

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CENTER DIRECTORS

IBADAN, NIGERIA

20, 22 and 23 JUNE, 1981

PARTICIPANTS

A.V.R.D.C.

Dr. G. W. Selleck

CIAT

Dr. John L. Nickel

CIMMYT

Mr. R. Havener  
Rr. Clive James

CIP

Dr. Richard sawyer  
Dr. Kenneth J. Brown  
Dr. Roger Rowe

I.B.P.G.R.

Dr. J. T. Williams  
Dr. N. M. Antishetty

I.C.A.R.D.A.

Dr. M. Nour  
Mr. G. E. G. Wightwick

I.C.R.I.S.A.T.

Dr. L. D. Swindale  
Mr. M. A. Banerji

I.F.P.R.I.

Dr. J. W. Mellor  
Mr. Peter Oram

IITA

Dr. E. H. Hartmans  
Dr. Bede N. Okigbo  
Dr. S. V. S. Shastry

ILCA

Dr. D. J. Pratt  
Dr. C. de Haan

ILRAD

Dr. D. Zwart

IRRI

Dr. D. J. Greenland  
Dr. M. R. Vega

ISNAR

Dr. W. K. Gamble  
Mr. A. von der Osten

WARDA

Mr. Sidi Coulibaly  
Dr. B. A. C. Enyi  
Dr. Nah-Doe Bropleh

OTHERS

Dr. Ralph W. Cummings  
Mr. M. Lejeune  
Mr. A. Hayman  
Mr. P. Greening  
Mr. J. P. Jacquotte  
Dr. H. R. Albrecht  
Professor A. H. Bunting  
Professor T. Odhiambo  
Professor Dr. Th. M. Wormer  
Mr. Sean Forster  
Dr. Eric Sicely

## OPENING

1) The Meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. in the Director General's Board Room with Dr. E. H. Hartmans in the *chair*. Dr. Hartmans welcomed the participants from the International Agricultural Research centers, the Chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Secretariats of TAC and Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).

2) It was announced that the Center Directors will not be required by TAC the whole of Saturday (20 June) and Tuesday (23 June). The scheduling of discussions of the Consultative Group (CG) Secretariat with the Center Directors will be fitted within the week-long schedule.

3) In reply to Dr. Sawyer's comment that Center Directors cannot take any longer than a week, Dr. Cummings suggested that the CG Secretariat discussions on the individual Center budgets must follow, not precede the TAC deliberations; and as such this has to be only on Friday 26 June.

4) The timetable of the business sessions of TAC and center Directors was tabled, noted and the Center Directors suggested that there should be more consultation between Directors and TAC Secretariat in drawing up the timetable.

## AGENDA

5) The Agenda, as proposed was adopted with the suggestion that item 3(i) viz the sharing of information on Center policies be deferred for discussion at a later time.

## MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1980 MEETING IN MANILA

6) Paragraph 5 to read "Dr. Hartmans asked if any Center was providing educational allowances for university students of staff: Apart from ILCA, no Centers were and the majority believed that it was not needed".

7) Last line of paragraph 7 of the Minutes to read "Examples of Boards taking active interest in the operating activities of the Centers were noted".

(Dropping the word "interferring")

MATTERS ARISING FROM MANILA MEETING

(i) Current Funding (1981)

8) Mr. M. Lejeune stated that there has been no major change from the report in October 1980. The European pledges dwindled in relation to the upward revision in the value of dollar; the impact of the higher dollar value on Centers will vary. The total pool of pledges was only \$132.7 million against the expectation of \$139 million in October 1980.

9) Dr. Swindale commented that cash flow problems lead to under-spending and this should not be interpreted as the ability of the Centers to do with less resources.

10) Dr. Nickel emphasized that any curtailment in the resources over the "agreed" level at Lima meeting should be reflected as a shortfall, not as a revision in the budget. Also, that many donors require annual — tracts prior to the release of funds — treating a long term commitment as an annual independent grant. Mr. Lejeune promised to address this problem if each Center would advise him of the documentation requirements of the specific donors.

(ii) Funding Forecast for 1982

11) Mr. Lejeune said that while it is too early to predict, the total pledges (from old and new donors) may approach \$160 million. Among the old donors, only USA, EEC, World Bank and IFAD may increase their contribution in real terms over 1981 level. On the side of demands for resources, the CGIAR projection for 1982 is \$170-\$173 million — leaving a gap of 4 percent.

