

**Board for International Food & Agriculture Development
BIFAD**

Wednesday, October 12, 2005
Des Moines Marriott Downtown
700 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa
Room: Cedar Rapids Council Bluffs

145 Meeting Agenda

- 8:30 a.m.....Welcoming and Opening Remarks—M. Peter McPherson
8:45.....Research Priority Setting & Proposed CRSP Portfolio—USAID
10:15.....Coffee Break
10:35.....TraiNet Status— David Sammons, USAID-Purdue
11:00.....EGAT Senior Agricultural and NRM Science Advisor—David Sammons,
11:30.....University Partnerships with Private Sector Contractors—David Sammons
11:45.....Global Horticulture Assessment: Next Steps—John Thomas, USAID
12:00.....Adjourn for Lunch
1:00 to 4:30.....Open Forum on Agriculture and Nutrition
1:00.....A. *Panel 1—Roles and Links to Counter HIV/AIDS*
1:45.....B. *Panel 2—Cereal, Pulses and Animal Source Foods in Human Nutrition*
2:45.....Coffee Break
3:15.....C. *Panel 3—BioTech: Opportunities and Challenges*
4:30.....Report on Post Award Progress on SANREM and IPM CRSP—
Theo Dillaha, Virginia Tech
5:15.....Update on Long-term Training Pilots—John Thomas, USAID
5:30.....SPARE Report—Dr. Winfrey Clarke, Chairman SPARE
5:45.....Motions from the Floor and Public Comment—M. Peter
McPherson
6:15.....Adjourn

BIFAD Members Present:

Peter McPherson, Stewart Iverson, Sharron Quisenberry, Carol Lewis, William DeLauder, Mike Deegan, Anthony Laos

Introduction and Opening Remarks-Peter McPherson

Commends USAID for willingness to investigate new and better ways of reviewing CRSPs, and being open to the possibilities for innovation and/or new research foci.

Research Priority Setting and Proposed CRSP Portfolio- John Thomas (USAID/EGAT/AG Acting Director, Office of Agriculture)

The CRSP Review process began about two years ago during a management review of the subsectors IPM, SANREM, and Fisheries. The review process was initiated by the recognition that USAID needed to rationalize its investments, prioritize its work, and better tell the story about what USAID wants to achieve. There had been no recent assessments of individual CRSPs in terms of their relevance to current research needs.

The goal of USAID is to have an impact on increasing incomes and reducing poverty: To develop a coherent CRSP research portfolio that addresses critical agriculture and natural resources management issues relevant to current development needs.

Objectives:

- Identify a coherent vision and set of research priorities consistent with agricultural strategy and agency priorities
- Identify most critical research issues with potential for development impact
- Propose mechanisms for implementation of this program
- Develop a portfolio of activities that are flexible and responsive to USAID mission needs

Process to date has been:

- Desktop review of priority setting process
- Stakeholder consultation in DC
- Public dissemination and feedback on research framework and proposed CRSP portfolio
- Review of feedback from University partners, USAID mission staff and BIFAD.

The current status is that the proposed changes are PROPOSED. There is room for revision. The proposed modifications include:

- Change from CRSP to CRCBD (Collaborative Research and Capacity Building for Development)

Development of **Research Themes** (these do not refer to individual CRCBDs...rather there may be topics or focal points that are relevant to one or more of the themes.)

1. Staple Food Systems for Increased Incomes
2. Higher Value Products for Diversified Incomes
3. Agricultural & Natural Assets for Maintenance and Regeneration of the Resource Base
4. Policy, Markets, Trade & Governance for Pro-poor Growth

Proposed **program themes** include (programs are more specific in orientation and contribute to furthering knowledge in, and realization of, the above broad research themes):

1. Grains, Roots, and Tubers
2. Legumes
3. Aquaculture and Fisheries
4. Horticulture/Specialty Crops
5. Animal-based Food Systems.

It is also composed of CRCBD program themes that focus on critical cross-cutting research, capacity building, and development issues:

6. Soil, Water, and Ecosystems Services
7. Assets and Market Access
8. Innovations for Fragile and Marginal Areas
9. Promotion, Integration, and Response

USAID has been communicating changes and receiving review feedback via the USAID website. We have received both support and points of concern. Overall feedback has been thoughtful. After feedback, we will consult with BIFAD to release the final portfolio. Some concerns:

- Not enough time for feedback
- People wanted to, but weren't able to, see the feedback from others. We are making an effort for that to happen, but we need to eliminate names from comments. We will be posting comments publicly, and for the next round of comments, we are exploring how to set up an interactive website.

