



**Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)**

# **2004 CGIAR Financing Plan**

**October 2003**

Part A: ISC-SC Transition Team Comments on the Centre  
2004-2006 Medium Term Plans

Part B: Investment and Financing Requirements of the 2004  
CGIAR Research Agenda

Attachment 1: Summary of the 2004 Financing Plans and the  
2004-2006 Medium-Term Plans of the Sixteen  
CGIAR Centers

Attachment 2: Cover Notes of the Sixteen CGIAR Centers

**SDR/SC:IAR/03/17**

**CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH  
SCIENCE COUNCIL**

**ISC-SC TRANSITION TEAM COMMENTS  
ON THE CENTRE 2004-2006 MEDIUM TERM PLANS**

SCIENCE COUNCIL SECRETARIAT  
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
October 2003



**Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)**

---

**iSC-SCIENCE COUNCIL TRANSITION TEAM**

3 October 2003

Dear Ian,

It is with pleasure that I transmit the iSC-SC Transition Team Comments on the Centre 2004-2006 Medium Term Plans. The consultants to this Team, Hans Gregersen, Alain de Janvry and myself, have been closely associated with the MTP process, and are very pleased to see continual progress toward effective planning and reporting with an output focus.

I wish to draw attention to the excellent efforts of Tim Kelley and Sirkka Immonen who, along with their colleagues in the SC Secretariat, are producing such high quality work during this time of transition, with all its uncertainties. The present Secretariat team is the best I have seen in my many years of working with the System. They are truly professionals, with an intimate knowledge of the Centre programmes.

Sincerely,

Richard Harwood  
Coordinator, iSC/SC Transition Team consultants

Mr. Ian Johnson  
CGIAR Chair  
World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433  
USA.



## Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. SUMMARY</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. CENTRE SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 CIAT	3
2.2 CIFOR	3
2.2 CIMMYT	3
2.4 CIP	5
2.5 ICARDA	5
2.6 ICLARM	5
2.7 ICRAF	5
2.8 ICRISAT	6
2.9 IFPRI	7
2.10 IITA	8
2.11 ILRI	8
2.12 IPGRI	9
2.12 IRRI	10
2.14 ISNAR	10
2.15 IWMI	10
2.16 WARDA	11

### **ANNEX 1: THE MTP REVIEW PROCESS**





## **ISC-SC TRANSITION TEAM COMMENTS ON THE CENTRE 2004-2006 MEDIUM TERM PLANS**

This Commentary was prepared by the iSC-SC Transition Team and SC Secretariat following the expiration of the Term of Appointment of the interim Science Council on September 15, 2003. The changes from the regular iSC process, and the criteria used for this Commentary are presented in Annex 1.

### **1. SUMMARY**

#### **Consolidation of Research Projects**

Several Centres continue to consolidate their research projects into fewer thematic areas, with a move from discipline/output orientation to problem/opportunity orientation. This has often been a result of a strategic planning exercise. This is done in the interest of bringing the impact focus explicitly to the forefront, for attributing research efforts to development targets and for streamlining management. The more fundamental research is being embedded within the broad, impact-oriented themes. This change has some positive aspects. It gives a Centre greater flexibility to adjust activities within the broad project framework to reflect changes in needs and opportunities over the short term. It helps to communicate the prioritized broad impact areas within the Centre, and to the partners, donors and other stakeholders. It may eventually reveal where the Centres have clearly common interests and opportunities for synergies. Finally, it simplifies project reporting.

On the other hand, there are some concerns associated with this trend towards project consolidation and closer R&D integration. In order not to lose transparency and sharp research focus, the fundamental, process-oriented research needs to continue to provide scientific clarity and international public goods to permit extrapolation of technologies across gradients of environmental and ecosystem change. While ‘blending’ the research and development components of project work for enhanced impact sounds appealing, there is concern that this could result in a loss of transparency and visibility (when projects are identified in broad problem or goal oriented terms, e.g., “Food security, markets and livelihoods in Africa”) and potential loss of a sharp scientific focus, with serious implications. An increasing emphasis on short to intermediate-term solutions to major constraints to productivity and environmental management may compromise Centres’ long term productivity in strategic and basic research. This highlights the need for continuous evaluation of the comparative advantages and specific roles of the CGIAR Centres, national partners, NGOs and development agencies in the R-D continuum. In order to assure continuous accountability and performance monitoring at all levels, it is imperative that Centres complement the thematic project structure with very careful and transparent planning of activities, resource allocation, outputs and milestones that will allow easy monitoring of achievements across the range of work from strategic upstream research to development activities. To a great extent planning and resource allocation is becoming more difficult due to the influence of restricted funding on the shift toward short-term impact oriented consolidated projects, where the fundamental science piggybacks on the more “attractive” impact oriented activities. This is a point that has been highlighted by the iSC and TAC over the last several years.

## **Progress in the Use of Logframes**

Centres are generally following a complete logframe format in presenting their project portfolio, with project goals, purpose, and outputs being supported by indicators. Activities and their milestones are specified by many Centres. Continuing progress is needed for some Centres. There continues to be a pattern of more effective conceptualization and bringing a greater level of coherence to project portfolios by more clearly articulating Centre goals at the global, regional, community and household levels. This serves to sharpen the individual project agendas as they become oriented to best contribute to these goals. The output focused and forward looking logframe provides a suitable framework for accurate planning and setting verifiable indicators and milestones for targets against which achievements can be measured. Linking resources to outputs in a realistic manner, as highlighted in the logframe manual, is not yet practiced, but it would be desirable for efficient management, meaningful evaluation and enhanced credibility. This is ever more important with the shift towards very large theme oriented projects that cover a range of very different kinds of activities.

## **Systemwide and Ecoregional Programmes**

The systemwide and ecoregional programmes are spelled out in logframe format in only a few cases. Some coordinating Centres have begun the identification process, and list the Systemwide Programmes (SWPs) for which they have responsibility as separate projects within their portfolios. Centres that collaborate in SWPs led by others tend to fold their SWP outputs into the logframes of their normal themes and projects. Some identify them as SWP activities, and some do not. Greater uniformity of presentation will be needed to clarify these important SWP and Ecoregional efforts and fully show the synergies of multi-partner activities in coordinated efforts. The standardized logframe system is ideally suited to aggregation at the SWP level to provide scientific overview for investors and to those reviewing such coordinated efforts. They can clearly show the effects of blending strengths of diverse partners toward solution of difficult and complex problems, and should be more effectively applied to all SWPs.

## **Challenge Programmes**

The three approved Challenge Programmes, Biofertilization, Water and Food, and Unlocking Genetic Diversity in Crops for the Resource Poor have moved quickly in implementation. All are in an early formative stage, and none have fully completed their research planning and MTP formulation. In order to appropriately assess and follow the substance of the CPs and their progress, it is essential that:

- lead Centres provide an overview MTP logframe to spell out CP goals, purpose and outputs at a global scale, and to indicate the responsibility of individual Centres for general categories of activities.
- Individual partner organisations show details of their research planning for any CP they are participating in, and clearly identify specific activities as CP involvement.

This would provide a means for assigning responsibility and accountability by the lead Centre at the global level, and for specific outputs and activities with their indicators and milestones to be identified by the individual Centres. It would also allow individual Centres to demonstrate the completeness of their own programmes, with the appropriate portions

dedicated to support of the CP. Aggregation for the overall CP could then be easily done for overall CP reporting, if not in the global level CP for MTP purposes.

It is important that the aggregated CP budgets not be folded into Centre budgets, as in most cases the convening Centre actually uses a relatively small portion of CP resources, with most being pass-through. Incorporation into a single Centre distorts the investment share allocated to that Centre. Secondly, if the CP management itself does not specify the appropriate logframe output distribution, it could seriously skew not only the Centre's output balance but also the global balance. This has happened with the Biofortification CP which was initially classified in the financial analysis almost entirely within the policy output, while the CP is mainly focused on germplasm improvement. This would distort the level of both IFPRI's and the System's policy output, while failing to capture the added investment in genetic improvement. This highlights the need for CP management to provide the proper distribution of outputs for CP resources, as part of CP MTP.

## **2. CENTRE SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS**

The following are the iSC-SC Transition Team's specific comments on individual Centres' 2003 financing plans and their 2003-2005 MTPs. Discussion focuses on changes of a programmatic nature considered significant in terms of the criteria used.

### **2.1 CIAT**

No major changes were introduced into the CIAT project portfolio in the 2004-2006 MTP. Significant changes were made in CIAT's 2003-2005 MTP and the current plan emphasizes implementation of those course adjustments and greater cross programme integration and overall coherence. CIAT appears to have achieved full programme integration with TSBF, has operationalized the Biofortification CP (with IFPRI) and is actively involved in two other CPs.

