

*REPORT*

New Delhi,  
India,  
25-27  
November  
1998

**FAO Commission for  
Controlling the Desert  
Locust in the Eastern  
Region of its  
Distribution Areas  
in Southwest Asia  
Twenty-first session**



**Report of the**  
**Twenty-first Session of the FAO Commission for Controlling**  
**the Desert Locust in the Eastern Region**  
**of its Distribution Areas in Southwest Asia**

New Delhi, India

25-27 November 1998

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS**

**Rome, 1998**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of recommendations.....	3
Inauguration.....	4
Opening .....	4
Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Commission.....	4
Adoption of agenda .....	4
Election of the Drafting Committee .....	5
The Desert Locust situation 1996-98 and outlook to spring 1999 .....	5
A review of the Desert Locust survey and control activities carried out by the Member Countries during 1996-98 .....	5
Anti-locust survey and control potential available in Member Countries of the Commission .....	6
Review of the recommendations of the twentieth session and progress made .....	6
Report of the twelfth session of the Executive Committee .....	8
Report by the previous chairman on Commission activities since the last meeting .....	8
Financial position of the Commission and assistance provided to member countries, as at 31 October, 1998 .....	8
Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Committee .....	9
Date and place of the next session.....	9
Adoption of the report.....	9
Closure of the Commission session.....	10

### APPENDICES

I. List of participants .....	11
II. Agenda .....	14
III. Resources for Desert Locust survey and control .....	15
IV. Report of the Twelfth Session of the Executive Committee .....	16
Annex 1: List of Participants .....	23
Annex 2: Agenda.....	26
V. Tables on the Financial Position of the Commission Trust Fund.....	27
V. Equipment to be purchased under TF9123 .....	33

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission recommended that:

1. India and I.R. Iran be provided with e-mail as a means to improving communication and timely reporting.
2. If FAO can find evidence that a microlight can be used to detect hopper bands and solitarious adults, the FAO should make an arrangement with a microlight supplier for a demonstration in Pakistan.
3. FAO enquire with Afghanistan's neighbouring countries on the possibility of providing assistance with pesticide stocks in the event that Afghanistan is invaded by locust.
4. I.R. Iran again investigate the possibility of establishing a radio link between Tehran and Karachi and if this proves feasible, the Commission approved the purchase of one radio for Tehran.
5. FAO should revive the Commission Secretary post forthwith, and the original Terms of Reference should be used with the additions specified.
6. The Commission Chairman and Vice-Chairman to follow the matter up in Rome and raise it at the next DLCC meeting; each country to seek high-level support for the re-establishment of the post.
7. The Commission Agreement should be updated; the Secretariat should follow up on the matter and submit a new version of the Agreement to Member Countries for comment.
8. There should be a monthly border meeting between locust officers of Pakistan and I.R. Iran on the 7<sup>th</sup> of each month at the Mand/Pishin border post, March-June, inclusive. The establishment of this arrangement should be initiated by the National PPD/PPO with assistance from the relevant FAO Representatives.
9. I.R. Iran and Pakistan exchange information on locust activity on a weekly basis from March to June initially by fax and then by e-mail once it becomes established in I.R. Iran.
10. The Secretariat should confirm the funds used over the last three years for border surveys in India with the FAO Representative. If these funds were not used, the necessary action should be taken to order a vehicle.
11. The Secretariat prepare a budget for 1999 totalling US \$ 190,000 and maintain the budget for 2000 at the standard figure of US \$ 71,450.

## **INAUGURATION**

1. Following an introduction by the Joint Secretary, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Mr. P. D. Sudhakar, the Twenty-first Session of the Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in the Eastern Region of its Distribution in Southwest Asia, and the Twelfth Session of its Executive Committee which preceded it, were inaugurated by the Hon'ble Minister of State for Agriculture of the Government of India, Shri Som Pal. In his address, the Hon'ble Minister in welcoming delegates to the Commission, recalled seeing, as a child, swarms of locust flying past for hours and days, darkening the sky and nibbling away at anything green until there was nothing left. With 60 countries in Africa and Asia potentially affected by the Desert Locust, international cooperation was essential to face the challenge and FAO, as global coordinator, provided the counter balance of the locust swarms. The Hon'ble Minister reviewed the efforts made by India since 1939 when the Locust Warning Organization was established to combat the locust threat through effective survey, control and research. He stressed the need for continued cooperation among locust-affected countries and mentioned the need to locate the Commission Secretariat within the Region. In conclusion, the Hon'ble Minister wished success to the deliberations of the Commission Sessions.

2. The Senior Officer, Migratory Pests, FAO HQ, Mr. Clive Elliot added some words on the importance FAO attached to the Commission and the need to revitalize its activities. Mr. Peter Rosenegger, FAO Representative for India and Bhutan, on behalf of the FAO Director-General, welcomed Commission delegates and said that FAO's support for locust management was underlined by the Director-General's Special Programme 'Emergency Prevention System for Transboundary Animal and Plant Pests and Diseases', otherwise known as EMPRES. A major part of EMPRES was devoted to the Desert Locust.

3. In closing the ceremony, Mr. R.L. Rajak, Plant Protection Adviser to the Government of India, thanked the Hon'ble Minister for his encouragement and the delegates and participants for their support.

## **OPENING**

4. The Twenty-first Session of the Commission was opened by the outgoing Chairman, Mr. M.D. Mohsin (Pakistan). He welcomed the delegates from Afghanistan, India and I.R. Iran, the Secretariat from FAO HQ, an observer from France and other participants. He pointed out that the Commission had not met since 1995, so much ground needed to be covered to catch up. He wished the meeting success and useful discussions.

5. The participants are listed in Appendix I.

## **ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION**

6. Mr. Mohsin called for nominations for Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the 21<sup>st</sup> Session. Mr. R.L. Rajak (India) was elected as Chairman, proposed by I.R. Iran and seconded by Pakistan. I.R. Iran was elected as Vice-Chairman, proposed by India and seconded by Afghanistan.

## **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

7. The Agenda was adopted, as shown in Appendix II.

## **ELECTION OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE**

8. A Drafting Committee composed of Mr. Jagdish Prasad (India) and the FAO Secretariat including the NPO from Afghanistan was elected.

