

J.T.W.

REPORT OF THE
EXTRA - ORDINARY MEETING
OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

Held in Geneva
14 - 16 June 1982

FAO/UNDP EUROPEAN COOPERATIVE PROGRAMME
FOR CONSERVATION AND EXCHANGE
OF CROP GENETIC RESOURCES



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS



UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

RER/80/005
GB82/Extra
Meeting Report

FAO/UNDP EUROPEAN COOPERATIVE PROGRAMME
FOR
CONSERVATION AND EXCHANGE OF CROP GENETIC RESOURCES

REPORT OF
EXTRA-ORDINARY MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
Geneva, 14-16 June 1982

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Geneva, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ADDRESSES OF WELCOME	1
III. ITEMS OF INFORMATION	2
IV. ADOPTION OF AGENDA	3
V. REPORT OF THE EVALUATION MISSION	3
VI. DISCUSSION REGARDING CLOSER COOPERATION BETWEEN ECP/GR AND THE IBPGR	6
VII. REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC)	8
VIII. BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR PHASE II	9
IX. RECOMMENDATIONS	9
X. CLOSURE	10

APPENDICES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>APPENDIX I</u> : Participants and Observers	11
<u>APPENDIX II</u> : Address of Welcome by Mr. P. Bourgois, Assistant Administrator and Director of the UNDP European Office	15
<u>APPENDIX III</u> : Address of Welcome by Dr. A. de Fauconval, Representative of FAO	18
<u>APPENDIX IV</u> : Agenda	21
<u>APPENDIX V</u> : Statement by Professor L. Kähre, Chairman of the IBPGR	22
<u>APPENDIX VI</u> : Report of the Second Meeting of the ECP/GR Scientific Advisory Committee, held at the Cereal Institute, Thessaloniki-Greece, 26-28 April 1982	24
<u>APPENDIX VII</u> : ECP Cash Budget Expenses in Phase II	28

I. INTRODUCTION

The Extra-Ordinary Meeting of the FAO/UNDP European Cooperative Programme for the Conservation and Exchange of Crop Genetic Resources was held in Conference Room B of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) on June 14-16, 1982. A list of those who were present is given in Appendix I.

The Meeting was opened by the Chairman of the Governing Board, Mr. M. Pencic, Yugoslavia, who welcomed the representatives of member countries, observers and others, and reminded them of the purpose of the Meeting. It was to obtain views about the organizational structure of Phase II of ECP/GR in the event of a decision being taken to extend the project, its budget and the best way in which costs could be met. The views of the Meeting would be the basis for final decisions at the 3rd Meeting of the Governing Board to be held in Brussels on 18-19 October 1982.

II. ADDRESSES OF WELCOME

In his address of welcome (Appendix II), Mr. P. Bourgois, UNDP representative, said he thought that delegates would wish to bear in mind that the objective of ECP/GR is a self-sustaining programme which implies that a budget is both adequate and manageable. Various methods were possible of which cost-sharing was the most straightforward. He reminded the Meeting that cost-sharing budgets and payments schedules for UNDP-assisted projects must be established in UNDP's accounting unit which is a US dollar equivalent. UNDP would be unable to agree to other arrangements for cost-sharing which would create currency management problems and an administrative burden out of proportion to the magnitude of the budget.

As regards institutional arrangements, he thought that if the Meeting agreed with the proposal to have Phase II associated with the IBPGR, delegates might wish to consider along with other proposals, the possibility of the transitional arrangements beginning immediately, with the IBPGR assuming full responsibility from the outset of Phase II - should funding be assured - in January 1983.

Mr. A. de Fauconval welcomed delegates on behalf of the Director-General of FAO. He too spoke of the issues that had to be discussed and said that FAO would do all that it could to see that the wishes of Governments as reflected through decisions of the Governing Board of the ECP/GR are met as fully as possible (Appendix III).

Speaking on behalf of the IBPGR, its Chairman, Mr. L. Kähre said that the Board was ready to cooperate with all countries and all organizations concerned with plant genetic resources. It would willingly accept responsibility for ECP/GR though separate funding would be necessary. The project would continue the Board's association with European programmes to which it had been giving both financial and technical support especially in IPF countries.

Mr. Kähre expanded on the subject of cooperation between IBPGR and Phase II of the ECP/GR when he spoke to item 4 of the agenda (Appendix V).

III. ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Following the addresses of welcome, Mr. de Bakker informed the Meeting of several letters that had been received giving Government views as follows:

- Austria: agreed in principle to join Phase II;
- Belgium: interested in the objectives of ECP/GR but not yet ready to join Phase II;
- German Democratic Republic: finance was a problem; a decision would be based on the findings of the Extra-Ordinary Meeting;
- Norway: a statement that it would be represented by Mr. Kähre.

A personal statement had been received from Mr. Skov (Vice-Chairman, Denmark). He agreed with the recommendations made by the Evaluation Mission, was in favour of locating the ECP/GR administration at Nyon and trusted that the Meeting would reach a decision about funding Phase II.

Mr. de Bakker informed the Meeting that Czechoslovakia had signed the Project Document.

Mr. Mota (Portugal) informed the Meeting that his Government would await the findings of the Extra-Ordinary Meeting of the Board before making a decision whether or not to participate in Phase II of the project.

Mr. Kramski (Poland) expressed the hope that other countries would follow Poland in trying to pay at least the first year contribution to Phase II in convertible currency.

IV. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The proposed agenda was adopted (Appendix IV). The Chairman then invited discussion on the first item.

V. REPORT OF THE EVALUATION MISSION*

This was taken page by page and in general was well received by the Meeting. Three typographical errors were noted:

- page 6
last paragraph: after "collecting expeditions" insert
"seed storage facilities"
- page 14 5.1: change "meetings of the Advisory Committee"
to "meetings of the Intergovernmental and
Executive Committees"
- page 16 6.3
line 11 to read: "should advise the IBPGR and Governments".

* Distributed with the letter of invitation to the Extra-Ordinary Meeting of the Governing Board.

The following are the main points that were raised during the lengthy discussion of the Report:

Mr. Porceddu (Italy) feared that too close a link with plant breeders might lead to an emphasis on breeding lines and neglect of wild species and other accessions of no immediate breeding value (p.6 of the Report). This view was supported by Ms. Skorda (Greece) who said that genebanks were established to save material for future generations not just for short term purposes.