### **2.2 CIFOR**

The current Plan essentially rolls forward the previous MTPs, although it reflects progress in strategic reformulation as CIFOR continues to reflect and re-evaluate its medium-term strategy, an ongoing process currently scheduled to conclude in the last quarter of 2003. Thus, any changes to the research agenda resulting from strategic programmatic revisions will be fully reflected in next year's submission

### **2.3 CIMMYT**

CIMMYT has undergone financial difficulties which were reflected in roughly a 10% cut in 2002 evenly across all 21 projects and in a 12% reduction in the number of IRS. The reduced IRS levels are planned to be maintained through the MTP period. In the current MTP the funding prospects have considerably improved and in 2003, fiscal allocation to projects was increased, again evenly across the portfolio. At the time of the financial draw-back CIMMYT stated a need to re-examine some of its research priorities and has now gone through a strategic planning exercise, involving broad consultation with stakeholders from different constituencies. The aim has been to position the Centre strategically for the next 10-15 years and to enhance integrated research perspective, partnerships and synergies at all

levels. The current Plan, proposing a new organisation and project structure, is an interim one and subsequently the logframe planning has not been completed.

This exercise is highly commendable to help the Centre focus on research areas of high priority under circumstances of unpredictable financing, and to increase flexibility to respond to changing needs and opportunities. The projected resource allocation by CGIAR output categories reveals few shifts through 2006. CIMMYT plans to increase its overall allocation to South Asia, while reducing its presence in Latin America, and keeping its activities in other regions at earlier levels. CIMMYT also plans to implement shifts in specific crop resource allocation in the near term and in the long term as deemed necessary by its analysis of trends in poverty as well as maize and wheat supply and demand. We expect that the priority setting exercise, not yet concluded, and the new strategic plan, along with the new project structure will lead to reassessment of Centre priorities with clear focus on fundamental areas of research for the continuous production of international public goods.

CIMMYT's new organisational structure involves 7 interim projects, which seem to house all on-going research activities. The project structure and titles reflect a change from output orientation with identifiable disciplinary and commodity content to problem/opportunity orientation. This trend is occurring also elsewhere among the CGIAR Centres. In the new project titles CIMMYT's crop orientation is generally losing visibility. However, its genetic resources - a core resource, responsibility and research area - are in the future provided a clear identity in the project *Maize and wheat genetic diversity for humanity*, which has a strong upstream research emphasis. Four projects - *Livelihoods and risk in rainfed, stress prone foodgrain systems*, *Food security, markets and livelihoods in Africa*; *Ensuring world food security through sustainable intensification in densely inhabited areas*; *Improving livelihoods and conserving natural resources in tropical agrosystems* - have a strong focus on particular agroecosystems and their characteristic production and livelihood problems. The project *Policies and institution that maximise research impact* has a significant focus on impact and other activities that facilitate priority setting, in addition to policy research. The project *Sharing and managing knowledge*, has a strong emphasis on information flow analysis, development and use and encompasses training and capacity development services.

We find the main characteristics of the new strategy commendable in adding flexibility for follow up on future priority areas, by increasing subsidiarity in decision making and enhancing disciplinary and institutional integration toward common goals. It is too early to comment on the project content, as the plan provided is an interim one. Furthermore, the interim Plan does not allow tracing the volume of input associated with planned output. However, as each project covers a large number of activities ranging from information management, resource management, genetic improvement and policies to partnerships and capacity building, setting clear milestones and monitoring their achievement must be transparently and accurately communicated to the stakeholders to provide transparency and accountability.

CIMMYT is one of the lead Centres for the Challenge Programme on Unlocking Genetic Diversity, and the Centre has received 1.5 m US\$ from the World Bank since the approval of the CP for a one year inception phase. Activities for this CP are referred to in one logframe output for Project 1. CIMMYT also participates in the Biofortification CP, with two output targets also under Project 1, and in the Water and Food CP. The Centre has not yet provided a more detailed operational plan for its involvement in CPs.

## **2.4 CIP**

The Centre has just completed a vision and strategy exercise, and it will finalize its detailed impact targeting and strategic planning exercise before the end of 2003. Its results will be captured and reflected in a final version of the 2004-2006 MTP due later in the year. CIP's programme structure has been realigned into two 'constellations': research projects and partnerships projects, in order to realize "gains in efficiency, effectiveness and flexibility of program". Accordingly, the number of projects has gone from 13 in the 2003-2005 to 12 in the 2004-2006 Plan. This appears to be primarily a realignment rather than a major programmatic shift in focus. .

## **2.5 ICARDA**

During 2003, a large grant from USAID to support quality seed activities and needs assessment in Afghanistan and another grant for upgrading ICARDA's gene bank slightly shifted the balance of Activities and Outputs and provided temporary increase in budget in the previous plan. In the 2004-2006 MTP these activities will receive relatively less emphasis. Other than this, there are no major programmatic changes in the project portfolio compared with the 2003-2005 MTP. There are some minor changes within projects.

## **2.6 ICLARM**

All of the 2003-2005 MTP projects have been retained in the 2004-2006 MTP, with only minor modifications. The Centre should be commended for submitting a very thorough and comprehensive MTP.

## **2.7 ICRAF**

ICRAF embarked on a new 'theme-based' structure in 2003 in conjunction with fundamental changes in the organizational structure, mode of doing business, and the appointment of new senior leadership positions. Accordingly, the 2004-2006 MTP reflects the outcome of programme re-focusing and a new corporate strategy. Dissolving the previous five research and development programmes and its two major divisions, ICRAF has now re-oriented its programme along four major themes. The overall goal is to more closely connect problem-driven research with development processes and partner activities to achieve greater impact.

The four new themes are:

- 1) Land and People: Land productivity for Sustainable Livelihoods
- 2) Trees and Markets: Enhancing tree-based systems and markets
- 3) Environmental Services
- 4) Strengthening Institutions

Each theme is comprised of four projects, reflecting most of the former agenda. The primary result of these changes has been to integrate the more basic research elements of the former Ecosystem Processes and Management into the impact-oriented programmes. The strategy of "embedding" basic natural resources research into development-oriented programmes is very much in line with state-of-the art thinking promoted by the Centre

Directors Sub Committee and its community-of- practice INRM scientists throughout the System. It appears that most of the actual project research remains, often with adjustment of outputs and milestones. The overall balance among activities, as evidenced by budget allocation, remains without major change. ICRAF is encouraged to continue its very successful basic ecosystem research within this new context in order to deliver process-focused science that assists and guides extrapolation of INRM outputs as truly international public goods.

Each of the three Systemwide Programmes for which ICRAF hosts or has leadership responsibility (Alternatives to Slash and Burn, African Highlands Ecoregional Programme and the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Programme) are identified as separate programmes, complete with budget and logframe overview. The Centre is to be commended for this organization and transparency which gives prominent visibility and form to each of those programmes. ICRAF has contributed in a significant way to proposals for several Challenge Programmes. It participates in the Water and Food CP, with that work folded into its project on enhancing watershed functions, located within its Environmental Services Theme. Its activities in ten systemwide programmes are likewise folded into its four themes.

## **2.8 ICRISAT**

The number and description of the MTP projects (ICRISAT's global themes) remains unchanged at six. ICRISAT's overall budget is projected to decline by about 7% (due to US\$3.5m in separation costs incurred in 2002). However, a relatively large increase in funding is planned to a single project, the Water, Soil, and Agro-biodiversity Management project, from US\$4.3m in 2002 to US\$6.9m in 2004, and US\$7.5m in 2006. This stems from a major contribution to the Desert Margins Ecoregional Programme. At the same time, four projects - Harnessing Biotechnology for the Poor, Crop Improvement (breeding), Management and Utilization for Food Security and Health, Sustainable Seed Supply Systems for Productivity, SAT Futures and Development Pathways – are projected to receive between 9 and 14% less in absolute terms in their budgets in 2004. The MTP narrative does not provide a completely satisfactory justification for this rather large shift in activity and output focus. It could simply be a function of the vagaries in special project restricted funding.

In 2003, in an effort to maximize the impact synergies between themes and synchronize proposed expenditure with development goals, ICRISAT articulated four Global Impact Target Areas (GITAs) to help weave together all global themes (i.e., the MTP projects). Although these are intended to “help target ICRISAT's budget allocation more efficiently and thus facilitate a more distinct attribution of research efforts to development targets”, it is not clear how this will be achieved and whether the rationale is compelling enough. The Centre will provide further elaboration on these in the next MTP.

There are no changes to ICRISAT's 2004-2006 MTP in response to its 5<sup>th</sup> EPMP, as the Centre is awaiting the deliberations and outcome from discussions within ExCo and the Group at AGM '03, but notes that the potential changes recommended will serve as useful tools for sharpening ICRISAT's strategic thinking in the next five year period. ICRISAT is involved at this stage in one CP (Biofortification).

## 2.9 IFPRI

Guided by its new long-term Strategic Plan recently endorsed by the Board, IFPRI has proposed changes to its 2004-2006 MTP consistent with its new strategy over the next several years. The new MTP reflects important programmatic structure and organizational changes at the Institute that are described in IFPRI's new strategy "Food Policy for Poor People: IFPRI's Strategy for Research, Capacity Strengthening and Policy Communication". Accordingly, the 2004-2006 MTP highlights IFPRI's new research and outreach agenda, communications and capacity strengthening activities, priority setting process, impact assessment work and organizational structure. IFPRI has defined its thematic and geographic focus using four sets of criteria based on strategic principles, emerging issues, comparative advantage and processes driven by demand for new knowledge. What emerges are 12 partly-linked research and outreach themes under which IFPRI's 21 projects have been grouped and defined.