## **THE DESERT LOCUST SITUATION 1996-98 AND OUTLOOK TO SPRING 1999**

9. The working paper reviewed the situation, starting with the spring breeding season of 1996, and continuing to the end of the summer breeding season of 1998.

10. During this period, locust populations remained at a relatively low level in the spring and summer breeding areas although there were increases in locust numbers associated with good rainfall and subsequent breeding in most years. These occurred in Baluchistan during the spring of 1996 and 1998, and along the Indo-Pakistan border in 1997. A few swarms from the Central Region may have reached Tharparkar, Pakistan in 1997 and some swarms arrived from the Central Region in southern I.R. Iran in 1998, giving rise to higher than normal populations. Control operations were undertaken by India (22,930 ha), I.R. Iran (55,679 ha), and Pakistan (56,721 ha) in 1996-98.

11. The delegates from India and Pakistan indicated that some areas were difficult of access. The balance of evidence suggested that a second generation of breeding was produced locally in August and September, 1997 rather than a second incursion of swarms from the Central Region.

## **A REVIEW OF THE DESERT LOCUST SURVEY AND CONTROL ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT BY THE MEMBER COUNTRIES DURING 1996-98**

12. A number of observations based on an analysis of data received from Member Countries was presented in a working paper. It was noted that in 1996-98:

- i) The timing and duration of breeding varied during the spring and summer;
- ii) Timely control operations in the spring prevented swarms from moving to the summer breeding areas;
- iii) The length of spring breeding had a pronounced effect on locust numbers in summer areas;
- iv) Pre-monsoon rains fell in many years but they only had an impact when higher numbers of locusts were present;
- v) Surveys in India are organized by the calendar for administrative reasons, but additional surveys are done according to unusual environmental conditions;
- vi) Initial invasions and breeding are sometimes difficult to detect, especially in remote or inaccessible areas;
- vii) Reporting delays sometimes occurred during periods of increased locust activity when all available staff were deployed for survey and control operations. In India, they also were sometimes associated with delays in receiving data from the Meteorological Department and in transmission to FAO HQ;

- viii) Survey details are missing in some cases. India indicated their willingness to include more details and to send a technical report in advance of the complete fortnightly bulletin. Pakistan and India will give consideration to using the *FAO Desert Locust Survey and Control Form*.

13. The Commission **RECOMMENDED** that India and I.R. Iran be provided with e-mail as a means to improving communication and timely reporting.

14. In order to improve locust detection in areas of difficult access, members considered the use of a microlight aircraft. If FAO can find evidence that a microlight can be used to detect hopper bands and solitarious adults, the Commission **RECOMMENDED** that FAO make an arrangement with a microlight supplier for a demonstration in Pakistan.

### **ANTI-LOCUST SURVEY AND CONTROL POTENTIAL AVAILABLE IN MEMBER COUNTRIES OF THE COMMISSION**

15. The Secretariat had circulated forms to each Member Country, requesting details to be filled in on pesticide stocks, vehicles, radios, GPS, sprayers, aircraft and personnel. The data provided are tabulated as Appendix III.

16. In discussion of the topic, Members considered the question of how much buffer stock of pesticide should be maintained. New stocks of pesticide normally took several months to be processed and delivered. It was agreed that a buffer stock of between 10,000 and 20,000 litres of a pesticide that could be applied at 0.5-1.0 l/ha was appropriate, i.e. coverage of 10,000-40,000 ha of infestations, in a recession situation. Larger stocks should be maintained when there was any likelihood of invasion from the Central Region.

17. The case of Afghanistan was different since Desert Locust outbreaks normally developed only by invasion from I.R. Iran or Pakistan. Buffer stocks were not appropriate and given current circumstances, Afghanistan would need help with pesticides. The Commission **RECOMMENDED** that FAO enquire with Afghanistan's neighbouring countries on the possibility of providing assistance with pesticide stocks in the event that Afghanistan was invaded by locusts. FAO would also identify funds to cover transportation costs to the appropriate site in Afghanistan for such donations.

### **REVIEW OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TWENTIETH SESSION AND PROGRESS MADE**

18. The working paper reported systematically on the 21 recommendations that had been made by the 20<sup>th</sup> Session. In discussion of the progress made, the Commission noted that a number of recommendations had already been covered by the Executive Committee. Points of interest were as follows -

- i) I.R. Iran reported that the only feasible means of communication between Tehran and Karachi was telephone and fax, as there were restrictions on the use of radios for international calls. Pakistan reiterated the importance of radio communications during locust upsurges. The Commission **RECOMMENDED** that I.R. Iran again investigate the possibility of establishing a radio link between Tehran and Karachi,

and if this proves feasible, the Commission approves purchase on one radio for Tehran

- ii) It was noted that the question of expanding the FAO Desert Locust Control Committee to cover other locust species was to be debated at the next DLCC meeting.
- iii) Joint locust surveys in southern Afghanistan were impractical at present and should anyway only be considered if there is significant locust activity in northern Baluchistan.
- iv) On the question of re-establishing the Secretariat post within the Region, the Member Countries felt that FAO should recognize their strong commitment to the work of the Commission and the considerable resources they were investing in Desert Locust management. No locust swarms had escaped the region for many years to cause problems to countries in other regions. The revival of an international Secretary post would be an appropriate response to the Commission Members' efforts. Members felt that the Terms of Reference originally developed for the post should be used as the base, but they should be expanded to include the organization of the following regional studies and trials:-
  - a) improving pesticide application techniques with a view to reducing the amount of pesticides used;
  - b) introducing more environmentally friendly control methods including mycopesticides, botanicals, and barrier treatments with IGRs; and,
  - c) investigating economics and the cost/benefit ratio of control in order to reduce costs while maintaining the necessary efficiency.

19. These studies should be organized to complement similar studies being carried out by EMPRES field programmes in the Central Region and be considered as a means by which EMPRES activities could be implemented in the Eastern Region.

20. The Secretary post should also be given special responsibility for assisting countries to develop national training programmes and systems for checking that procedures taught were being properly used under field operation conditions.

21. Member Countries did not accept that the Secretary post could be handled by national staff rotating annually between countries. It was felt that recruitment procedures would be too cumbersome, that countries would have difficulty in releasing staff for a whole year and that arrangements for office and secretarial assistance would be difficult to implement.