Messrs. Lamberts (Netherlands) and Williams (FAO) thought that the participation of plant breeders in evaluation studies was essential both to get the work done and to benefit from their expertise.

Mr. Dambroth (Federal Republic of Germany) regarded "characterization" as a genebank activity whereas evaluation was the start of breeding. Mr. Kähre stated that this procedure was agreed IBPGR policy. Mr. Dambroth further thought that Working Groups should be for categories of crops (e.g. cereals, industrial crops) not specific crops.

Ms. Waldman (Israel) drew the attention of the Meeting to the need of financial support for pre-breeding.

When the Mission's recommendations were considered (p.6, 6.3), the Meeting agreed with and accepted the first four; namely that:

- (i) ECP/GR should be extended into a Phase II
- (ii) Phase II should be under the aegis of the IBPGR
- (iii) a full time Executive Secretary should not be appointed; the office should be merged with that of the Executive Secretary of the IBPGR
- (iv) an Intergovernmental Committee should replace the present Governing Board

The fifth one, that the Advisory Committee should be disbanded, led to considerable discussions. The work of the Committee was appreciated but on balance, the majority of delegates accepted the recommendation that the Committee would not be required in Phase II.

Mr. Williams (FAO) informed the Meeting that if the project passed to the IBPGR the link with the EUCARPIA Gene Bank Committee would be retained as the Executive Secretary of the IBPGR was an ex officio member of the Committee. He also informed the Meeting that the IBPGR had several specialist advisory committees and a number of senior advisors.

Mr. Jenkins (United Kingdom) spoke well of the Evaluation Report and endorsed Mr. Williams' views.

Mr. Veyrat (Spain) congratulated the Mission on its Report and echoed Mr. Jenkins' sentiments in full.

Mr. de Fauconval said that FAO accepted the recommendations of the Evaluation Mission believing that they reflected the wishes of the majority of country representatives and pointed the best way towards the development of Phase II.

Mr. Kähre said that the Nordic Group of countries had studied the Report and thought it was excellent.

Mr. Jördens (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he was grateful to have the opportunity of saying that he thought it was a clear and concise Report that would very much help his Government to consider cooperation with the ECP/GR in Phase II. It reflected his Government's wishes for the project to be related to the IBPGR, to have a simple structure and to concentrate on a few well chosen activities.

Concerning the Evaluation Mission's recommendation that Working Groups should form the framework for Phase II detailed discussion was delayed until the next day's Meeting, although the recommendation was accepted in principle.

In view of the recommendation in the Evaluation Mission Report that the IBPGR should operate Phase II and the acknowledged difficulty in accommodation at FAO Headquarters, Mr. Ingold (Switzerland) asked if there was any further information available. He reminded the Meeting that the offer of accommodation by Switzerland for the European Officer of the project was still open.

Mr. Williams said that in view of the discussion it was apparent that there would be the need for an officer to deal with the day-to-day running of the project coupled with the active collaboration of specialists in the Executive Secretariat. The question of accommodation was under review.

VI. DISCUSSIONS REGARDING CLOSER COOPERATION BETWEEN
ECP/GR AND THE IBPGR

Mr. Kähre welcomed the opportunity to explain that the discussions on the above subject took place at the Annual Meeting of the IBPGR held on 16-19 February in FAO Headquarters. They are summarized in Appendix V. He said that the IBPGR wishes to work with all countries in which there are genetic resources programmes. The IBPGR also currently provides technical assistance to IPF countries of Europe (ca. \$200,000 per annum) and if it takes over executing responsibility for the ECP/GR, will continue to provide such additional funds.

In the ensuing discussion, it was evident that delegates wished to know whether administrative arrangements could be completed in time to allow the IBPGR to take over the project by 1 January.

In answer to such queries, Messrs. de Fauconval and Williams said they did not foresee any difficulties in meeting the deadline if such it was.

Mr. Jenkins (United Kingdom) said that his Government would like to see a particular staff member within the IBPGR delegated as from 1 January to be responsible for the ECP/GR programme, to ensure that its identity was retained. Ms. Waldman (Israel) supported this view.

Mr. Painter speaking for the UNDP hoped that the Meeting would make recommendations regarding a 'transitional' phase. Institutional arrangements for Phase II would depend on adequate funding and country participation.

The Chairman asked delegates to state as far as possible the views of their respective Governments. In summary all Governments agreed that the IBPGR should assume operating responsibility for Phase II from 1 January 1983 without a transitional period of the type considered in GB82Extra/WP2.

The following gave preliminary pledges to contribute funds:

Bulgaria
Cyprus
Finland
Federal Republic of Germany (subject to clear description of the relationship of the parties involved and to Treasury approval)
Greece
Hungary
Netherlands
Poland
Sweden
USSR
United Kingdom (subject to Treasury approval)
Yugoslavia

The following countries gave preliminary pledges to contribute in Phase II on condition that the majority of countries participated viz.:

Italy
Spain
Switzerland

Delegates of the following countries agreed to recommend to their Government participation in Phase II:

Denmark (information by letter)
Iceland (through the delegate for Sweden)
Israel
Norway (through the delegate for Sweden)
Portugal

The delegates of Czechoslovakia (Mr. J. Kalavsky) and Turkey (Mr. B. Cankorel) who attended the Meeting as observers, said that they had not been authorized to make any commitments.

The question of payment in national currencies was raised. The USSR delegate (Mr. Shumaev) said that his Government would contribute to Phase II in roubles if it participated in the project, while the delegate from Portugal (Mr. Mota) said that his Government would wish to pay in escudos, a convertible currency.

Mr. Kostov (Bulgaria) and Mr. Varkonyi (Hungary) thought that difficulties would arise if their Governments have to pay in convertible currency.

Mr. Jakubiec (Poland) also was of this opinion, although his Government would endeavour to pay the first year's contribution to Phase II in a convertible currency.

Mr. Lamberts (Netherlands) informed the Meeting that his Government would pay 10% above its formal contribution in the event of a shortfall in contributions.

Mr. Lamberts also said that his Government favoured a programme based on Working Groups of which the maximum number should be six initially. As regards the location of an IBPGR European Officer, his Government favoured Geneva but could accept Rome.

Mr. Kähre thanked the Meeting for the confidence it had shown in the IBPGR by deciding unanimously to transfer the project to the Secretariat of the IBPGR. The Board would do its utmost to meet the wishes of Governments and would maintain the identity of the ECP/GR.

