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THE CHAIRMAN: We have a very full agenda today, and we very much appreciate your interest in being here. My name is Bob Easter, and I serve as the Chair of the Board for International Food & Agriculture Development, and I just very quickly want to introduce the other Board members. Some of you know them from long experience and others may not, President Bill DeLauder, former president of Delaware State, now Emeritus. He’s a member of our Board just on my far right. Sitting next to him the newest member of the Board, H Barlow. H, if you’d raise your hand. He has joined us. This is his first meeting from Kentucky just appointed by the President. And Tim Rabon from New Mexico at the center of the table has been on the Board now for about two years, I believe. Tim, is that correct? And Ron Senykoff, who is in the back of the room, is staff support from USAID, our secretariat. And if you have questions or issues with the room and other things today as we go forward, please let Ron know and we’ll deal with those. The program this morning will evolve beginning with some presentations to give us some background for discussions that we’ll have later in the day. And the first of those presentations is by Steven
Gale, who is Senior Advisor for USAID for Legislative and Public Affairs Bureau. And the topic is one that I think you’ll find very intriguing. I have e-mail interchanges with Administrator Fore periodically, and recently she introduced the topic of the Global Development Commons, and that was a new one for me. I don’t live in Washington so I’m not always aware of some of the terms that are on the table so I Googled it and I learned quite a bit in that process. And so, Steven, if you would come forward we’d be delighted to hear your comments and give us an introduction to Global Development Commons. Thank you.

MR. GALE: Thank you, Bob. It’s a pleasure to be here before BIFAD. I’m Steve Gale, and I work in Legislative and Public Affairs at USAID. And my agenda this morning is really your agenda. I’d like to talk for about 10 or 15 minutes and discuss what the Administrator has in her mind for what we all consider a very bold vision to transfer information from the developed to the developing world, and then I’d like to leave enough time to answer your questions and encourage your questions because this Global Development Commons is something that USAID is a catalyst for but is something that we won’t own and don’t want to own. It needs to be out there in the public space. Let me let
the Administrator introduce the Global Development Commons by way of a You Tube video. In late January of this year the Administrator was at the World Economic Forum in Davos, and You Tube was a partner with the WEF, and they had booths set up in a very informal way, and the top leaders at WEF all decided that that might be a very useful tool to introduce themselves, their organizations, and their vision for the developing world. So if you have a seat that gives you access to the screen, that would be great. If not, feel free to move around. And let me introduce Administrator Fore to you by You Tube.

***

[Video shown]