Clarifications regarding the proposed changes:

- Core funding for individual CRSPs will target more focused research
- CRSPs were deliberately framed broadly to allow flexibility to access a broader range of University expertise and to attract Mission support via potential buy-ins.
- USAID will not shift funding of research activities to missions. Instead missions will be provided the opportunity to buy in for additional research.

Some issues for further discussion:

- How to maximize integration of nutrition
- Need to build on strengths, research should benefit Title XII institutions, but we also need to keep in mind how to improve livelihoods in developing countries
- Need to explore what the US comparative advantages are
- Consistent among all was that capacity building is a valuable US contribution to development
- How to further include private sector partners
- How do we maximize integration and incorporate key topics such as nutrition?
- How do we maximize inter-CRSP collaboration?
- How do we consolidate knowledge across the CRSP portfolio?

- Clarifications are needed on primary research themes. What is the appropriate breadth of core research for certain CRSPs? (particularly for Fisheries; Grains, Roots and Tubers; and Legumes)

Discussion

Main Points:

- **Nutrition is identified as one critical area that cuts across all CRSPs**, and which might be a way to strengthen inter-CRSP activities.
- Jeff Dahlburg of Sorghum producers-INTSORMIL was useful in both US and in developing countries, and we are **concerned that the proposed merging of sorghum research into the broader research focus of grains, roots, and tubers**, would threaten this valuable research and advancement in sorghum production.
- McPherson-made the point that there **must be mission buy in** to what the CRSPs are doing.
- Demment, Global Livestock-USAID needs to be aware of how resources are spread out geographically and/or topically. Thus far, the way that decisions have been made with regards to the new framework threaten to use the resources unwisely, and to dilute their potential. **Not enough hard decisions have been made about where to focus resources**. We can't just lump everything together.
- There must be a continued focus on long term capacity building. Some of the language in the new framework is troubling because it seems to favor short term training. **The piece that is missing is long term training and institutional capacity building**.
- **The portfolio must contain a vision of the future**. There must be a promotion of imagination and creativity. That is not evident in the proposed framework. We need to have a portfolio that is **defined by critical issues and is more articulate**.
- **Process of developing new framework is a cause for concern** because AID has lost capacity in agriculture. The people who made these decisions are not necessarily well versed in international agriculture. **Substance is a concern**....it needs to be scientifically analyzed over a longer period of time. For example, there is no mention of water and how to manage it....this is an emerging crisis.
- **Concern that this is donor driven process**, and seeking a way to spread money across commodities. This is a recipe for disaster, as in the CG system. Because it is donor driven by short term objectives, and driven by forces outside of the country, there is never any capacity building in the countries.
- **Funding** is one of the main issues-generalized discussion on how to leverage the limited resources in best way possible. This still needs to be worked out. There will be a need to find funding elsewhere. We cannot reduce the funding for what we have in the CRSPs...they would be ineffective.
- USAID has been asked by Congress to expand the portfolio, but we have limited resources. So we need to consolidate. We will continue core funding, but don't know yet which research areas. This is why we need help from BIFAD.
- Some CRSPs have millions of dollars of mission buy in, other have little.
- It is not really an option to add more CRSPs...you go past the point of critical mass and reduce the overall effectiveness of all of them.

- The new acronym (CRCBD) is going nowhere. CRSP is already recognized.
- There seems to be a pattern that emerges in this discussion “if it isn’t broken, don’t fix it.”

TraiNet Status-David Sammons (USAID/Purdue)

Background-From the perspective of the agency, TraiNet ensures that students are legitimate. Universities objected to using it because it does not enable them to track students on their campuses reliably and thus universities feel TraiNet exposes them to unacceptable security risks.. There has been an ongoing effort to resolve this issue...which would address university concerns and also address security concerns on the part of the agency. Agency has decided that there is no flexibility, and that TraiNet has to be imposed (response from Fred Scheck).

In terms of the J1 Visa requirement, the Agency will review requests from missions to waive the requirement on a case by case basis.

There is no real flexibility on the university concern, but there is some flexibility on the mission concern and the J1 Visas. There is no other way to appeal the decision, and no flexibility on the TraiNet requirement.

Universities are responding by scheduling activities in countries rather than bringing them here.

BIFAD agreed to revisit the issue after a year.

