out. The IBRD has also felt this. If this is well done with continuity of personnel, it would help the U.S. as well as other donors. After some discussion of alternatives between IBRD and Foundation staff and myself, we have agreed that the best scheme would be for the Bank to take on the responsibility for this surveillance/guidance vis-a-vis the Centers and to report its findings to the CG (i.e., to the donors). We expect this to be proposed to the CG and will support it. We are all concerned to meet this need in a way that will avoid any subverting of the policy responsibility of the individual Boards for their respective Centers.

Recommendations.

That the U.S. respond to the request, under Agenda item 3, for a statement of intent regarding financing of Centers for 1972 by indicating the amounts shown in Attachment 2.

APPROVAL: U J H #

DISAPPROVAL: _____

DATE: 12/2/71

That the U.S. remind the CG of its January 1971 statement to the CG of longer term financing intent (footnote on page 2), as needed to meet the requirements of the discussion of Agenda items 4 or 7.

APPROVAL: LC JAH

DISAPPROVAL: _____

DATE: 12/2/71

Clearances:

AFR
NESA
LA
SA/EAD
PPC

TABLE A

INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTERS

1972-1976 ESTIMATED FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS*
(in \$million)

	1972			1973			1974			1975			1976		
	Core	Capital	Total	Core	Capital	Total	Core	Capital	Total	Core	Capital	Total	Core	Capital	Total
CIAT	2.8	n.a.	2.8(a)	3.3	0.5	3.8	3.7	0.3	4.0	4.2	0.2	4.4	4.6	0.2	4.8
CGMYT	3.7	1.3	5.0	4.2	0.4	4.6	4.5	0.3	4.8	4.8	0.2	5.0	5.1	0.5	5.6
IITA	3.2	0.6(b)	3.8	3.7	0.3	4.0	4.2	0.2	4.4	4.7	0.3	5.0	5.1	0.4	5.5
IRRI	2.6	0.4	3.0	2.7	0.3	3.0	2.9	0.3	3.2	3.1	0.4	3.5	3.3	0.5	3.8
Livestock (Africa)(c)	Start up Costs	{	1.0	1.6	3.0	4.6	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.4	1.0	3.4	3.0	1.0	4.0
Upland crops (India)			0.5	1.0	3.0	4.0	1.6	5.0	6.6	1.9	2.0	3.9	2.5	1.0	3.5
Potatoes (Peru)			0.4	1.0	-	1.0	1.2	0.1	1.3	1.3	-	1.3	1.3	0.1	1.4
TOTAL	13.7	2.3(a)	16.5(a)	17.5	7.5	25.0	20.1	8.2	28.3	22.4	4.1	26.5	24.9	3.7	28.6

(a) Excludes capital requirements for CIAT for which no firm figures available.

(b) Excludes over-run (\$700,000) on construction costs.

(c) Arbitrarily doubled all IBRD figures for E. Africa portion of livestock center (animal disease research), on basis AID and Rockefeller Foundation intent to press for simultaneous development production and disease components of an overall center in East and West Africa. Costs may not build up as fast as shown in 1973.

This is a slightly adapted version of the table of estimated requirements distributed by the IBRD for the Dec. 3-4 meeting. It does not provide for new programs that may be introduced at existing centers, or for additional centers that have been suggested and might be recommended later. Sizeable new initiatives of the latter type beyond those in the table do not seem likely in the next year or two, but future TAC recommendations are uncertain.

1972-73 FINANCING BY AID FOR INTERNATIONAL CENTERS

Estimated AID financing for 1972 and 1973 is as follows. 1972 estimates are based on actual Bureau budgeting (except for the new upland crops center in India), and reflect some transitional considerations in moving towards a 25% formula within the broadened CG participation. 1973 provisional estimates merely project 25% of core and capital budgets.

	(\$ millions)	
	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>
CIAT (LA)	.720 <u>1/</u>	.950
CIMMYT (TAB)	.925 <u>2/</u>	1.150
IITA (AFR)	1.030 <u>3/</u>	1.000
IRRI (EA)	.750 <u>4/</u>	.750
African Livestock (AFR)	.500 <u>5/</u>	1.150
Upland Crops (NESA or TAB)	.125 <u>6/</u>	1.000
Potatoes (TAB)	<u>.100</u> <u>7/</u>	<u>.250</u>
TOTAL	4.150	6.250

1/ Former "full partner" share with foundations. About 25% core budget.

2/ Estimate is increase from former \$750,000 share and is 25% core budget: may need to consider later increasing contribution further towards full $\frac{1}{4}$ share of \$1,250,000 for core and capital budget, depending on financing forthcoming from other sources and possible reduction capital budget.