***

MR. GALE: Well, thank you, Administrator Fore, for an overview of the Global Development Commons, and I would strongly encourage you to follow Bob’s lead and go on to usaid.gov, our public web site, and you’ll find the Global Development Commons. And if you happen to Google the Global Development Commons, which I do from time to time you’ll find that it has something like 10,000 hits, so the Commons itself is really taking off, and I want to try to add some detail to it as Administrator Fore outlined the vision. And so one
asks, okay, well, what is it actually? And it’s a virtual space. By that I mean a portal or a web site and in this web site you have everyone who’s involved in development from farmers to ministers to bilaterals to universities to NGOs. As I mentioned, it’s not something that we own or any of the parties own. For those who are familiar with Wikipedia, it’s that kind of concept. It’s not owned but everyone participates. And the reason for the Commons is that if you think about it, and many of you have been in this for a number of years, if you ask yourself what’s changed in the last couple of years in foreign assistance, well, just about everything has changed. Ten years ago bilateral donors and other institutions were 80 percent of flows going into developing countries, and everybody else was 20 percent. Well, in just a short period of time that’s completely flipped, and now the Bill Gates Foundation and Hewlett Packard Foundation and many other foundations are in fact becoming the major players. So there have been dramatic changes in development assistance. Think about remittances, those funds flowing back to countries by workers outside of their indigenous country. If you added up all of the bilateral assistance and all of the foreign assistance you’d find that remittances, which a couple of years ago...
were quite small, are now more than three times the total of all foreign assistance. So the landscape for development has rapidly changed, and development assistance doesn’t look like it did just a couple of years ago. If you add on to that the notion that the Internet has radically changed information, if you think of those two concepts, that gives you sort of the underlying core about what the Development Commons is, trying to capture changes, dramatic changes in development, combine those with information sharing. And information sharing is not new. It’s been around for a while. But I think we need as a group to reconsider and reposition how we use information sharing to advance development. And the other core principle is that if you think about all that information sharing over the years a lot of it has been at the top upper levels where the world bank and USAID and maybe BIFAD executive are talking, but I’m not sure a lot of that information is being shared with fishermen and farmers and coffee growers. So here’s just a couple of comments. You will know this already either by yourself or if you have children or nieces and nephews or whatever that the Internet is exploding in use. There’s over a billion people using the Internet. Now what you may not have realized is that more than half of those
are in the developing world. That’s the next big market. By 2011 two out of every three users of the Internet are going to be in the developing world so if you want to reach people on the Internet and you want to reach people in the developing world it’s being shaped before us. And I think the other aspect to the Global Development Commons is that again there’s so many new players. You could -- five years you could count or aggregate the number of players in development assistance now. There is an explosion in public and private stakeholders in development assistance which is great so development assistance has changed. The Internet is exploding, many, many more players. So why isn’t it working? Why aren’t we making the kind of advances that we would like to in sharing information with those in the developing world? I don’t know the answer but I’ll posit a couple of things. One is that if you try to look at material and get what you need if you’re the end user you’re going to find it’s not that easy. There’s a lot of information out there so you have these 10,000 hits on Global Development Commons but you may find that what you’re interested is hit number 2000. You’re going to have wade through 8,000 hits. So if you look at Google, Yahoo, some of the major search engines they’re interested in -- that’s not their line
of business, sharing development information. Their line of business is speed and number of hits, et cetera, not necessarily content. So they are in a different business than we’re in. Also, if you look at the information on the Internet it’s not necessarily accurate, and no one claims that it is. So if you have a medical issue and you want to Google you’re going to have to wade through a lot of web sites to find the actual content, and the same thing is true for development. The third reason why I think things haven’t come together as quickly as we would like it to be is that I’m not sure we’re reaching the right audience, that is, we’re not reaching the people who could benefit most from development assistance. That doesn’t mean that it’s always the farmer and it could be a minister or an implementer of a USAID program or any other program, but it’s definitely been a top heavy information exchange, not pushing down towards the lower ends. I just make two other points about -- I don’t want to over emphasize and exaggerate the Internet. In many countries like Afghanistan, parts of Africa, radio is the big vehicle. But the point is still the same that increasingly more and more people are onto the Internet or relying more on radio, and where does the radio content come from, often from people who are using
the Internet. So I mention that point because I don’t
want to say that we expect in five years every single
person to have a mobile phone that’s web enabled, but
that’s where it’s going. What are the goals of the GDC?
Well, there’s really just four. The first three have to
do with what we’re calling Developmental Portal 2.0.
That’s outside the Ronald Reagan Building, outside of
our missions in the field, that has to do with
accelerating real time exchange of information. AID’s
role, we just want to be a catalyst. We don’t want to
own it. We don’t want to build a platform necessarily,
but what we want to do is kick the can further down the
road, and not assume that it’s going to happen randomly.
We want to catalyze the development of a portal that
shares development information. To do that, we need to
build partnerships with leading public and private
sector organizations because, as I mentioned earlier,
it’s not our line of business, portal development, and,
two, the real experts are not within USAID. We have
some very talented people in our organization. We have
many award winning web sites, but when we come to work
at AID we’re generally focused on development
assistance, not on web development. So those first
three points are what we would to achieve, what the
Administrator is an achievable goal outside in the
larger world. And the last one I think is relevant to USAID in particular within headquarters and all are missions abroad is that if we are going to be a leader in information sharing then we need to work on our own information and connect all of our web sites so that you can easily index and search and learn about AID, and surprisingly that’s not as easy as you would think. So there are some of the players, governments, multi-lateral, academics, business, foundations, universities. This is going to be a global effort and we’re going to need partnerships all along the way. We’re going to need partnerships within USAID to build that fourth goal, that internal smart portal, and we’re already beginning to really inventory what we have with USAID because without that we’re unlikely to build a smart portal if you don’t know what exists. We think, we think now we have about 300 web sites, but my guess is as we look further we’re probably supporting a number of more web sites. We have a number of advisory groups as any entity like ours would need to have to get good ideas from the outside. We have a mission director’s working group that has told us great idea, wonderful idea, Administrator Fore, but we need to do some field testing on this and make sure we know the requirements of the end users. Our theory is don’t build it and
assume they’ll come. Go to the people who are the potential end users and ask them if you had a mobile phone what are the barriers for you getting the information you need to reduce poverty and advance economic growth. So we’re going to do some field testing of it and I think -- I think I’m really done with my Power Point. Secretary of State Colin Powell once made an address that said we have a lot of threats in America, and the biggest threat we have is the Power Point, but I succumb to using the Power Point in any case. I’m done and happy to entertain questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our minutes are recorded so I would appreciate it if you ask a question, and we’ll begin with the Board, that you identify yourself for our secretary. Yes, Dr. DeLauder.

