

THE CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Twenty-Seventh Meeting, Los Baños (Philippines), 9-17 March 1982

TAC REVIEW OF 1982 PROGRAMMES AND BUDGETS

Agenda Item 5

Proposed Objectives of the Discussion

The attached document "TAC Review of 1982 Programmes and Budgets" by the CGIAR Secretariat is distributed as background information for the Committee. This document provided guidelines for the Centres submissions to TAC regarding further adjustments in their programmes and budgets for 1982. The proposals of the Centres were sent to the members by each Centre individually. Prior to the meeting, a TAC working group will have analyzed the Centres proposals, taking into account the latest developments in the financial situation of the CGIAR. The Committee should examine the Centres proposals in the light of the observations and suggestions of the working group and make recommendations for selective adjustments of their 1982 programmes and budgets so as to accommodate the anticipated resource shortfall.

TAC SECRETARIAT

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

January 1982

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

1818 H St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20433 U.S.A.
Telephone (Area Code 202) 477-3592
Cable Address - INTBAFRAD

December 10, 1981

FROM: The Secretariat

TAC Review of 1982 Programs and Budgets

A. Purpose of Memorandum

1. This memorandum describes the information needed from the centers to enable TAC to review 1982 programs and budgets with a view to recommending program reductions or alterations in the event that sufficient funds cannot be found to fully fund centers budgets at the reduced ("fallback") level conditionally approved by the Consultative Group in November this year.

B. Objectives of TAC Review

2. The level of funding likely to be available in 1982 cannot yet be estimated with certainty. Several donors have yet to indicate how much they will contribute and a great deal hinges on fluctuating values of currencies that are impossible to predict. In view of this the essential objective of the TAC review is to produce a plan for allocating resources to centers that will be sufficiently flexible to accommodate whatever level of funding may eventuate as the year progresses. For this to be accomplished promptly and equitably TAC will need to receive the appropriate data from centers in a comprehensive but succinct form, presented in a reasonably uniform way.

/...

Attachments

Distribution:

Center Directors
TAC Chairman
TAC Secretariat

C. Background

3. The total of all centers' budget requests for 1982 amounted to \$176.7 million gross or \$172.8 million net. It was however apparent at Centers Week in November that, on the basis of pledges made on that occasion and estimates of likely contributions by donors who did not pledge at that time, it was likely that no more than about \$155 million would be provided. Consequently the Group decided to approve, subject to the availability of funding, all centers' budgets at their reduced or "fallback" levels as they appeared in Table IA of the Secretariat's note of November 4 (Annex A). Total requirements for the system at the reduced level amounted to \$166.8 million gross or \$163 million net. Since likely contributions were substantially below the conditionally approved net budgets, the Group requested TAC to reconsider individually all the centers' programs for 1982 with a view to recommending reductions or alterations sufficient to accommodate the likely underfunding. Since Centers Week the funding situation has deteriorated further, and the review by TAC requested by the CGIAR is needed even more.

4. At the close of the Group's meeting (on November 13) staff of the two Secretariats met, at the Centers' request, with most of the Center Directors (all but IITA, ILRAD and IBPGR) to discuss how the review by TAC could best be accomplished and what should be done in preparation. At this meeting it was agreed that:

(a) TAC would undertake the review of all centers' budgets at its 27th meeting which will be held at Los Banos from March 9 through 16, 1982;

(b) Since the Center Directors had agreed among themselves that no center would be represented in person at the TAC sessions on this matter, all submissions by the centers would be exclusively in writing;

(c) All the center submissions for the review would be simultaneously provided to the two Secretariats and to all TAC members in time to be received no later than January 30, 1982;

(d) In arriving at its recommendations TAC would compare proposed program alterations both within and between centers. Hence recommended reductions or alterations in programs would reflect TAC's views on priorities, would be selective and could affect the recommended funding of centers disproportionately;

(e) In order to undertake the review TAC would need appropriately detailed data from each center on the following:

(i) What activities were curtailed, postponed or otherwise affected by the underfunding experienced in 1981;

(ii) The extent to which the above reductions or alterations in activities were compensated for by converting activities from core to Special Projects and by obtaining extra-core funding;

(iii) The effect on resources received in 1981 due to changes in the dollar value of non-dollar contributions and the extent to which there were compensating effects due to changes in the dollar value of the currencies in which centers incurred expenditures;

(iv) The effects of price increases experienced in 1981 and the extent to which actual experience differed from budgeted expectations;

(v) A list of program activities which for 1982 would be reduced, altered, abandoned or not initiated should there be a funding shortfall of up to 10% below the approved level of funding (net requirements at the "fallback" position). Items on the list would be individually costed and prioritized;

(vi) An explanation of the likely impact on the center assuming various levels of underfunding in 1982;

(vii) The extent to which the effects of underfunding core activities could be compensated for by converting core program items to Special Projects and obtaining extra core funding for items so converted.

It was also agreed the CG Secretariat would issue guidelines for the preparation of center submissions using a uniform format, so they would be both comprehensive and easy to compare one with another.

D. Center Submissions

5. Extent of Reductions. As already mentioned in paragraph 2 the essential objective of the TAC review is to arrive at a plan that is sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of reductions in program activities which may be necessary as a result of a range of possible levels of underfunding. The extent to which reductions will be necessary is difficult to say, but substantial reductions may be required. Moreover, in applying priorities TAC may well be selective as between centers, and will therefore wish to have a wide enough range of choices before them. Each center is therefore asked to prepare an additional "fallback list" on the assumption that underfunding could be as much as 10% below the reduced budget level approved by the CGIAR. Each item on the list (i.e. each candidate for modification or removal from the core program) should, as was done last year for the original "fallback" list, be individually costed, including the relevant provision for price increases, working capital and attributable overhead costs, and given a priority ranking (first reduction first).

6. Format. Centers are asked to adopt a uniform format for their submissions. Attached, as Annex B, is a sample format for your guidance. The layout envisaged provides the opportunity for a center to present appropriate background information, to indicate the impact on the center of the underfunding already experienced in 1981, and to indicate how it intends to handle further underfunding in 1982. Incorporated in the sample format are indications as to what data are requested in the various sections of the submission, and how data can be most conveniently summarized in tabular form. We wish to emphasize that the body of the submission need not be long. Its purpose is to give background and explain the information provided in the tables. Only a few pages should suffice.