22. In conclusion, Member Countries **RECOMMENDED** that FAO should revive the post forthwith, and that the original Terms of Reference be used with the above additions. It was further **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission Chairman and Vice-Chairman follow the matter up in Rome and raise it at the next DLCC meeting. It was also **RECOMMENDED** and that each country seek high-level support for the post re-establishment.



23. It was noted that Member Countries' views on developing EMPRES activities in the Region had been discussed at the Executive Committee.
24. The **RECOMMENDATION** from previous meetings that the Commission Agreement should be updated still stood. The Secretariat was requested to follow up on the matter and submit a new version of the Agreement to Member Countries for comment.
25. On Member Country cooperation, it was noted that there was daily radio contact between Karachi and Jodhpur (June-November); monthly meetings between Indian and Pakistani Locust Officers at the border (June-November); joint border survey, I.R. Iran/Pakistan (April-May).
26. It was **RECOMMENDED** that there should be a monthly border meeting between locust officers of Pakistan and the I.R. Iran on the 7<sup>th</sup> of each month at the Mand/Pishin border post, March-June, inclusive. The establishment of this arrangement should be initiated by the National PPD/PPO with assistance from the relevant FAO Representatives.
27. It was further **RECOMMENDED** that I.R. Iran and Pakistan exchange information on locust activity on a weekly basis from March to June initially by fax and then by e-mail once it becomes established in I.R. Iran.
28. It was noted that effective communication with Afghanistan could be made through the FAO/UNDP Crop Production Project for Afghanistan, based in Islamabad, by e-mail, fax and telephone. There was also a weekly UN flight to Herat which could carry mail.
29. India mentioned that some data on crop damage had been collected in Rajasthan. The Secretariat agreed to provide information on measuring grain losses in sorghum and millet. No data had been collected in I.R. Iran or Pakistan. It was agreed that the **RECOMMENDATION** that studies on economic aspects of locust control and environmental side-effects should be carried out by Member Countries should stand.

#### **REPORT OF THE TWELFTH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

30. The report (Appendix IV) was adopted by the Commission and the recommendations it contained were endorsed.

#### **REPORT BY THE PREVIOUS CHAIRMAN ON COMMISSION ACTIVITIES SINCE THE LAST MEETING**

31. It was reported that one Executive Committee meeting had been held in 1997. The Chairman had pursued the re-establishment of the Secretary post with FAO's Assistant Director-General and with the Director of the Plant Production and Protection Division.

#### **FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE COMMISSION AND ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO MEMBER COUNTRIES, AS AT 31 OCTOBER, 1998**

32. The working paper presented information on the final accounts for 1995, 1996, 1997 and provisional accounts for 1998, so that the complete picture since the last Commission Session could be reviewed (The Tables are presented in Appendix V). Detailed expenditure information was also provided. The financial situation of Member Country contributions to the Commission was given.

33. The Commission expressed its thanks to the Secretariat for the information provided and for the work put in to administer the Commission's Trust Fund.

34. In respect of the contribution amounts outstanding, India said that it was almost up to date and would settle the 1998 contribution before the end of its financial year, ending in March 1999. I.R. Iran said that a formal commitment had been given to settling the 1998 contribution through the FAO Representative's office in Tehran. Arrangements were also being made to pay US \$ 50,000 of the arrears by the same route. The Commission expressed its great appreciation of I.R. Iran's new approach to settling its arrears, which would do much to put the Commission back onto a more equal and active footing.

35. Pakistan said that the arrears amounted only to US \$ 20,975. Steps would be taken to settle this amount as soon as conditions allowed. In the meantime, a full breakdown of Pakistan's payments and calculations would be provided to the Secretariat in the near future.

36. In connection with establishing the 1999 and 2000 budgets, it was agreed to list equipment that Member Countries wished to be purchased from their Trust Fund (Appendix VI).

37. In consideration of the 1999 and 2000 budgets for the Trust Fund of the Commission, it was noted that the recommendations made by the Executive Committee and endorsed by the Commission had budgetary implications totalling US \$ 49,500. The total cost of the equipment listed in Appendix V was US \$ 76,000. Routine activities for the Commission Members including the Joint Border Survey I.R. Iran/Pakistan, the India/Pakistan Border Survey, production of Commission reports, the holding of the 13<sup>th</sup> Executive and the 22<sup>nd</sup> Commission, and the travel of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Commission to Rome came to US \$ 64,500. The Grand total for 1999 was therefore US \$ 190,000 including servicing costs.

38. The Commission **RECOMMENDED** that the Secretariat prepares a budget for 1999 totalling US \$ 190,000 and maintains the budget for 2000 at the standard figure of US \$ 71,450.

#### **ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

39. The Chairman called for nominations for these positions. I.R. Iran was elected as Chairman of the Executive Committee, proposed by Afghanistan, seconded by Pakistan. Pakistan was elected as Vice-Chairman, proposed by India and seconded by I.R. Iran.

#### **DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION**

40. As recommended by the Executive Committee, the Commission accepted with great appreciation the offer of the I.R. Iran to hold the 22<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission and the 13<sup>th</sup> Session of the Executive Committee in Tehran, I.R. Iran. A date in November 1999 would be fixed in consultation with the I.R. Iran and the Director-General of FAO.

#### **ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

42. The Commission unanimously adopted the report.

**CLOSURE OF THE COMMISSION SESSION**

43. Mr. R.L. Rajak, Chairman, thanked the delegates of Afghanistan, the I.R. Iran and Pakistan for their valuable contributions, the FAO Representative and the FAO Secretariat for their strong support of the meeting and the participants from India for their hard work.

44. Mr. M.D. Mohsin, on behalf of the visiting delegation, thanked the Government of India for the excellent arrangements that had been made which had ensured a successful meeting. Mr. Peter Rosenegger, FAO Representative for India and Bhutan and Mr. Clive Elliott, Senior Officer, FAO HQ thanked the Government of India for hosting the meeting.

45 The Chairman declared the meeting closed.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****INDIA**

Mr. R.L. Rajak  
Plant Protection Adviser to the Government of India  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
(Department of Agriculture & Cooperation)  
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage,  
Shashtri Bhavan,  
New Delhi – 110 001.