MR. DELAUDER: Yes. Good morning. Thanks for that presentation. Three quick questions. One is has it all been university people developing this concept?

MR. GALE: We have. Right now we are working and getting ideas from universities, Michigan State University, Ohio University, so our doors are open and we welcome that kind of insight. Again, it’s not our main line of operation.

MR. DELAUDER: I understand. Now do you expect to contract this out to someone or is this
something that you’re going to try in your own capacity within USAID to maintain?

MR. GALE: I expect down the road we will need additional support in terms of our contractual support but those decisions have not really been made yet. Really in a way this is an opportunity because you’re at the ground level now. We have a concept but we don’t have arms and legs for this yet, but I expect something will come down the line.

MR. DELAUDER: Okay. Then the last question is have you given thought to how you evaluate the effectiveness once it’s up and operating?

MR. GALE: That’s an excellent question. These are all excellent questions. My background is monitoring evaluation and so I was always thinking what are our benchmarks, is it number of hits, is it number of players? So I thought about it but I haven’t made much progress, but it’s an excellent point.

MR. DELAUDER: Yeah. Just going on number of hits may not necessarily say that you’re getting the information to the people that you...

MR. GALE: Absolutely. I totally agree. Hits we already know. They don’t tell us much. They’re just outputs, and we’re interested in impacts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Dr. Christensen.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: I’m intrigued with this. My question is have you thought about more languages than just English because a lot of the people that you’re going to be trying to reach are going to be French speaking or Farsi speaking or Arabic speaking.

MR. GALE: Yes. We know that an English language version is going to have a very limited target so we’re thinking of expanding it. We just saw a wonderful demonstration by Michigan State University yesterday on a network they built in a food network, and one of the first questions that came out, that’s great, is it in multiple language, is it in Hindi? I guess they’re working in India. So, yes, we think multiple languages are fundamental for the success. That’s our target audience. The vast majority are not going to speak English, and a vast majority even in their indigenous language will be illiterate so this system needs to have ample video. Maybe you’re handling mangoes but you don’t have the Hindi text capability. Well, if you see the product and you see how it’s quality controlled and packaged maybe that’s sufficient so both multiple languages and video we think are essential. But we’re a long way from there, but we’re thinking along the same lines as that.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Do you intend on this web
site to reference other web sites where people actually
have this kind of information insofar as you know about
it?