EGAT Senior Agricultural and NRM Science Advisor

It was decided at the May 19th meeting that in order for EGAT to strengthen its foundation in science, there needed to be a high level, well-respected, extremely capable, internal science advisor to work on agricultural and natural resources management issues. This position is in accordance with the agency agriculture strategy that science and technology will be mobilized in development. A position description was drafted. There were three changes made from an earlier draft reviewed by BIFAD as follows:

1. Reporting-would report to deputy assistant administrator that is responsible for agriculture, not to the Assistant Administrator of EGAT..
2. The position would complement the position of agency chief scientist. The chief scientist will work at a conceptual level, while the agriculture science advisor would be more at a “hands-on” programming and operations level.
3. The responsibilities assigned this individual are condensed. S/he would advocate use of science that is high quality and relevant to the goals of the agency, and strengthen science to be congruent with bureau’s agricultural and natural resources management portfolio.

BIFAD must decide if it can support this and we can start recruitment.

In terms of David Sammons' position as university liaison, he will be finished next summer. There will be a need to hire someone else (it was agreed that this position is important to USAID, and must be renewed). There is agreement that there needs to be someone to work with universities and to work technically within the Office of Agriculture.

The point was made that the science advisor needs to at least have a "dotted" direct line to the assistant administrator...even if that line is not used on a regular basis. The person must have the ability to have direct access to the assistant administrator. This position needs to be high profile and high level.

At Jackie Schafer's USAID/DAA/EGAT request, this EGAT advisor should report to the deputy administrator as noted above.

At Peter's request, it is noted that this person needs to have dotted line access. This person would be occupied with CRSPs for at least ½ the time. During the interview process, this person will ask how much time will be spent with the CGIARs. We don't want it to be a lot, since they will have limited impact there. We should not wait for the chief scientist to be hired. We need to push this along, and the money will follow.

Motion passed on beginning process to find Agriculture Science Advisor

Global Horticulture Assessment: Next Steps-John Thomas

The assessment was completed in June. The assessment team was made up of people from Michigan State, Purdue, UC Davis, Hawaii, and achieved excellent participation. It was a model for how to get multiple stakeholders together. It cost \$500,000, but it was a model for how we should identify research objectives. We are now looking to many issues that this has raised and need to resolve them. For example, we need to better understand the demand side of things. Where are the gaps? Where are we already supporting? What is the best implementation mechanism? It does not have to be a CRSP...it could be an IQC, for example. Or could be funded with direct input from a mission, since many agriculture programs are embedded in strategic objectives. The October 7th meeting was a good start.

Revisit CRSP Issue

Points made by Peter McPherson

- There is a concern about deferring major decisions to a bidding process and to the CRSPs, rather than looking at the whole and trying to make some strategic allocations.
- There is concern that the decisions that are made now, are only relevant now, and will change in five years. We have become more of a short term agency, and the fear is that this could push the CRSPs into more short term operations at the expense of building capacity. If you were continue to use a commodity focus, the concern is that you miss new and important pressing matters.
- There is also a question about money. I am against more CRSPs. At some point, it becomes ineffectual because resources are so diminished.

Sharon Quisenberry (BIFAD Member) notes that there needs to be a systems approach to making decisions and that there cannot be a dilution of resources.

Mike Deegan (BIFAD Member) It is important that CRSPs have a focus on health and safety. There needs to be advanced research into industrial agriculture, which creates a wealth basis for those countries. As it is, it looks like we are spread way too thin. We need to take more of a proactive approach, rather than reactive.

But how do we arrive at what the priorities are?

University Partnerships with Private Sector Contractors-David Sammons

A brief has been provided. AID is increasingly relying on private sector contractors, particularly for the larger projects. Universities are an important source of expertise in many of these projects. Thus, many of the private sector contractors tap them for input and involvement during the proposal writing process. However, universities are reporting that when the time comes to do the work, they are often bypassed or shut out. They feel as though they are getting the short end of the stick on these contracts.

To address this problem, several suggestions have been made: Universities get teaming agreements upfront; to request on part of universities a right of first refusal; clearer rules on proposal evaluation with proposed subcontractors (how often will subs be used, etc); post-project reviews to determine if universities were used effectively.

Some of the larger contractors (Chemonics and DAI) were asked to provide feedback. Overall they say that contractors do not systematically abuse their subcontractors. The goal of business is development, not to generate business for universities. Four points:

1. Universities need to be more flexible in terms of providing their personnel
2. There are questions about how to partner in light of concerns about access to data and IPRs.
3. Further monitoring would be excessive
4. Short term assignments may not be a good fit for universities.

With the endorsement of BIFAD, SPARE will provide additional feedback and findings to BIFAD in February.