The significant changes in the 2004-2006 MTP relate to six projects, some of which have evolved from earlier projects (e.g., Institutions for Market Development, Pathways from Poverty) or result from consolidation (Participation in High-Value Markets), but others are clearly new initiatives (Diet Quality and Diet Transition; Nutrition Policy Processes; and Spatial Patterns and Processes in the Agric., Environment and Poverty Nexus). IFPRI is also conducting 'exploratory research' on four topics of high priority as identified in the new IFPRI strategy. These relate to: understanding and developing strategy options for developing countries; governance and food security; food and water safety; and rural-urban food security linkages. The Centre expects to launch projects on these topics once the full scope and scale of the issues have been explored. Two other projects have or will soon be concluding - Gender and Intra-household Aspects of Food Policy and Urban Challenges to Food and Nutrition Security. Finally, to more effectively implement its new Strategy, IFPRI has re-organized its programmatic structure by adding a new division titled Development Strategy and Governance Division - to develop coordinated, comprehensive strategies to improve food security with developing country partners, and has combined elements of two older divisions into one, now known as the Markets, Trade, and Institutions Division.

The budget for IFPRI in 2004 is US\$27.5m, a US\$2.0 m increase over 2003. This growth in budget can largely be attributed to new funding for the Biofortification Challenge Program, global public goods project from the World Bank, growth in exploratory activities, and the 2020 Africa Conference. The CGIAR Secretariat financial tables show a 44% increase in research resources proposed in 2004 (from US\$25.5m in 2003 to US\$36.7m). This is largely a consequence of full budgeting of the CP on Biofortification, i.e., US\$10.7 m allocated to this CP in 2004 of which the vast majority is pass-through to other CGIAR Centres and other partners. According to IFPRI financial tables only US\$1.52 m of the total is allocated to IFPRI for this CP, and it is only this aspect which is described in the IFPRI 2004-2006 MTP.

No separate and integrated program MTP has been provided by CIAT or IFPRI for the Biofortification CP, although a full budget table is provided. IFPRI informs us that this is because the major donor for this CP, the Gates Foundation, had only recently approved the proposal not leaving sufficient time to permit development of the MTP with the proper review and approval process by the CP Programme Advisory Committee and the CIAT and IFPRI Boards. A comprehensive MTP for the CP will be developed in the coming months.

The Centre should be commended for undertaking what appears to be a systematic and well-formulated strategic planning process resulting in a new thematic and programmatic structure. The three overarching research themes related to food system functioning, governance and innovations seem to be logical and appropriate as a framework for IFPRI's programmatic thrusts. The several new initiatives proposed in the new MTP address topics of growing global importance (e.g., diet quality, governance issues) but previously all but neglected within the CGIAR. It is encouraging to note that all new projects are subjected to a rigorous *ex ante* review process. IFPRI should also be commended for undertaking exploratory projects prior to launching full projects to more clearly define the scope and nature of these potentially new research endeavours. Centres should also be encouraged to, as IFPRI has done, identify within the new MTP, those projects that are coming to a close.

## **2.10 IITA**

Although there are no major structural changes in the programme between the previous MTP and the 2004-2006 Plan, the current MTP highlights an "end-user driven" approach and focuses efforts on short to intermediate-term solutions to recognized major constraints to productivity and environmental management. The "research for development" (R4D) integrated approach is captured in the summary of many factors and their interactions which characterize the research focus. Economic phenotype performance (P) is characterized by:  $P = \text{Genotype} \times \text{Environment} \times \text{Crop Management} \times \text{Policy (affecting both people and markets)} \times \text{Institutional Arrangements} \times \text{Social Demographics}$ . IITA embeds these activities into the research-development continuum. The three disciplinary and three agro-ecological zone projects are compartmentalized as in previous years, but with increasing output focus shown in the reported logframe. IITA's long list of collaborative networks, ecoregional and systemwide projects are all folded into the six projects. This integrated approach is consistent with the approach proposed by the broad partnership of the SSA Challenge Programme.

## **2.11 ILRI**

ILRI's MTP 2004-2006 is based on its revised strategic plan, Livestock – a pathway out of poverty. The new project portfolio includes 6 projects, one being the Systemwide Livestock programme. The new projects reflect problem/opportunity oriented themes, and incorporate ILRI's previous 7 projects that had a more disciplinary orientation. Simplified project structure is also aimed at making ILRI's research agenda more flexible. In ILRI's new strategy, three development pathways, Securing assets; Improving productivity; and Accessing markets, are combined with research opportunities that include: Adoption of available research products; Improved tools and strategies; and Strategic research for new tools. The themes have been developed to provide clarity and focus and to enhance delivery of research outputs. ILRI shows prospects for modest growth in funding. It plans to maintain its emphasis in Sub-Saharan Africa, and foresees growth in South Asia. ILRI aims at giving increased attention to livestock other than cattle and foresees further shifts in the current systems and species profiles.

In the overall institutional goals ILRI would seem to give more emphasis on producers as opposed to the previous strategic goals with a consumer/produce focus, although ILRI also plans to address peri-urban and landless systems in the future. Access to and affordability of livestock products, however, remain relevant for urban poor people, as reflected in the CGIAR's Vision and Strategy. The new project structure houses ILRI's previous project activities, but the reorganisation provides focus in the new themes: Project 1, *Targeting*



*research and development opportunities*, focuses on identification of opportunities for intervention; Project 2, *Enabling access to innovation* focuses on innovation process development; Project 3, *Improving Market Opportunities*, a collaborative project with IFPRI, builds on the themes developed by these institutes for a CP submission, now with a more pronounced focus on the poor; Project 4, *Application of biotechnology to secure assets*, encompasses upstream research in biotechnology; and Project 5, *People, livestock and environment*, has a strong INRM approach to research. Within this project framework, an increase in activities contributing to Germplasm Improvement and Policy output categories is planned. We believe that this project structure will allow ILRI and its partners to identify and focus on activities with high probability of impact while giving the Centre good visibility in the upstream research area. We suggest that the overuse of the term “innovation” as a research categorization and as an identifier of groups of beneficiaries adds a risk of blurring the roles of different players in the research-development continuum and reducing accountability.

ILRI mode of operation is characterised by research partnerships both with CGIAR and other partners, as exemplified by a joint project with IFPRI, making available a bioscience facility under a NEPAD network, and development of a Centre for Integrated Natural Resource and Knowledge Management involving CGIAR Centres and other partner institutions. These initiatives are commendable.

## **2.12 IPGRI**

IPGRI's 2003-2006 MTP reflects prospected growth in funding of over 20% from 2002 to 2004. This MTP follows the directions defined in the institutional strategy from 1999, *Diversity for Development*. However, from the beginning of 2003, IPGRI's project portfolio has been re-adjusted, resulting in a more rational grouping of activities within projects. These adjustments have not lead to significant programmatic changes. IPGRI has, however, initiated a strategic planning exercise, which will be fully reflected in the next MTP. IPGRI's 5<sup>th</sup> EPMR, completed in spring 2003, called for identification of research areas where IPGRI has clear comparative advantage and could reach high visibility and impact.

The adjustments to IPGRI's project portfolio anticipated the strategic planning exercise. In the new portfolio, IPGRI's work on *ex situ* and *in situ* conservation methodologies and strategies are combined in a single project to promote synergy and complementarity. IPGRI's policy and legal work is being expanded along with the launching of the new Genetic Resources Policy Initiative. IPGRI has also initiated research in nutrition with support from restricted funds. IPGRI has broadened its project on coconut to bring together work on commodities of importance to the poor, e.g., cacao. New research is being initiated involving the conservation and use of crop genetic diversity to control pests and diseases in support of sustainable agriculture. There are many areas of research where IPGRI could, within its broad mandate, justify increase of activity. We emphasize the importance of IPGRI's strategic planning to identify areas of strategic genetic resources research of high priority where the Centre has comparative advantage to provide international leadership, as called for by the EPMR and to avoid spreading efforts too broadly and thinly..

In the MTP IPGRI has highlighted its concern that although fundraising for endowment within the Global Conservation Trust initiative has been successful, technical operations essential for implementation of the Trust are at risk of not being funded. The iSC has expressed its strong support to the Trust, and we consider that its full development must be financially secured.

IPGRI is one of the lead Centres for the Challenge Programme on Unlocking Genetic Diversity, which is at its first inception year. Activities for this CP have been budgeted within four of IPGRI's projects. A total of 1.3 m US\$ of restricted funding is expected from sources yet to be identified. Programme details for the CP are not yet available.

### **2.13 IRRI**

The 2004-2006 MTP indicates no substantive programmatic deviations from last year's Plan. Some activities, however, will be deferred to accommodate staff changes resulting from the Institute's current funding environment, but these are not reflected as longer term changes in activities under the current MTP. New activities will be added and expanded to reflect IRRI's participation in the different Challenge Programmes, but those activities have not yet been reflected in the MTP.

