

At this time, I am told, 6 such action programs have been recognized by the U.S. National Committee and some 6 additional are in formative stages and show promise of comparable development.

It is also noteworthy that since publication of the U.S. National Committee report and the subcommittee program statements, approximately 100 individual research proposals have been submitted for inclusion in the IBP, good evidence that these publications are bearing fruit.

I think that a smooth and responsive transition to the research phase on this program is actively under way. The IBP committee-subcommittee structure, I understand, will be retained so the advisory roles that the members fulfill may be preserved and so that continuous broad program development is assured. At the same time with the emergence of the "action programs" and with an appointed director of each, the intensive coordination involved will be provided. For the record, a list of the "action programs" is attached to this statement.

Some of the difficulties of funding the IBP were discussed during the initial part of this hearing on 9 May. I think that Roger Revelle very accurately described these to you in his prepared statement, and the apparent conclusion from his statement suggests that an IBP "line item" be established somewhere in the Federal budget. During discussion of that suggestion it was brought out that during these times there would be a fiscal hazard in following this suggestion since such a line item might be stricken during the budgetary competition for funds and that an agency might then be loath to allocate any funds to the IBP as such. We concluded that the present method of funding is perhaps safer. Involved in this discussion was the question—just how much will the IBP cost, and a "guesstimate" of \$50 to \$75 million over a five-year period was given. This figure included \$60 million for recognized IBP "action programs" and projects and \$15 million for those still undergoing definition. During the 6 June portion of this hearing a rough estimate of \$100 million was provided. I have been furnished with a more recent estimate that brackets the cost between \$105 and \$135 million. This latter estimate involves \$21 million for training—an estimate that was not included in the previous figures. All estimates however are carefully qualified and point out that as additional IBP "action programs" are identified, the 5 year estimate will probably increase. The significance of this apparent escalation in my opinion is related not so much the Committee's inability to estimate as it does to the rapid increase in interest in the IBP which is spreading through our community of biologists.

In the course of these hearings, several references have been made to comparisons between the International Geophysical Year and the IBP.

The budgets of several agencies contained a "line item" for the IGY; these items were defended by all and were supported by the Congress. With the words and thoughts that established the IGY and with its existence, a focus of purpose was established. As I understand the Subcommittee's intent, it is desired to establish a focus of purpose for the IBP and, in so doing, to seek some assurance that it can be defended without endangering the overall support of the IBP research effort.

In essence, the problem boils down to an exploration of the ways in which—

1. Additional funds can be secured to support IBP activities.
2. The specific purpose of the IBP can be highlighted in agency budgets.
3. The budgetary identification of IBP funds can best be safeguarded during the authorization and appropriation process.

Each of these three questions, of course, consists of two parts—one referring to the formulation of the President's budget for submission to Congress—the other to the Congressional actions on that budget.

As to the second part, that of likely Congressional actions, I am in no position to speculate upon this question. Certainly, the members of this Subcommittee are in a far better position to deal with this matter than am I. I would hope that a Subcommittee Report on the IBP would go far toward assuring sympathetic acceptance of this important program. I would also think that the judgments of the several involved agencies concerning the exact method used for highlighting the IBP in their budgets should be given due weight.

I have sought the advice of the Bureau of the Budget concerning the problem of highlighting the IBP in the President's budget.

I was told that, in principle, there is no objection to the identification of funds for a program such as the IBP. The fact that the IGY was circumscribed and involved a single year commitment whereas the IBP is intended to extend over a