Tel: +91-11-3385026  
Fax: +91-11-3384182

Mr. N.C. Tuhani  
Joint Director (Entomology)  
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage,  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
N.H.IV, Faridabad

Tel: +91-0129-213985  
Fax: +91-0129-212125

Mr. R.M. Shukla  
Deputy Director (Entomology)  
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage,  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
N.H.IV, Faridabad

Tel: +91-0129-213985  
Fax: +91-0129-212125

Mr. Jagdish Prasad  
Deputy Director,  
Locust Warning Organisation,  
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage,  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
Jodhpur

Mr. P.P. Sinha  
Asst. Director (Entomology),  
Locust Warning Organisation,  
Ratamada, Jodhpur, Rajasthan

Mr. U.B. Choudhary,  
Asst. Director (Entomology),  
FSIL, Bikaner.

**I.R. IRAN**

Mr. Mehdi Ghaemian  
Plant Protection Officer  
Plant Protection Organization  
No.2, Tabnak Ave.  
Evin, Tehran

Tel: +98-21-2402046  
Fax: +98-21-2403197  
e-mail: [m\\_ghaemian@hotmail.com](mailto:m_ghaemian@hotmail.com)

**PAKISTAN**

Mr. M.D. Mohsin  
Plant Protection Adviser & Director General,  
Ministry of Food Agriculture & Live Stock,  
Department of Plant Protection,  
Malir Halt, Karachi – 27

Tel: +92-21-4577382, 4592011-14  
Fax: +92-21-4574373

**FAO**

Mr. P. Rosenegger  
FAO Representative  
PO Box 3088  
New Delhi 110 003

**Tel:** +91-11-4693060  
**Fax:** +91-11-46201154718  
**E-Mail:** [FAO-IND@field.fao.org](mailto:FAO-IND@field.fao.org)

Mr. Clive Elliott  
Senior Officer,  
Locust and Other Migratory Pests Group, AGP

Tel: +39-06-570-53836  
Fax: +39-06-570-55271  
e-mail: [clive.elliott@fao.org](mailto:clive.elliott@fao.org)

Mr. Keith Cressman  
Information and Forecast Officer,  
Locust and Other Migratory Pests Group, AGP

Tel: +39-06-570-52420  
Fax: +39-06-570-55271  
e-mail: [keith.cressman@fao.org](mailto:keith.cressman@fao.org)

Mr. A.Z. Habibi  
FAO National Professional Project personnel  
Herat, Afghanistan  
c/o Mr. AB. Stride  
STA, AFG/96/004, FAO Islamabad,  
POB 1476, Islamabad, Pakistan

Tel: +92-51-828217  
Fax: +92-51-826439  
e-mail: [sharif@isb.comsats.net.pk](mailto:sharif@isb.comsats.net.pk)

## **OBSERVERS**

Mr. Tahar Rachadi  
Locust Control Specialist,  
CIRAD-AMIS/Prifas  
BP 5035 -  
34032, Montpellier,  
France

Tel: +33-4-67-61-58-43  
Fax: +33-4-67-41-09-58  
e-mail: [tahar.rachadi@cirad.fr](mailto:tahar.rachadi@cirad.fr)

**AGENDA**

1. Opening of the Session
2. Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Commission
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Election of the Drafting Committee
5. The Desert Locust Situation 1996-98 and Outlook to the Spring of 1999
6. A Review of the Desert Locust Survey and Control Activities Carried out by the Member Countries during 1996-98
7. Anti-Locust Survey and Control Potential Available in Member Countries of the Commission
8. Review of Recommendations of the Twentieth Session and Progress Made
9. Report of the Twelfth Session of the Executive Committee
10. Report by the Previous Chairman on Commission Activities since the Last Meeting
11. Financial Position of the Commission and Assistance Provided to Member Countries
12. Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Executive Committee
13. Date and Place of the Next Session
14. Adoption of the Report

## RESOURCES FOR DESERT LOCUST SURVEY AND CONTROL

Resources	FAO/Afghanistan	India	I.R.Iran /1	Pakistan /1
<b>PESTICIDES</b>				
ULV (ltrs) in stock ha. covered	Nil	17,491 28,649	25,915 51,830	102,000 190,200
E.C.(ltrs) in stock ha. covered	Nil	Nil	89,216 89,216	Nil
Dust (kg.) in stock ha. covered	Nil	Nil	5,000	Nil
Bait (kg.) in stock ha. covered	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
<b>VEHICLES (No.)</b>				
4 x 4 working	10	67	30	85
Trucks working	02	05	06	08
<b>RADIOS (No.)</b>				
Mobil working	10	13	Nil	51
Fixed working	02	56	Nil	33
<b>GPS (No.)</b>				
Hand held working	05	20	10	10
Aerial working	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
<b>SPRAYERS (No.)</b>				
Hand held working	500	324	250	2,215
Vehicle mounted working	03	69	20	75
Aerial working	Nil	Nil	20	Nil
<b>AIRCRAFT (No.)</b>				
Survey working	Nil	Nil	Nil	
Control working	Nil	Nil	20	
Both working	Nil	Nil	Nil	21
<b>PERSONNEL (No.)</b>				
Technical	10	168	700	200
General	20	122	300	162

/1 includes total resources available for plant protection activities.



**Report of the  
Twelfth Session of the Executive Committee  
FAO Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in the Eastern Region  
of its Distribution Area in Southwest Asia**

New Delhi, India

23-24 November 1998

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS**

**Rome, 1998**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of recommendations.....	18
Opening .....	18
Agenda.....	19
Election of the drafting committee.....	19
Report of the eleventh session of the Executive Committee.....	19
Training and Fellowships .....	20
The EMPRES (Desert Locust) programme and its research activities .....	21
Agenda of the twenty-second session of the Commission.....	22
Date and place of the next session.....	22
Any other business .....	22
Adoption of Report.....	22
Closure of Meeting.....	22

### ANNEXES

1. List of participants .....	23
2. Agenda .....	26

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

It was recommended that:

1. FAO should assist member countries to identify suitable donors for the disposal of obsolete pesticides.
2. When EMPRES workshops were held in the Central Region, participants from the Eastern Region be included.
3. FAO should continue to coordinate training in the Eastern Region.
4. FAO should organise a national training workshop in Pakistan on survey and control, to follow on from those previously undertaken in India and I.R. Iran.
5. All major equipment orders should in future include training in the use of the equipment by the supplier, and spare parts for the equipment.
6. FAO should investigate the possibility of Micron providing training on the use and maintenance of Ulvamast and Micro-Ulva sprayers, and making an assessment of spare part requirements.
7. Member Countries should use the feedback from the FAO Information and Forecasting Unit as a means of improving their locust reporting quality.
8. FAO should arrange for an expert in radio utilization and maintenance (a possible candidate may be available in Islamabad) to provide assistance to Pakistan and India.
9. A request be made at the next DLCC meeting in May 1999 to use Fellowship funds for short-term training in the Eastern Region and this point be included in the DLCC Agenda.
10. FAO initiate discussions with donors on possible support to EMPRES activities, covering training and operational research. FAO Representatives should be asked to assist in this matter, as appropriate.
11. An updated version of the Provisional Agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> Session be used also for the 22<sup>nd</sup> Session. One correction was noted, being the addition of "Report of the Chairman on Commission activities" .
12. FAO should identify a consultant to make an investigation into using vehicles specially adapted for desert conditions for survey and control operations.

