

# BIFAD 148 Meeting Summary

July 6, 2006

## **Agenda**

8:30 a.m.	Welcoming and Introduction of new BIFAD members-M. Peter McPherson, Chairman
8:45 a.m.	Asia Near East programming for agriculture- Scott Christiansen, USAID/ANE/TR
9:15 a.m.	Europe and Eurasia programming for agriculture- Roger Bloom, E&E/EG
9:30 a.m.	Education for Development (The Program)- Martin Hewitt, USAID and Jeanne Marie Duval, HED
10:15 a.m.	Break
10:30 a.m.	Partnerships for Food Industry Development (PFID)- Jeff Lee, USAID/AG and Jim Simon, Rutgers University
11:15 a.m.	Food Security III (FS III) – John Staatz, Michigan State University
12:00 p.m.	Agricultural Biotechnology Support Project II (ABSP II) Frank Shotkoski, Cornell University
12:45 a.m.	Lunch
1:45 p.m.	The New Foreign Assistance Framework: Economic Growth- James Smith, DAA/EGAT
2:15 p.m.	Report out on CRSP Council Discussion of CRSP Guidelines- John Thomas, EGAT/AG
3:00 p.m.	CRSP Portfolio Implementation Status-John Thomas
3:15 p.m.	Status Report on Universities as Subcontractors- Mark Walther, USAID/OAA
3:30 p.m.	Other Items of General Interest and Summary- Peter McPherson
3:45 p.m.	Adjournment

## **BIFAD Board Members**

**Chair** M. Peter McPherson  
**BIFAD Members** Robert Easter  
Timothy Rabon  
Catherine Bertini  
Allen Christensen  
William DeLauder

## **Welcome and Introductions of New BIFAD Members**

*Opening Comments, Peter McPherson*

History/Current Status of BIFAD

- The Board is 30 years old. At its inception, it had a substantial staff and large pool of resources from which to draw. The Board contributed/guided to some issues that were at a formative stage in the agency.
- When I became administrator of AID, I brought the BIFAD perspective with me, which included an emphasis on human resources, institution building and technology creation. This approach was not strongly successful.
- BIFAD did not regain strength after that. President Clinton did not appoint a BIFAD chair and board in the first term, even though appointment of a board was a statutory requirement.
- Lately, BIFAD has begun to regain strength.
- The role originally envisioned for BIFAD, and as laid out in the statute, is for the university community to advise and assist the agency. The agency makes the final decision.
- Over the last years, we have been exploring how to redefine the relationship, and how “advise and assist” might have evolved to reflect a university community that is reasserting its role. The Bissell paper ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/agriculture/bifad/implementation\\_of\\_title\\_xii\\_june\\_22\\_06.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/agriculture/bifad/implementation_of_title_xii_june_22_06.pdf)), for example, was useful in elucidating the history and the viewpoints of many stakeholders, and it was useful in re-clarifying the role of BIFAD and the universities.
- AID has become accustomed to treating universities, particularly the CRSPs, as contractors.
- We are in a period of transition, with new BIFAD members on board, and of working out the relationship over the next year.
- The relationship between AID and the universities should continue to be strengthened.
- Some issues that we need to work out: cost-sharing wording in RFA, some very technical issues, sweeping policy questions (e.g. short term vs. long term nature of aid)
- Most aid is now short-term, emergency. We have lost our balance in that we no longer focus enough on long-term aid.
- Questions the agency needs to confront: What role does AID play in long-term training? What role does AID have in the creation of new technology? What role should AID play in institutional development? The university is key to contributing to these kinds of questions/roles. The university is not so good at managing large good and service transfer programs.
- What is the position of BIFAD on these questions? We need to deal with the smaller, specific issues, such as how the RFA is worded, but we also need to figure out the overall, guiding vision of the balance.

*Introductions of new BIFAD members:*

- **Catherine Bertini**-professor of public administration at the Maxwell School at Syracuse University. Prior to that, assistant secretary at USDA, executive director at World Food Program (WFP), and under secretary general in the UN.
- **Bob Easter**-Dean in the College of Agricultural Consumer and Environmental Sciences at the University of Illinois. Animal scientist by profession, working in graduate education and training related to production of animals as food for humans.