3/ \$750,000 "full partnership" share with Foundations and Canada plus \$280,000 capital contribution previously agreed.

4/ Former "full partnership" share: also 25% budget.

5/ AFR proposed sharing with Rockefeller Foundation of start up costs.

6/ Assumed $\frac{1}{4}$ U.S. share on start up costs, if goes ahead and expected interest several organizations. No present AID budget for this item.

7/ Proposed U.S. share on start up costs.

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Second Meeting

December 3, (and, if necessary, December 4) 1971

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Adoption of Agenda
2. Presentation of the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) by the Chairman of the Committee
3. Discussion and Statements of Intention regarding financing for 1972 of the programs recommended by TAC:
 - a) International Center of Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)
 - b) International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT)
 - c) International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
 - d) International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)
 - e) Animal Disease Laboratory
 - f) International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-arid Tropics (ICRISAT)
 - g) International Potato Center (subject to review by TAC)
4. Review of Five-Year Financial Requirements projected for programs recommended by TAC
5. Review of other programs under study and their possible financial requirements
6. Financing for feasibility studies
7. Discussion of Future Method of Operations and 1972 Schedule of Meetings of Consultative Group and TAC.
8. Other business
9. Press Communique

FED. MEMORANDUM FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR

NOV 29 1971

TO : EXSEC /s/ Samuel C. Adams, Jr.
 FROM: AA/AFR, Samuel C. Adams, Jr.
 SUBJECT: U.S. Position Concerning Proposed African Livestock Center
 for Presentation at the Consultative Group Meeting
 Scheduled to be Convened on December 3, 1971

A. SUMMARY

During the October 1971 meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) it considered but did not accept the recommendations of the International Livestock Task Force for establishing a comprehensive International African Livestock Center. The Task Force proposed that the Center should have two laboratories, namely, a Livestock Production Laboratory in Nigeria and an International Animal Disease Laboratory in Kenya. Instead, the Technical Advisory Committee has indicated that it will recommend to the Consultative Group on December 3, 1971 the establishment in Kenya of an International Laboratory for Animal Diseases. Also, a combined study of animal health and production work done by organizations in the Francophone and Anglophone countries would be made.

It is believed that the Committee's proposal would in fact result in a rejection of the concepts upon which existing international institutes and centers such as IRRI and CIMMYT have been developed. The policies underlying these organizations have been exceptionally successful in accelerating production. We believe that a comprehensive International African Livestock Center with a package approach to the principal production and disease constraints limiting the development of Africa's livestock potential is a high priority. In view of the recommendations expected to be presented to the Consultative Group by the Technical Advisory Committee, AFR recommends that the following guidelines be adopted in stating the U.S. position when the agenda item concerning livestock development in Africa is discussed.

B. Recommended United States Position at Consultative Group Conference

1. The U.S. is in general agreement with the findings and recommendations of the International Livestock Task Force. It firmly supports the establishment of one comprehensive International African Livestock Center with one Board of Trustees, one Director, and two associate directors. It should be responsible for research programs directed towards solving both production and disease constraints. Its International Livestock Production Laboratory should be located in West Africa (Nigeria) and its International Laboratory for Animal Diseases in Eastern Africa (Kenya). Without the mechanism of an

independent center, it is seriously doubted if the coordinated in-depth research programs necessary in coping with the formidable impediments to developing the livestock potential of African countries can be realistically launched and sustained in a manner that will result in meaningful programs within a reasonable period of time.

2. The recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee concerning another study of animal production and health research should be opposed. This proposal would delay action initiating project assistance by at least one year. The report of the International Livestock Task Force recommended that one of the first functions of the new Center should be a thorough review of the literature resulting from research carried out in both Francophone and Anglophone countries. The Technical Advisory Committee has already had the proposal for an International Livestock Center under consideration twice. The proposal for a year's additional study by two specialists is limited primarily to reviewing existing research. No indication is given in the Committee's minutes that it views this study as pertaining to the concept of an international center which would be responsible for mobilizing an inter-disciplinary team for a coordinated approach in resolving the principal constraints to increasing livestock production in Africa. We have reasons to believe that the study is being proposed as a delaying tactic. The Task Force Report recognizes that considerable research and extension work has been in Africa but points out that it has had little impact upon traditional livestock husbandry.