MR. GALE: Yes. On the smart portal, the one
we’re trying to build within USAID there are many cases
where we are not the leader surprise, surprise in some
area. Maybe it’s water conservation, and maybe the
Dutch have the best web site. We’re going to hyperlink
from us to other web sites. Again, we just see us as
sort of the first place to go but not necessarily where
you’re going to end up, so yes.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: A lot of American
universities and their development organizations have
their own web sites where I think the information on
there is pretty sound by and large.

MR. GALE: I totally agree. The last thing we
want to do is invent another web site. We’re not in the
web site -- we have a very small staff. Amy Cole [ph]
is sitting midway here, raise your hand, Amy, T.J., an
intern from LPA, you’re looking at the Global
Development Commons staff. The three of us are not
going to change the world, but we think we can lay a
foundation to make some changes. Those are all good
questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Other questions from the Board?
Questions from the audience? I think this is incredibly exciting, and if you think about some of the challenges that you’ll have to work through, how best to structure this, how best to deliver it. It will require a lot of input and effort. Is there anything that you need from this Board, any perspective that we could offer to you?

MR. GALE: Well, what I would encourage everyone here is first go on to the web site, poke around, see what interests you. Shoot me an e-mail. Again you’re at the ground floor of I think a very exciting opportunity to transfer information to the developing world where like most enterprises our doors are wide open. Eventually they begin to sort of close a little bit as we get things done but now is the time to send us your best ideas and links to other web sites because we are in the building stage and very open to suggestions and ideas. So if something doesn’t come to you now, it’s too early in the morning for that kind of a brainstorm, feel free to contact me. Go on the web site. And I guess if there are no further questions, thank you very much for your attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Back in early November the Administrator was the keynote speaker at NASULGC, National Association of Land-Grant Universities and State Colleges, and at that meeting she announced a
summit of university leaders, presidents, and
chancellors. And to give us a bit of background in
expectations from that summit, Martin Hewitt, Senior
Education Officer, EGAT.

MR. HEWITT: Good morning, everyone. Nice to
be here. My name is Martin Hewitt. I’m with the
Education Office EGAT, USAID. As mentioned actually
this sort of operationalizes some elements of what Steve
spoke about on the Global Development Commons because
that’s what this higher education summit for global
development, which is scheduled for April 29 and April
30 this year is designed to do. So I’ve got a one-page
concept paper about this summit, and I’ll leave it with
you. And as we speak, we’re in the midst of organizing
the summit. So let me just give you some background.
Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Secretary of
Education Margaret Spellings will convene a higher
education summit for global development in Washington,
D.C. on April 29 and April 30, 2008. Extending the
vision of -- there was a 2006 university presidents
higher education summit. The goal of the 2008 summit is
to expand the role and impact of U.S. and foreign higher
education institutions in worldwide social and economic
development. The objectives of the summit will be, one,
to broaden partnerships and networks amongst U.S., other
developed country and developing country, higher
education institutions, the private sector, and
foundations. The participants are U.S. higher education
institutions, about 110 of them, 90 foreign
institutions, higher education institutions, and 40 or
so U.S. corporations and foundations. Two, to highlight
and expand emerging and innovative approaches to
exchanges, teaching, research, technology transfer, and
business development. And, three, develop strategies to
establish new and enduring higher education
relationships for international development particularly
in science and technology, engineering, and other fields
that support innovative and economic growth. Now part
of our team consists of -- that are helping to organize
this consist of members from the State Department,
members from the Education Department, science advisor,
Nena Fedderoff [ph], the Administrator’s science
advisor. So focus on innovation. The summit will
showcase innovative, emerging, and thought provoking
approaches to economic, educational, business, and
scientific collaboration. Showcasing these approaches
is intended to stimulate discussion of new ideas and
strategies that, one, go beyond the current practices,
two, overcome the obstacles that impede higher education
interactions and knowledge, the technology transfer in
developing countries, and, three, promote new kinds of collaborative partnerships that leverage contemporary communications technologies. We envision the major summit outcomes to be the U.S. government will advance its global vision of higher education development cooperation and move its shared interest with its partners to a higher priority on the national agenda. Specific outcomes will include an increase in the number and kind and quality of strategic partnerships between U.S. universities and colleges, foreign universities, private sector partners, foundations that apply new and innovative models and approaches particularly in science, engineering, and other fields that support economic growth and build capacity to solve global challenges. Two, follow on a 2008 regional forums in Africa and Middle East will jump start partnership development and expansion so after the summit we envision at least conferences in perhaps one in the Near East and one in Africa. These partnerships will yield measurable increases in graduate study and faculty exchange programs for U.S. universities and colleges. Thirdly, new approaches to technical assistance programs, applied research, short and long-term training programs, institutional development exchange programs, and other development of curriculum and learning tools.
Fourthly, expand the use of information and communications technologies to support new approaches including virtual teaching and learning and web-based dissemination of best practices. And, fifth, creation of a global university network for building capacity and science and technology in developing countries. So the partnership -- the participants, as I mentioned, the summit will bring together higher education presidents from around the world with leaders from the government, philanthropy and business sectors, the Secretaries of State and Education and the USAID Administrator will be invited to speak, among others. The format, the summit will start with an evening reception, dinner, and keynote speakers on Tuesday, April 29. On Wednesday, April 30, the summit will include presentations on innovative partnerships and networks related to higher education. Small break out groups will consider strategies to expand or broaden new approaches to partnerships and networks, and how best to facilitate new kinds of linkages. A closing session will summarize the new strategies and focus on next steps. Regional USAID bureaus or other groups will organize additional meetings on May 1 with leaders from developing country institutions of higher education to explore relevant regional initiatives and programs and plan future
events. So essentially this is a two-day affair.