- **Allen Christensen**-Director of the Ezra Taft Benson Food and Agricultural Institute at Brigham Young University for the last five years. Prior to that, spent 30 years at California State Polytechnic University as a professor of animal and veterinary science, dean of the College of Agriculture and provost and academic vice president. Also was an inaugural member of the Joint Committee on Agriculture, Research and Development that used to report to BIFAD.
- **Tim Rabon**-Cattle operator from New Mexico, and collaborates with the extension program at New Mexico State University.
- **Bill DeLauder**-President Emeritus of Delaware State University, Executive Director of the Commission on Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship program. A physical chemist by training.

*Summarized comments from board members regarding future of BIFAD:*

- The task at hand is to strengthen the role of BIFAD as an advisory body to AID, especially on long-term development and on food and agriculture, and to do it in a way that makes the best use of resources and which yields a productive outcome for BIFAD/universities and AID.
- The process of advising AID is also in fluctuation. The BIFAD meeting is a sensible forum for advising AID.
- There are continuing pressing development needs, not much changed from 20-30 years ago, such as alleviating poverty and hunger, as stridently as the war on terror. The university system clearly can contribute to this task, and should be drawn in more.
- The work of BIFAD has to be presented/constructed in a way that is resonant with foreign policy, and which demonstrates the importance of strong agriculture and food systems as it relates to poverty reduction. Programming is increasingly coming from the State Department.

### ***Asia Near East programming for agriculture***

*Scott Christiansen*-Agricultural Development Officer for Asia and the Near East Bureau, working in the office for technical support in the environment team (*handout of PowerPoint presentation given out. The presentation is available upon request*). The presentation described the major agriculture programs in the 3 regions by country: MENA, South Asia, and East Asia. [http://www.usaid.gov/locations/asia\\_near\\_east/](http://www.usaid.gov/locations/asia_near_east/)

- We are more and more in collaboration with the State Department in terms of decision making of our programs.
- Much of what occurs in the region is agricultural in nature, though it is often “embedded,” or coded, in other areas, such as economic growth, democracy and governance, health, environment, etc. This results in an underestimation of agriculture as a driver/vehicle for progress in all sectors. Part of the message of the presentation was to look for opportunities in agriculture in other sectors.
- Highlighted countries included Pakistan, India, Iraq, Afghanistan, China, Egypt, Indonesia, Philippines, Bangladesh

### ***Europe and Eurasia programming for agriculture-***

*Roger Bloom, Division Chief for Market Transitions in E&E/EG (handout of PowerPoint presentation given out. The presentation is available upon request)*. Mr. Bloom described examples of agriculture programs in the E&E region.

[http://www.usaid.gov/locations/europe\\_eurasia/](http://www.usaid.gov/locations/europe_eurasia/)

- This bureau is unique in that it was created in 1989. The mission is to transition from formally communist states to democracies with open markets. The principle areas of assistance are economic prosperity and security, energy in infrastructure, democracy, human rights and social transition.
- Agriculture programs are typically embedded in economic prosperity and security assistance. The focus in agriculture is on agribusiness development, NRM, and land reform. The intent is to make agriculture competitive and to establish functioning market economies. A DC-based program is the Regional Competitiveness Initiative, which assists producers and processors to provide fresh produce to some of the region's largest supermarket chains. There is also the farmer-to-farmer program.
- The particular role of supermarkets in creating access and supply chains for rural farmers.
- Highlighted countries included Albania, Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan.

### ***Education for Development (The Program)***

*Martin Hewitt USAID(CTO HED) and Jeanne Marie Duval, HED.* Presented an overview and examples of specific HED programs and how HED supports the work of the agency.