3. The U.S. position opposes the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee that an International Laboratory for Animal Diseases be established as a separate entity. However, it supports authorizing the Board of Trustees of the International African Livestock Center to proceed in planning and developing the International Laboratory for Animal Diseases proposed by the Committee. Unless the program of the new Center includes both the production and disease research elements valuable time will be lost, and the delay in getting a comprehensive program underway may result in increased funding difficulties. In view of the nature of the unresolved problems relating to the planning of the International Livestock Production Laboratory, this program should be initiated with a small staff on a limited basis with activities being expanded as sound analysis and experience warrant. It is believed that this would be the most appropriate course of action and would be more effective than the study proposed by the Technical Advisory Committee.

4. The U.S. should seek a general consensus of the members participating in the Consultative Group meeting that: (a) the establishment of a comprehensive and integrated International African Livestock Center including both production and disease research programs is supported; and (b) it would be a commendable endeavor for the interested donors to proceed with the formal organization of such a Center. This permits essential flexibility.

5. The International African Livestock Center should have the authority to execute research contracts with existing organizations involving technical cooperation and the conduct of specific activities. Research relating to livestock production and diseases must in some instances be located in different ecological zones. Also, livestock production and disease programs are already in existence. The work of the new Center should supplement rather than duplicate what has been done or is in the process of being done, except as circumstances may justify. Further, it is important that the Center continually strive to strengthen its linkages with existing research organizations in both the Francophone and Anglophone areas of Africa, particularly with those stations which will wish to be affiliated with the Center.

6. The U.S. agrees with the Technical Advisory Committee that planning for the International Laboratory for Animal Diseases in Kenya should give priority emphasis to negotiating for the facilities of the East African Veterinary Research Organization (EAVRO) at Muguga, Kenya. If this effort is not successful negotiations for locating the facilities at Kabete, near Nairobi should then be initiated with the Government of Kenya.

C. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

An International Livestock Task Force consisting of eight specialists from seven countries, including three in Africa, was appointed to make a survey of the livestock situation in African countries. It recommended the establishment of a comprehensive International African Livestock Center which would address both production and disease constraints and serve Francophone and Anglophone countries. This Center would have one Board of Directors, one Director and two associate directors. It would develop a net work of associated African research stations based upon voluntary agreements with selected institutions. Such relationships would not involve promises of financial assistance. However, the directors of these associated research organizations would have an advisory role in the planning of the Center's annual research programs. Operations of the Center would include two major thrusts:

1. A livestock production research laboratory would be located at Zaria, Nigeria. Its research programs would include work in: the selection and genetic improvement of livestock, animal nutrition problems, forage crops, marketing, livestock farming systems adapted to African conditions, and animal health (excluding Trypanosomiasis and East Coast Fever), facilities which would be an integral part of the laboratory's operations would include a range research area near Toukonous, Niger, a feed lot research area at Mokwa, Nigeria; and

an area near Ibadan, Nigeria for rain forest research work. This latter activity would involve cooperative research relationships with the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA).

2. An international laboratory for animal disease research would be located in the vicinity of Nairobi, Kenya. It would serve as the Eastern Africa arm of the Center and would concentrate upon research aimed at protecting livestock against the two most serious animal killer diseases in Africa, East Coast Fever and Trypanosomiasis. This laboratory would also have a small team of researchers concerned with livestock production problems.

The headquarters of the African Livestock Center would include the office of the Director, the library, the information center and the training component. It could be attached to either laboratory, depending upon the plan adopted for starting and developing the Center.

The most important function of the African Livestock Center would be to assemble a multi-disciplinary team of scientists to develop research programs designed to solve the basic production and socio-economic problems that are serving as constraints to livestock development in Africa. Another important activity would be training programs for research and extension leaders. Emphasis would also be given to training graduate students under cooperative relationships with universities, central library facilities would be developed and the literature resulting from research carried out in both Francophone and Anglophone countries would be reviewed and collated. Also, the Center would establish an information unit for publishing and distributing research and extension materials.

The Technical Advisory Committee to the Consultative Group considered the report of the International Task Force during the Committee's meeting in October, 1971 held in Rome, Italy. The minutes of this meeting definitely indicate that the Committee did not accept the recommendations of the task force relating to the establishment of one African Livestock Center with coordinated research programs for controlling animal diseases and increasing livestock production. Instead it adopted the view that two parallel international efforts should be adopted which would include:

1. Animal Disease Research

A strong international cooperative effort should be initiated which would concentrate upon immunological methods of overcoming East Coast Fever and Trypanosomiasis. For this program the Committee supported the establishment of an International Laboratory for Animal Diseases in Kenya using the facilities of East African Veterinary Research Organization (EAVRO) at Muguga if negotiations with the East African Community are successful, otherwise the offer of the

Government of Kenya for locating the Laboratory at Kabete, Nairobi should be accepted. To support this program the Committee will recommend that the Consultative Group give consideration to long term financing for an estimated capital budget of \$3,343,000 for the laboratory and recurrent costs of about \$500,000 for the first year and rising to \$1,500,000 in the fifth year.

