I have read H. Graves' paper on "Alternatives to IADS." No doubt Harold's observations will be helpful in thinking through a number of questions vital to IADS's future operations. He also examines a number of alternatives which are not viable and gives a good analysis why this is so. A number of questions are also raised which should be carefully answered - particularly for the community at large.

As I see it, IADS will have to come to some conclusion or give consideration to the following:

1. Does or does it not matter that IADS is a U.S. incorporated non-profit organization? I think it does not.

2. Should or should not IADS establish itself independently of the RF? I think it should.

3. Should IADS establish a base or its principle headquarters outside of the U.S.? I think serious thought should be given to this question but feel that Washington, D.C. probably offers the best location. Geneva or Amsterdam might also provide all of the conditions one would want but a major factor, as Harold points out, is going to be taxation laws.

4. On the matter of program, I feel that IADS indeed will have to distinguish what its unique qualities are and what its major kind of activity is. I don't think we should become paranoid about this, however, and let every criticism reduce the effort to a level acceptable to everybody but of little value to anyone.
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5. I'm not convinced that IADS can operate financially without obtaining untied contributions. Your comment #3 in the memo of January 17 regarding support for centers does not reflect the part that the centers also had substantial core unrestricted support. Although only time will tell, I think it is unwise to state that IADS will not need or can operate without core support. If it can, I would like to know how as this will also affect RF support.

In summary, I'm not sure that Harold has given you a specific formula, but my impression is that IADS should seek some form of association with the CGIAR. If that is done, your location problem diminishes in importance and other issues become more easily resolved. However, some very careful planning and negotiating will have to be done if IADS is to gain CG acceptance but that I feel is the major question before us now.

J.A.P.
Reaction to your discussion paper "Alternatives for IADS"

This is an excellent review. The following points come to my mind as I studied it:

1. The current version of the paper appears to assume that IADS will have substantial continuing care costs not covered by overhead charges, or management fee as we sometimes call it. This may not be true; most of IADS' work may be either (a) contract operations or (b) restricted care or even special projects. We could make all work "special projects."

2. Re para 6: Insofar as IADS is undertaking special projects such as (a) preparation of development-oriented literature or (b) assisting smaller, poorer countries, there may be little competition with national organizations, since none of them really could undertake such work. And, IADS should not, in my view, be in competition with such national organizations: the help of all is needed.

3. Re para 10: Similar point: we may need only special project funding from donors; but it would be best, probably, to qualify IADS for general support should that become desirable. (Most support for international research centers by bilateral agencies began with restricted funds.)

4. Re paras 12-14: Would you be willing to undertake a review of the basis of IADS overhead charges as part of your assignment with us? Would be a great help. We have thought that institute practice is a useful guide.
5. Re para 16: What accounts for the difference in the experience of IFDC and IFPRI in employment of non-U.S. nationals. What are the implications for IADS.

6. Re para 42: It would be helpful to know which of the "wide range of service" IADS seemingly lacks the capabilities to provide. Which donors "would be willing to see the service used over the complete range...?"

7. Re paras 47-48: IADS, de facto, specializing in national agricultural research and training with the qualification that IADS is very much concerned with making investments in national systems result in reasonably quick returns to the country. IADS also extends the concept of research to include farm level work, as well as establishment of goals and relevant planning.

8. Re para 50; last sentence: IADS is the Rockefeller Foundation's effort to get action underway.

9. Re para 51: This approach would seem to make sense to me (SN). The reaction of the IADS Board would be important.

10. Re para 52, and recommendations of the Review Committee: IADS probably would not require "major financial commitments" from CGIAR, since most of its work for individual countries (80-90% of the total) should be financed by loans or grants to the countries, or by the countries themselves.

11. Sir John Crawford told me, in discussions in Washington on January 13, that he would be pleased to review your report to IADS and to comment on it. Please feel free to send him a copy for his reaction and/or to talk with him. It is my understanding that he, at least, might favor explorations of the desirability of association of IADS with CGIAR.

13. Location of IADS. IADS presently has offices at 1133 Avenue of the Americas in space on the 24th floor which is rented on a year to year basis from The Rockefeller Foundation. It has been assumed from its establishment in 1975, that IADS should within a few years move to another location.

In considering possible new locations, several probably desirable features of a permanent site, not in order of importance, should be kept in mind:

a) IADS will need to employ at its headquarters persons of high professional standing of diverse nationalities. Such persons will be concerned about residence status, taxation, education of children, housing;
b) The location should contribute to the IADS image as an international organization;

c) English probably will continue as the first language of IADS; supply of English speaking supporting staff therefore will be important;

d) IADS should be able to operate up to 16 hours per day, seven days per week. Staff members should live close to headquarters and be able to participate in evening work when desirable;

e) Costs of operations should be reasonable. Telephone, telegraph, postal, and airline service must be good;

f) Easy access to major donor organizations, and to embassies of developing countries, would be an advantage;

g) The desirability of a tropical location where field testing and training of various sorts could be conducted, should not be overlooked.

Would you be willing to work with us in determining alternative locations which might be considered?

We should discuss the desirability of your visiting the major donors to obtain their views directly, preferably before the May meeting.

S.W.
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Mr. Harold Graves
4516 Grantham Avenue
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015