7. Timing. Submissions should be sent simultaneously to both Secretariats and to the individual TAC members to reach all recipients by January 30. Each of the Secretariats would appreciate receiving six copies of each submission.

8. Review Process. It is anticipated that TAC will spend about two days on the review exercise. The precise procedure and methodology of the review has not yet been finalized. It is expected, however, that the "end product" will be for each center a set of several (say three) recommendations, one for each of several degrees of possible underfunding of the system as a whole. It is likely that those donors most interested in the subject will send representatives to the TAC meeting as observers. They will be given ample opportunity to express their views.

9. Implementation of TAC's Recommendations. TAC's recommendations will be available as advice to the centers and the donors. As the year progresses and the total amount of resources becomes clearer and firmer, the Secretariat will use its best efforts to ensure that the resources are allocated equitably in the light of TAC's recommendations.

Table IA*

1982 Centers' Reduced Core Budget Requirements
((\$'000))

	<u>Operations</u>	<u>Capital</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Increases in</u> <u>Gross Requirements</u> <u>over 1981 Approved</u> <u>Budget</u> (%)		<u>Real Growth (or Decrease) in</u> <u>Operations compared with 1981</u> (%)
			<u>Gross</u>	<u>Net</u>			
CIAT	19,281	334	19,615	19,215	1,865	10.5	(0.3)
CIMMYT	23,018	687	23,705	23,325	2,890	13.9	(4.7)
CIP	10,019	484	10,503	10,353	903	9.4	(2.2)
IBPGR	3,795	—	3,795	3,570	395	11.6	1.5
ICARDA	14,544	2,576	17,120	16,795	2,120	14.1	5.9
ICRISAT	15,285	2,125	17,410	17,260	2,765	18.9	1.2
IFPRI	3,269	19	3,288	3,268	288	9.6	(2.7)
IITA	19,036	913	19,949	19,749	2,199	12.4	(4.0)
ILCA	10,613	687	11,300	11,075	1,000	9.7	5.6
ILRAD	10,070	757	10,827	9,469	(786)	(6.8)	(8.8)
IRRI	21,856	308	22,164	21,814	2,427	12.3	(0.5)
ISNAR	3,758	210	3,968	3,918	1,568	65.3	43.0
WARDA	<u>3,198</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>3,198</u>	<u>3,178</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	157,742	9,100	166,842	162,989	17,747	11.9	(0.4)

*This is "Table IA" which was given to the CGIAR as an attachment to the Secretariat's memorandum "1982 Funding" dated November 4, 1981. It served as the basis for the Group's conditional approval of 1982 budgets.

Proposed Format of a Center's Submission

* * *

Statement by [Center] for TAC's Review
of its 1982 Program and Budget

Table of Contents

- I. HISTORICAL
- II. 1981 EXPERIENCE
 - (a) Approved versus Actual Funding in 1981
 - (b) Program Changes Made
 - (c) Implications of Funding Shortfall
 - (d) Summary
- III. REVIEW OF 1982
 - (a) Recommended and Approved Budgets in 1982
 - (b) Possible Economies and Program Alterations at Various Levels of Underfunding
 - (c) Implications of Funding Shortfalls
 - (d) Summary
- IV. CONCLUSIONS

[Date]

Statement by [Center] for TAC's Review
of its 1982 Program and Budget

I. HISTORICAL

1. In this section the centers could include a brief general description of the financial and budgetary environment as it prevailed just prior to 1981. They could briefly describe how the center handled what were then, for most centers, relatively small levels of underfunding. Corrective measures were probably merely ad hoc since the underfunding was then thought to be a temporary phenomenon.

II. 1981 EXPERIENCE

2. The purpose of this chapter is to acquaint TAC with the changes in the approved 1981 program forced by underfunding, and the consequent lower level of activity with which the centers will begin 1982.

(a) Approved versus Actual Funding in 1981

3. Changes of two different types will have affected the process of bringing the actual funding requirements into balance with expected funding. The first are strictly financial in character (changes in earned income, funds brought forward) and the second are changes in programs (changes in the volume of work actually done with the financial consequences). This section is concerned with the first type of changes, and centers are asked to comment on the data which are to be provided in the first part of Table I (Attachment I to Annex B), Part A. Funding, Item 2.

4. More specifically, centers should indicate the extent they were able to reduce the level of their net requirements below the level approved at the Manila meeting by financial changes rather than program changes. Examples are increases in earned income and/or in funds brought forward from the previous year. Sources of additional earned income should be identified. If earned income was reduced, reasons should be indicated.

5. Centers should also indicate their present "best estimate" of actual funding in 1981.

6. The difference between the estimated funding and the approved net requirements may include a certain amount of exchange "losses" incurred on non-dollar contributions, due to the strengthening of the US dollar during 1981. The amount of exchange losses can be identified by comparing the dollars realized (or translated for bookkeeping purposes) with the equivalent dollar amounts shown for non-dollar currencies in the Secretariat's letter of January 1981 which were based on November 1980 exchange rates. However, some such losses would only be "book" losses which did not materialize in practice because some non-dollar contributions

were not converted into US dollars. This would apply, for example, to contributions of host countries which were disbursed and spent in the local currency without conversion into US dollars. The amount of such "book" losses should be identified.

(b) Program Changes Made

7. This section should include comments related to the information to be provided in the second part of Table I (Attachment I), Part B. Gross Requirements, Items 2 through 4.

8. This part of Table I should identify the changes which have been made during the year to the approved program so as to bring the levels of expenditure in line with likely available funding. Changes made may have included additions as well as reductions. Centers are asked to explain these changes in program rather than purely financial terms, so that TAC will be able to focus on their implications for the center's programs.

9. Centers are asked to identify, in program terms, all reductions and deletions which have been made to the program as it was approved by the CGIAR before underfunding necessitated reductions, including the very first 2.5% "across-the-board" cut decided at Manila.

10. With respect to each program item which has been reduced or deleted from the 1981 approved core program, please comment on the following points:

-- Was the activity an ongoing activity continued from the previous year or a new activity planned to be initiated in 1981?

-- Was the activity (or the part of it deleted from the core program) discontinued, or was it continued in whole, in part, or in some similar form as an extra-core activity financed by extra-core resources (in cash or in kind)? Please indicate the source of the extra core resources and explain any change in the originally planned activity consequent to its transfer out of the core program.