<http://www.aascu.org/alo/>

- The ALO office is now called the Higher Education for Development Program. A new cooperative agreement with AID was signed in September 2005 through the American Council for Education (ACE).
- HED allows the agency to take advantage of 2800 institutes of higher education, which have multifaceted expertise, and which can contribute in many ways to international development. Currently, HED has over 280 partnerships nationally and internationally, and provides a forum (and expertise from universities) for addressing key issues of concern to the agency.
- Partnerships are funded centrally Leader Awards; Associate Awards, come from mission, collaborative awards occur with other government agencies).
- Partnerships are developed between US institutions and foreign education institutions, and engage in dialogue on many issues, as well as strengthen educational opportunities for US and foreign students through research, exchanges and training, and through institution strengthening. Multiple partners are characteristic, including NGOs, bilateral and multilateral institutions. The advantage of the HED program is that it is nimble and flexible. HED has also launched the Development Specialists Program, the goal of which is to provide broad and diverse sources of technical and advisory expertise to USAID (<http://www.aascu.org/alo/devspecialist/devspecialist.htm>).
- Cost Sharing
  - HED typically requires a cost-sharing arrangement for partnerships whereby universities contribute 25%. But technical assistance arrangements are set up differently, and obligation by the university is reduced because they are providing the assistance.
  - Mr. Allen Christiansen wondered if asking universities to grant tuition waivers was asking the state to subsidize a federal program. Ms. Duval responded cost sharing is reflective of the cooperative agreement, through which both sides are asked to put in something, and that the particularities of any given cost share vary.
  - Funding has been modest (approx \$8 million), and now HED is trying to market directly to missions and bureaus.

- Traditional agricultural research projects are de-emphasized in the current Cooperative Agreement. Current agriculture interventions are more focused on natural resources management or water management as part of strategic objectives.

### **Partnerships for Food Industry Development (PFID)**

*Jeff Lee, Team Leader of Office of Agribusiness and Markets, USAID/AG and Jim Simon, Rutgers University presented an overview of the PFID program, and gave specific examples.*

- Focus of team is to create competitive participation in global trading systems by creating better linkages between producers, the value chain, and the market.
- PFID program focus is to create a regulatory and policy environment that is based in science, and which applies food processing and market technologies to create increased sales of the value added product, and improves supply chains. Missions can buy into this program.
- It is a joint university and food industry technical assistance program. The leader agreement is managed by the Agribusiness and Markets Team within EGAT/AG.
- Three major programs that strengthen food industries: PFID Meat, Seafood and Poultry (with Louisiana State, funding of \$5 million); PFID fruit and vegetable (with Michigan State, \$9million); PFID Natural Products (with Rutgers, \$2.5 million).
- Because of declining funding, everything we do is geared towards achieving results in the short term.
- Dr. Simon from Rutgers spoke specifically on the Natural Products/ASNAPP project, which uses a scientifically-based and market-driven model that seeks to develop and strengthen successful private and public partnerships in sustainable economic growth of sub-Saharan African natural plant products. These agribusiness partnerships are based on the development of local, regional, and international trade in natural products, based upon the regions' unique ethnic/traditional natural products (which include teas, spices and flavorings, aromatic oils, medicinal plants, and plant-based cosmetic ingredients) that have scientifically verifiable functional properties and are in market demand. For example, there is a focus on indigenous plants because these are things that work well in local and regional markets. This PFID project built on the work of the ASNAPP (Agribusiness Sustainable Natural African Plants Products) program.
- Specific examples of PFID projects included projects in Ukraine (Breeze Limited), Nicaragua, South Africa, Georgia, Ukraine, Moldova, Ghana, Egypt, and Senegal.

### **Food Security III (FS III)**

*John Staatz, Michigan State University (PowerPoint presentation available on request)*

<http://aec.msu.edu/fs2/>

- FSIII represents a longstanding partnership with AID, with EGAT and predecessors.
- Food Security is defined as “assuring that people have adequate food at all times for a healthy and active life. There are three dimensions: availability, access, and utilization. Approaches focus on policy, building institutions, capacity building.
- Capacity building has activities that include long term training and supporting productive public and private partnerships.
- The agreement is a Leader with Associate award, an arrangement that has been a key factor in building partnerships. The focus is exclusively in Africa, and many African partnerships have been established with diverse groups (universities, government, private companies).

- The original RFA laid out five guiding principles. Focus on issues important to EGAT and missions fully involve African researchers and other partners, build capacity, and maintain institutional memory.
- Work is grounded in 3 themes: early food system performance, improve markets to achieve growth and poverty alleviation, understand relationship between food security and NRM.
- Quite a bit of work is being done around linking emergency responses to longer term development, and designing emergency assistance in a way that does not disrupt local food markets.
- We also look at broader issues, such as the impact of HIV and AIDS on households, and found that impacts are specific to households, and determined by who is ill, or who dies, in the household.
- Other issues: child nutrition, development of learning/education materials, strengthen outreach, emphasize capacity building.
- MSU has a long term commitment in Africa.
- Important findings: (1) On the whole, farmers are net *buyers*, rather than producers, of household staples. (2) Building markets requires good policy and good design work (they don't spring up spontaneously) (3) Private sector will indeed serve remote and rural areas if there are good incentives. (4) pricing can influence food preferences (5) cash crops can help improve food security.