VII. REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC)

Mr. Lamberts, member of SAC, introduced the report (Appendix VI). In essence this report using seven criteria, defines the crops to be given priorities in Europe. From these, in order of priority, a selection was made of those that should be the subjects of Working Groups in Phase II. This took into account past and present activities of organizations in Europe concerned with crop genetic resources.

The report also made a series of recommendations with particular emphasis on characterization and data management, as requested by the Governing Board.

There was general agreement that the Working Groups of Phase I should continue in the belief that soon they would be able to operate without special support from the ECP/GR though the project would wish to be kept informed of progress.

As regards Working Groups for Phase II, it was decided after prolonged discussion that the SAC report should be endorsed and used as the basis for a plan of operation that would clearly define terms of reference for Working Groups considering specific crops and groups of crops and the responsibilities and obligations of Governments.

VIII. BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR PHASE II

The proposed budget together with the proposed contributions of countries weighted according to the UNO contribution scale and expressed in US dollars is given in Appendix VII; the proposed contributions are shown in Table II.

The budget proposal was seen to be in line with recommendations of the Evaluation Mission. It was accepted in principle by the Meeting and would be used in the preparation of plan-of-operation for Phase II.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Meeting recommends that the Report of the Evaluation Mission be adopted and implemented;

It recommends that the ECP/GR should be continued for a Phase II, 1983-1985, and that the programme should be operated under the aegis of the IBPGR as a special project with its own identity and funding.

The Meeting further recommends that the merger should be effective from 1 January 1983 and that Phase II should be based on plans for the institutional arrangements of Working Groups and their terms of reference to be submitted to the Third Meeting of the Governing Board due to be held in Brussels on 18-19 October 1982.

It was agreed that a draft Project Document will be prepared by a small working group composed of representatives of UNDP, FAO and IBPGR, which would be circulated to Governments at least one month before the October Meeting of the Governing Board.

X. CLOSURE

The Board read the draft report of the Meeting. It was adopted subject to the incorporation of the amendments and corrections that were raised during discussion.

The Chairman thanked delegates for their active participation and then declared the Meeting closed.

APPENDIX I

PARTICIPANTS

1. MEMBERS

1.1 Country members:

BULGARIA

Mr. L. DJILIANOV
Permanent Representative
of Bulgaria to FAO, Rome
Embassy of Bulgaria
Via Rubens, 21
00197 ROME

Prof. Dr. K. KOSTOV
Director
Institute of Plant Introduction
and Genetic Resources
'K Malkov'
L. Dimitrova 42
BG-4122 SADOVO, PLOVDIV

CYPRUS

Dr. V.D. KRENTOS
Director
Agricultural Research Institute
Ministry of Agriculture and
Natural Resources
NICOSIA

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. J. KALAVSKY
Third Secretary
Permanent Mission of the
Czechoslovak Socialist Republic
to the United Nations Office
in Geneva

FINLAND

Prof. Dr. K.R. MANNER
Director
Governmental Institute of
Plant Breeding
SF-31600 JOKIOINEN

GREECE

Dr. E. SKORDA
Deputy Director
Cereal Institute
THESSALONIKI

HUNGARY

Dr. P. VARKONYI
Secretary of the Permanent Mission
of the Hungarian People's Republic
to the Office of the United Nations
in Geneva

ISRAEL

Dr. M. WALDMAN
National Council for Research and
Development, Building III
Kiriath Ben-Gurion
JERUSALEM

Mr. M. SHATON
First Secretary
Permanent Mission of Israel
to the United Nations Office
in Geneva

ITALY

Prof. E. PORCEDDU
Director
Germplasm Institute
Via G. Amendola 165/A
I-70126 BARI

NETHERLANDS

Dr. H. LAMBERTS
Director
Foundation for Agricultural
Plant Breeding
P.O.Box 117
6700 AC WAGENINGEN

POLAND

Prof. Dr. Z. GERTYCH
First Deputy, Scientific Secretary
of Agriculture and Forestry Sciences
Polish Academy of Sciences
OO-901 WARSAW PhiN 2101

Dr. J. JAKUBIEC
Deputy Director of I.H.A.R.
Plant Breeding and
Acclimatization Institute
05-870 Blonie
RADZIKOW, K/WARSAW

Dr. B. KRAMSKI
Director
FAO/UNDP Agriculture Programme
ul. Wspolna 30
OO-950 WARSAW

PORTUGAL

Dr. M. MOTA
National Coordinator
Department of Genetics
Estação Agronómica Nacional
2780 OETRAS

SPAIN

Dr. P. VEYRAT
Director, Coordinacion y Programas
Instituto Nacional de
Investigaciones Agrarias, INIA
José Abascar, 56
MADRID 3

SPAIN cont.

Dr. J.M. BOLIVAR
Deputy Coordinator of
Genetic Resources
Instituto Nacional de
Investigaciones Agrarias, INIA
José Abascar, 56
MADRID 3

Dr. J.R. PRIETO
Counsellor Agriculture Affairs
Permanent Mission of Spain to
the United Nations Office in
Geneva

SWEDEN

Prof. L. KÄHRE
Director
Swedish State Seed Testing and
Certification Institute
S-17173 SOLNA

- representing also DENMARK,
ICELAND and NORWAY -

SWITZERLAND

Dr. M. INGOLD
Deputy Director
Station fédérale de recherches
agronomiques de Changins
CH-1260 NYON

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. G. JENKINS
Scientific Adviser
Agricultural Research Council (ARC)
160 Great Portland Street
LONDON WIN 6DT

YUGOSLAVIA

Dr. M. PENCIC
Director, Development and Research
Maize Research Institute
Zemun - 11081 BELGRADE

1.2 Ex officio members:

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Dr. A. DE FAUCONVAL
Deputy Director
Agriculture Operations Division
FAO Headquarters
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 ROME

Dr. J.T. WILLIAMS
Chief Crop Genetic Resources Centre
and Executive Secretary of
International Board for Plant
Genetic Resources (IBPGR)
FAO Headquarters
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 ROME

Dr. K.S. DODDS
Senior Consultant to FAO
FAO Headquarters
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 ROME