12) Brazil, Austria, Finland and India are expected to join the CG system as new donors in 1982 and make a total contribution of about \$3 million. Dr. Harms suggested contact with African Development Bank and African Development Fund as potential donors.

PROCEDURES FOR BUDGET 1982

13) Mr. Lejeune suggested that the Centers should draw up the budgets based on the fall back position (5 percent shortfall in funding) and indicate supplementary budget items.

14) The Center Directors felt that the budget should reflect the need for resources in order to fulfill its obligations. Should this be guided by the forecast of resources given by CG and develop a budget on the fall back position, the donors fail to appreciate the immensity of the underfunding and its negative impact on the success of the Centers. Also it is disadvantageous to accept the fall back position as a reality and give the impression that the Centers can get by with short falls. The CG Secretariat, on the other hand, argued in favour of keeping the donors fully informed of the activities which will be foregone if underfunding does occur. The trend of funding over the recent years has certainly been one of "shrinking real growth" particularly for the mature centers.

15) Dr. Swindale argued that the visible impact of the short fall may be deferring an activity or eliminating certain positions, but the long term impact is the inability of Centers to fully discharge their responsibility to developing countries. Dr. Mellor argued that the Centers' response to cutbacks will depend upon the prediction of how long the system will face the shortage of resources. Some of the ~~ad hoc~~ actions now being taken may not harm the Centers in the short run, but will certainly harm them in the long run. If the centers know for sure that the short fall is expected to continue, the measures they

adopt may be substantially different.

16) Mr. Havener argued in favour of Centers preparing a M get request on the basis of needs and follow an operating budget which is determined by the available resources. In answer to the query of Dr. Cummings whether the Board of Trustees have been fully appraised of the funding prospects; the Center Directors confirmed that this has been done.

17) The Chairman concluded the discussion by stating the concensus that the centers will submit to the CG Secretariat the budgets at the planned level. They will also provide the details of cuts, should the funding be at fall back position. The CG Secretariat Will summarise the impact of shortfall on program of individual Centers and on the CG system as a whole. The CGIAR members will receive the budgets as initially proposed by the Centers.

18) Mr. Lejeune agrees in principle to the proposals made by Center Directors. He reminded the meeting of the discussion that took place in Manila in 1980 when Centers were required to prepared a five-year plan bearing in mind:

- a) the "Budget baseline";
- b) the "Budget ceiling"; and
- c) the provision of an itemised "change list", etc.

However, the Secretariat has not received from any Center a budget prepared on this basis although the CG Secretariat has to prepare an aggregate budget for all the Centers reflecting these three hypothetical positions. He agrees with John Nickel that staff morale will be unduly affected if Centers have to include items that will have to be dropped in case full funding is not obtained. Nevertheless a detailed budget with full justification for every staff position and every program should be submitted to the Secretariat. Donors generally expect detailed budgetary document. The Directors were advised to make a statement in their budget document that they were informed by the Secretariat to prepare their budget on the basis of the three positions discussed in Manila. He does not hold

4 out any hope for a budget in excess of \$160-161,000,000. The CG commentary will show for each Center the percentage growth the respective budget has allowed for whether as growth or whatever it is. The Center Directors agreed to the proposal.

19) Mr. Lejeune referred to *the* discussion that took place in Manila on the IARC Treasurers' meeting, CG is still of the view that the meeting should take place, although the original idea to schedule the meeting for October 1981 will no longer be feasible. The review team is still discussing the matter and although its report should be available before October, it is most unlikely that the report would have been discussed by then and therefore a suitable terms of reference for the meeting of financial officers cannot possibly be drawn up for an October meeting. It may well be that the meeting will have to be scheduled for April 1982. In answer to a question as to what the financial review will involve, Mr. Lejeune said it will involve all documentation generally put out by the CG regarding budget preparation, allocation of resources, periodic review of Centers accounting procedures etc. The Center Directors took note.

#### CGIAR REVIEW

20) Mr. Lejeune reviewed the status of the review. The Study Team prepared no formal report but a document on issues and options. The Study Team has ceased to function; and the Review Committee is preparing the draft report which will be discussed at the meeting in July 1982.