-- What are the implications for the program concerned of the reduction or deletion, such as the effect on time of achieving the program's objective, level of intensity, quality, and scale? Also other longer-term implications, particularly those affecting the 1982 program, should be indicated.

-- How was the reduction in expenditure achieved? Please comment on the means by which the reduction was achieved, such as delaying recruitment, freezing vacant/new positions, substitution of staff, reduction in support manpower or material means, deferment of actions (such as contracts, training activities, capital expenditure), etc.

11. TAC, as well as the CG Secretariat, may be concerned with the financial actions described in section (a) above (paragraphs 3-6), but its

analysis of the reductions and deletions in operations will mainly focus on volume changes. Centers are therefore asked to cost these reductions and deletions in constant 1980 dollars, consistent with the 1981 approved programs and budgets as presented by the centers in their Program and Budget Papers submitted to the Group in September 1980, in which the provisions for price increase in 1981 are indicated as a separate line item. Corresponding additional costs, due to price increases over the 1980 price level, and the consequent adjustment in working capital, should also be indicated in columns (3) and (5) provided in Table I. Reductions or deletions in capital expenditure should be costed in current 1981 dollars (column 6).

12. To the extent additions were made to the approved program, they should be formulated and costed in the same way as explained in paragraphs 10 and 11 above. Such additions could have occurred by reactivating positions which in the original program and budget were expected to be frozen, or unforeseen capital expenditures could have been made. The rationale for such additions should be indicated.

13. Item 4 of Table I, Part B should indicate the reduced level of activities estimated for 1981. With regard to operations, the difference between the amount shown in constant 1980 dollars (column 2) in Item 4 and the corresponding amount shown in Item 1 of Part B should indicate the net reductions in volume terms that were made during the year. The total price provision indicated in the last line of column 3 should reflect the actual price increases experienced by the centers, taking into account factors such as possibly more favorable exchange rates for local currencies (used for paying local staff), or actual changes in price increases compared with budgeted expectations.

(c) Implications of the Funding Shortfall

14. In this section centers have the opportunity to present the wider implications of the adjustments they have had to make during the year on the center's total program and its activities as a whole.

(d) Summary

15. Please summarize briefly, referring to Table I as necessary.

III. REVIEW OF 1982

16. The purpose of this chapter is to indicate to TAC how the center proposes to change its approved 1982 program to cope with various degrees of underfunding.

(a) Recommended and Approved Budget in 1982

17. What centers have been able to achieve in 1981 is, as shown in Chapter II, less than planned. In this section please briefly describe, qualitatively and quantitatively, progress and growth contemplated in 1982 compared with the estimated outcome in 1981. Please make two comparisons with 1981: first compare expectations (growth, expansion of certain types

of activities, etc.) under the full 1982 program and budget as recommended by TAC, and second, compare expectations under the reduced ("fallback") program and budget approved by the Group as shown in Table II (Attachment II to Annex B).

(b) Possible Economies and Program Alterations at Various Levels of Underfunding

18. In this section the centers are asked to comment on the information to be provided in Table III (Attachment III to Annex B). The point of departure will be the reduced budget as approved by the Group in November. The presumption is that the "fallback list", as arrived at in the 1982 budget preparation process and as endorsed by TAC (Table II, Attachment II to Annex B), still stands. In some cases, however, changes to that list may be necessary if additional reductions now bring into question the validity of any of the reductions included in the original list.

19. Each center is asked to present a list, additional to the original fallback list, which brings the reduced net requirements to a level 10% below the approved (reduced) net requirements. This is a change from the procedure followed in the preparation of the original fallback list where the reduction applied to gross requirements. The reason for this change is that the review has to take available resources as the starting point. Consequently, any change in any component of the gross requirements (program levels, price provision, working capital, capital expenditure) or in any component of centers' own core resources (earned income, funds brought forward) will have to be compensated by a corresponding change in another of these components so as not to alter the level of net requirements. It should be added that the 10% reduction is higher than the presently estimated system-wide likely level of underfunding. TAC, however, will need a list of this size from each center to enable it to be selective in making its recommendations respecting each center.

20. The first part of Table III deals with net requirements. Centers are asked to indicate the center's own core resources (earned income and funds brought forward) consistent with the level of net requirements (at 10% below the approved level) and in view of the expected outcome for 1981. If the level of earned income is a function of the level of funding (i.e. the net requirements), centers should indicate the levels of earned income corresponding to different levels of funding. The sum of the amounts shown in columns (1), (2) and (3) will determine the level at which gross requirements will have to be set (column 4 and column 12, last line).

21. The second part of Table III deals with the gross requirements and the step by step adjustments proposed by the center to bring down total gross requirements to a level in line with net requirements of as much as 10% below the level conditionally approved at Centers Week.

22. Each of the proposed adjustments should be itemized, prioritized and described in program terms. This will allow TAC to analyze the proposals across centers at different levels of underfunding, and to choose

among the proposals according to priorities. Purely budgetary expressions of reductions should therefore be avoided (e.g. expressed in terms of object of expenditure such as travel, contingencies, etc.).

23. With respect to each program item proposed for reduction, deletion or deferment on this additional fallback list, please comment on the following points:

-- Is the activity an ongoing activity continued from the previous year, or a new activity which was originally planned to be initiated in 1982?

-- Will the activity (or the part of it proposed for deletion from the core program) be discontinued, or will it be continued in whole, in part or in a similar form as an extra-core activity to be financed by extra-core resources (in cash or in kind)? The center should indicate this possibility and assess the degree of probability. If donors have already been lined up, they should be identified, as well as the status of the negotiations, if any.

-- What are the implications of the reduction or deletion for the program concerned such as the effect on time of achieving the program's objective, level of intensity, scale and other longer-term implications?

-- How will the reduction in expenditure be achieved? Please comment on the means by which the reduction would be achieved, such as delaying recruitment, freezing vacant/new positions, substitution of staff, reduction in support manpower or material means, deferment of actions (such as contracts, training activities, capital expenditure), etc.

24. For the system as a whole, about 20% of the funding is restricted to particular activities. If a substantial proportion of the funding for a particular activity is provided on condition established by the donor that it be applied exclusively to that activity, too large a reduction in it may jeopardize the center's receipt of funds. Centers will presumably take this into consideration in drawing up their lists of reductions.