Dr. G. DE BAKKER
Executive Secretary
ECP for Conservation and Exchange
of Crop Genetic Resources
UNDP Headquarters
Palais des Nations
1211 GENEVA 10

UNITED NATIONS
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Mr. P. BOURGOIS
Assistant Administrator and Director
UNDP European Office
GENEVA

Mr. T. PAINTER
Deputy Director
UNDP European Office
GENEVA

Mr. R. ISSINSKI
Chief, Programme Section
UNDP European Office
GENEVA

2. OBSERVERS

2.1 Permanent observers:

IBPGR MEDITERRANEAN PROGRAMME

Prof. E. PORCEDDU
Chairman of the IBPGR Mediterranean
Germplasm Programme
Germplasm Institute
I-70162 BARI, Italy

IBPGR

Prof. L. KÄHRE
Chairman, International Board for
Plant Genetic Resources
FAO Headquarters, ROME

2.2 Ad hoc observers:

GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF

Prof. Dr. M. DAMBROTH
Director
Institut für Pflanzenbau und Pflanzen-
züchtung der Bundesforschungsanstalt
für Landwirtschaft
Braunschweig-Völkenrode (FAL)
Bundesallee 50
D-3300 BRAUNSCHWEIG

Dr. R. JÖRDENS
Regierungsrat
Bundesministerium für Ernährung,
Landwirtschaft und Forsten
Postfach 14 02 70
D-5300 BONN 1

TURKEY

Mr. B. CANKOREL
Counsellor
Permanent Mission of Turkey to
the United Nations Office in
Geneva

UNION OF SOVIET
SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. M. A. SHUMAEV
Head of the Department for
Technical Assistance through
the U.N. State Committee for
External Economic Relations
of the USSR
Ovtchinnikovskaya Naberezhnaya 18/1
MOSCOW J-324

EUCARPIA

Dr. H. LAMBERTS
Chairman of EUCARPIA
Foundation for Agricultural
Plant Breeding
WAGENINGEN

UPOV

Dr. H. MAST
Vice Secretary-General of the
International Union for the
Protection of New Varieties of Plants
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 GENEVA 20

Mr. A. HEITZ
Administrative and technical
assistant of the
International Union for the
Protection of New Varieties of Plants
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 GENEVA 20

APPENDIX II

ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY MR. P. BOURGOIS,
ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR AND DIRECTOR
OF THE UNDP EUROPEAN OFFICE

Mr. Chairman,

The European Cooperative Programme for the Conservation and Exchange of Crop Genetic Resources is one to which the United Nations Development Programme has attached great importance, both for its intrinsic value in the critical area of food production and as a channel for contacts and exchange of views between countries and groups of countries. I am glad, therefore, to have the opportunity of addressing your important meeting on behalf of UNDP.

The importance of the ECP/GR has been amply demonstrated by the high scientific level of participation from the countries of the region; in welcoming today the distinguished delegates, I note with satisfaction that this is once again the case, a fact which augurs well for the success of this meeting.

The commitment of FAO, as Executing Agency for UNDP, has been another important factor in the development of the programme, and I am happy to welcome to Geneva once again our colleagues from FAO.

I also welcome the presence of the Chairman and the Executive Secretary of the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources, a body with which UNDP is already associated through the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research.

It will be recalled that the decision to hold this Extra-Ordinary Meeting of the Governing Board of the ECP/GR was taken during the Second Annual Board Meeting last December. It was anticipated that by the time of the Extra-Ordinary Meeting (and I quote): "Discussions could have been held at a national level about financial contributions and the report of the Evaluation Mission would be available. With such information it should then be possible to reach a decision about the funding of Phase II."

The Evaluation Mission has aptly commented in its report that the success of a programme of this nature depends basically on the willingness of participating countries to cooperate among themselves, and that decisions to exchange genetic resources and information on genetic resources can only be taken by those responsible for the individual gene banks. The rôle of organizations such as UNDP is only to encourage such cooperation and help create conditions which will facilitate exchanges.

The ECP/GR has now been in operation with UNDP inputs since 1980. From the outset, it was foreseen that this First Phase, in which all cash support derives from UNDP, and which will end in December of this year,

would be followed by a Phase II, involving Government participation in the costs of the programme, and which would in turn lead to a situation where the programme was satisfactorily consolidated as an ongoing activity receiving all its support from participating countries, and in which no further UNDP assistance would be required.

With this overall concept in mind, the Mission's recommendations were in essence that:

- the ECP/GR should be extended into a Second Phase;
- Phase II should be executed under the aegis of the IBPGR, but should be separately financed;
- the institutional arrangements for Phase II should be simplified, and the costs of management reduced, with the functions of Executive Secretary of ECP/GR being assumed by the Executive Secretary of IBPGR, the present Governing Board of ECP/GR being replaced by an Inter-Governmental Committee for the European Programme to advise the IBPGR, and the present Scientific Committee of the ECP/GR being disbanded;
- the backbone of the Phase II work programme should be Crop Working Groups, which should be limited initially to six selected crops;
- balanced participation from all four groups of countries in the region, including contributions to the costs of the programme, were essential for the success of Phase II.

With this background, UNDP hopes that this distinguished gathering will be able to address itself to two points fundamental to the successful implementation of Phase II, beginning January 1982, and which are reviewed in the report of the Evaluation Mission - that is, the funding of Phase II, and the institutional arrangements for a cost-effective programme, both of which points are addressed in the report of the Evaluation Mission.

Firstly, we hope significant progress can be made in defining arrangements to fund the continuation of the programme. UNDP stands ready to share with participating countries the cost for the Second phase beginning in January, within the concepts I have mentioned earlier. Delegates will no doubt wish to bear in mind that the objective is a self-sustaining programme, which implies a budget which is both adequate and manageable. It may be possible to achieve this by one or more methods, or combinations of methods. Cost-sharing has been mentioned as the most straight-forward means, and this is probably still the case. Nevertheless, I understand that the matter of currency has been mentioned as an issue to be defined. While noting what has been discussed in earlier meetings, I must recall, Mr. Chairman, that cost-sharing budgets and payments schedules for UNDP-assisted projects must be established in UNDP's accounting unit, which is a US dollar equivalent. UNDP would be unable to agree to other arrangements for cost-sharing, which would create currency management problems and an administrative burden out of proportion to the magnitude of the budget.