SPARE Report (change in agenda), Dr. Winfrey Clarke, SPARE Chair (handout provided)

1. Rewrite of SPARE Charter is complete and SPARE's new charter has been signed. New charter increases membership from six to eight: Land Grant representatives are Winfrey Clarke-Virginia State/SPARE Chair; Sandra Russo-University of Florida; Bobby Moser-Ohio State University. Non-Land Grant member is Robert Parrlberg-Wellesley. USAID members are: David Hess EGAT/AG; John Thomas Acting Director EGAT/NRM; and an as yet unnamed individual possibly from a geographic bureau. The private sector representative is Jane Gleason from DAI). SPARE has

two liaisons: Tony Laos representing BIFAD, and John Vreyens, representing NASULGC/BOAA.

2. SPARE Agenda:

- a. CRSP management issues and concerns-how to more fully engage CRSPs in supporting agency goals. Assist in appointment of new science advisor.
- b. Explore ways for the university community to be more engaged in assisting USAID in implementing agency goals.
- c. Facilitate USAID and BIFAD efforts to increase long term training.
- d. Facilitate agency efforts to expand M&E and to engage the university community in M&E efforts.

Discussion points:

- Look to universities as collaborators to enhance and improve long term training.
- Before moving forward on how SPARE will work with and engage the private sector and universities, please run the methodology by BIFAD.

Open Forum on Agriculture and Nutrition

(There is a PDF document that contains all PowerPoint presentations from this forum. Below are summary points of presentations and discussion)

Panel 1-Roles and Links to Counter HIV/AIDS

Speakers: Stewart Iverson—Moderator
Ms. Boitshepo Bibi Giyose, UNDP/Botswana
Dr. Mary Shawa, Government of Malawi

Presentation 1: “The Role and Impact of HIV/AIDS on Food Security and Nutrition: The African Experience” Ms. Boitshepo Bibi Giyose.

Presentation 2-“Nutrition Roles and Links to Countering HIV/AIDS: Malawi’s Experience,” Dr. Mary Shawa.

Panel 2-Cereal, Pulses and Animal Source Foods in Human Nutrition

Speakers: Dr. Montague, UC Davis—Moderator
Dr. Timothy Phillips, Texas A&M
Dr. Maurice Bennink, Michigan State University
Dr. Lindsay Allen, USDA/UC Davis

Presentation 1: “Building Human Capacity for National Development in Developing Countries,” Montague Demment.

Presentation 2: “Aflatoxin, Human Health, and Novasil Clay,” Timothy Phillips.

Presentation 3: “Disease Prevention and Nutrition Promoting Properties of Beans and Pulses,” Maurice Bennink.

Presentation 4: “Animal Sourced Foods to Improve Micronutrient Nutrition and Human Function in Developing Countries,” Lindsay Allen

Panel 3-Biotech: Opportunities and Challenges

Speakers: Josette Lewis—Moderator
Dr. Florence Wambugu, Africa Harvest Biotech Foundation International
Mr. Jack Bobo, U.S. Department of State
Ms. Josette Lewis, USAID
Dr. Manjit Misra, Director, Biosafety Institute, Iowa State University

Presentation 1: “Biotechnology in the Context of International Development,”
Josette Lewis

Presentation 2: “Biotechnology Opportunities and Challenges,” Florence
Wambugu

Presentation 3: “State Department Outreach Activities on Agricultural
Biotechnology,” Jack Bobo.

Presentation 4: “Science Based Risk Assessment for Generation and Use of GM
Products,” Manjit Misra.

Reconvene BIFAD Meeting:

Update on Long-term Training Pilots, John Thomas, USAID

Two projects:

1. Pilots through ALO in Mali and East Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda). It has started and is occurring with Montana State University (Mali) and Ohio State University (East Africa) as the lead universities. Seven participants are in the Mali program, two of which are women. The coursework in Mali is sandwiched, and those students will set up a biotechnology entrepreneurial center when they go home. 12 Students from East Africa have started degree training at Ohio State University and Michigan State University, 2 of which are women.
2. The other project is a collaborative design project with Zambia and Ghana. Michigan State University is taking the lead through the Bean/Cowpea CRSP. This is a performance improvement program, open to public and private sectors. An agent of change is selected to be trained in the US, and then will return to lead the thinking process. There were 11 institutions that applied in Zambia. There are some issues to be discussed. For example, we wanted the private sector to be involved, but they have a difficult time in letting their people go because they are already working with little resources, and cannot necessarily afford to send someone away

for training, or those that work there do not have minimum requirements to attend school in the US. We have reserved 2 spots for private sector participants from Zambia. Missions have been very interested in this kind of training.