### ***Agricultural Biotechnology Support Project II (ABSP II)***

*Frank Shotkoski, Cornell University* (Dr. Shotkoski spoke about the various projects. Specific information on projects can be found on the website)

<http://www.absp2.cornell.edu/>

- The primary focus of the ABSP II project is to introduce and bring agriculture biotechnology to the developing world in a commercially safe fashion dealing with all the biosafety ramifications. It is a support group that helps to bring in the technology and to find local support for it. The ABSP project wants to be pulled in by people who want the technology.
- Total of about 8 projects. Projects in India, Bangladesh, Philippines, Indonesia, Mali, Uganda.
- The approach is to use biotechnology to solve problems only in situations where there is no viable conventional alternative and when the political environment is conducive. The idea is just to bring bioengineered products to the most resource-poor farmers for sustenance, rather than to big producers or food processors.
- A good communications strategy has been paramount: how technology can be accessed and used legally, how it should be used.
- We work through a Leader Associate Award, with \$15 million from EGAT, USA Associate award of \$3.5 million, matching funds from Cornell at about \$4 million.
- Project works through public/private partnerships, 75 in all. There are 17 national and regional partners, nine different US universities, nine private sector entities, six of the CGIARs, six NGOs, and 28 smaller partners.
- Examples of projects: Late blight resistant potatoes in India, Bangladesh and Indonesia; multi-virus resistant tomatoes in Indonesia, Philippines and Mali; banana project in Uganda; reduction of use of pesticides on/increase yields of eggplant in India (with Monsanto); drought and saltwater tolerant rice in China.

## **The New Foreign Assistance Framework: Economic Growth**

*James Smith, DAA/EGAT (materials handed out at meeting)*

- Publicly released documents can be found on [www.state.gov](http://www.state.gov), and the New Foreign Assistance Framework can be found at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/65643.pdf>.
- Fundamental purpose of the reform is to ensure that we are providing both the necessary tools and the right incentives for host governments to secure conditions necessary for their citizens to achieve their full human potential.
- The overarching goal of US foreign assistance is “Helping to build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that will respond to the needs of their people and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system.” From now on, all foreign assistance funds are measured against achieving this goal.
- Five by Five matrix as laid out in new framework. Five categories of countries: rebuilding countries, developing countries, transforming countries, sustaining partnership countries, and restrictive countries.
- Agriculture is part of economic growth. There are two parts to improving agriculture as it relates to economic growth: creating enabling environment (policy, market standards) and improving agriculture sector productivity (research and technology dissemination, land and water management, finance, etc).
- Currently, a very intensive process is ongoing to discuss the five areas of programming.
- There are 19 accounts that are managed by USAID and State. We are not budgeting by account. Rather we tell each country how much they have in total to work with, here are the five broad objectives, and ask them to determine what mix of resources will work best. The Secretary of State will then determine if that mix is achieving our objectives in those countries, or if a different mix is needed. Changes may either turn out to be large or small.
- BIFAD’s contribution relates to the economic growth portion of this.

## **Update-Title XII Analysis**

*Richard Bissell, National Academy of Science*

- Goal of paper was to look at the role of BIFAD and the agency as stipulated by Title XII legislation.
- After last presentation on the draft report, changes were incorporated based on feedback.
- The opportunity to program from the long term may be present in the new foreign assistance framework. The types of long term programming that you find in each of the stages will differ...how you program for the long term will vary by context. The challenge is for land grants to recognize and design approaches in those various stages.
- Reactions to the paper will be discussed at length in the next meeting.

## **Report out on CRSP Council Discussion of CRSP Guidelines-**

*John Thomas, EGAT/AG*

- Some important roles for BIFAD include: (1) Bring a voice to AID’s agriculture programming from both the public and private sectors, (2) Raise issues that are important in agriculture and advocate for them, and mobilize organizations to address them, (3) Help AID work with partners, especially universities, and help them adjust to changes in USAID and the way that we work.