Secondly, regarding institutional arrangements, the Mission has endorsed a proposal, which we understand to have been widely discussed during and after the December meeting and which appears to enjoy a wide measure of support, that is, the merging of the Secretariat of the ECP/GR with that of the IBPGR. Should this proposal enjoy final endorsement by this Extra-Ordinary Meeting, and provided, of course, it is acceptable to the IBPGR itself, the meeting will, no doubt, wish to consider what transitional arrangements are necessary. The Secretariat of the ECP/GR has already proposed some alternatives, which are contained in GB82 Extra/WP2. In the event of there being agreement to transfer responsibility to IBPGR, and since the current phase of the project, will, in any case, end in December of this year, you may wish to take into consideration, as well as the two alternatives proposed by the Secretariat of ECP/GR in GB82 Extra /WP2, a third - that is, transitional arrangements beginning immediately, with IBPGR assuming full responsibility from the outset of Phase II - should funding be assured - in January 1983.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate UNDP's support for the programme, and our confidence that this Extra-Ordinary Meeting will produce decisions regarding the scope, funding and institutional arrangements for Phase II, which will enable the Project Document to be prepared in time for approval by the Annual Meeting of the Governing Board in mid-October, and for Phase II operations to continue uninterrupted from January 1983.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, many thanks.

APPENDIX III

ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY DR. A. DE FAUCONVAL,
REPRESENTATIVE OF FAO

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Representative of UNDP, Mr. Chairman of the IBPGR,
Delegates and Colleagues,

Once again I have the pleasure and privilege of welcoming you on behalf of the Director-General of FAO to this Extra-Ordinary Meeting of the Governing Board of the European Cooperative Programme for the Conservation and Exchange of Crop Genetic Resources.

Straight away I am going to use this opportunity to assure the Meeting that FAO is as strongly committed as ever to making a success of the ECP/GR and giving its full and willing support to its activities.

Let me remind you, first, of the situation that was left after last December's Meeting of the Board.

I think it is fair to say that, at least, we did agree that the results so far justify a Second Phase of the project if that can be arranged. But there were several problems left unresolved.

Concerning membership and costs of the project:

- several countries have sent observers to our previous meetings but have not yet decided whether or not to join the project;
- a number of countries are unable to pay a share of project costs in convertible currency and some have reservations about doing so;
- no decision has been taken on how to share costs between participating countries;

And finally, concerning administration:

- bearing in mind that the Board was unanimously in favour of asking IBPGR whether it would be willing to consider ways and means of having closer collaboration between the ECP/GR and the IBPGR, a decision on this issue has to be reached.

We look to this Meeting, of course, to clear up these various matters.

At this juncture, I am not going to say anything about the problem of cost-sharing. Obviously, it will be discussed fully during the course of the Meeting.

As regards the possibility that the day-to-day management of the project may be undertaken by the IBPGR if a Phase II is arranged, this also will be discussed.

Whatever decision is taken during the course of this Meeting, FAO will continue to do all it can to see that the wishes of Governments as reflected through the decisions of the Governing Board of the ECP/GR, are met as completely as possible.

We at FAO will still have very direct links with the project. The Secretariat of the IBPGR is within FAO and Dr. Williams, its Executive Chief, is also Chief of the Crop Genetic Resources Centre of FAO.

I am sure that Dr. Kähre, the Chairman of the IBPGR, also here on the platform, will agree wholeheartedly with me when I say that FAO and the IBPGR are ready to serve the project as best they can and we members of them are equally anxious to encourage an awareness of the value of crop genetic resources and to promote their use for the improvement of our crop plants.

Turning now to another item on the agenda - the Report of the Evaluation Mission. It is tabled for your consideration.

The main recommendations in the Report are:

- that the ECP/GR should be extended into a Phase II, possibly associated with IBPGR;
- that emphasis in Phase II should be on practical achievements; they are to be dealt with by Working Groups dealing with a few carefully selected crops.

Unfortunately, the financial contribution from the UNDP will not be as high as we might have wished. Financial stringency has become the rule these days. Nevertheless, we must try to develop an effective programme even though our financial resources are limited.

Finally, in concluding, I must mention the obvious. As you see, Dr. G. de Bakker is here on the platform occupying the place reserved for the Executive Secretary to the Board.

Dr. de Bakker's appointment ended last December and since then he has carried out the duties of the post on a part-time basis. That we have not gone ahead with the appointment of someone to replace him is in line with the findings of the Evaluation Mission.

As you will see, the Mission has recommended possible changes in the administration of the project in the event of a close link with the IBPGR. In other words, the necessary administrative arrangements are being made so that the decisions that will be taken at this Meeting can be implemented straightforwardly and without problems.

Thank you.

APPENDIX IV

A G E N D A

Monday, 14 June 1982

14.30

- I Opening and Welcome
- II Adoption of Agenda
- III Report of Evaluation Mission

Tuesday, 15 June 1982

9.30

- IV Report on discussions regarding closer cooperation between ECP/GR and IBPGR, held during annual meeting of IBPGR in Rome, 16-19 February 1982
- V Report of the third meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee held at Thessaloniki, Greece, on 28 April 1982
- VI Budget Proposal for Phase II (1983-1985)
- VII Recommendations to Governments and UNDP regarding continuation of Programme into Phase II

Afternoon

Free for report writing

Wednesday, 16 June 1982

9.30

- VIII Adoption of Report
- IX Closure

APPENDIX V

STATEMENT BY PROFESSOR DR. L. KÄHRE, CHAIRMAN OF THE IBPGR

Mr. Chairman, friends and colleagues,

I welcome this opportunity of speaking to you on behalf of the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources. You will recall that at your last Governing Board meeting in December 1981, you, as representatives of countries, requested the views of my Board concerning a much closer collaboration and possible integration.

If I may digress Mr. Chairman, for a few minutes, I would like to explain the present relationships and then go on to provide a summary of the IBPGR's discussions in February 1982. To the present, there has been a close contact between the ECP and the IBPGR, largely in the person of Dr. Williams who is the Executive Secretary of the IBPGR, and who as the Chief of the Crop Genetic Resources Centre of FAO provides the technical backstopping for FAO-operated projects on genetic resources. The IBPGR has also attended the meetings of the ECP; you will also recall that one of the major sub-regional programmes of the ECP is a purely IBPGR programme, that is the Mediterranean programme.