USAID wants to see missions include long term training as a tool. So far, all funds for training are coming from central funding. From the central bureau, we have provided about \$4.2 million for the BIFAD LTT and Borlaug Fellowship Programs for capacity building. For these current projects the WID Office provided \$500,000 for the Borlaug Women in Science program.

We will need to explore ways of making this a bigger initiative.

Post Award Progress on the SANREM and IPM CRSPs **Theo Dillaha, Virginia Tech**

Handout provided. There is a PDF version of the PowerPoint presentation.

Update on how the SANREM and IPM CRSPs are progressing since their award October 1, 2004.

Leader with Associates Leader with Associates

- First two CRSPs using LWA model
- Leader/Management Entity
- Fully staffed and operating on first day
- Leader aspects working well

Research Programs

Immediate Awards

- **IPM– Technology Transfer**
 - Partners and collaborators (20)
 - Continuation of previous IPM activities
 - \$880,000 over two years
- **SANREM– Knowledge Management**
 - Partners (8)
 - Synthesis of SA and NRM knowledge
 - \$720,000 over two years

Bridging Awards

- RFA within 2 weeks
- 12 applications
- 4 awards for \$381,042
- Funding within 3 months

Competitive Planning Awards

Funding for travel to host countries to:

- Identify research needs
- Consult with potential partners, stakeholders, & USAID Missions and Bureaus

- Develop collaborative research plan strategic objectives.

SANREM Planning Awards

- RFA within 3 months
- Worldwide distribution
- 74 applications
- 18 awards for \$702,444
- External Review Panel
- Funding within 6 months

IPM Planning Awards

- RFA within 2 months
- Worldwide distribution
- 30 applications
- 16 awards for \$259,000
- External Review Panel
- Funding within 5 months
- +1 long-term global impact assessment award

IPM Long-Term Research Awards

- RFA within 2 months
- 17 Applications
- 1 without Planning Award
- 12 awards for \$7,000,000
- External Review Panel
- Funding within 11 months
- 6 Regional Programs
- 6 Global Themes

SANREM Long-Term Research Applications

- RFA within 3 months
- 28 applications
- 10 without Planning Awards
- External Evaluation Panel
- 4 to 6 awards for \$6,350,000
- Funding within 15 months
- **Initial partners = 8 of 28**

SANREM Long-Term Research Award Applications

- 11% 3 Europe and Eurasia
- 41 Total Countries
- 39% 11 Africa
- 14% 4 Asia and Near East
- 21% 6 Latin America & Caribbean
- 14% 4 Global

Associate Awards

- Funding from USAID Missions/Bureaus
- Leader and sub-awardees pre-qualified
- CRSP CTO verifies technical fit with program description
- Award to Leader, who manages the Associate Award team.
- Associate Award CTO/AO from Mission/Bureau
- Goal: >\$1 million/year
- IPM has one \$375,000 award

\$1 million per year is a goal. Success will depend on establishing good working relationships and records with Missions. This will take time. IPM's Associate Award was result of accomplishments during the previous IPM CRSP.

Lessons Learned

- IPM successful with AA because of pre Phase III activities.
- SANREM will take time because of new ME.
- Initial SANREM partners were confused as to what the advantage of being a partner was. Some indicated that they had put in significant effort in putting together the initial proposal, with limited benefits (1) systems coordinator grants in some cases; 2) networking and 3) earlier info on the RFA (which should not happen in future due to COI).

Add "external review panel to manage conflicts of interest". The MEs put in mechanisms to manage conflicts of interest. These mechanisms were in our proposals and were required by USAID. With respect to saying that consortium members shouldn't have any input into the RFA, point out that the RFA development process for SANREM was done during a meeting of consortium members. It's not like any one consortium member had an inside track.

The competitive process drives people to spread themselves thinly in order to be competitive. Also, whereas in the old days the ME could broker different research components, we no longer have this ability. For example, the IPM global themes are supposed to work with the winning regional programs, but each wrote his/her proposal with only limited knowledge of the other. Getting the global themes and the regional programs working together with separate budgets will be a big challenge. You don't have this same problem in SANREM

For more extensive information, see the PowerPoint presentation.

Discussion:

Peter noted that he would like the SANREM CRSP to be able to say with great clarity 3 or 4 things that they CRSP will do over a 5 year period. He was of the opinion that the mandate of the CRSP right now is too much like university academia.

Tag Demment suggested that if USAID wants a CRSP to have a definitive list, that there needs to be consultation with USAID to decide the key issues, which is something that

never happens. It is unfair to ask this new CRSP to define those things at the very beginning because they are just getting started, and it takes a process of learning to be able to define those things.

Peter suggested that the new science advisor will be able to help out in defining these things.