21) Mr. Lejeune briefed the Center Directors on the highlights of the discussions at the Paris meeting in May 1981. It was obvious that the subjects discussed were complicated and the views divergent. The topics were:

- a) Purpose and objectives of the system - Unanimous
- b) Longevity - Original concept that the IARCs are "temporary" is no longer valid. Their role may change, but the need is continuous.

- c) Program focus - The focus will be on generation of new technology. In general, basic research will be outside of the CG system.
- d) Technical assistance - However important this may be, IARCs should refrain from being *the* agencies of technical assistance.
- e) Crop focus - Limited to food crops and to the extent possible not to expand beyond the current responsibilities, favouring the multidisciplinary approach to genetic improvement.
- f) Factor Research - e.g. Water Management, etc. to be fully integrated within the existing IARCs rather than establish separate Centers.
- g) Training is crucial, but not to pursue it to the extent it might jeopardise the research output of scientists.
- h) Mode of operation - Avoidance of overlaps in activities of IARCs in one and the same country or region and consideration of other means (e.g. networks) to discharge the responsibilities of IARCs.
- i) Structure of the CG System - The roles of OGIAR, TAC, Board of Trustees, IARCs and Developing Countries in the development of programs and their review and evaluation were discussed. In general, a plea was made to increase the role of the developing countries in program development and management.
- j) Management - It is proposed to set up a separate entity - Management Advisory Committee (MAC) - but problems were encountered in arriving at its composition.
- k) Board of Trustees - The accountability of the Boards is important. Opportunities to brief the new trustees on the scope and functions of the CG system to be increased.
- l) Reviews - The TAC Quinquennial Reviews to continue. Periodic

reviews on the management of IARCs may be needed, In general, the reviews of programs and budgets should be taken up together.

22) Dr. Cummings made supplemental remarks on his impressions of the Paris meeting:

- a) Although the research networks have been successful, their success depended upon a strong relationship with a research base.
- b) The demarcation between the care and special projects is blurred. Views were divergent, but in general it was felt that a review of care programs should be taken up together with that of special projects.
- c) Stripe Reviews have been useful. In future they may be extended to craps which are part of responsibility of more than one Center. The members of TAC are to be serviced better than at present.

#### CLOSED SESSION OF THE CENTER DIRECTORS

23) The Center Directors felt that although Dr. N. C. Brady and Dr. R. L. Sawyer are represented in the OGIAR Review Committee they functioned in a personal capacity rather than as spokesmen of the Center Directors. The initial enthusiasm in favour of MAC was dampened by the apprehension of negative impact on "small donors"; and the difficulty in finding "representatives" of various donor/sponsor/beneficiary groups without making the MAC rather unwieldy. The overall impression was that status quo will prevail rather than setting up the MAC.

24) Center Directors would have appreciated a greater opportunity to make their own inputs in the OGIAR Review process. They hope that this will indeed occur in later stages of the review. They notice an undue rush in finalisation of the report of the Review Committee. Dr. Sawyer has been

requested to urge a slowing down in the process and to give the Center Directors as a group an opportunity to consider and comment on the Draft Report of the Review Committee.

25) Some Directors expressed concern over the reduced opportunities for direct donor interaction with the Centers in the existing mode of operations of the CG system. They felt that the original position of direct interaction between the donors and IARCs must be restored. This view reflects the concensus of the Directors.

26) Some additional points have been made. Firstly, the donor role in mobilisation and allocation of resources needs to be increased. This can be better done by a small group, rather than at the Centers' week. Secondly, the TAC judgements on programs, priorities and progress are not able to receive direct interaction with the donors, to the extent desirable. Thirdly, the Secretariat which should implement a policy outlined by donors is more often second-guessing the IARCs and Boards and is unable to look at the impact of continuously dwindling resources on the system as a whole. For example, if the present trend of resources continues up to 1985, will IARCs be able to discharge the roles expected of them? These considerations led the Directors to propose to the CGIAR Review Committee the establishment of a small Executive Committee of the donors with which TAC and IARCs interact and which in turn works with the CG Secretariat on resource allocation issues. The views of the Directors have been telexed to the Chairman of the Review Committee.