From the discussions at recent Governing Board meetings, it has become clear that Governments have feared duplication of efforts when different organizations, however closely related, are working in the same region. It has also been apparent that rather much of the action reported at the Governing Board meetings of the ECP has been IBPGR activities. To give you some examples, the IBPGR has paid for the establishment of gene banks in Cyprus, Greece, Portugal and Spain, it has funded numerous collecting missions, it has assisted several countries in implementing computerized documentation systems and these activities have been largely in the IPF countries as direct technical assistance.

The IBPGR has been established with a world mandate to see that crop genetic resources are collected, conserved and used by plant breeders and other plant scientists. The Board, at its meeting in February 1982, made it quite clear that this mandate is interpreted so that the Board will, as far as possible, link with any genetic resources activities wherever these are taking place in the world. Most of the core funds of the IBPGR come from Ministries of Development so that the Board uses most of its funding in IPF countries. The IBPGR is not solely an agency for technical economical assistance, although it does have funds to be used to stimulate programmes as and where these are feasible. It will continue to do so but this does not preclude us working with efforts in North America or in Europe where a number of our technical meetings are held and where we must be aware of all the activities so that we can mobilize the transfer of technology.

The IBPGR has stated clearly that it is willing to take over the ECP and this would be carried out as a special project so that our donors would not be afraid that we might be spending too much money in the developed world. The IBPGR would establish a separate fund for Phase II of the project to include Government contributions and UNDP counterpart funding. The IBPGR would, of course, continue to provide a certain amount of additional technical assistance from core funds to certain European countries and to give you some idea of the present input, this is approximately \$ 200,000 per annum.

The Executive Secretary informs me, and the Evaluation Report also hints, that some of the European countries have expressed the wish that the ECP does not lose its identity. The IBPGR is aware of these feelings and if it operates the ECP from 1 January 1983, if not earlier, would be careful that the identity would be maintained. If the IBPGR Secretariat takes over the programme then several of its specialist technical officers would be involved in different aspects of the European work.

It is apparent that what has motivated much of the thinking behind the proposed change-over is the need not to duplicate activities and to streamline the administrative costs. Reduction in the administrative costs must be dear to the hearts of all the participating Governments in the present economic climate. The IBPGR is convinced that the recommendations of the Evaluation Mission for the programme to be taken over by the IBPGR will result in such streamlining and not least, certain savings which the UNDP has requested.

Lastly, I should also mention that many of the donors of the IBPGR are member countries of this programme. The IBPGR is anxious that Governments realize that the continuation of the ECP requires an additional sum of money specifically for the work in Europe. As always, the IBPGR, as a custodian of public money, wishes funds to be expended to lead to positive practical work and enhanced cooperation. The IBPGR, through its operations works for progress and maximum cooperation between countries and political alliances. It is a neutral organization and sees this as a mechanism to ensure that crop germplasm is readily available for breeders wherever they are so that the use of this material will lead to the betterment of man's welfare.

The IBPGR stands ready to take the responsibilities which you might wish to accord it.

APPENDIX VI

REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE
ECP/GR SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE, HELD AT
THE CEREAL INSTITUTE, THESSALONIKI, GREECE, 26-28 APRIL 1982

1. The following members attended:
Messrs. J.G. Hawkes (U.K.) (Chairman), A.F. Merezhko (USSR), J. Unk (Hungary), M. Mota (Portugal), H. Lamberts (Netherlands), L. Navarro (Spain), S. Blixt (Sweden).
Apologies for absence were received from Messrs. S. Ellerström (Sweden), M. Rives (France), G.T. Scarascia-Mugnozza (Italy), C. Lehmann (GDR), J. Szyrmer (Poland) (but represented by Mr. J. Jakubiec) and L. Kähre (Sweden) (but represented by Mr. J.T. Williams). In addition Messrs. G. de Bakker (ECP/GR) and J.T. Williams (FAO and IBPGR) attended.
2. The committee was welcomed by the Chairman and the provisional agenda was adopted. On behalf of FAO, Mr. Williams outlined the principal conclusions of the UNDP/FAO ECP/GR Country Evaluation Mission which had taken place in March 1982. This statement was unofficial because the report had not finally been accepted by FAO and the Governing Board. In essence it is recommended that the programme should continue but in a modified form, possibly under the umbrella of the IBPGR and at a lower budget level. The organization would be based on a number of Crop Working Groups, which if they include sufficient scientific expertise, would mean the disbanding of the SAC. Budgetary restraints could further mean that the number of Crop Working Groups would possibly be limited to six.

Recommendations for new activities for implementation
in Phase II:

Working Groups on Selected Crops

3. In order to produce a plan for the selection of the working groups, backed by scientific considerations, the SAC identified a number of criteria viz:
 1. Whether the crop is indigenous within a sub-region
 2. Whether there is significant secondary diversity
 3. Whether extant collections contain representative material
 4. Importance to breeders
 5. Degree of economic importance for the country
 6. Evaluation needs
 7. Special value to certain countries

4. Priority crops were identified within the following sub-regions: (a) COMECON, (b) Nordic, (c) Mediterranean, (d) EEC. The COMECON region was subdivided into north and south. Those of highest priorities within the sub-regions were listed, including certain minor crops. Those crops which rated priority in all sub-regions were listed as first priority crops for genetic resources work in Europe; those which rated priority in three sub-regions were listed as second priority crops in Europe; and those which rated priority in two sub-regions were listed as third priority crops for Europe. They are listed below:

<u>Priority 1</u>	<u>Priority 2</u>	<u>Priority 3</u>
Barley	Wheat	Tomato
Forages	<u>Vitis</u>	<u>Allium</u>
<u>Prunus</u>	Maize	Beet
	Aromatic and	Potato
	Medicinal Plants	<u>Pisum</u>
	<u>Brassica</u>	
		Rye
		<u>Vicia faba</u>
		Oat
		<u>Capsicum</u>

5. The SAC considered ongoing working parties and activities; in particular those of EUCARPIA, COMECON, IBPGR, ECP/GR in Phase I and the EEC. Where a crop was considered to be adequately covered by these activities the SAC agreed there was no need for a Crop Working Group in Phase II of ECP/GR, e.g. for wheat, maize, Brassica, tomato and Capsicum. Allium was considered to be only partly covered.
6. A number of crops which are important but have only restricted distribution were identified viz: cotton, tobacco, Citrus and sunflower. The SAC agreed that these rated special interest in view of their production by some countries and their importance to others.
7. For Phase II the SAC agreed to recommend the following Working Groups:
- Priority 1 : Barley, forages, Prunus
Priority 2 : Vitis, aromatic and medicinal plants, beet, potato, Pisum
Priority 3 : Rye, oat, Allium
- In addition ad hoc meetings need to be held to advise the ECP on action for the special interest crops in the following order of priority: first: Citrus, second: cotton, third: tobacco and fourth: sunflower.
8. The SAC was aware of other meetings on crops which take place from time to time, and asks the Board to note that ECP/Working Groups can be combined with such meetings, thereby reducing costs.