### OPENING

1. The Twelfth Session of the Executive Committee of the FAO Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in the Eastern Region of its Distribution Area in Southwest Asia was, together with the Twenty-First Session of the Commission, opened by the Hon'ble Minister of State for

Agriculture of the Government of India Shri Som Pal. He wished success to the deliberations of the two meetings.

2. A list of participants in the 12<sup>th</sup> Session appears as Appendix I.

## **AGENDA**

3. The Agenda, as approved, is given as Appendix II.

## **ELECTION OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE**

4. Mr. A. Habibi and Mr. Jagdish Prasad agreed to work with the Secretariat in drafting the Report.

## **REPORT OF THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

5. In reviewing this report, the Committee gave particular attention to the following recommendations of the 20<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission:

### **Recommendation 1.8 – Afghanistan Surveys**

6. It was noted that the region of Afghanistan most frequently affected by Desert Locust in the spring was the southern part and that normally this becomes infested when adjacent areas of northern Baluchistan in Pakistan or I.R.Iran were infested first. In the current calm situation, no action in Afghanistan was required, but good contact between Afghanistan and the other two countries should continue to be maintained, with the assistance of FAO.

### **Recommendation 3.3 – Obsolete Pesticides**

7. Pakistan said that 20 metric tons (mt) of flowable pesticides had been incinerated in a cement kiln. Some small quantities of non-flowable materials will be shipped out to Germany by GTZ, but substantial quantities of obsolete pesticides remained. India said that 264 mt of BHC and 52 mt of dieldrin awaited disposal. Afghanistan had 77 mt of BHC still remaining. In I.R.Iran, no problem with obsolete pesticides related to Desert Locust control had been identified. It was agreed that advice on the technology and procedures for disposal could be obtained from FAO on request to the Chief, AGPP, and that individual countries should investigate which donors or companies would be likely to assist in disposal. It was further **RECOMMENDED** that FAO should assist member countries to identify suitable donors.

### **Recommendation 4 – Restoration of Commission Seat**

8. This issue was deferred to the main Commission meeting.

### **Recommendation 6.1 – Fellowship**

9. Since this matter was considered under a separate working paper on training and fellowships, it was deferred to discussion of the paper.

### **Recommendation 9.3 – Equipment purchased**

10. A working paper on the financial position of the Commission and of all purchases made had been prepared for the main Commission meeting and discussions were deferred.

### **Other recommendations**

11. One further recommendation had been made in the Report, concerning the holding of a regional Workshop under EMPRES. The Committee noted that the first EMPRES field programme had only become operational in 1997. Although many activities had been initiated, it could not yet be said that any breakthroughs had been made. The Committee agreed that it was too early for a Regional Workshop under EMPRES to be held. Nevertheless, it was important that training continue in available technologies such as ULV spraying and the use of GPS for survey. Furthermore, when workshops were held in the Central Region, it was **RECOMMENDED** that participants from the Eastern Region be included.

### **TRAINING AND FELLOWSHIPS**

12. The working paper reviewed training activities since the last Commission meeting, including national workshops in India and I.R. Iran and three joint border surveys between Pakistan and I.R. Iran. Both the workshops and one of the surveys had been supported by FAO staff, with consultancy assistance also provided for the former. The Committee wished to put on record their great appreciation of this assistance. FAO had been gratified that the last two joint surveys had been successfully completed without FAO support, indicating greater national capacity and sustainability of the activity. FAO would welcome the development of national training courses led by the best of national staff who were highly competent.

13. In discussions, the Committee felt that continuing inputs from FAO staff were needed. However, it was pointed out that the capacity for FAO staff to do training was limited because of current staff shortages and the fact that around 30 countries throughout the Desert Locust range would have equal call on such assistance. FAO inputs would inevitably be widely spaced and it was felt that they should be directed mainly at building national capacity, through train-the-trainers programmes.

14. The Committee discussed current training needs. The importance of training being provided for new equipment was mentioned, citing deliveries that had been made during the 1993 upsurge for which no training had been provided.

15. In conclusion, the following **RECOMMENDATIONS** were made:-

- that FAO should continue to coordinate training in the Eastern Region.
- that FAO should organise a national training workshop in Pakistan on survey and control, to follow on from those previously undertaken in India and I.R. Iran.
- that all major equipment orders should in future include training in the use of the equipment by the supplier, and spare parts for the equipment.

- that FAO should investigate the possibility of Micron providing training on the use and maintenance of Ulvamast and Micro-Ulva sprayers, and making an assessment of spare part requirements.
- that member countries should use the feed-back from the FAO Information and Forecasting Unit as a means of improving their locust reporting quality.
- FAO should arrange for an expert in radio utilization and maintenance (a possible candidate may be available in Islamabad) to provide assistance to Pakistan and India.

16. In connection with the Fellowships to be funded over the next years by DLCC, India indicated that it was not interested in training at Ph.D or M.Sc. levels, but would like to use some of the DLCC funds to cover short-term training and/or study tours for its staff. Pakistan said that it was interested both in M.Sc. courses within the region and in short-term training. I.R. Iran said that interest was primarily in M.Sc. training outside the region and short-term training within the country. Afghanistan said that the situation did not allow external M.Sc. training at this stage. It was explained that the DLCC funds had been specifically ear-marked for Fellowship training and the use of any of the funds for short-term training would require DLCC endorsement. This could be requested at the next DLCC meeting in May 1999 and it was **RECOMMENDED** that this point be included in the DLCC Agenda.