25. In the analysis of proposed reductions and deletions in operations, TAC will mainly focus on volume changes compared with the approved program and budget level. Centers are therefore asked to cost the itemized proposals in constant 1981 dollars, consistent with the way in which budget requests were presented in the Program and Budget Papers submitted to the Group in September 1981, in which price provisions are indicated as a separate line item. Corresponding additional costs due to price increases over 1981 price levels and the consequent adjustment in working capital, should also be indicated in columns (8) and (10). Proposals related to capital items should be costed in current 1982 dollars (column 11).

26. If a center feels that, based on its latest estimated rates of exchange and rates of price increases in 1982, there is a need to adjust

price increase provisions up or down, it can do so as long as the effect of this change is absorbed by adjusting reductions in other items down or up.

27. It should be emphasized that the additional "fallback" list does not presuppose any particular final level of funding for a center. As explained in the introductory part to this memorandum, TAC will recommend a set of different levels of expenditure at different levels of underfunding. These levels will be specific to each center and they will be capable of being applied in a flexible way during the year as a function of the actual level of funding that materializes.

(c) Implications of Funding Shortfalls

28. In this section the centers have the opportunity to present more global considerations regarding the implications of funding shortfalls, at different levels, on the center's research program activities as a whole.

(d) Summary

29. Please summarize briefly, referring to Table III as necessary.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

30. This is for any conclusions the center would wish to draw to the attention of TAC or the Secretariats.

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- CIAT -

A.	FUNDING (in \$000)	Funding by CGLAR	Net Require- ments	Center's Core Resources		Gross Require- ments	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
				Earned Income	Funds Brought Forward		
1.	Approved budget request	-	17,350	400	-	17,750	
2.	Estimated 1981 outcome						

B. ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Sr.M.Y.	80\$000	Price Prov.	81\$000	W.C. Adj.	Capital Exp.		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1. <u>Approved budget request</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>15,219</u>	<u>1,892</u>	<u>17,111</u>	<u>225</u>	<u>414</u>	<u>17,750</u>	
2. <u>Program items reduced</u>								
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Subtotal								
3. <u>Program items added</u>								
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Subtotal								
4. <u>Estimated 1981 Outcome</u>								

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- CIMMYT -

A. <u>FUNDING (in \$000)</u>	<u>Funding by CGIAR</u>	<u>Net Require- ments</u>	<u>Center's Core Resources</u>		<u>Gross Require- ments</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
			<u>Earned Income</u>	<u>Funds Brought Forward</u>		
1. Approved budget request	-	20,415	400	-	20,815	
2. Estimated 1981 outcome						

B. ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	<u>Operations</u>				<u>Capital</u>		<u>Total Gross Requirements</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
	<u>Sr.M.Y.</u>	<u>80\$000</u>	<u>Price Prov.</u>	<u>81\$000</u>	<u>W.C. Adj.</u>	<u>Capital Exp.</u>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1. <u>Approved budget request</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>16,800</u>	<u>3,360</u>	<u>20,160</u>	<u>255</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>20,815</u>	
2. <u>Program items reduced</u>								
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3. <u>Program items added</u>								
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
4. <u>Estimated 1981 Outcome</u>								

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- CIP -

A. <u>FUNDING (in \$000)</u>	<u>Funding by OGLAR</u>	<u>Net Require- ments</u>	<u>Center's Core Resources</u>		<u>Gross Require- ments</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
			<u>Earned Income</u>	<u>Funds Brought Forward</u>		
1. Approved budget request	-	9,400	200	-	9,600	
2. Estimated 1981 outcome						

B. ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	<u>Operations</u>				<u>Capital</u>		<u>Total Gross Requirements</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
	<u>Sr.M.Y.</u>	<u>80\$000</u>	<u>Price Prov.</u>	<u>81\$000</u>	<u>W.C. Adj.</u>	<u>Capital Exp.</u>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1. <u>Approved budget request</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>7,950</u>	<u>770</u>	<u>8,720</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>802</u>	<u>9,600</u>	
2. <u>Program items reduced</u>								
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3. <u>Program items added</u>								
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
4. <u>Estimated 1981 Outcome</u>								

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- IBPGR -

A. <u>FUNDING (in \$000)</u>	Funding by CGLAR	Net Require- ments	Center's Core Resources		Gross Require- ments	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
			Earned Income	Funds Brought Forward		
1. Approved budget request	-	3,388	12	-	3,400	
2. Estimated 1981 outcome						

B. ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
Sr.M.Y.	80\$000	Price Prov.	81\$000	W.C. Adj.	Capital Exp.			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	
1. <u>Approved budget request</u>	<u> </u>	<u>3,091</u>	<u>309</u>	<u>3,400</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>3,400</u>	
2. <u>Program items reduced</u>								
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
Subtotal								
3. <u>Program items added</u>								
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
Subtotal								
4. Estimated 1981 Outcome								

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- ICARDA -

A.	FUNDING (in \$000)	Funding by OGIAR	Net Require- ments	Center's Core Resources		Gross Require- ments	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
				Earned Income	Funds Brought Forward		
1.	Approved budget request	-	14,900	100	-	15,000	
2.	Estimated 1981 outcome						
B.	ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS						Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
		Operations		Capital		Total Gross Requirements	
	Sr.M.Y.	80\$000	Price Prov.	81\$000	W.C. Adj.		Capital Exp.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1.	Approved budget request	33	10,420	1,540	11,960	- 3,040	15,000
2.	Program items reduced						
	a.						
	b.						
	c.						
	d.						
	e.						
	f.						
	etc.						
Subtotal							
3.	Program items added						
	a.						
	b.						
	c.						
	d.						
	e.						
	f.						
	etc.						
Subtotal							
4.	Estimated 1981 Outcome						

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- ICRISAT -

A.	<u>FUNDING (in \$000)</u>	Funding by OGIAR	Net Require- ments	Center's Core Resources		Gross Require- ments	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
				Earned Income	Funds Brought Forward		
1.	Approved budget request	-	13,861	350	434	14,645	
2.	Estimated 1981 outcome						

B. ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Sr.M.Y.	80\$000	Price Prov.	81\$000	W.C. Adj.	Capital Exp.		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	Approved budget request	66	11,849	1,066	12,915	215	1,515	14,645
2.	Program items reduced							
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3.	Program items added							
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
4.	Estimated 1981 Outcome							

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- IFPRI -

A.	<u>FUNDING (in \$000)</u>	<u>Funding by CGIAR</u>	<u>Net Require- ments</u>	<u>Center's Earned Income</u>	<u>Core Resources Funds Brought Forward</u>	<u>Gross Require- ments</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
1.	Approved budget request	-	2,980	20	-	3,000	
2.	Estimated 1981 outcome						

B.	<u>ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS</u>	<u>Operations</u>				<u>Capital</u>		<u>Total Gross</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant</u>
		<u>Sr.M.Y.</u>	<u>80\$000</u>	<u>Price Prov.</u>	<u>81\$000</u>	<u>W.C. Adj.</u>	<u>Capital Exp.</u>	<u>Requirements</u>	<u>Section of Narrative</u>
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	for Comments
									(8)
1.	Approved budget request	23	2,715	285	3,000	-	-	3,000	
2.	Program items reduced								
	a.								
	b.								
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
	f.								
	etc.								
	Subtotal								
3.	Program items added								
	a.								
	b.								
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
	f.								
	etc.								
	Subtotal								
4.	Estimated 1981 Outcome								

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- IITA -

A.	<u>FUNDING (in \$000)</u>	<u>Funding by OGIAR</u>	<u>Net Require- ments</u>	<u>Center's Core Resources</u>		<u>Gross Require- ments</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
				<u>Earned Income</u>	<u>Funds Brought Forward</u>		
1.	Approved budget request	-	17,050	700	-	17,750	
2.	Estimated 1981 outcome						

B. ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	<u>Operations</u>				<u>Capital</u>		<u>Total Gross Requirements</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
	<u>Sr.M.Y.</u>	<u>80\$000</u>	<u>Price Prov.</u>	<u>81\$000</u>	<u>W.C. Adj.</u>	<u>Capital Exp.</u>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	Approved budget request	52	14,364	2,154	16,518	207	1,025	17,750
2.	Program items reduced							
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3.	Program items added							
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
4.	Estimated 1981 Outcome							

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- ILCA -

A.	<u>FUNDING (in \$000)</u>	<u>Funding by CGIAR</u>	<u>Net Require- ments</u>	<u>Center's Earned Income</u>	<u>Core Resources Funds Brought Forward</u>	<u>Gross Require- ments</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
1.	Approved budget request	-	10,136	164	-	10,300	
2.	Estimated 1981 outcome						

B.	<u>ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS</u>								
		<u>Operations</u>			<u>Capital</u>				<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
		<u>Sr.M.Y.</u>	<u>80\$000</u>	<u>Price Prov.</u>	<u>81\$000</u>	<u>W.C. Adj.</u>	<u>Capital Exp.</u>	<u>Total Gross Requirements</u>	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	Approved budget request	71	8,172	594	8,766	-	1,534	10,300	
2.	Program items reduced								
	a.								
	b.								
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
	f.								
	etc.								
	Subtotal								
3.	Program items added								
	a.								
	b.								
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
	f.								
	etc.								
	Subtotal								
4.	Estimated 1981 Outcome								

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- IIRAD -

A.	<u>FUNDING (in \$000)</u>	<u>Funding by CGIAR</u>	<u>Net Require- ments</u>	<u>Center's Core Resources Earned Income</u>	<u>Funds Brought Forward</u>	<u>Gross Require- ments</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>		
1.	Approved budget request	-	11,493	120	-	11,613			
2.	Estimated 1981 outcome								
B.	<u>ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS</u>								
		<u>Operations</u>		<u>Capital</u>			<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>		
		<u>Sr.M.Y.</u>	<u>80\$000</u>	<u>Price Prov.</u>	<u>81\$000</u>	<u>W.C. Adj.</u>	<u>Capital Exp.</u>	<u>Total Gross Requirements</u>	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	<u>Approved budget request</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>9,582</u>	<u>462</u>	<u>10,044</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>1,369</u>	<u>11,613</u>	
2.	<u>Program items reduced</u>								
	a.								
	b.								
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
	f.								
	etc.								
Subtotal									
3.	<u>Program items added</u>								
	a.								
	b.								
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
	f.								
	etc.								
Subtotal									
4.	Estimated 1981 Outcome								

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- IRRI -

A.	<u>FUNDING (in \$000)</u>	<u>Funding by OGIAR</u>	<u>Net Require- ments</u>	<u>Center's Core Resources</u>		<u>Gross Require- ments</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>		
				<u>Earned Income</u>	<u>Funds Brought Forward</u>				
1.	Approved budget request	-	19,437	300	-	19,737			
2.	Estimated 1981 outcome								
B.	<u>ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS</u>								
		<u>Operations</u>			<u>Capital</u>		<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>		
		<u>Sr.M.Y.</u>	<u>80\$000</u>	<u>Price Prov.</u>	<u>81\$000</u>	<u>W.C. Capital Adj. Exp.</u>	<u>Total Gross Requirements</u>		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	Approved budget request	58	15,988	3,235	19,223	314	200	19,737	
2.	Program items reduced								
	a.								
	b.								
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
	f.								
	etc.								
	Subtotal								
3.	Program items added								
	a.								
	b.								
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
	f.								
	etc.								
	Subtotal								
4.	Estimated 1981 Outcome								

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- ISNAR -

A.	<u>FUNDING (in \$000)</u>	<u>Funding by OGIAR</u>	<u>Net Require- ments</u>	<u>Center's Core Resources</u>		<u>Gross Require- ments</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
				<u>Earned Income</u>	<u>Funds Brought Forward</u>		
1.	Approved budget request	-	2,300	100	-	2,400	
2.	Estimated 1981 outcome						

B. ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	<u>Operations</u>				<u>Capital</u>		<u>Total Gross Requirements</u>	<u>Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments</u>
	<u>Sr.M.Y.</u>	<u>80\$000</u>	<u>Price Prov.</u>	<u>81\$000</u>	<u>W.C. Adj.</u>	<u>Capital Exp.</u>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	Approved budget request	12	2,230	170	2,400	-	-	2,400
2.	Program items reduced							
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3.	Program items added							
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
4.	Estimated 1981 Outcome							