- A CRSP council meeting was recently held, where the revised guidelines were discussed. A draft of the revised guidelines had been prepared that incorporated all the changes, resulting from past dialogue and deliberation during the portfolio review. There was not time to go through a detailed review.
- There are a number of decisions that need to be made by BIFAD on the revised guidelines, and other revisions also need to be made that reflect updated funding realities, (e.g. use of a cooperative agreement under Leader with Associates award, the use of core funding). Other changes: remove redundancies, remove some of the restrictions on cost-share, make it shorter for primary research, and remove some of the directives regarding CRSP governance.
- Generally, the CRSP directors agreed with the broad changes. The next step is to get representatives from AID, BIFAD, and CRSPs to discuss what is needed in guidelines. The objective for this process is to build a partnership between AID and universities, which would be reflected in the guidelines.
- We need to agree on the purpose and objectives of the guidelines, and how the guidelines will be used, and the content. It is the belief of Tim Williams and John Thomas that the guidelines should describe roles, expectations of USAID and universities within the framework of Title XII. This will be important for universities who have never had a relationship with AID.
- Chairman McPherson noted that these issues of guidelines needed to be resolved expeditiously and in an efficient manner. He also noted that he could spend only half a day in deliberations about what the guidelines should be. This should be a meeting where about six representatives from the affected groups should be present, and that there should be a document at the end of it that can be brought to the next meeting for approval.
- Tim Williams (U of Georgia) and John Thomas agreed to meet to get further along in the process before bringing Chairman McPherson in.

## **Cost Sharing**

- RFAs require cost sharing. Under the old CRSP agreements there was a stated 25% cost share. But, it has been AID's policy to eliminate the fixed cost share. It is up to the university to state for the cost share, but there are no points awarded on the cost proposal. The CRSP council asks that AID impose a fixed cost share amount.
- One concern among universities is the university competes for the management entity and needs a guarantee of cost share from all of the subcontractors.
- From a university perspective, it is fixed and known in advance to all players.
- From a university perspective, it is not yet clear what authority the ME has to insist on the cost share from the subcontractors. Right now, the RFA does not specify the source of the cost share, and the ME does not want to be the guarantor for all of the cost share. As it stands, it is not clear what is required.
- From the USAID perspective, USAID intends to award the single ME, and it is the responsibility of the ME to obtain the cost share from the subcontractors. If they don't agree to some of the cost share, then they don't get the contract. This is to bring the CRSPs into regular agency guidance on cost share, instead of having them have a unique arrangement.
- Typically, under the new guidance, they don't set a direct amount because they let the marketplace figure out what can be brought to the table. It will vary among primes and subs, but it has to be worked out according to relevant circumstances.

- These are grants and cooperative agreements, so that they are shared programs, which is why the cost share is required.
- In judging the proposals, the cost share *per se* doesn't have any points, but impact does, and the impact is increased if there is more money available for the project because the cost share is greater. If the university puts in more money, the impact will be greater, and therefore the bid has a better position. So, while cost share doesn't have any points, the fact that increased cost sharing will indirectly be favored more. With no cap, no one can have an idea of what to propose.
- Universities accept the required cost share, but would prefer to have a cap on it. From the government perspective, there shouldn't be caps because there should be a limit on what can be achieved.
- Chairman McPherson suggested that some deliberation on setting a cap and a minimum.

## **Guidelines**

- Guidelines are instructive, not required. They should not be prescriptive, and they should not tell CRSPs how to govern. There are certain things, however, that need to be memorialized in the guidelines, e.g. cost share, agreement on priorities, two five-year terms, neutrality for an incumbent...etc.

## ***Status Report on Universities as Subcontractors-***

*Mark Walther, USAID/OAA*

- There is a pilot solicitation out in global health. The next one in the cue is a multiple award IQC in anti corruption.
- We are in the process of determining a time frame for the proposed rule making. We have put out a notice of the proposed rule to elicit input from the wider community.
- There was some concern that mega-contractors would only be required to notify AID of any changes in subcontractors, but the guidance actually requires a response from AID, the agreement officer, or the contracting officer. The mega-contractor is required to notify the agency and get consent for any time they are performing work under a contract where they are not using their original partners.
- Chairman McPherson noted that it was important to get the rule instituted, and not to wait for a full cycle of the award to be completed (5 years).
- Chairman McPherson noted that BIFAD would be deliberating on how to proceed with finding some hard data to determine the efficacy of longer term training, and to quantify the perception that AID is moving back to short term training.

In closing, new BIFAD members were presented with formal certificates to acknowledge their appointments.