Collection Missions

9. Collection activities, especially with more than one country participating, should be encouraged and high priority should be given to:
 - aromatic and medicinal plants (new activity)
 - landraces and old cultivars of vegetables (high genetic erosion)
 - certain forage grasses and legumes (high genetic erosion)
 - fruit trees, especially apple, pear, peach, cherry and Citrus (due to be replaced by new varieties)
 - beet (emergency situation)
 - Brassicas (erosion and breeders' needs)
 - wild species of wheat and Aegilops (erosion and breeders' needs)

Characterization and data management

10. Urgent attention should be given to characterization and data management and exchange. In addition, all Working Groups should endeavour to include an expert as member in these matters.

11. Recommendation on Information Management

- a. It is recommended that all genebanks formulate an information structure without delay.
- b. Every effort should be made by genebank managers to obtain minimum computer capacity sufficient to accommodate all records.
- c. High priority should be given to the accession of all relevant data into the computers.
- d. It is recommended that a justification should be made to the genebank managers for each entry before it is accepted.
- e. The formulation of descriptor lists should follow the standard structure recommended by IBPGR. Special emphasis should be placed on passport data.
- f. Genebank managers should be encouraged to enter all relevant information into the computer from the literature and elsewhere, including that concerned with actual genes and alleles.
- g. A small group of experts should be formed to deal with urgent information problems when they arise.
- h. The preparation of an improved second edition of the Directory of Genetic Resources Institutions in Europe should be undertaken without delay.

12. Training and Symposia

- a. Group training is urgently needed in the characterization and handling of genebank material, especially in relation to cross-pollinated crops.
- b. A Workshop on 'Pre-breeding in relation to Genebanks' is considered of very high priority and should be supported in conjunction with that to be held by EUCARPIA in April 1983 in Yugoslavia.
- c. The importance of seed physiology in genebank practice is recognized and the SAC recommended that each genebank should possess a person trained in this discipline. Training is necessary in this field and the contribution of the EUCARPIA/EEC/IBPGR Workshop to be held at Kew, U.K. in July 1982 was welcomed.

13. Research Projects

The SAC asks the Governing Board to stress to member Governments the need for research on in vitro techniques for the long-term genetic conservation of vegetatively propagated crops, and especially fruit trees. It is also urged that the ECP should see that where appropriate technology is available on in vitro techniques for these crops this should be transferred as far as possible to member countries.

14. Contacts with Plant Breeders

The SAC recognized the continuing importance of the EUCARPIA Gene Bank Committee in supporting links between genebanks and plant breeders. ECP Working Groups are recommended to give higher priority than at present to evaluation by breeders and others.

15. Quarantine

Better contacts are urged between genebanks and quarantine officers with a view to developing simplified and safer quarantine methods to speed up genetic resources exchanges.

16. The Chairman thanked the Greek Government and the staff of the Cereal Institute for the generous hospitality offered to the participants.

APPENDIX VII

ECP/GR CASH BUDGET EXPENSES IN PHASE II ESTIMATED IN
US DOLLARS - PER YEAR (1983, 1984, 1985) AND IN TOTAL
FOR PHASE II

During the Second Meeting of the Governing Board of ECP/GR in December 1981, a preliminary budget for Phase II was presented and discussed. Several delegations made reservations regarding several points:

- the budget was deemed to be too high and that ways should be found of reducing it,
- the need was expressed for a much closer relationship between ECP/GR and the IBPGR. An added advantage could be the saving in cost of personnel. The financial contributions of member countries could then be paid to IBPGR, earmarked for the European programme,
- several countries stated that they could only contribute in their own non-convertible currency,
- the proposed classification of countries in one of the five classes, which determines the amount of the contribution to be paid by the individual country, was in certain cases not found acceptable.

Taking into account these views, a new proposal for a cash budget for Phase II has been drafted, (Table I) in which some items are cut, e.g. assuming that the salary of the Executive Secretary could be partly paid from the IBPGR budget item for the Mediterranean Programme.

Also the share of the countries in the contribution has been recalculated. Since it is not known yet, which countries would be participating under the new regime, all European countries are enumerated, using the category system, while the classification of individual countries in five categories has been fixed using their percentage share in the UNO-contribution-scale as a basis (see Table II). If some of the countries listed in this table do not want to participate, the other countries shall have to share the difference because the budget-total remains the same in principle.

The matter of paying in own soft currency, as some countries propose, requires further discussion. Assuming that all countries with soft currency would sign the Project Document for Phase II, about 25% of the country contributions would be received in soft currency. For Phase II this would mean in 1983: 25% of 30% = 7.5% (= \$ 13.125), in 1984: 25% of 50% = 12.5% (= \$ 25.875) and for 1985: 25% of 70% = 17.5% (= \$ 41.825) of the total cash income. The amount of \$ 13.125 in

1983 could perhaps be spent for some items of the budget, e.g. consultant fees, fellowships, travel to and from soft currency countries with own airline, local expenses (hotels etc.) for meetings and symposia. It becomes doubtful, however, whether the much higher amounts of soft currency in 1984 and 1985 could be spent. It might be possible though to spend half of those amounts.