Table I

1981 Funding and Adjusted Expenditures

- WARDA -

A. FUNDING (in \$000)	Funding by CGLAR	Net Require- ments	Center's Core Resources		Gross Require- ments	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
			Earned Income	Funds Brought Forward		
1. Approved budget request	-	2,925	10	150	3,085	
2. Estimated 1981 outcome						

B. ADJUSTMENTS IN GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Sr.M.Y.	80\$000	Price	81\$000	W.C. Adj.	Capital Exp.		
			Prov.					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1. <u>Approved budget request</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>2,789</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>2,851</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>3,085</u>	
2. <u>Program items reduced</u>								
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Subtotal								
3. <u>Program items added</u>								
a.								
b.								
c.								
d.								
e.								
f.								
etc.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Subtotal								
4. <u>Estimated 1981 Outcome</u>								

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	%Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.	Total Cap.					
CIAT - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	17722	2303	20025	94	575	669	20694	400	20294	3.6	16.6
Fallback: 1. Forage Agronomic Position	67	9	76	6	33	39	115				
2. Asia Cassava Regional Position	89	11	100	8	20	28	128				
3. Rice - Economic Position	89	12	101	8	30	38	139				
4. Beans - Pathology Position	95	12	107	9	33	42	149				
5. Agroclimatology Position	115	15	130	11	16	27	157				
6. Program Support	51	6	57	5	-	5	62				
7. Training & Conferences	153	20	173	14	-	14	187				
8. Capital Expenses (buses mainly)	-	-	-	-	142	142	142				
Sub-total	659	85	744	61	274	335	1079				
FALLBACK BUDGET	17063	2218	19281	33	301	334	19615	400	19215	(0.3)	10.5

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	%Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.	Total Cap.					
CIMMYT - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	20416	4050	24466	399	410	809	25275	380	24895	1.3	21.4
Fallback: 1. South Asia Wheat - 1.0 MY	132	26	158	13	-	13	171				
2. Bread Wheat - 1.0 MY	101	20	121	10	-	10	131				
3. Plant Operations	90	18	108	11	-	11	119				
4. Maize Training - 1.0 MY	101	20	121	10	-	10	131				
5. Training Fellowships	152	30	182	15	-	15	197				
6. Training & Conferences	552	105	657	55	-	55	712				
7. Coop. Program - Maize & Wheat	84	17	101	8	-	8	109				
Sub-total	1212	236	1448	122	-	122	1570				
FALLBACK BUDGET	19204	3814	23018	277	410	687	23705	380	23325	(4.7)	13.9

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	%Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.	Total Cap.					
CIP - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	8880	1553	10433	164	456	620	11053	150	10903	1.8	15.1
Fallback: 1. Reduction post doctoral positions (-2)	79	13	92	8	-	8	100				
2. Reduct. Conferences	20	3	23	2	-	2	25				
3. Reduce Degree Training	20	3	23	2	-	2	25				
4. Eliminate Sabbatics	39	7	46	4	-	4	50				
5. Defer filling Position postharvest tech.	71	12	83	7	-	7	90				
6. Reduction in research contracts (nematology, Audigenum Species, genetic material)	79	13	92	8	-	8	100				
7. Reduction regional contracts	47	8	55	5	-	5	60				
8. Defer irrigation well La Molina	-	-	-	-	100	100	100				
Sub-total	355	59	414	36	100	136	550				
FALLBACK BUDGET	8525	1494	10019	128	356	484	10503	150	10353	(2.2)	9.4

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital		TOTAL	Less	Net	%Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.	Cap.				
ICARDA - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	13447	2017	15464	72	2945	3017	18481	325	18156	12.4 23.2
Fallback (not prioritized):										
Fanning Systems	47	8	55	6	-	6	61			
Cereals	87	14	101	11	-	11	112			
Food Legume	73	12	85	9	-	9	94			
Forage	84	14	98	11	-	11	109			
Special Services	30	5	35	4	-	4	39			
Library	1	-	1	-	-	-	1			
Station Operations	62	10	72	8	-	8	80			
Computer	2	-	2	-	-	-	2			
Engin. Services	28	5	33	4	-	4	37			
Training and Workshops	59	10	69	8	-	8	77			
Direction	146	25	171	19	-	19	190			
Finance	64	11	75	8	-	8	83			
Purchasing	17	3	20	2	-	2	22			
Personnel	3	-	3	-	-	-	3			
Logistics	7	1	8	1	-	1	9			
Damascus & Others	3	-	3	-	-	-	3			
Site Maintenance	9	1	10	1	-	1	11			
Building & Grounds	30	5	35	4	-	4	39			
Motor Pool	27	5	32	3	-	3	35			
School	3	-	3	-	-	-	3			
Contingency	8	1	9	1	-	1	10			
Capital - Buildings	-	-	-	-	200	200	200			
Capital - Equipment	-	-	-	-	141	141	141			
Sub-total	790	130	920	100	341	441	1361			
Fallback Position	12657	1887	14544	(28)	2604	2576	17120	325	16795	5.8 14.1

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	%Real	% Increase
	Price		Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp	Total Cap.				Growth	Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Prov.								Oper.	
IBPGR - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	3631	363	3994	-	-	-	3994	225	3769	6.8	17.5
Fallback: 1. Info. & doc. activities	61	6	67	-	-	-	67				
2. Regional activities (reduction in support to national programs and in training of personnel)	120	12	132	-	-	-	132				
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____				
Sub-total	181	18	199	-	-	-	199				
FALLBACK BUDGET	3450	345	3795	-	-	-	3795	225	3570	1.5	11.6

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital		Total Cap.	TOTAL	Less	Net	%Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.						
ICRISAT - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	13830	2352	16182	233	2143	2376	18558	150	18408	7.1	26.7
Fallback: 1. Soil management Agron. position, WA Farming System.	121	21	142	2	-	2	144				
2. International cooperation biological position	21	4	25	-	-	-	25				
3. Genetic research - Groundnut Germplasm Botanist position	53	9	62	1	-	1	63				
4. Position WA Groundnut breeder- pathol.	140	24	164	11	-	11	175				
5. Position WA Sorghum pathol.	92	16	108	7	-	7	115				
6. Reduction in equipment and minor construction	-	-	-	-	197	197	197				
7. Reduction in research operation	338	58	396	33	-	33	429				
Sub-total	765	132	897	54	197	251	1148				
FALLBACK BUDGET	13065	2220	15285	179	1946	2125	17410	150	17260	1.2	18.9