#### **THE EMPRES (DESERT LOCUST) PROGRAMME AND ITS RESEARCH ACTIVITIES**

17. The working paper described how the EMPRES Programme was structured to cover the whole Desert Locust range including the Western, Central and Eastern Regions. The process by which the field programmes in the Central Region was developed and supported by donors was mentioned. It was explained that donors had so far indicated their preference for supporting countries mainly in Africa. Capacity in the Eastern Region was considered well developed with a long history of effective action. Donors' support for the Central Region had been directed by each donor at specific elements in the EMPRES Programme. These were described.

18. The Committee felt that if donors were apprised of the efforts made by Member Countries to prevent locust upsurges and of their interest to do this more efficiently, for less cost, and in a more environmentally friendly manner, then donor support for EMPRES activities might well be forthcoming. Member Countries indicated that they would welcome donor support for EMPRES training activities designed to modernise and improve survey and control. They would also welcome support for operational research in the region.

19. Member Countries indicated their research priority interests were as follows:-

Afghanistan – gregarious locust populations do not regularly occur within Afghanistan, with the result that opportunities for research would be limited. It was, therefore, impractical to identify research priorities.

I.R. Iran – survey and control improvements, biological control.

India – biological control including mycopesticides and botanicals, improved technology for pesticide applications.

Pakistan – improvement in pesticide application techniques, locust management strategies, biological control.

All the countries, except Afghanistan, also indicated an interest in research trials on barrier treatments of hopper bands.

20. In conclusion, the Committee **CONFIRMED** that the Eastern Region was interested in donor-supported EMPRES activities, covering training and operational research, and **RECOMMENDED** that FAO initiate discussions with donors on possible support. FAO Representatives should be asked to assist in this matter, as appropriate.

#### **AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE COMMISSION**

21. The Committee **RECOMMENDED** that an updated version of the Provisional Agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> Session be used also for the 22<sup>nd</sup> Session. One correction was noted, being the addition of "Report of the Chairman on Commission activities" .

#### **DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION**

22. The Committee **ACCEPTED WITH ACCLAIM** the offer of the Director of the Plant Protection Organization of the Ministry of Agriculture of I.R. Iran to hold the next Session of the Commission in Tehran.

23. The suggested date was November, 1999. The Secretariat was asked to finalise the date in consultation with I.R. Iran and the Director-General of FAO, and to inform Member Countries as soon as a date could be fixed.

#### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

24. The delegate of I.R. Iran mentioned the difficulty faced in carrying out locust survey and control in certain parts of the locust range where deep sand or dunes occurred. Other Member Countries had similar problems in some areas. It was agreed that the possibility of using vehicles specially adapted for such conditions needed investigation. It was **RECOMMENDED** that FAO should identify a consultant to make such investigation. Any vehicle identified should be able to carry ULV spraying equipment.

25. The problem of private spray aircraft in India not being equipped with Micronairs was raised and of FAO helping to purchase such equipment. It was explained that FAO could not purchase such equipment for use by a private company. It would be better to make it clear to companies tendering for contracts, that contract terms would insist in aircraft being equipped with Micronairs.

#### **ADOPTION OF REPORT**

26. The report of the Twelfth Session was adopted.

#### **CLOSURE OF MEETING**

27. The Chairman declared the meeting closed.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****INDIA**

Mr. R.L. Rajak  
Plant Protection Adviser to the Government of India  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
(Department of Agriculture & Cooperation)  
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage,  
Shashtri Bhavan,  
New Delhi – 110 001.

Tel: +91-11-3385026  
Fax: +91-11-3384182

Mr. N.C. Tuhani  
Joint Director (Entomology)  
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage,  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
N.H.IV, Faridabad

Tel: +91-0129-213985  
Fax: +91-0129-212125

Mr. R.M. Shukla  
Deputy Director (Entomology)  
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage,  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
N.H.IV, Faridabad

Tel: +91-0129-213985  
Fax: +91-0129-212125

Mr. Jagdish Prasad  
Deputy Director,  
Locust Warning Organisation,  
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage,  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
Jodhpur

Mr. P.P. Sinha  
Asst. Director (Entomology),  
Locust Warning Organisation,  
Ratamada, Jodhpur, Rajasthan

Mr. U.B. Choudhary,  
Asst. Director (Entomology),  
FSIL, Bikaner.



**I.R. IRAN**

Mr. Mehdi Ghaemian  
Plant Protection Officer  
Plant Protection Organization  
No.2, Tabnak Ave.  
Evin, Tehran

Tel: +98-21-2402046  
Fax: +98-21-2403197  
e-mail: [m\\_ghaemian@hotmail.com](mailto:m_ghaemian@hotmail.com)

**PAKISTAN**

Mr. M.D. Mohsin  
Plant Protection Adviser & Director General,  
Ministry of Food Agriculture & Live Stock,  
Department of Plant Protection,  
Malir Halt, Karachi – 27

Tel: +92-21-4577382, 4592011-14  
Fax: +92-21-4574373

**FAO**

Mr. Clive Elliott  
Senior Officer,  
Locust and Other Migratory Pests Group, AGP

Tel: +39-06-570-53836  
Fax: +39-06-570-55271  
e-mail: [clive.elliott@fao.org](mailto:clive.elliott@fao.org)

Mr. Keith Cressman  
Information and Forecast Officer,  
Locust and Other Migratory Pests Group, AGP

Tel: +39-06-570-52420  
Fax: +39-06-570-55271  
e-mail: [keith.cressman@fao.org](mailto:keith.cressman@fao.org)

Mr. A.Z. Habibi  
FAO National Professional Project personnel  
Herat, Afghanistan  
c/o Mr. AB. Stride  
STA, AFG/96/004, FAO Islamabad,  
POB 1476, Islamabad, Pakistan

Tel: +92-51-828217  
Fax: +92-51-826439  
e-mail: [sharif@isb.comsats.net.pk](mailto:sharif@isb.comsats.net.pk)

## **OBSERVER**

Mr. Tahar Rachadi  
Locust Control Specialist,  
CIRAD-AMIS/Prifas  
BP 5035 -  
34032, Montpellier,  
France

Tel: +33-4-67-61-58-43  
Fax: +33-4-67-41-09-58  
e-mail: [tahar.rachadi@cirad.fr](mailto:tahar.rachadi@cirad.fr)