27) The CG Secretariat and the Chairman of TAC took note of the views of Directors and sought additional clarification on the role of the proposed Executive Committee of donors; and it was agreed to have a discussion between the two members of the Review Team (Drs. Evans and Sehni) now at Ibadan, and the Center Directors. Drs. Evans and Zehni - the members of the Review Committee

have met with the Directors to exchange views on the progress of CGIAR Review.

#### LONG RANGE PLAN

28) A TAC paper on the subject was previously circulated. The Directors feel that the CG ought to have given their guidelines for the preparation of the long-term plan of each Center about three years ago before work commenced on the matter. Most Centers infact finalised their long range plans and their Boards have approved. All that may be required is for each Center to update its document from year to year to make it current. It was observed that although the objectives of Centers may be similar, they have been handled differently in the long range plan. This is as it should be in order for each Center to retain its own identity. Also circumstances do change from time to time and hence the need for flexibility of approach and methodology of preparing the plan. It was agreed that the inclusion of special projects in a Center long range plan is not feasible.

#### PLANT BREEDERS' RIGHTS

29) Dr. Hartmans said that the IARCs policies are in favour of making available the germplasm freely to public or private Institutes. While this negates the principle of IARCs holding Plant Breeders' rights, instances are known when IARC materials got into the hands of profit-oriented institutions who registered the material through the Plant Breeders' rights. Although some Directors felt that PBR will restrict the flow of elite germplasm to developing countries, the concerns are equally great to preclude a private agency profiting from the research done by non-profit organizations (IARCs) and ensuring that the farmers in developing countries have access to the right materials.

30) Dr. Zwart reminded the group that the problem is not limited to plant materials but also other products of IARC research, e.g., the vaccines. Others mentioned small machinery, biological control agents and agro-chemicals.

31) Professor Bunting mentioned the non-existence of international laws to deal with the problem. The routes to take are to protect the IARC products by registration in host countries and to encourage the developing countries to institute appropriate legislation to protect the products of public and private Institute research.

32) The immediate decision needed is whether the IARCs should respond to the invitation by the two organizations UPOV and ASSINSEL (the latter is an association of plant breeders) and enter into a dialogue in order to get them better acquainted with the mode of operation of IARCs and the flow of materials that flows from the Centers. The consensus was in favour of a positive response from the IARCs - pending the examination of legal issues by TAC. IRRI and CIMMYT will send a representative to the proposed meeting in Geneva in November 1981 to establish a line of communication by explaining the operation of the respective programs, but without committing IARCs on policy issues.

#### WATER MANAGEMENT

33) TAC Secretariat has circulated a detailed questionnaire to IARC Directors and they have been returned. Also, additional comments have been made on the proposal after the Manila Meeting in October 1980. The Center Directors wish to know whether TAC Secretariat has summarised these; and if it did, the Centers wish to receive the relevant document.

#### PLANT NUTRITION

34) The TAC paper on the subject had previously been circulated. Dr. Swindale does not favour the establishment of a new institute to handle the matter as suggested in the TAC paper. In his view a better alternative is to strengthen the current effort being made by Centers and to establish a

coordinating body similar to IBPGR. Dr. Greenland supports the need to coordinate work that is going on in the Centers as well as in national programs on the subject. In his view the important thing is to assist or strengthen national program efforts and not to compete with them. There should be appropriate linkage between Centers and national institutions. Many other Directors oppose the establishment of a new umbrella organization and support the view that current work in the Centers as well as in national institutions be strengthened. Dr. Okigbo made a brief reference to a recent workshop that took place at IITA where the need for the establishment of a data bank was stressed. The recommendation of the workshop favours the establishment of appropriate linkage between Centers and national programs as opposed to the establishment of a coordinating center. As to which agency should provide the services of a data bank, the consensus is for FAO to provide it in its regular program. The Chairman summarized the discussion that in view of the ecological differences between developing and developed world, research on plant nutrition should take place in the developing countries and therefore the work should be done in the Centers. FAO will appear to be in the best position to supply the desired services of a data bank. There should therefore be a meeting between the FAO, the Centers and national institutions to work out the detail of the type of information service desired and the mechanism for co-ordination among Centers and national programs.

#### PEST MANAGEMENT

35) The Center Directors note that this matter is separate from ICIPE admission to CG system since this has been resolved by setting up a separate consortium of donors. The consensus was that pest management should be expanded to insect, diseases and weed control. In response to a suggestion for

a stripe review on pest management, the Center Directors felt that the desk review of IARC publications already made by the TAC Secretariat might be sufficient. Should additional funds be available, this aspect of research can be strengthened at the existing Centers.