### **2.14 ISNAR**

As a result of the on-going restructuring process, ISNAR's new programme agenda and its 3 MTP projects are likely to become an identifiable part of the IFPRI core research agenda, as ExCo has just endorsed this proposal. Accordingly, an update of the ISNAR programme MTP 2004-2006 should be required once the results of the restructuring process are known and agreed upon by the CGIAR and other Centres.

A major change in the 2004-2006 MTP is the reduction in project numbers, from six to three. Essentially, this follows the recommendations of the 4<sup>th</sup> EPMR panel in radically sharpening its programmatic focus. ISNAR will discontinue its work on policies for institutional innovation (previous project 1), on building capacities for cross-sector demands (previous project 5), and on entrepreneurial partnerships (previous project 6). The area of linking research and stakeholders (previous project 2) has been expanded to the broader field of institutional change towards effective innovation systems (new MTP project 1). Learning for institutional innovation/ISNAR's training activities (previous project 3) will concentrate on the organization and management of agricultural research (new MTP project 2). The MTP focus on new technologies will concentrate on institutions and organizations for innovation in biotechnology (new MTP project 3). The ISNAR Restructuring Team Report had identified the two new themes of the first two MTP-projects and recognized the current and future significance of ISNAR's work on agricultural biotechnology. ISNAR added the third project, which applies the themes of institutional change and of organization and management to the field of biotechnology. These appear to be very positive developments.

ISNAR management and staff should be commended for their responsiveness and flexibility throughout a very trying and uncertain transition period.

### **2.15 IWMI**

Of the 8 projects described in IWMI's 2004-2006 MTP Plan; Projects 1-7 (including system-wide initiatives led by IWMI) are on-going with no significant programmatic changes planned. MTP project 8 is new and reflects the launching of the CP on Water and Food.

IWMI's budget has risen by almost 150% in three years (since 2000) and is projected to continue to rise. IWMI should be commended for its aggressive pursuit in defining and

funding new initiatives in water related issues. The new SC may want to have a close look at how the programmatic agenda has changed in the last few years, and the implications thereof, including commenting on the SC perspective regarding an optimal portfolio for water management research.).

Of the US\$22.5 m expenditure planned for 2004, US\$7m is for the CP of which at most US\$3m is IWMI's project work. IWMI anticipates another US\$3m from other donors, bringing the total budget for this CP in 2004 to US\$10m. This means that excluding the CP, IWMI's 2004 budget is not more than US\$18.5 m, amounting to a net US\$2.5 m reduction in IWMI's regular programme budget between 2003 and 2004 if the CP is not considered. This is accounted for by a significant decrease in funding to Project 6, the Comprehensive Assessment (from US\$3.6m to US\$1.1m). Although recognizing the complementarities between these two 'projects', this raises a key issue – to what extent are these funds moving across project activities, in this case from Project 6 to Project 8 (IWMI's CP project). This relates to the broader systemwide issue of whether CPs in fact are substituting some funds rather than tapping into new sources of funds, as originally intended. This is less a criticism of IWMI, and more a strategic question for the whole System. In general IWMI appears to be on track and developing a good water resources portfolio.

## **2.16 WARDA**

With the development and finalization of a new Strategic Plan 2003-2013, WARDA would have new opportunities for bringing about much needed changes and taking up new challenges. Nevertheless, only minor structural changes have been brought forward in the 2004-2006 MTP. WARDA's agenda remains structured around a portfolio of 13 MTP projects.

Because of the crisis that erupted in Côte d'Ivoire, WARDA relocated its headquarters temporarily from M'bé to Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, and most of its research staff to the ICRISAT station in Samanko, Mali. Activities of Programmes 1 and 3, the work on sustainable systems and the environment were most affected during the early period of the crisis, with loss of some 2002 field data, and inability to utilize several sites in the peri-urban programme. The temporary relocation of most WARDA scientists and support staff to Bamako enabled the Centre to continue to pursue most of its research agenda. The collaborative programme work, in particular, was enhanced during this period. The African Rice Initiative (ARI) was launched, with hiring of a project coordinator. 2003 is considered a transition year, as many projected activities were either delayed or did not materialize. In addition, two key positions became vacant in 2003: the Director of Research and the Policy Economist. WARDA is actively pursuing the posting of a number of staff from collaborating institutions, agencies and donor countries that will strengthen its human resources and delivery systems.

The new Strategic Plan for 2003-2013 is being completed. The WARDA physical plant has remained largely intact, with maintenance activities now underway. This is testimony to the high local regard for WARDA work. It is planned for staff to return toward the end of 2003, with a full MTP agenda planned for 2004. While some research has been delayed, investors have responded with support to fully fund the planned agenda.

The WARDA staff, Governing Council and many collaborating partners are to be highly commended for their dedication and extra-ordinary efforts through this trying period in bringing WARDA programmes to the verge of full operation.

## THE MTP REVIEW PROCESS

It has been standard practice for the TAC and subsequently the iSC to provide an annual assessment to the Group of programme changes of each Centre and of shifts in the combined project portfolios of all CGIAR Centres. Programmatic implications of funding gaps and of resource allocation trends were highlighted. The iSC followed a practice of assigning two to three of its Members, and at least one of the Secretariat staff to closely monitor programmes and reviews of each given Centre, based on scientific background and regional experience of the Members. Visits to the Centres were encouraged. These Members and Secretariat staff then led the analysis of MTPs for their Centres and drafted Commentaries for review and approval by the entire iSC.

Since 2002, the Centres have submitted their financing plans together with their revised MTPs in September, based on planning guidelines issued to the Centres by the CGIAR Secretariat in June. The financing plans were reviewed by the ExCo and endorsed by the Group at AGM02. On the basis of recommendations stemming from the report of the Change Design and Management Team, the iSC was requested to review only new MTPs or those MTPs which deviated significantly from the previously approved plans.

In 2002, **all** CGIAR Centres submitted their financing plans for 2003 and MTPs for 2003-2005 to the iSC. The iSC assessed these plans and provided a commentary on all, paying particular attention to those which were new or contained substantial changes. The iSC's commentary was submitted to AGM directly, but was not included in the meeting agenda.

At the time of its final, specially-called meeting in Berkeley, California (iSC/TAC 85) on August 29-31, only 7 of the 2004-2006 MTPs had been received, and none had been available for prior analysis. The iSC's term came to an end in 15<sup>th</sup> September, 2003. For this reason the iSC was not able to officially review Centre MTPs.

The CGIAR Director requested the iSC-SC Transition Team, with assistance from the Secretariat, to complete the review. All Transition Team Members have had several years of experience with the MTP review process, going back to its inception. All MTPs had been received by Sept 16, and the CGIAR Secretariat's financial analysis and synthesis became available on 23<sup>d</sup> September.

In order to meet a deadline for providing a commentary for the AGM, the Transition Team was requested to restrict its analysis to those MTPs that had significant changes. It decided not to provide a comment on MTPs where no changes were observed nor an assessment of Centre achievements. In judging what constituted a "significant" change, all Centre MTPs were checked for substantial changes. The preliminary assessment, however, considered five particular conditions:

- The Centre has recently had an EPMR (CIP, ICRISAT, IPGRI, ISNAR);
- The MTP is based on a new strategic plan (CIMMYT, IFPRI, ILRI) that led to significant programmatic changes;

- The Centre has been under considerable financial stress (CIMMYT, ICRISAT, IRRI);
- The Centre MTP included substantial elements of a Challenge Programme (IFPRI, IWMI)
- There were special circumstances affecting the Centre (WARDA, ISNAR)

Based on the preliminary assessment, the team decided to provide a commentary for the following 10 Centres: CIMMYT, ICRAF, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IITA, ILRI, IPGRI, ISNAR, IWMI and WARDA. The MTPs of the remaining 6 Centres, CIAT, CIFOR, CIP, ICARDA, ICLARM and IRRI, showed few changes in the rolling plan.

In the detailed analysis, the team paid particular attention to scientific priorities and focus of the overall research portfolio or of major projects within it; the research content of the portfolio as reflected by significant restructuring or addition/phasing out of projects; linkages and partnerships with other institutions involved in research and development; and responsiveness to major recommendations of iSC-commissioned external reviews.

An assessment of overall Systemwide portfolio balance was not done. The addition of the Challenge Programmes to the portfolio has added significant resources, but their programme development has not progressed to complete logframe-based definition, and thus could not be fully assessed on the basis of planned outputs. Secondly, the commodity-based standard of former assessments has become increasingly obsolete, and the ongoing SC-led Priorities and Strategies exercise is planned to provide a new baseline against which the CGIAR Research Agenda at the Centre, Regional and System levels can be assessed.



**Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)**

## **Investment and Financing Requirements Of the 2004 CGIAR Research Agenda**

**October 2003**

## **Introduction:**

This document summarizes the financial requirements of the 2004 research programs and their financing as projected by the CGIAR Centers. It is organized into four sections as follows:

1. **Section I** summarizes the aggregate proposal in terms of the investment level and how it is projected to be financed.
2. **Section II** outlines the financial decision-making cycle followed for the 2004 program review and approval.
3. **Section III** discusses the highlights of the investment and financing proposals.
4. **Section IV** discusses the investment proposals from various dimensions.