2. Animal Production and Health Research

The Committee accepted the finding of the International Livestock Task Force that reinforcement is needed for research on animal production in the several important ecological zones and that the prevention of disease is an essential component of animal production methods. Where possible such studies should be based on the existing national research facilities. In the opinion of the Committee the International Livestock Task Force was not able to review the evidence of past research findings of ongoing national and international research programs and their potential for reinforcement. The need for a well equipped library with a bilingual staff was accepted. As the next step the Committee will recommend that the Consultative Group finance a comprehensive study by a team of two experienced specialists (one veterinarian and one animal husbandryman) which would be attached in turn to well equipped centers in French-speaking and English-speaking countries and have facilities for travel. The terms of reference for the study would be defined by the Technical Advisory Committee.

The relationships between France and the Francophone countries in Africa must be considered, especially if a comprehensive International African Livestock Center is established. These relations are believed to be the primary reason that the International Livestock Task Force was unable to reach a unanimous agreement in formulating its recommendations. France has research contracts with all of the Francophone countries except Guinea. These provide for French financial support and significant administrative influence by French directors of research organizations. Any likelihood of potential interference with the continuing operations of the French contracts is likely to stimulate negative reaction from the French Government.

Some comments of Dr. Jean Pagot, French member of the International Livestock Task Force, have indicated that the French Government would support a livestock research organization patterned after the West African Rice Development Association (WARDA). Dr. H. E. Lepissier, French Government official with responsibilities relating to foreign aid programs, recently stated at AID/W that a WARDA

organization would not be supported. His reasoning was that the WARDA Governing Council includes only member states. He believes that donors should have representatives on the Board of Trustees. It is believed that French support for a comprehensive International African Livestock Center may be possible if: (a) an acceptable arrangement can be made for representation of both the French Government research organizations and the research institutions of the Francophone countries on the Board of Trustees of the Center; and (b) the contracts between the Center and Associated Stations has some flexibility for financial assistance. Dr. Lepissier indicated that the French Government might possibly agree to support an International African Livestock Center if it did not conflict with the French Government's research programs in West Africa and if African Governments and organizations were receptive to its coming into being.

ATTACHMENT 2

Comments by Joel Bernstein on African Livestock Research

Mr. Chairman, there is a certain dilemma presented by the combination of three conclusions reflected in the papers before us on the proposed African Livestock Center, and in the further explanations by Sir John.

- We have learned that, over the course of the two TAC meetings, there developed a consensus of most members that significant progress on African livestock problems does require a broad program approach covering the principal factors affecting the whole livestock system, as the Task Force in animal production and health in Africa had indicated. This same conclusion has been reached on a number of other occasions, including a February 1970 international conference at Bellagio on developing country agricultural research priorities and some subsequent special panel discussions among agricultural and livestock people.
- However, the TAC feels that it does not yet have adequate information or adequately worked out proposals on how to structure and locate the production components of an overall livestock center, or on how to relate such components to other research entities and programs in Africa. Thus the TAC has indicated a need for additional study and work on the proposals before it can make a definitive recommendation on how to proceed with the production component of an African livestock center.
- However, the TAC did feel that it had an adequate basis for recommending, as it did, that efforts proceed to establish a major disease component of an African livestock effort, viz., the proposed East African animal disease laboratory.

The problem is how to develop the most constructive course of action to reconcile these three conclusions. This presents a dilemma because of the need to proceed from the beginning of any concerted international effort in this field in the framework of an African Livestock Center concept that is broad enough to cover all of the major components of the actual livestock systems--breeding, forage, water supply, production management, diseases, regulation and legal factors, the many components of the marketing sub-systems, and so forth. We are concerned that donor efforts not be wasted through failure to implement this approach.

Our concern arises from recognition that the central purpose of development assistance is sizeable improvement in the lives of developing country peoples and that, in the case of any new livestock ventures in Africa, this goal translates into sizeable increases in meat actually consumed and widespread income increases by those engaged in production and marketing of meat. To achieve these purposes requires basic changes in the total systems of human effort that create meat and move it into people's mouths--changes that are not likely to be accelerated much without the kind of program organization that can produce a potent vertical systems approach to the prevailing problems.