ROLE OF IFPRI

36) Dr. Mellor highlighted the complementarity in the roles of IARCs which deal with micro-economics and stop at recognising the policy implications of the on-going biological research; and the economists in IFPRI who primarily focus the macro-economic policy issues. Close contacts between the economists in IFPRI and other Centers is mutually beneficial.

37) Present level of interaction of IFPRI with other IARCs can be summarised as follows:

- a) visits of IARC economists to IFPRI;
- b) disaggregation of coarse grain data for ICRISAT; 7
- c) analysis and interpretation of FAO data on production and consumption of food;
- d) placement of IFPRI staff (special projects) at the Centers - e.g. IRRI

38) In future, IFPRI will play an increasing role in -

- a) optimal national production mixes in view of dynamics of consumption demands.
- b) regional meetings to develop priorities jointly with CIAT CIP, CIMMYT etc.
- c) the problems of traction (for e.g. in Africa) in view of energy crises and the role of cattle
- d) allocation of resources for research (with ISNAR)

39) IFPRI's contacts are different from other Center contacts, which are often limited to the Ministries of Agriculture. Geographically, the priority is Africa but the studies in Asia are aimed at what can be learnt for transfer of experience to other regions. Scarcity of trained manpower that

prevails in Africa and middle-East will slow down the effectiveness in these regions. In general, IFPRI collaborates with IARCs where the national programs are weak, while it prefers to work with the national institutes in a region like Asia.

#### PENSION PLANS FOR U.S. PERSONNEL

40) Dr. Hartmans suggested the expansion of discussion to U.S. and non-U.S. personnel. The present plan is not indexed for cost of living and also not protect the employee from the fluctuation of exchange rates between the U.S. dollar and home currency. A suggestion to appoint a consultant was not favoured since the best he can do is to produce a comparative study on compensations. The concern, as per Dr. Mellor, is the relative changes in interest rates vs. inflation; and that the personnel that could be at a disadvantage are those who accept a lump sum payment on retirement. Such personnel can be offered a consultancy advice. This matter will be further examined at the next meeting.

#### INTERNATIONAL STAFF SALARIES

41) Dr. Havener expressed concern over the real decline in the compensation to international staff which may lead to an inability of IARCs to attract good staff. He proposed an update of Thorson Report and confirmed the availability and willingness of Mr. Thorson to undertake the work and report back to Center Directors by October 1981. The proposal was agreed. Dr. Havener has been authorized to contact Mr. Thorson with a somewhat limited terms of reference. Those Centers located in developed countries and those which follow UN scales (ISNAR IBPGR IFPRI and ~~WARDA~~) will not participate in this update, but requested that they were kept fully informed. It will be examined how Thorson Report findings can be shared with those agencies which provide the consultant with comparative data on compensations. Dr. Hartmans will contact IIE to obtain the salaries of the U.S. Land Grant Colleges of

Agriculture and Forestry.

TAX REIMBURSEMENT

42) The Center Directors exchanged the information on tax reimbursement entitlements of staff employed by the different Institutes.

RESEARCH PROGRAMS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

43) Dr. Swindale explained that ICRISAT responded to the request from SADC by mounting a mission (in cooperation with ISNAR) and recommended regional research centers for sorghum, millets and groundnut. He did not think it was proper to release the report without the permission of SADC and said that permission was requested.

44) Dr. Hartmans said that initiatives of this type may get cut off hands due to lack of coordination. He gave an example of similar request from IRAZ which was referred to ISNAR. He wondered whether ICRISAT could not have involved other Centers. Dr. Swindale explained that the original request from SADC was for a regional center for sorghum, millet and groundnut, but the ICRISAT response emphasized the scope for other crops and therefore other IARC involvement.

45) Dr. Gamble commented that ISNAR does not intend to take a coordination role of other IARCs. Dr. Swindale mentioned that some organizations (e.g. OAU/SRTC) wish to coordinate the roles of IARCs; and this could fetter the initiatives of the Centers. Dr. Hartmans concluded the discussion by stating that the Centers may keep each other informed of their initiatives and when possible to team up in order to preclude other agencies from playing a coordination role.