Again, I think it speaks to what Steve spoke about earlier sort of operationalizing elements of the commons whereby we bring in as mentioned U.S. and foreign higher education institutions and leaders, as well as philanthropy, corporations, and foundations, and sort of generate, showcase illustrative examples of work that’s being done, and sort of catalyze and mobilize and generate relationships to expand our work. I work with the Higher Education for Development Program which we operate through the U.S. Higher Education Association and much of our work especially recently has engaged other partners whether they’re corporations or foundations in the work, and I think of our work as creating infrastructures of relationships that others can tap into. So I think this summit, I think, could be a very important event to highlight approaches and try to scale them and expand them. So I think we’re looking forward to a very fruitful and significant event. So thank you very much. Any questions?

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: How do you intend to invite the presidents? This will be a blanket invitation or will there be specific invitations?

MR. HEWITT: Well, specific. We’ve got 110
U.S. institutions, and I should say that we are trying
to balance and reconcile the huge number, the demand to
participate in this, so we’re looking for state
representation. We’re going -- these are looking for
institutions that are prominent in research and
development. We’re also looking at colleges and
universities. We’re looking at community colleges.
We’re looking at some private institutions. We’re
looking at some private institutions. We’re looking at
women-owned and minority serving institutions, and so
we’re trying to create a balance across the spectrum of
U.S. higher education, and then we’re also looking at --
through our Higher Education for Development Program we
have many partners that we have worked with in the
present agreement and so we’re tapping into that. We’ve
also asked our bureaus, our regional bureaus, to provide
their input as to institutions that should be invited.
The Department of State has some institutions that they
have worked with that they would like to see invited.
The Department of Education works fairly considerably
with community colleges, so we’re trying to strike this
balance and reach across the spectrum of -- so we’ve
been sending out, -- we’re sending out e-mails, save the
date e-mails. We’re following those up with calls, with
telephone calls.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: Are you looking for suggestions from this Board as to people that ought to come?

MR. HEWITT: I think we’re open to that, and I would suspect that — well, I’m not going to second guess but I would suspect that many of the institutions that you might suggest are probably ones that we’re in the midst of involving or inviting.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Without getting into an extensive commercial on behalf of Brigham Young University, the president of that university has traveled to over 100 different nations and over 70 percent of the students on that campus speak two or more languages. So he might bring an interesting dimension to that.