What we mean by a vertical systems approach is one that:

- establishes clear and meaningful basic purposes--along the lines already suggested--and realistic intermediate goals that research and development will try to attain, based on realistic assumptions about other significant factors effecting the basic purposes;
- identifies clearly the key elements in the total systems of human effort involved with livestock production and marketing;
- identifies where the most immediate bottlenecks really are to achievement of the program goals, i.e., where would a concentration of the necessarily limited external assistance produce the greatest progress towards the goals;
- organizes an integrated, interdisciplinary attack on the sets of problems identified with the most important bottlenecks, with appropriate interrelating of the various strands of effort;
- tries out and demonstrates the effectiveness of new combinations of technology and practices at significant points in the vertical chain of action from meat production to consumption.
- extends its knowledge in ways best calculated to assure widespread applications.

There needs to be a "nerve center" where the system analyses can occur and where the scarce resources needed for the most sophisticated types of interdisciplinary teamwork and testing of findings can be concentrated. Such a center could also facilitate exchanges of knowledge, experience and ideas between itself and national centers and among national centers, and could provide valuable training and guidance in output oriented research for Africans--in other words, it could further the network concept that was stressed in the original statements of CG and TAC purposes as the way to assure strengthening of research in individual developing countries and complementarity of their work and that of the international research centers.

This concern that the approach to an African livestock center start from the beginning in a broad system context is not theoretical. It reflects hard experience. There have been many livestock research and development efforts scattered in bits and pieces all over Africa--dealing with various aspects of breeding, forage, water, disease, slaughtering, etc. Much of this work has no doubt been very creditable, within its limited terms of reference. But the attainment of significant results in increasing meat actually consumed and incomes generated has tended to be frustrated by inability to coordinate the various elements of research and development in major attacks on the actual bottlenecks in the vertical livestock systems.

While there can be valuable contributions from new methods of controlling particular animal diseases, it could be wasteful for this work to get too far ahead of improvement in other factors in the livestock systems that need change before improved disease control can affect the basic purposes. If particular kinds of disease work get too far ahead, investment in this work has been wasteful in the same sense that investment in a bridge is wasteful when it is finished well before connecting roads are in place. Moreover, it is likely to be very difficult to patch together various disease and production oriented efforts within a single broad institution and program once the disease program proposed for East Africa has a life of its own with associated vested interests. Having said this, we would not like to see worthwhile elements of the overall effort to improve African livestock systems held back if they are ready to move ahead, as long as this can be reconciled with the need to assure the kind of broad approach I've been describing.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to us that there is an approach that could reconcile the various needs that I've described and that could bring constructive progress on the question before us, consistent with the TAC recommendations. This could result from a CG consensus on the following three points.

- (1) Agreement in principle on the need for an approach to development of an African livestock center that envisages an institution whose R & D scope covers the overall improvement of African livestock systems. Such a center might include installations in several African countries that would focus on selected elements of the overall livestock systems of Africa, but it should have from the beginning a single widely based Board and a single Director to assure a well integrated approach to the complex set of factors involved in increasing substantially the contribution made by livestock production to the well being of the African peoples.
- (2) CG Chairman should be requested to convene an early meeting of potential donors and those interested organizations with large current investments in African livestock research to confer and seek a consensus on how to proceed in general and to begin to discuss such questions as the kind of Board membership desired, nominees, how the Director should be selected and who might be nominated to the Board, etc.--and also to indicate the likely extent of their future financial support.
 - One advantage of this step is that it's the most practicable way to provide part of the advice the TAC report says it needs to make further recommendations, viz. advice re what "financial facilities are currently available or likely to be available".

- Moreover, presuming that the bulk of the Board including the Chairman should be able Africans of recognized stature and widely representative, the early activation of a broadly based Board will give a strong role for African leadership in the subsequent shaping process for the different elements of the livestock program.
 - This step would also mean that, to the extent that donors are interested, they could consider the provision of initial funding that would (a) permit proceeding with definite steps to establish the East Africa disease laboratory, on the basis of the TAC recommendations and assuming that this action is ready to go, and (b) also provide some funding for further planning and studies and consultations, as needed, to reach a satisfactory basis for proceeding subsequently with the production elements of the overall livestock center.
- (3) Acceptance by the CG of the TAC recommendation for the preparation of a more complete and fully documented report for future consideration by TAC, particularly in respect to the effectiveness of current research on animal production and health in Africa and the role that existing facilities (suitably strengthened if necessary) might play in an overall research network for which the proposed International Center might provide the focal point. The group convened under point (2) should consider, in consultation with the Chairman of TAC, the organization and financing of a team to prepare this report, for which the TAC should prepare terms of reference. The team should build on the information already available from prior studies and should start by collecting and evaluating information available from existing organizations with wide experience in problems in livestock development in Africa--completing its work within six months.

OCM- NOVEMBER 11, 1971
BRIEFING MATERIAL FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR
FOR Dec. 3-4, 1971 World Consul.Grp.Mtg.