In addition, there are two attachments to this summary document, as follows:

1. Attachment I is a summary of the financial and program highlights, as well as project cost tables, of each of the sixteen Centers covering the 2004-2006 Medium-Term Plan period.
2. Attachment II are the cover notes from each Center introducing its proposal and highlighting salient points from the Centers' perspectives.

## **Section I: Summary of the 2004 Proposals**

**Investment:** Centers have proposed an aggregate investment (including for Challenge Programs) of \$408 million for 2004, \$12 million higher than their current estimate for 2003 and - approximately \$39 million (11 percent) over the actual 2002 investment total.

**Financing:** The \$408 million in planned aggregate investment is to be financed by identified investor grants of \$342 million (excluding world Bank general support), \$11 million in Center income, and the balance of \$55 million in a combination of World Bank general support, reserves and funding still to be identified.

## **Section II: 2004 Financial Decision-making Cycle**

The calendar used for the 2004 financial decision-making was first approved at AGM01 in context of the CGIAR reform agenda. It combines the review and approval of both the medium term (2004-6) and financing (2004) plans of the Centers. Key points in the cycle are as follows:



### **June 2003**

- Guidelines issued to Centers;

### **July – August 2003**

- Centers interacted with investors and prepared detailed Financing Plans (FP) for 2004, and revised their MTPs for 2004-2006;

### **October 2003**

- ExCo recommends and the Group approves the 2004 CGIAR Financing Plan and 2004-6 updated MTPs at AGM03;

### **January 2004**

- Investors begin disbursement of funds;
- Centers begin implementation of Approved Research Agenda.

## **Section III: Highlights of the Investment and Financing Proposals**

### Significant Changes Proposed in 2004:

While the majority of Centers (ten) indicate that their proposals are essentially extensions of their 2003-2005 MTPs, six others have indicated significant changes in their 2004 portfolio. The proposals of IFPRI, ILRI and ISNAR reflect implementation of new strategies while those of CIFOR, CIMMYT and World Agroforestry are interim proposals based on new strategies still in process of being developed. These changes can be summarized as follows (details in attachments I and II):

- IFPRI: the proposal is based on a new strategy, which includes IFPRI's co-leadership of the Biofortification Challenge Program;
- ILRI: has revised its strategy to identify three development pathways out of poverty for livestock holders;
- ISNAR: incorporates the recommendations of the fourth EPMR and ISNAR Restructuring Team (IRT) resulting in a portfolio of three, instead of six, projects;
- CIFOR: is currently engaged in reformulating new interim strategies in its three research programs;
- CIMMYT: while completing a new one, CIMMYT is proposing an interim strategy that reduces its portfolio from twenty one to seven projects;
- World Agroforestry: is adding a major new project to its portfolio.

### Aggregate Investment Proposal:

This section analyzes the distribution of the aggregate investment proposal of \$408 million by Center and by CGIAR output.<sup>1</sup> As table 1 shows, CIMMYT, IITA and IFPRI propose the highest levels of investment (of \$40 million, \$38 million and \$37 million) while WARDA and ISNAR propose the smallest (of \$11 million and \$10 million, respectively). In terms of CGIAR output, Sustainable Production is proposed to receive the highest investment (\$138 million), and Germplasm Collection the lowest (\$50 million).

**Table 1. Requirements of the 2004 Research Agenda by CGIAR Outputs<sup>1</sup>**

(\$ million)

	Germplasm Improvement	Germplasm Collection	Sustainable Production	Policy	Enhancing NARS	Total Agenda
CIAT	10.6	5.1	11.6	1.9	5.2	34.4
CIFOR	-	2.6	7.4	3.3	1.2	14.5
CIMMYT	12.5	5.7	10.7	1.8	9.1	39.8
CIP	5.9	2.4	8.2	2.2	3.3	22.0
ICARDA	4.4	3.6	10.6	1.1	3.3	23.0
WorldFish	1.0	0.1	8.5	4.2	1.6	15.4
World Agroforestry	1.5	3.0	10.0	6.6	7.5	28.7
ICRISAT	6.3	1.4	8.8	2.9	3.7	23.0
IFPRI	-	9.2	1.4	16.1	10.1	36.7
IITA	6.9	1.2	14.0	5.6	9.2	36.9
ILRI	2.2	1.9	18.4	3.6	2.8	28.9
IPGRI	5.1	8.9	4.5	3.3	9.0	30.7
IRRI	7.5	3.7	10.0	3.6	6.1	31.0
ISNAR	-	-	-	4.4	5.2	9.6
IWMI	-	-	9.3	7.9	5.2	22.5
WARDA	2.1	1.1	4.3	1.1	2.6	11.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>66.0</b>	<b>49.9</b>	<b>137.8</b>	<b>69.5</b>	<b>85.0</b>	<b>408</b>

<sup>1/</sup> Translation of old CGIAR undertaking/activity into Outputs:

Germplasm Improvement = Germplasm Enhancement and Breeding + Networks, as appropriate

Germplasm Collection = Saving Biodiversity + Networks, as appropriate

Sustainable Production = Production Systems Development and Management, Protecting the Environment + Networks, as appropriate

Policy = Improving Policies + Networks, as appropriate

Enhancing NARS = Strengthening NARS - the three sub activities + Networks, as appropriate

### Challenge Programs:

Included in the proposals of the lead Centers are the three approved Challenge Programs: Biofortification CP co-led by CIAT and IFPRI, Water and Food CP led by IWMI, and Genetic Diversity. Although there is currently about \$0.5 million of funding (4 percent of the total budget) still to be identified in the Biofortification CP, it is expected to be fully funded in 2004. The Water and Food CP is also expected to be fully funded based on a projected overall

<sup>1</sup> See translation from CGIAR activity/undertaking into CGIAR output in table 1

surplus by IWMI. The work program of the Genetic Diversity CP is still under development and CIMMYT has already received the first tranche of World Bank funding for the CP and a further 4 million Euro from the European Commission is anticipated in 2003.

**Table 1a. Summary of Challenge Program Proposals <sup>1</sup> in 2004-6 MTPs**  
(\$ million)

	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Program: Biofortification Challenge Program (IFPRI)</b>				
	2.4	11.9	12.2	12.6
<b>Program: Water and Food Challenge Program (IWMI)</b>				
	5.5	10.0	10.4	10.7
<b>Program: Genetic Diversity Challenge Program</b>	Work Program being developed			

<sup>1</sup> include components implemented by non-CGIAR partners

### **Highlights of the 2004 Financing Projections:**

The \$408 million required for the 2004 proposed investment will be financed by \$342 million in investor grants (excluding World Bank), complemented by \$11 million in Center income, and a combination of World Bank support and reserves totaling \$55 million (net). Table 2 below summarizes the proposed financing plans by Center.

**Table 2: Financing the 2004 Research Agenda**

(\$ million)

	<b>Financed by:</b>				<b>Memo: funding changes</b>		
	<b>Total Requirements</b>	<b>Investor Grants <sup>1/</sup></b>	<b>Center Income</b>	<b>Other <sup>2/</sup> sources</b>	<b>2002 Actual Grants</b>	<b>2004 vs. 2002</b>	
					<b>Amount</b>	<b>%</b>	
CIAT	34.4	29.8	0.8	3.8	27.4	2.4	9%
CIFOR	14.5	12.4	0.2	1.9	11.0	1.4	13%
CIMMYT	39.8	34.7	1.0	4.1	31.6	3.1	10%
CIP	22.0	23.4	0.1	(1.5)	16.0	7.4	46%
ICARDA	23.0	17.3	0.6	5.1	20.6	(3.3)	-16%
WorldFish	15.4	12.1	0.1	3.2	11.4	0.7	6%
World Agroforestry	28.7	23.6	0.5	4.6	19.2	4.4	23%
ICRISAT	23.0	20.0	0.8	2.2	17.4	2.6	15%
IFPRI	36.7	22.7	0.5	13.4	20.4	2.3	11%
IITA	36.9	30.9	3.3	2.7	27.8	3.1	11%
ILRI	28.9	25.9	0.8	2.2	23.7	2.2	9%
IPGRI	30.7	26.4	0.3	4.0	22.4	4.0	18%
IRRI	31.0	25.7	1.6	3.7	24.7	1.0	4%
ISNAR	9.6	10.2	0.1	(0.6)	7.0	3.2	45%
IWMI	22.5	18.6	0.2	3.7	18.0	0.6	3%
WARDA	11.2	8.5	0.4	2.3	8.3	0.2	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>11%</b>

<sup>1/</sup> Pending allocation by the WB, Center projections of WB funding are shown under "other sources".

<sup>2/</sup> World Bank support, Center reserves and/or funding to be identified.

Four Centers are planning 2004 on a deficit basis: CIFOR (\$0.5m), ICRISAT (\$0.2m), IFPRI (\$0.7m) and IITA (\$1.4m).

An equal number projects surpluses: CIP(\$0.5m), ISNAR (\$1.1m), IWMI (\$0.25m) and WARDA (\$0.6m).

Deficits and surpluses are included in the "other sources".