**AGENDA**

1. Opening of the Session
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Election of the Drafting Committee
4. Report of the Eleventh Session of the Executive Committee
5. Training/Fellowships
6. Research/EMPRES
7. Agenda of the Twenty-Second Session of the Commission
8. Date and Place of the Next Session
9. Any other Business
10. Adoption of the Report

Table 1

**Trust Fund no. 912300 - MTF/RAS/001/MUL**  
**Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in South-West Asia**

**Summary Budget and Expenditures until 1998**

	Prior years	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Total
<b>Receipts</b>							
Contributions		35,735.31	51,326.75	25,910.94	50,635.52	32,880.00	<b>196,488.52</b>
Interest		12,293.53	13,138.00	21,600.84	14,364.34	5,684.39	<b>67,081.10</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,911,199.00</b>	<b>48,028.84</b>	<b>64,464.75</b>	<b>47,511.78</b>	<b>64,999.86</b>	<b>38,564.39</b>	<b>2,174,768.62</b>

	Prior years	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998 (provisional)	1998 (provisional balance)	Total (excluding 1998 balance)	Total (including total 1998)
<b>Expenditures</b>									
<b>Code Personnel Services</b>									
1100 Short term experts	14,282	0	0	8,495	9,552	0		<b>32,329</b>	<b>32,329</b>
1300 Admin Support	106	0	0	0	0	0		<b>106</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Travel</b>								<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2000 Sessions of Commission plus Survey teams	50,659	14,949	25,485	13,942	24,884	15,409	8,591	<b>145,328</b>	<b>153,919</b>
<b>Contractual Services</b>								<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
3000 Transl., printing	5,073	0	0	0	0	0		<b>5,073</b>	<b>5,073</b>
<b>General Operating Exp.</b>								<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4000 GOE survey teams, misc. <b>Expendable equipm.</b>	31,104	9,679	22,377	9,081	4,091	24,541	1,459	<b>100,873</b>	<b>102,332</b>
5000 Pesticides, books, supplies <b>Non-Exp. equipm.</b>	49,266	0	384	3,381	-450	0		<b>52,581</b>	<b>52,581</b>
6000 GPS, cars, pesticides <b>Fellowships</b>	283,392	125,112	0	55,327	413	26,055	3,211	<b>490,299</b>	<b>493,510</b>
8000 Courses <b>Project Servicing Costs</b>	120,673	13,597	-1,430	5,500	-5,500	0		<b>132,840</b>	<b>132,840</b>
9100 5% codes 50&60								<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
13% other codes	45,478	11,225	6,055	7,749	4,292	2,910	5,053	<b>77,709</b>	<b>82,762</b>
9200 <b>Prior years</b>	917,052							<b>917,052</b>	<b>917,052</b>
9600 <b>Unallocated balance</b>								<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,517,085</b>	<b>174,562</b>	<b>52,871</b>	<b>103,475</b>	<b>37,282</b>	<b>68,915</b>	<b>18,314</b>	<b>1,954,190</b>	<b>1,972,504</b>
<b>Cash Balance</b>	<b>394,114</b>	<b>267,581</b>	<b>279,175</b>	<b>223,211</b>	<b>250,929</b>	<b>220,579</b>			

Table 2 a)

**EMPRES**

Trust Fund MTF/RAS/001/MUL Budget entity 912300

Final expenditures year 1995

	US\$	
1100 <b>International Experts and Consultants</b>		
Subtotal		0.00
1300 <b>Admin.Support Personnel</b>		
Subtotal		0.00
2000 <b>Duty Travel</b>		
Surrendering CMTA	-199.95	
Participation session Exec.Committee	15,018.46	
DSA costs/other expenses for		
Joint-Survey Teams: Pakistan/Iran	11,128.32	
Correction CMTA costs	-462.00	
Subtotal		25,484.83
4000 <b>General Operating Expenses</b>		
Publication pool charges	3,106.00	
Fuel and GOE India/Pakistan	21,758.51	
Correction Pool charges communications	-2,487.87	
Subtotal		22,376.64
5000 <b>Expendable equipment</b>		
Maps DL survey	384.25	
Subtotal		384.25
6000 <b>Non-expend. equipment</b>		
Subtotal		0.00
8000 <b>Fellowships and training</b>		
Adjustments of CMTAs trainees	-1,430.03	
Subtotal		-1,430.03
9100 <b>Support Costs</b>	6,055.30	
Subtotal		6,055.30
<b>Total</b>		52,870.99
<b>Rounded (as per Finsys)</b>	US \$	<b>52,871</b>

Table 2 b)

## EMPRES

Trust Fund MTF/RAS/001/MUL Budget entity 912300

Final expenditures year 1996

		US\$
<b>1100 International Experts and Consultants</b>		
Pool charges	11.91	
RLA Dobson (Consultant Trainer)	7,067.00	
Travel Dobson to India Training	1,427.72	
Subtotal		8,506.63
<b>1300 Admin.Support Personnel</b>		
<b>2000 Duty Travel</b>		
DSA/other costs India Workshop	3,230.67	
Participation session Exec.Committee	4,012.97	
DSA Joint-Survey Team members Pakistan/Iran	8,831.29	
Surrendering CMTAs	-2,132.56	
Subtotal		13,942.37
<b>4000 General Operating Expenses</b>		
Publication pool charges(circ.letter)	81.00	
Fuel and GOE costs Pakistan/Iran border survey	9,000.00	
Subtotal		9,081.00
<b>5000 Expendable equipment</b>		
Training material India	500.00	
Maps for Pakistan	880.86	
Field supplies Pakistan	2,000.00	
Subtotal		3,380.86
<b>6000 Non-expend. equipment</b>		
Customs costs import.Toyota India	2,000.00	
Purchase Toyota Pick-up India	17,648.16	
Purchase Toyota Pick-up Iran	15,600.00	
GPS for Iran	3,635.08	
GPS for Afganistan	1,968.50	
GPS for India	7,262.91	
GPS for Pakistan	7,212.40	
Subtotal		55,327.05
<b>8000 Fellowships and training</b>		
India training course	5,500.00	
Subtotal		5,500.00
<b>9100 Support Costs</b>	7,749.30	
Subtotal		7,749.30
<b>Total</b>		103,487.21
<b>Rounded (as per Finsys)</b>	US \$	<b>103,487</b>

Table 2 c)