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	%Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.	Total Cap.					
IFPRI - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	3144	377	3521	-	30	30	3551	20	3551	4.8	18.4
Fallback: 1. Expansion Production Program	80	10	90	-	-	-	90				
2. Reduct. Consultants & Collaborative Research	10	1	11	-	-	-	11				
3. Reduction in Travel	75	9	84	-	-	-	84				
4. Reduction in Computer Use	25	3	28	-	-	-	28				
5. Reduction in Board's Expenses	35	4	39	-	-	-	39				
6. Equipment	-	-	-	-	11	11	11				
Sub-total	225	27	252	-	11	11	263				
FALLBACK BUDGET	2919	350	3269	-	19	19	3288	20	3268	2.7	9.6

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	% Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.	Total Cap.					
IITA - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	16671	3334	20005	353	641	994	20999	200	20799	0.9	18.3
Fallback: 1. Defer replacement equipment Physical Plant Services	169	34	203	17	-	17	220				
2. Defer filling position senior scientist in each of the four research programs	422	84	506	42	-	42	548				
3. Reduce level operations research programs	217	43	260	22	-	22	282				
Sub-total	808	161	969	81	-	81	1050				
FALLBACK BUDGET	15863	3173	19036	272	641	913	19949	200	19749	(4.0)	12.4

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	% Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap.	Total Cap.					
		Prov.			Exp.						
ILCA - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	9514	1389	10903	155	532	687	11590	225	11365	8.5	12.5
Fallback: Unspecified	253	37	290	-	-	-	290	-	-		
FALLBACK BUDGET	9261	1352	10613	155	532	687	11300	225	11075	5.6	9.7

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	% Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.	Total Cap.					
ILRAD - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	9299	930	10229	143	1025	1168	11397	1358	10039	(7.4)	(1.9)
Fallback: 1. Staff Housing	-	-	-	-	300	300	300				
2. Reduction in lab equipment	-	-	-	-	100	100	100				
3. Delayed staff recruitment	144	15	159	11	-	11	170				
Sub-total	144	15	159	11	400	411	570				
FALLBACK BUDGET	9155	915	10070	132	625	757	10827	1358	9469	(8.8)	(6.8)

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	% Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.	Total Cap.					
IRRI - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	19800	2799	22599	268	700	968	23567	350	23217	3.0	19.4
Fallback: 1. Plant Breeder/Phys. Tissue Culture 0.75 MY	100	12	112	9	-	9	121				
2. Plant Pathologist	100	12	112	9	-	9	121				
3. Fill positions of soil Edapholog. C.S. Specialist, Liaison Scientist, for the Middle East with Sabbatic Leaves	59	6	65	5	-	5	70				
4. Defer filling of support staff in soil chemistry, plant physiology, etc.	44	4	48	4	-	4	52				
5. Reduce involvement in collaborative research	92	10	102	8	-	8	110				
6. Defer replacement of equipment	128	14	142	12	-	12	154				
7. Reduce training & conferences	74	8	82	7	-	7	89				
8. Reduce travel	16	2	18	1	-	1	19				
9. Reduce General Operations Budget	56	6	62	5	-	5	67				
10. Defer construction of Post-doctoral apartments	-	-	-	-	250	250	250				
11. Defer construction of Screen-houses	-	-	-	-	100	100	100				
12. Defer purchase of electron microscope	-	-	-	-	200	200	200				
13. Reduce budget renovation	-	-	-	-	50	50	50				
Sub-total	669	74	743	60	600	660	1403				
FALLBACK BUDGET	19131	2725	21856	208	100	308	22164	350	21814	(0.5)	12.3

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	% Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.	Total Cap.					
ISNAR - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	<u>3613</u>	<u>343</u>	<u>3956</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>4177</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>4127</u>	50.5	74.0
Fallback: 1. Study on factors influencing research effectiveness (18 MM consultants)	<u>181</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>198</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>---</u>		
FALLBACK BUDGET	3432	326	3758	210	-	210	3968	50	3918	43.0	65.3

Table II

FALLBACK POSITION

	Operations			Capital			TOTAL	Less	Net	% Real Growth Oper.	% Increase Gross Exp.
	Oper.81\$	Price Prov.	Oper.82\$	WCADJ	Cap. Exp.	Total Cap.					
WARDA - RECOMMENDED BUDGET	2916	379	3295	-	71	71	3366	20	3346	2.3	9.1
Fallback: 1. Subregional coordination	24	12	36	-	8	8	44				
2. Research Support	8	4	12	-	59	59	71				
3. Conferences & Training	14	7	21	-	-	-	21				
4. Library & Documentation	9	4	13	-	4	4	17				
5. General Administration	10	5	15	-	-	-	15				
Sub-total	65	32	97	-	71	71	168	-	-		
FALLBACK BUDGET	2851	347	3198	-	-	-	3198	20	3178	-	3.7

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- CIAT -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's Core Resources		Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Approved budget request	19,215	400	-	19,615	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	17,294				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Price		Prov.		W.C. Capital	Exp.		
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	82\$000		Adj.			
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1. Approved budget request	57	17,063	2,218	19,281	33	301	19,615	
2. <u>Proposed Reductions</u>								
Priority ^{a/} / <u>Program Items</u>								
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3. <u>Resulting Reduced Level</u>								

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- CIMMYT -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's Core Resources		Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Approved budget request	23,325	350	30	23,705	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	20,993				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	Price	82\$000	W.C. Capital			
	(6)	(7)	Prov.	(9)	Adj.	Exp.	(12)	(13)
1. Approved budget request	78	19,204	3,814	23,018	277	410	23,705	

2. Proposed Reductions

Priority^{a/} / Program Items

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- etc.