### **Analysis of Grants By Center:**

Investor grants represent the Centers' best estimate at this point in time of the likely support they can reasonably expect in 2004. For a number of Centers, this includes estimates of grants that are under negotiation with investors with varying degrees of probability of success. In some cases, a number of Centers believe that while the negotiations have not yet concluded at the time of preparing their financing plans, the probability of success is high enough to warrant inclusion of these grants in their projections without attributing these to a specific investor. This is referred to in the Center submissions as "unidentified funding", and amounts to about \$14 million (approximately 4 percent of the projected funding). This is concentrated at the following Centers: IFPRI (\$5.5 million), IPGRI (\$2.6 million), World Agroforestry (\$2 million), IRRI (\$1.5 million) and WorldFish (\$1 million). This partly explains the large amount of funding from "other sources" included in table 3 for these Centers. Based on past experience, it seems reasonable to include this funding in the projections without attributing it to specific investors.

The aggregate amount of \$342 million in investor grants projected by Centers for 2004 represent an increase of approximately \$35 million (11 percent) over the comparable 2002 actual amount that they received (\$307 million). As the World Bank's CGIAR support remains at \$50 million, this analysis concentrates on the funding projected by Centers from other investors.

### **Sources of Forecasted Growth in 2004 Funding:**

Of the six major groups of investors, three (Europe, North America and the International and Regional Organizations) will be responsible for about \$29 million of the forecasted growth in funding between 2002 and 2004. Multi-donor and non-CGIAR members are responsible for the remaining increase of \$6 million. Funding from the other three groups (Pacific Rim, Developing Countries, International and the Foundations) are projected to remain constant over the same period.

In monetary terms, North America leads all CGIAR investor groups in funding growth in 2004 compared with the 2002 actual. The 2004 contribution from North America amounts to about \$83 million, an increase of \$17 million (26 percent) over the 2002 actual amount of \$66 million. The increase is attributed solely to Canada whose contribution more than doubles, from \$11 million to \$28 million while that of the United States remains constant.

The second highest increase is from Europe where investors are forecasted to increase their contributions by a net amount of \$9 million (6 percent). Within the group, however, are significant variations in the projections. Increases are forecasted from Germany (\$5.6 million or 54 percent), Switzerland (\$2.6 million or 16 percent), Sweden (\$2.4 million or 22 percent), Netherlands (\$2 million or 12 percent) and Austria and Belgium, each of about \$1 million. On the other hand, decreases are projected from the United Kingdom (\$3 million or 13 percent), European Commission (\$2 million or 8 percent) and Denmark (\$1.7 million or 17 percent).

Finally, International and Regional Organizations are forecasted to increase their support from approximately \$22 million to \$24 million from 2002 to 2004, a growth rate of 11 percent. Contributing to this increase are mainly IFAD (\$1.8 million or 32 percent), and smaller increases from the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank and UNEP. On the other hand, decreases of just under \$1 million each are projected from FAO and UNDP.

In addition to 57 CGIAR investors, a number of multi-donors-funded projects (including for Challenge Programs) and non-CGIAR members are also forecasted to support the research agenda in 2004. Centers forecast that this source of funding will increase from \$26 million in 2002 to about \$32 million in

2004, an increase in volume (\$6 million) and rate (22 percent) that is slightly higher than that experienced in the last several years.

Annex I provides details, by investor, of changes in funding in 2004 compared with 2002 actuals and 2003 as estimated by Centers. Annex 1a provides details of the 2004 projections by Center and investor.

### **Destination of the Forecasted Growth in 2004 Funding:**

A center-by-center analysis of the forecasted \$35 million confirms that, with the exception of ICARDA which projects a decline of 13 percent, all Centers are projecting an increase in their *identified* support in 2004 compared with 2002. Table 2 illustrates the changes in amount and percentage terms. In absolute terms the highest increases are projected by CIMMYT, CIP, World Agroforestry, IITA, IPGRI and ISNAR.

Table 3 illustrates a time series of Center identified funding (excluding the World Bank) between 2002 and 2004.

**Table 3. Funding Other than from the World Bank by Center**

(\$ million)

	2001	2002	2003	2004
	actual		estimate	proposal
CIAT	24.3	27.4	31.0	29.8
CIFOR	10.7	11.0	12.8	12.4
CIMMYT	34.5	31.6	33.9	34.7
CIP	16.0	16.0	17.7	23.4
ICARDA	18.5	20.6	22.6	17.3
WorldFish	10.8	11.4	15.6	12.1
World Agroforestry	19.2	19.2	23.9	23.6
ICRISAT	18.0	17.4	20.1	20.0
IFPRI	19.3	20.4	20.6	22.7
IITA	28.2	27.8	33.8	30.9
ILRI	21.9	23.7	26.0	25.9
IPGRI	19.8	22.4	27.1	26.4
IRRI	26.1	24.7	24.5	25.7
ISNAR	7.0	7.0	8.7	10.2
IWMI	9.8	18.0	17.4	18.6
WARDA	7.8	8.3	9.0	8.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>342</b>
<b>Memo item</b>				
World Bank	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>392</b>

## **Section IV: Analysis of the Investment Proposals from Various Dimensions.**

### **Changes in Investment Growth Rates by Center:**

From a time series perspective the \$408 million proposed for 2004 compares with \$369 million actual level for 2002 and \$394 million estimated for 2003 (Table 4). From the Centers' perspective, the majority (twelve Centers) propose increases in their investments compared with 2002. Of these, ILRI proposes an increase of 5 percent or less, three (CIAT, ISNAR and IWMI) propose increases of 6 – 10 percent, four (CIP, IITA, IPGRI and WARDA) propose increases of 11 – 20 percent, and four (CIFOR, WorldFish, World Agroforestry and IFPRI) propose increases in their investments of over 20 percent compared with the 2002 actual levels. The remaining four Centers (CIMMYT, ICARDA, ICRISAT and IRRI) propose reduced levels of investment in 2004 compared with 2002. IRRI's and ICRISAT's proposals are 7 percent lower while, CIMMYT's and ICARDA's are lower by 5 percent or less. Of the twelve Centers proposing increases over 2002, eight (CIFOR, CIP, World Agroforestry, IFPRI, ILRI, IPGRI, IWMI and WARDA) also show increases when compared with 2003 estimates, hence confirming a growth trend from 2002 to 2004. The other four (CIAT, WorldFish, IITA and ISNAR) show reductions in investment levels when compared with 2003, meaning they are estimating higher levels of investments in 2003 than they are proposing for 2004. Of the four Centers that propose decreases in investment levels in 2004 compared with 2002, CIMMYT and IRRI show an increase between 2003 and 2004 (of 2 and 6 percent, respectively) while ICARDA and ICRISAT continue to show a small or no decrease.

**Table 4. CGIAR Investments by Centers**

(\$ million and percent)

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2004 vs		2004 vs 2006	
	actual		estimate	proposal	plan		2002	2003	Amt	%
CIAT	29.7	32.3	35.2	34.4	34.5	34.5	6%	-2%	0.1	0%
CIFOR	12.6	11.7	13.9	14.5	14.5	14.7	24%	4%	0.2	1%
CIMMYT	40.7	41.3	39.0	39.8	40.8	42.0	-4%	2%	2.1	5%
CIP	19.7	19.2	19.4	22.0	22.5	22.9	15%	13%	0.9	4%
ICARDA	21.3	24.3	26.7	23.0	23.9	24.9	-5%	-14%	1.9	8%
WorldFish	13.1	12.3	17.4	15.4	15.9	16.4	25%	-12%	0.9	6%
World Agroforestry	22.9	21.8	26.6	28.7	27.9	28.5	32%	8%	(0.2)	-1%
ICRISAT	23.9	24.7	23.5	23.0	23.8	24.8	-7%	-2%	1.8	8%
IFPRI	22.5	22.7	25.5	36.7	37.7	39.3	62%	44%	2.6	7%
IITA	35.3	32.6	38.5	36.9	37.0	37.1	13%	-4%	0.2	1%
ILRI	28.2	27.5	28.7	28.9	30.4	31.9	5%	1%	3.0	10%
IPGRI	23.1	25.6	29.4	30.7	32.2	33.8	20%	4%	3.1	10%
IRRI	32.6	33.4	29.3	31.0	32.0	34.0	-7%	6%	3.0	10%
ISNAR	8.1	8.9	10.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	8%	-9%	(0.0)	0%
IWMI	11.4	20.7	21.5	22.5	23.5	24.5	9%	4%	2.0	9%
WARDA	9.7	9.8	10.3	11.2	12.3	12.6	14%	9%	1.4	13%
<b>Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>6%</b>

Over the MTP period (2004 – 2006), total investments are projected to increase by \$23 million (6 percent). At the Center level investment plans in absolute terms remain fairly stable over the period with only four Centers (IFPRI, ILRI, IPGRI and IRRI) planning increases of \$3 million (the largest absolute amount). However, the planned increase by 2006 will bring IRRI to just about its actual 2002 level of investment. The increases each represent a growth rate of about 10 percentage or higher from 2004 to 2006. The second highest level of absolute increase (\$2 million) is planned by ICARDA, ICRISAT, IWMI and CIMMYT, representing a growth rate of 8 percent for the first two and 9 and 5 percent for the last two. CIP, WorldFish and WARDA each plan increases in their investment of about \$1 million, representing increases of 4, 6 and 13 percent. CIAT, CIFOR, World Agroforestry, IITA and ISNAR plan increases of less than \$1 million, or no increase at all, during the period.