## EMPRES

Trust Fund MTF/RAS/001/MUL Budget entity 912300

Final expenditures year 1997

	US\$	
<b>1100 International Experts and Consultants</b>		
Conversion	-11.65	
RLA Dobson (Consultant/Trainer - Iran)	9,563.76	
Subtotal		9,552.11
<b>1300 Admin.Support Personnel</b>		
<b>2000 Duty Travel</b>		
Cancellation of 1995 commitment WBPR	-1,071.00	
Participation 3rd session Exec.Committee		
Rome 3-5/3/97		
(Shafi, Rigi, Rajak)	7,137.14	
Travel Dobson to Iran	2,609.88	
Training course Iran	3,030.00	
DSA Joint-Survey Teams Pakistan/Iran	18,162.49	
Correction travel Dobson	-4,984.31	
Subtotal		24,884.20
<b>4000 General Operating Expenses</b>		
Hospitality Cressman India 1996	80.42	
Lunch Commission HQ	104.71	
Training course Iran	281.15	
Joint-Survey GOE Pakistan/Iran	3,506.27	
Miscellaneous supplies	118.83	
Subtotal		4,091.38
<b>5000 Expendable equipment</b>		
Surrendering balance course India 1996	-500.00	
Books, periodicals	50.40	
Subtotal		-449.60
<b>6000 Non-expend. equipment</b>		
Customs costs import.Toyota	361.52	
Purchase order	51.92	
Subtotal		413.44
<b>8000 Fellowships and training</b>		
Surrendering balance cmt India course 1996	-5,500.00	
Subtotal		-5,500.00
<b>9100 Support Costs</b>	4,291.80	
Subtotal		4,291.80
<b>Total</b>		<b>37,283.33</b>
<b>Rounded (as per Finsys)</b>	US \$	<b>37,282</b>

**Table 2 d)****MTF/RAS/001/MUL 1998 Commitments and expenditures**

Budget component Line	Description	1998 budget	Amount Precommitted	Amount Committed	Expenditures	Available balance
2000	<b>Duty travel</b>	24,000.00				
	A/A DSA Joint-Survey Team Pakistan		9,100.00		9,100.00	-9,100.00
	A/A DSA Joint-Survey Team Iran		8,300.00		8,300.00	-8,300.00
	Surrender of travel cmt				-1,991.39	1,991.39
	Total available for commitment		17,400.00		15,408.61	<b>8,591.39</b>
4000	<b>General Operations Expenditures</b>	26,000.00				
	Report 11th Exec. com.		446.00		541.00	-541.00
	A/A Joint-Survey Pakistan		4,000.00		2,699.40	-4,000.00
	A/A Joint-Survey Iran		4,000.00		904.29	-4,000.00
	A/A GOE border survey Pakistan		5,000.00		5,000.00	-5,000.00
	A/A GOE border survey India		5,000.00		0.00	-5,000.00
	A/A Operating Costs 21st Comm.		6,000.00		0.00	-6,000.00
	Total available for commitment		24,446.00		9,144.69	<b>1,459.00</b>
6000	<b>Non-expendable equipment</b>	29,266.00				
	PR Micronair au7010 Iran		4,400.00	4,590.16	3,584.00	-3,584.00
	PR Micron ULV Iran		3,920.00	3,919.84	3,854.63	-3,854.63
	PR Toyota Pick-up Pakistan		18,700.00			-18,700.00
	Correction				-83.63	83.63
	Total available for commitment		27,020.00	8,510.00	7,355.00	<b>3,211.00</b>
9100	<b>Support costs</b>	7,963.00				
	Charges recorded				2,909.68	
	Total available					<b>5,053.32</b>
	<b>Total budget</b>	<b>87,229.00</b>				<b>18,314.71</b>

**The available budget is the total approved budget minus outstanding pre-commitments, minus outstanding commitments, minus expenditures**



Table 3

<b>TRUST FUND No. 9123.00 - MTF/RAS/001/MUL -</b>
<b>Inter-Regional - Commission for the Control of Desert Locust in the East Region</b>

Status of Contribution as at 31 October 1998 (final)  
(expressed in US\$)

Member	Outstanding Contribution	Received up	Outstanding
Government	31/12/97	to 31/10/98	31/10/98
	due for 1998		
<b>AFGHANISTAN</b>	11,000.00	2,750.00	13,750.00
<b>INDIA *</b>	20,288.92	27,000.00	*24,788.92
<b>IRAN</b>	309,928.91	25,000.00	334,928.91
<b>PAKISTAN</b>	55,304.51	16,700.00	61,624.51
<b>TOTALS</b>	396,522.34	71,450.00	435,092.34

\* 25% paid in local ccy through Imprest/Acc.

## APPENDIX VI

## EQUIPMENT TO BE PURCHASED UNDER TF9123

Item	Estimated cost US \$
<b>Afghanistan</b>	
10 sets of meteorological equipment and compasses, and 2 sets of maps	2,000
Anticholinesterase test kits for locust control operators	2,000
	-----
	4,000
<b>India</b>	
Establishment of e-mail in Faridabad & Jodhpur *	5,000
Purchase of spare parts for ULV sprayers	10,000
20 sets of GPS hand-held	6,000
Anticholinesterase test kits for locust control operators	2,000
	-----
	23,000
<b>I.R Iran</b>	
20 sets of GPS hand-held	6,000
Purchase of additional ULV sprayers	10,000
Establishment of e-mail in Tehran *	2,500
Anticholinesterase test kits for locust control operators	2,000
Purchase of one fixed HF radio	2,500
	-----
	23,000
<b>Pakistan</b>	
10 sets of VHF walkie-talkie, ground-to-air radios	8,000
20 sets of GPS hand-held	6,000
Purchase of spare parts for ULV sprayers	10,000
Anticholinesterase test kits for locust control operators	2,000
	-----
	26,000
	-----
Grand total:	76,000

In connection with funds from the TF which had been provided to India over the last two years for border surveys, the Commission was informed that these funds had, for various reasons, not been used. India requested that instead of funds for border surveys, a 4x4 vehicle should be purchased in 1999. It was **RECOMMENDED** that the Secretariat should confirm the figures with the FAO Representative and take the necessary action to order the vehicle.

\* support for establishing the e-mail network in India and I.R. Iran will also be provided from FAO's EMPRES funds.