— — — — — — — — — —

Subtotal

3. Resulting Reduced Level

— — — — — — — — — —

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- CIP -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's Core Resources		Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments (5)
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
1. Approved budget request	10,353	150	-	10,503	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	9,318				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements (12)	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments (13)
	Sr.M.Y. (6)	81\$000 (7)	Price		W.C. Capital Adj. (10)	Exp. (11)		
			Prov. (8)	82\$000 (9)				
1. <u>Approved budget request</u>	—	<u>8,525</u>	<u>1,494</u>	<u>10,019</u>	<u>128</u>	<u>356</u>	<u>10,503</u>	
2. <u>Proposed Reductions</u>								
<u>Priority^{a/}</u>	<u>Program Items</u>							
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
etc.		—	—	—	—	—	—	
Subtotal								
3. <u>Resulting Reduced Level</u>								

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- IBPGR -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's Core Resources		Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Approved budget request	3,570	50	175	3,795	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	3,213				

B.	<u>GROSS REQUIREMENTS</u>						Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Operations				Capital		
	Price				W.C. Capital		
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	Prov.	82\$000	Adj.	Exp.	
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
						Total Gross Requirements	(12)
							(13)

1. Approved budget request	---	3,450	345	3,795	---	---	3,795	
----------------------------	-----	-------	-----	-------	-----	-----	-------	--

2. Proposed Reductions

Priority^{a/} / Program Items

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- etc.

Subtotal

3. Resulting Reduced Level

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- ICARDA -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's	Core Resources	Gross	Reference to Relevant
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	Section of Narrative
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	for Comments
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Approved budget request	16,795	325	-	17,120	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	15,115				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	Price Prov.	82\$000	W.C. Capital Adj.	Exp.		
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1. <u>Approved budget request</u>	45	12,657	1,887	14,544	(28)	2,604	17,120	
2. <u>Proposed Reductions</u>								
<u>Priority^{a/} /</u>								
<u>Program Items</u>								
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3. <u>Resulting Reduced Level</u>								

^{a/} The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- ICRISAT -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's	Core Resources	Gross	Reference to Relevant
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	Section of Narrative
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	for Comments
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Approved budget request	17,260	150	-	17,410	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	15,534				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross	Reference to Relevant
	Price		Prov.		W.C. Capital	Exp.		
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	82\$000		Adj.		Requirements	Section of Narrative
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	for Comments
1. Approved budget request		13,065	2,220	15,285	179	1,946	17,410	
2. <u>Proposed Reductions</u>								

Priority^{a/} / Program Items

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- etc.

Subtotal

3. Resulting Reduced Level

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- IFPRI -

A. NET REQUIREMENTS	Net	Center's Core Resources		Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Approved budget request	3,268	20	-	3,288	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	2,941				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Price				W.C. Capital			
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	Prov.	82\$000	Adj.	Exp.	Requirements	
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1. Approved budget request	22	2,919	350	3,269	-	19	3,288	
2. Proposed Reductions								
Priority ^{a/} / Program Items								
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3. Resulting Reduced Level								

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- IITA -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's Core Resources	Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments (5)
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	
	ments	Income	Forward	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. Approved budget request	19,749	200	-	19,949
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	17,774			

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements (12)	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments (13)
	Price				W.C. Capital			
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	Prov.	82\$000	Adj.	Exp.		
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1. Approved budget request	60	15,863	3,173	19,036	272	641	19,949	
2. <u>Proposed Reductions</u>								
<u>Priority^a/</u>	<u>Program Items</u>							
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3. <u>Resulting Reduced Level</u>								

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- ILCA -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's Core Resources		Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments (5)
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
1. Approved budget request	11,075	225	-	11,300	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	9,967				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments (13)
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	Price	82\$000	W.C. Capital	Adj. Exp.		
	(6)	(7)	Prov. (8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	Requirements (12)	
1. Approved budget request		9,261	1,352	10,613	155	532	11,300	
2. Proposed Reductions								

Priority^{a/} / Program Items

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- etc.

Subtotal

3. Resulting Reduced Level

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- ILRAD -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's Core Resources		Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Approved budget request	9,469	200	1,158	10,827	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	8,522				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	Price Prov.	82\$000	W.C. Capital Adj.	Exp.		
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)		
1. <u>Approved budget request</u>		<u>9,155</u>	<u>915</u>	<u>10,070</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>625</u>	<u>10,827</u>	
2. <u>Proposed Reductions</u>								
<u>Priority^{a/}</u>	<u>Program Items</u>							
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3. <u>Resulting Reduced Level</u>								

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- IRRI -

A. NET REQUIREMENTS	Net	Center's Core Resources		Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Approved budget request	21,814	350	-	22,164	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	19,633				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Price				W.C. Capital			
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	Prov.	82\$000	Adj.	Exp.	Requirements	
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1. Approved budget request		19,131	2,725	21,856	208	100	22,164	
2. Proposed Reductions								

Priority^{a/} / Program Items

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- etc.

Subtotal

3. Resulting Reduced Level

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- ISNAR -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's Core Resources		Gross	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments (5)
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
1. Approved budget request	3,918	50	-	3,968	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	3,526				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross Requirements	Reference to Relevant Section of Narrative for Comments
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	Price Prov.	82\$000	W.C. Capital Adj.	Exp.		
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)		
							(12)	(13)
1. <u>Approved budget request</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>3,432</u>	<u>326</u>	<u>3,758</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>3,968</u>	
2. <u>Proposed Reductions</u>								
<u>Priority^{a/}</u>	<u>Program Items</u>							
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
etc.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Subtotal								
3. <u>Resulting Reduced Level</u>								

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.

Table III

1982 Additional Fallback List

- WARDA -

A. <u>NET REQUIREMENTS</u>	Net	Center's	Core Resources	Gross	Reference to Relevant
	Require-	Earned	Funds Brought	Require-	Section of Narrative
	ments	Income	Forward	ments	for Comments
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Approved budget request	3,178	20	-	3,198	
2. At 10% below the approved net requirements	2,860				

B. GROSS REQUIREMENTS

	Operations				Capital		Total Gross	Reference to Relevant
	Price		Prov.		W.C. Adj.	Capital Exp.		
	Sr.M.Y.	81\$000	82\$000		(10)	(11)	Requirements	Section of Narrative
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	for Comments
1. Approved budget request	30	2,851	347	3,198	-	-	3,198	
2. <u>Proposed Reductions</u>								
Priority ^{a/} / <u>Program Items</u>								
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
etc.								
Subtotal								
3. <u>Resulting Reduced Level</u>								

a/ The proposed program items should be ranked according to the degree of priority for deletion, i.e. the program item listed first would be the first item to be deleted.