### **Changes in Investment Shares by Center:**

Table 5 shows the result of these time series of investment levels in terms of Center shares in the CGIAR investment total. Results from the 2004 proposals by Centers show increases in shares of 3 percent (by IFPRI) and by 1 percent by four Centers (CIFOR, WorldFish, World Agroforestry, and IPGRI), compared with 2002. Five Centers (CIAT, CIMMYT, ICARDA, ICRISAT and IRRI) show reductions in their shares of the CGIAR total, each by 1 percent. The remaining six Centers (CIP, IITA, ILRI, ISNAR, IWMI and WARDA) maintain their shares. When analyzed from the perspective of 2004 proposals versus 2003 estimates, the majority of Centers (nine) show no change in their shares. Four (IFPRI, IPGRI, IRRI and IWMI) show increases in their shares while three Centers (ICARDA, IITA and ISNAR) show reductions in theirs.

Over the MTP period (2004 – 2006) Center shares remain remarkably stable for the majority of Centers (fifteen). The only proposals resulting in a change in shares is CIFOR (whose share decreases from 4 to 3 percent).



**Table 5. 2001-2006 CGIAR Investment Shares**

(percentage shares of the annual CGIAR total)

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
	actual		estimate	proposal	plan	
CIAT	8%	9%	9%	8%	8%	8%
CIFOR	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%
CIMMYT	11%	11%	10%	10%	10%	10%
CIP	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
ICARDA	6%	7%	7%	6%	6%	6%
WorldFish	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%
World Agroforestry	6%	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%
ICRISAT	7%	7%	6%	6%	6%	6%
IFPRI	6%	6%	6%	9%	9%	9%
IITA	10%	9%	10%	9%	9%	9%
ILRI	8%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%
IPGRI	7%	7%	7%	8%	8%	8%
IRRI	9%	9%	7%	8%	8%	8%
ISNAR	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%
IWMI	3%	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%
WARDA	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

## System Level Analysis

### Allocation of Investment by CGIAR Output:

At the system level, the proposed investments imply shifts in the shares by the outputs (Table 6). Compared with 2002 actual levels, the 2004 shares of Policy and Germplasm Collection increase by 2 percentage points each to 17 and 12 percent, respectively. This is due to reductions in the shares of Germplasm Improvement and Sustainable Production of approximately 2 percent each. Between 2002 and 2003 shares of each output remain stable.

Over the 2004 – 2006 period the shares of Outputs remain virtually stable except for Sustainable Production which declines by 1 percent to 33 percent. It is worth noting that from 2002 through the end of the MTP period in 2006, only the share of NARS remains constant while those of the other four outputs each shift by 2 percentage points or more. Germplasm Improvement and Sustainable Production decline by 2 and 3 percent, respectively while Germplasm Collection and Policy each increase by 2 percentage points.

**Table 6. Allocation of Investments by CGIAR Output**

(percentage)

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
	actual		estimate	proposal	plan	
<b>Germplasm Improvement</b>	18%	18%	18%	16%	16%	16%
<b>Germplasm Collection</b>	10%	10%	10%	12%	12%	12%
<b>Sustainable Production</b>	36%	36%	36%	34%	34%	33%
<b>Policy</b>	14%	15%	15%	17%	17%	17%
<b>Enhancing NARS</b>	23%	21%	21%	21%	21%	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Allocation of Investments by Object of Expenditure:**

The most noteworthy shift in the shares of the four objects of expenditure between 2002 and 2004 is the shift of 2 percentage points in the investment in personnel (from 49 to 47 percent) to supplies and services (from 40 to 42 percent). Meanwhile, the shares of travel and depreciation remain stable at 7 percent and 4 percent, respectively. There are no changes in the relative shares between 2003 and 2004, as well as during the 2004 – 2006 plan period. Table 7 below illustrates.

**Table 7. CGIAR Investments by Object of Expenditure**

(percentage)

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
	actual		estimate	proposal	plan	
<b>Personnel</b>	48%	49%	49%	47%	47%	47%
<b>Supplies and Services</b>	40%	40%	40%	42%	42%	42%
<b>Travel</b>	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%
<b>Depreciation</b>	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Allocation of Investments by Region:**

The proposed investment in 2004 would result in continued increase in the share of CGIAR investment dedicated to Sub-Saharan Africa. Compared with 2002, the share will increase to 46 percent from 43 percent, due mainly to shifts from Latin America and Caribbean (LAC – from 15 to 13 percent) and Asia (from 33 to 32 percent). During the same period the share of Central, West Asia and North Africa (CWANA) remains stable at 9 percent. Over the plan period (2004 – 2006), the regional shares remain stable at the level of the 2004 proposal. Table 8 illustrates.

**Table 8. CGIAR Investments by Developing Region**  
(percentage)

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
	actual		estimate	proposal	plan	
Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)	44%	43%	43%	46%	46%	46%
Asia	32%	33%	33%	32%	32%	32%
Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)	16%	15%	15%	13%	13%	13%
Central, West Asia and North Africa (CWANA)	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Annex 1: Support to CGIAR Research Agenda by Investor 2002-2004

Note: 2002 figures are actual; 2003 and 2004 are from Center financing plans. The 2004 have not yet been validated.

Members	2002 actual	2003 estimate	2004 proposal	Change, 2004 vs.		% Change, 2004 vs.	
				2002	2003	2002	2003
<b>Europe</b>							
Austria	0.2	0.3	1.1	0.9	0.9	474%	310%
Belgium	4.9	6.4	6.1	1.2	-0.3	25%	-5%
Denmark	10.1	9.9	8.4	-1.7	-1.5	-17%	-15%
EC	24.5	24.1	22.4	-2.1	-1.7	-8%	-7%
Finland	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	2%	0%
France	7.8	7.7	7.8	0.0	0.0	-1%	1%
Germany	10.4	13.0	16.0	5.6	3.1	54%	24%
Ireland	2.1	2.5	2.4	0.3	-0.2	13%	-6%
Italy	4.1	4.2	4.5	0.4	0.3	10%	8%
Luxembourg	0.8	0.9	0.7	-0.1	-0.2	-11%	-21%
Netherlands	17.0	20.8	19.0	2.0	-1.8	12%	-9%
Norway	10.4	10.9	10.6	0.2	-0.2	2%	-2%
Portugal	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.2	-6%	254%
Spain	1.3	1.5	1.9	0.6	0.4	46%	28%
Sweden	10.7	12.8	13.1	2.4	0.3	22%	3%
Switzerland	16.0	18.0	18.5	2.5	0.6	16%	3%
United Kingdom	24.8	28.6	21.7	-3.1	-6.9	-13%	-24%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>146.9</b>	<b>163.1</b>	<b>156.1</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>-7.0</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>-4%</b>
<b>North America</b>							
Canada	10.7	21.1	28.3	17.6	7.2	164%	34%
United States	54.9	59.3	54.4	-0.5	-4.8	-1%	-8%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>65.6</b>	<b>80.3</b>	<b>82.7</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>Pacific Rim</b>							
Australia	7.3	7.6	7.2	-0.1	-0.4	-2%	-5%
Japan	17.1	17.5	17.4	0.3	-0.1	2%	0%
New Zealand	0.7	0.9	0.6	-0.1	-0.2	-11%	-27%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>25.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>-3%</b>
<b>Developing Countries</b>							
Bangladesh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0%	0%
Brazil	0.9	0.3	0.2	-0.7	-0.2	-82%	-50%
China	1.0	1.0	0.9	-0.1	-0.1	-5%	-7%
Colombia	2.5	2.2	2.1	-0.4	-0.1	-17%	-6%
Cote d'Ivoire	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0%	20%
Egypt	0.8	0.8	0.7	-0.1	-0.1	-13%	-9%
India	1.0	1.4	1.0	0.0	-0.3	3%	-25%
Indonesia	0.2	0.1	0.1	-0.1	0.0	-71%	-2%
Iran	0.9	1.8	1.9	1.0	0.1	114%	6%
Kenya	0.2	0.1	0.0	-0.2	0.0	-80%	-18%
Korea	1.1	1.3	1.3	0.2	0.0	18%	-2%
Mexico	0.9	0.6	0.5	-0.4	-0.1	-42%	-10%
Morocco	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.4	0%	0%
Nigeria	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0%	0%
Pakistan	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0	0%	-6%
Peru	0.9	0.3	0.2	-0.7	-0.1	-81%	-46%
Philippines	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.0	43%	-8%
South Africa	0.8	0.6	0.8	0.0	0.2	-5%	34%
Syria	0.6	0.5	0.5	-0.1	0.0	-17%	0%
Thailand	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	52%	153%
Uganda	0.6	0.3	0.4	-0.2	0.1	-33%	29%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>12.7</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>12.7</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>International &amp; Regional Organizations</b>							
ADB	6.5	6.5	7.1	0.6	0.6	10%	10%
AFDB	0.6	0.2	1.4	0.8	1.2	132%	827%
AFESD	1.0	1.1	1.2	0.2	0.2	25%	16%
FAO	1.8	1.7	1.0	-0.8	-0.6	-42%	-38%
IDB	0.5	0.2	0.0	-0.5	-0.2	-100%	-100%
IDRC	2.4	1.9	2.7	0.3	0.8	14%	44%
IFAD	5.8	6.4	7.6	1.8	1.3	32%	20%
OPEC	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.0	71%	-10%
UNDP	1.5	0.8	0.7	-0.8	-0.1	-53%	-8%
UNEP	1.4	2.9	1.9	0.5	-1.1	35%	-36%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>24.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Foundations</b>							
Ford Foundation	1.3	0.6	1.1	-0.2	0.4	-18%	71%
Kellogg Foundation	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.0	-0.1	-7%	-28%
Rockefeller Foundation	7.5	8.3	8.0	0.5	-0.2	7%	-3%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Non-CGIAR Member</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>31.9</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>Total (excl. World Bank)</b>	<b>307.2</b>	<b>336.4</b>	<b>342.1</b>	<b>34.9</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2%</b>
World Bank	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0%	0%
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>1%</b>