POLICIES AND PROGRAMS OF ISNAR

46) Dr. Gamble, before discussing the plans of ISNAR, expressed appreciation to TAC for the long session with ISNAR at its 25th Meeting at Addis.

This was a special treatment given to *the* new Center and recommend such interaction with other Centers periodically.

47) The major thrust of ISNAR is on national research systems and this mandate of ISNAR goes beyond the commodity oriented IARCs. The program is in four areas -

- a) analysing existing national research organisations. This activity entails the background documentation, mounting of missions, identification of projects, detailed project plan preparation and working with the donors and host country in launching the projects. The countries are stratified into four levels of development and at this time ISNAR concentrates on the countries in mid-level.
- b) communication and information system.  
The concentration is on research systems. Selected publications are being collected. Attempt to be made to put together a complete set of publications of IARCs.
- c) Training - The manpower requirements are arrived at in the missions. Management training courses and workshops are being contemplated in cooperation with for example CIMMYT.
- d) Special studies - being developed presently in cooperation with IFPRI and AAASA.

48) Dr. Nickel commented that the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations and USAID have done a great deal in the 1960s in national institution building including strong post-graduate training programs. These activities have largely been discontinued. Dr. Mellor said that the present interest of donors is in line with ISNAR programs and that a major impact can follow.

#### CENTERS COOPERATION IN CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIA

49) In an earlier meeting (1977?) of the Center Directors, guidelines were developed to determine the liability for participants' travel from one IARC to the other. In the recent times, the invitations are extended and accepted; and later the negotiations often start to determine which Institute (host or participating) pays for expenses. Dr. Nickel volunteered to review the

past discussions and report at the next meeting of the Center Directors.

#### ROYALTY FOR IARC BOOKS

50) Dr. Vega *shared* with the group the keenness of the Peoples Republic of China to organize a book exhibition on IARC publications and their enquiry on the royalty payment in order to publish the chosen books in Chinese. The Centers were willing to participate in the exhibition, but not so keen to send participants. On hearing from IRRI about the scheduling of the exhibition, CIMMYT, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IBPGR, IITA and AVRDC will send the material to IRRI.

51) It was agreed that the priced or free publication of IARCs can be translated into Chinese with no payment of royalty. The publications which were contracted by IARCs to the commercial publishing houses will have to be dealt with separately since the royalty reverts to the publisher. On ascertaining the potential interest of the Peoples Republic of China, the latter could directly contact the publishers for terms on royalty.

#### CHARGE FOR PUBLICATIONS

52) CIAT and IRRI and more recently AVRDC have a charge on the Institute's publications. All others distribute the publications free of charge, except those contracted over the commercial publishing company.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

53) Dr. Hartmans shared the following information with the Center Directors -

(i) The OG Secretariat will develop the criteria for the determining of the first award for scientific work done at IARCs. The first award will be considered for 1982.

(ii) All Centers have responded to the queries from Mrs. Joan Joshi on service plan.

(iii) Dr. Nickel has made a further commitment to IADS on a tax


relief consultancy concerning U.S. nationals.

(iv) Center Directors are requested to advise *the* Chairman on prospective agenda items, together with the background documentation.


The Chairman will then finalise the Agenda and circulate to all Centers well in advance of the next **meting**.

(v) The Chairman will send a letter of appreciation to Drs. Brady, Darling and Allison for their valuable contributions to IARCs.

(vi) The Chairman will *send* a condolence message to the family of Drs Sterling Wortman and J. D. Drilon.

(vii) IFPRI will organize a picnic luncheon in *advance* of the Centers Week on 8 November, 1981. 

(viii) The next **meeting** of the Center Directors will be at Washington, D.C. on 5-6 November, 1981 with 7 November reserved (if needed) for in-depth discussions on the CGIAR review.

(ix) The next Annual Meeting of Center Directors will be at CIMMYT; tentatively **scheduled** for 19 June, 1982. The Chairman was *asked* to request TAC to timetable TAC sessions starting 21 June, 1982 and to **adhere** to the earlier **agreed** principle of completing the discussions with Directors within one week. 

(x) Dr. Selleck **invited** the Center Directors to hold their Annual Meeting (1983) at AVRDC. Directors welcomed this invitation, but the venue has to be cleared with TAC since the meetings will run concurrently with TAC meeting.