The actual calculations for Table II (the cash income estimate) are based on:

- UNDP and member-countries shall together cover the cash expenses of Phase II of the Programme (\$ 621.000).
- the amount in the foregoing being based on the assumption that the recommendation of the Evaluation Mission is accepted, namely that in Phase II, 6 Crop Working Groups will be functioning, meeting twice in this three-year period. For each additional Working Group the total expenses in Phase II will increase by \$ 50.000.
- that the ratio between the contributions paid by the two contributors shall change during the budget period 1983 - 1985 as follows:

UNDP/Countries	1983:	70/30 = \$ 122.500/52.500
	1984:	50/50 = \$ 103.500/103.500
	1985:	30/70 = \$ 71.700/167.300

Total expenses for three years, to be covered

for UNDP	:	<u>\$ 297.700</u>
for Countries	:	<u>\$ 323.300</u>

The contribution share of participating Governments shall be determined as follows:

the member states shall be divided into four classes, derived from the UNO-contribution scale:

Class I (10 weight-units) (UNO-contribution more than 3%)	-	France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, USSR, United Kingdom (paying each in Phase II US\$ 28.615)
--	---	---

- Class II (4 weight-units)
(UNO-contribution less than 3%
and more than 0,5%)
- Austria, Belgium, Denmark,
German Democratic Republic,
Netherlands, Spain, Sweden,
Switzerland
- (paying each in Phase II
US\$ 11.446)
- Class III (2 weight-units)
(IPF-countries and countries
paying UNO-contribution of
less than 0,5% and more than
0,1%)
- Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia,
Finland, Greece, Hungary,
Ireland, Israel, Norway, Poland,
Portugal, Romania, Turkey,
Yugoslavia
- (paying each in Phase II
US\$ 5,723)
- Class IV (1 weight-unit)
(UNO-contribution less than
0,1%)
- Albania, Cyprus, Iceland,
Luxembourg, Malta
- (paying each in Phase II
US\$ 2.861)

Each participating Government shall contribute in proportion to the number of weight-units of the class to which it belongs.

For each budget-year, the value of the weight-unit of contributions shall be obtained by dividing the total expenditure to be met from the contributions of the participating countries by the total number of weight-units.

The cost-sharing in Phase II between UNDP and the participating Governments (the Contribution Scale) is based upon:

- the budget estimates for 1983, 1984, 1985
- the country classification and weight-units,
based on classes derived from the UNO-contribution scale

Calculations have been made as follows to determine the contribution share for each country and each budget-year:

5 countries in Class I	(weight-unit 10)	5 x 10 = 50
8 countries in Class II	(weight-unit 4)	8 x 4 = 32
13 countries in Class III	(weight-unit 2)	13 x 2 = 26
5 countries in Class IV	(weight-unit 1)	5 x 1 = 5

Total number of weight-units:

113

Total share of budget to be covered by countries (see Table I) is:

in 1983 US\$ 52.500; value of one weight-unit is $\frac{52.500}{113} =$ US\$ 465

in 1984 US\$ 103.500; value of one weight-unit is $\frac{103.500}{113} =$ US\$ 916

in 1985 US\$ 167.300; value of one weight-unit is $\frac{167.300}{113} =$ US\$ 1.480.50

For the result of the calculations, based on the above, see Table II.

Table I

ECP/GR CASH BUDGET EXPENSES ESTIMATED IN US DOLLARS PER YEAR IN PHASE II (1983, 1984, 1985) AND IN TOTAL*

	1983		1984		1985		Total for Phase II	
	M/M	\$	M/M	\$	M/M	\$	M/M	\$
10. <u>Project Personnel</u>								
11.01 Coordinator	4	28,000	4	30,000	4	33,000	12	91,000
11.02 Consultants	5	28,000	5	32,000	5	35,000	15	95,000
11.99 Sub-total	9	56,000	9	62,000	9	68,000	27	186,000
13. Administrative Support		20,000		25,000		30,000		75,000
15. Official Travel		4,000		5,000		6,000		15,000
16. Other costs (inclusive of meeting costs)		25,000		30,000		35,000		90,000
19. Component total		105,000		122,000		139,000		366,000
29. <u>Sub-contracts</u>		-		-		-		-
30. <u>Training</u>								
30.31 Individual Training		25,000		30,000		35,000		90,000
30.32 Group Training		25,000		30,000		35,000		90,000
39. Component Total		50,000		60,000		70,000		180,000
49. <u>Equipment</u>		-		-		-		-
59. Miscellaneous (inclusive of publications)		20,000		25,000		30,000		75,000
TOTAL EXPENSES		175,000		207,000		239,000		621,000
UNDP's share of Total Expenses :		122,500		103,500		71,700		297,700
Countries' share of Total Expenses:		52,500		103,500		167,300		323,300

* / based on assumption of expenses for 6 crop working groups

Table II

CALCULATION OF CONTRIBUTION FOR EACH COUNTRY

COUNTRY	Contri- bution Class	Weight- Unit	U S \$			Total Phase II
			1983	1984	1985	
Albania	IV	1	465	916	1,480.50	2,861.50
Austria	II	4	1,860	3,664	5,922.00	11,446.00
Belgium	II	4	1,860	3,664	5,922.00	11,446.00
Bulgaria	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Cyprus	IV	1	465	916	1,480.50	2,861.50
Czechoslovakia	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Denmark	II	4	1,860	3,664	5,922.00	11,446.00
Finland	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
France	I	10	4,650	9,160	14,805.00	28,615.00
Fed. Rep. of Germany	I	10	4,650	9,160	14,805.00	28,615.00
German Democ. Rep.	II	4	1,860	3,664	5,922.00	11,446.00
Greece	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Hungary	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Iceland	IV	1	465	916	1,480.50	2,861.50
Ireland	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Israel	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Italy	I	10	4,650	9,160	14,805.00	28,615.00
Luxemborg	IV	1	465	916	1,480.50	2,861.50
Malta	IV	1	465	916	1,480.50	2,861.50
Netherlands	II	4	1,860	3,664	5,922.00	11,446.00
Norway	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Poland	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Portugal	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Romania	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Spain	II	4	1,860	3,664	5,922.00	11,446.00
Sweden	II	4	1,860	3,664	5,922.00	11,446.00
Switzerland	II	4	1,860	3,664	5,922.00	11,446.00
Turkey	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
U S S R	I	10	4,650	9,160	14,805.00	28,615.00
United Kingdom	I	10	4,650	9,160	14,805.00	28,615.00
Yugoslavia	III	2	930	1,832	2,961.00	5,723.00
Total weight-units		<u>113</u>				
Total Country Contribution:			52,500	103,500	167,300.00	323,300.00
UNDP Contribution:			122,500	103,500	71,700.00	297,700.00
TOTAL BUDGET:			<u>175,000</u>	<u>207,000</u>	<u>239,000.00</u>	<u>621,000.00</u>