### Annex 1a: 2004 Financing Details by Investor and by Center

Members	\$ millions														Total		
	CIAT	CIFOR	CIMMYT	CIP	ICARDA	World Fish	World Agrofor estry	ICRISAT	IFPRI	IITA	ILRI	IPGRI	IRRI	ISNAR		MMI	WARDA
<b>Europe</b>																	
Austria			0.00	0.64						0.08		0.43					1.1
Belgium	0.55	0.19	0.58	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.27	0.66	0.09	0.93	0.82	1.20	0.10	0.17	0.10	0.15	6.1
Denmark			0.67	0.59	0.30	0.44	0.87	0.13	0.92	1.69	0.86	0.47	0.61		0.83		8.4
EC	1.76	1.77	1.85	1.18	3.07	0.92	1.32	1.47	1.26	2.01	1.22	2.40	1.87			0.35	22.4
Finland		0.37					0.38		0.35		0.34	0.09					1.5
France	0.89	0.53	1.20	0.05	0.35		0.23	0.53		0.27	0.76	0.35	0.63		1.70	0.28	7.8
Germany	1.71	0.66	0.97	1.83	0.74	1.03	0.73	0.44	1.07	0.92	0.71	0.65	2.00	0.29	1.39	0.94	16.0
Ireland							0.64		0.63		0.70				0.41		2.4
Italy	0.11	0.08		0.24	0.84		0.29	0.14	0.27	0.14	0.64	1.66		0.10			4.5
Luxembourg				0.52								0.19					0.7
Netherlands	0.75	1.41	0.53	0.77	0.89	1.00	2.30	0.27	0.34	1.12	0.63	2.60	0.38	1.27	4.05	0.67	19.0
Norway	1.00	0.74	0.20	0.21	0.61	0.52	0.22	1.05	1.07	1.04	1.38	0.58	0.21	1.16	0.13	0.50	10.6
Portugal			0.083									0.20					0.3
Spain	0.10		0.29	1.09			0.14		0.08		0.08	0.13					1.9
Sweden	0.49	0.67	0.32	1.01	0.52	0.33	5.24	0.54	0.33	0.43	0.95	0.51	0.48	0.34	0.56	0.36	13.1
Switzerland	2.58	0.74	1.44	1.71	1.08		0.71	1.01	0.49	0.47	1.25	1.40	2.63	0.68	2.35		18.5
United Kingdom	1.40	1.40	1.65	1.02	1.13	2.29	1.13	1.79	0.47	0.99	3.05	0.92	2.96	0.27	0.83	0.37	21.7
<b>sub total</b>	<b>11.33</b>	<b>8.55</b>	<b>9.79</b>	<b>10.95</b>	<b>9.63</b>	<b>6.63</b>	<b>14.47</b>	<b>8.03</b>	<b>7.35</b>	<b>10.09</b>	<b>13.38</b>	<b>13.78</b>	<b>11.87</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>12.36</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>156.1</b>
<b>North America</b>																	
Canada	2.75	0.51	1.96	4.59	0.86	0.43	3.98	1.11	1.25	1.99	4.71	1.12	0.78	0.70	0.41	1.11	28.3
United States	3.78	0.68	9.47	1.58	1.81	1.91	1.52	2.67	4.63	11.16	3.19	1.35	5.16	3.73	1.31	0.51	54.4
<b>sub total</b>	<b>6.53</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>11.43</b>	<b>6.17</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>5.50</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>5.88</b>	<b>13.15</b>	<b>7.91</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>5.94</b>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>1.62</b>	<b>82.7</b>
<b>Pacific Rim</b>																	
Australia	0.44	0.33	2.02	0.33	0.34	0.43	0.41	0.49	0.70		0.18	0.40	0.79		0.31		7.2
Japan	1.63	0.84	2.46	0.74	0.67	0.26	0.36	0.98	0.52	1.55	0.63	0.76	3.55	0.24	0.52	1.69	17.4
New Zealand	0.20		0.138				0.04	0.15				0.10					0.6
<b>sub total</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>4.62</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>1.47</b>	<b>1.23</b>	<b>1.55</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>4.34</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>25.2</b>
<b>Developing Countries</b>																	
Brazil		0.05		0.03			0.03					0.05					0.2
China		0.01	0.43	0.12		0.01		0.05			0.03	0.12	0.13		0.05		0.9
Colombia	1.90		0.17												0.02		2.1
Cote d'Ivoire															0.06		0.1
Egypt				0.40	0.30												0.7
India			0.11	0.04	0.04	0.04		0.42	0.04		0.04	0.08	0.15	0.04	0.05		1.0
Indonesia		0.06															0.1
Iran			0.39	0.03	1.14			0.06					0.17	0.04	0.10		1.9
Kenya							0.02				0.02						0.0
Korea		0.06	0.15	0.12			0.05			0.05	0.04	0.22	0.61				1.3
Mexico	0.01		0.49	0.01								0.01					0.5
Morocco				0.35				0.05									0.4
Nigeria										1.00							1.0
Pakistan				0.18													0.2
Peru	0.05		0.061									0.05		0.01			0.2
Philippines		0.01	0.012			0.02	0.01	0.01				0.13	0.09	0.01			0.3
South Africa	0.05		0.05	0.05			0.05			0.03	0.06	0.05		0.05	0.38		0.8
Syria				0.50													0.5
Thailand	0.01		0.009			0.02	0.01					0.01				0.09	0.2
Uganda												0.40					0.4
<b>sub total</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>1.88</b>	<b>1.83</b>	<b>1.48</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>12.7</b>
<b>International &amp; Regional Organizations</b>																	
ADB	0.51	0.05	0.7		0.40	1.56		0.76	0.29		0.33	0.35	1.41	0.29	0.51		7.1
AFDB													0.39	1.00			1.4
AFESD				1.25													1.2
FAO	0.23		0.05	0.30	0.00			0.04			0.04	0.06	0.03	0.30			1.0
IDRC	0.34	0.05		0.59	0.15	0.01			0.00		0.11	0.92		0.04	0.54		2.7
IFAD	0.49	0.27	0.22	0.30	1.75	0.15	1.06	0.27	0.20	0.63	0.71	0.48	0.30		0.26	0.55	7.6
OPEC			0.05	0.16			0.05						0.08				0.3
UNDP	0.07		0.23	0.12	0.06		0.01									0.18	0.7
UNEP	1.89																1.9
<b>sub total</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>1.85</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>24.2</b>
<b>Foundations</b>																	
Ford Foundation		0.38				0.08	0.42		0.18								1.1
Kellogg Foundation	0.28													0.01			0.3
Rockefeller Foundation	1.36		2.719				0.77	0.79	0.38	0.32	0.21	0.39	0.52	0.04		0.53	8.0
<b>sub total</b>	<b>1.64</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>9.4</b>
<b>Non-CGIAR Member</b>																	
<b>sub total</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>1.53</b>	<b>2.12</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>8.08</b>	<b>4.07</b>	<b>2.52</b>	<b>8.15</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>41.6</b>
(Unidentified)	(0.35)	(0.02)	-	(0.39)	-	(1.06)	(1.87)	(0.34)	(5.45)	-	(0.26)	(2.60)	(1.48)	(0.35)	(0.10)	-	(14.3)
BCP									4.57								4.6
<b>Total ( excl. Worldbank)</b>	<b>29.77</b>	<b>12.38</b>	<b>34.69</b>	<b>23.43</b>	<b>17.30</b>	<b>12.06</b>	<b>23.62</b>	<b>19.97</b>	<b>22.74</b>	<b>30.88</b>	<b>25.94</b>	<b>26.40</b>	<b>25.66</b>	<b>10.17</b>	<b>18.63</b>	<b>8.51</b>	<b>342.1</b>
World Bank																	50.0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>29.77</b>	<b>12.38</b>	<b>34.69</b>	<b>23.43</b>	<b>17.30</b>	<b>12.06</b>	<b>23.62</b>	<b>19.97</b>	<b>22.74</b>	<b>30.88</b>	<b>25.94</b>	<b>26.40</b>	<b>25.66</b>	<b>10.17</b>	<b>18.63</b>	<b>8.51</b>	<b>392.1</b>