MR. HEWITT: Absolutely. Absolutely.

MR. DELAUDDER: How do we identify the foreign institutions?

MR. HEWITT: Well, I should say that part of our challenge in terms of supporting this effort, which it’s a costly effort, is to — we do have this mechanism which we — the HED mechanism before the ALO mechanism where we had numbers of partners whether from Africa or Asia or Latin America, we’re tapping into many of those partners, but we’ve also sought suggestions from our
regional bureaus, and then we have, as I mentioned, with our state colleagues and education colleagues and others making suggestions. And what we’re trying to do is we’re going to go out -- what we might say first here to go out and identify those institutions, and then we know that we’re not going to capture everyone. So we’re going to have to go back to tier two but we want to maintain that balance across the spectrum of those institutions, so I think we’re trying to be open and seek suggestions and advice but we do have -- it’s challenging to do it.

MR. DELAUDE: The list that you’re now working with, is that available?

MR. HEWITT: I think it’s -- we’re in the midst of trying to work through this so I think I’d rather not probably get into those specifics at this juncture.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the interesting developments today in education seems to be a fundamental change in paradigm. My perspective is that for the last several hundred years we’ve typically viewed higher education as bringing students to campus in a classroom and some relationship with an instructor. And we now have this emergence globally of degree offering institutions that are virtual, and our campus I
not unique. We now have what we call a fourth virtual
campus. There are private sector firm, as you well
know, that are degree granting institutions. How are
you going to engage with that because that in reality
can be a very significant part of the future of
education and development context.

MR. HEWITT: I can foresee featuring as one of
our themes or breakouts because we’re going to have at
least six an element of that in terms of virtual --
we’ve done some work through our program on SAMICH [ph]
programs. I talked to a fellow at Ohio State, but
anyway about some of the work that we’ve done, and some
others. Also, we’ve worked -- somewhat controversial,
we’ve worked with some private institutions at AID on
student loan program with some private for-profit
institutions through our Global Development Alliance,
which I was part of. And there’s some interesting
dynamics about that because of the lack of access and
the lack of space in many countries for students so
there’s this emergence of private institutions. Some of
them are reputable and others are not. That’s an
emerging growth industry in certain regions of the world
and certain countries so how we’re going to address that
-- we may address that as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess the point, do you
intend to invite the leaders from some of these organizations to the meeting of presidents?

MR. HEWITT: I could just say possibly, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask one other question. This has the potential of being a footing for a fairly fundamental change in how education is engaged with in development. What do you anticipate is the outcome? What will be the action steps that will come out of this? You know, an interesting paper would be one thing but is this the beginning of something else?

MR. HEWITT: I think that we’re hoping to -- what we’re trying to do is seek from all the participants some thoughts about -- well, some practices and some thoughts in terms of highlighting some of the work that’s going on out there, some of which we are aware of but much of which -- some of which we’re not aware of, and we were talking about Qual Com [ph] Corporation working with San Diego State University really about applying the research or commercializing or applying research from the academy and to promote economic growth, and so the higher education is a catalyst for any number of things. Some of them are pretty much dramatic sort of commercial. So I think there’s a lot of -- our sense is that higher education is a modality that achieves any number of objectives,
and we got many programs that work with MBAs or public health. I think hopefully this conference will be sharing and interacting with some of the institutions and corporations and foundations. I would like to see us really grow the work and catalyze relationships and mobilize more people so that they’re much more appreciative of and provocative as to what can be done and how it can be done. And so I see it as — it’s just two days but I see it as potentially a very big event.

THE CHAIRMAN: Other questions from the Board? The audience. Dr. Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: I’m Tim Williams from the University of Georgia. I’m really concerned that there’s a vision for something happening beyond that, and what I don’t see happening is some way that there’s a budget developed that’s going to build on this. What is happening inside USAID’s planning process for budget in 2009 for this to take off because without tying some resources to it the meeting is going to be another meeting and everyone is going to go home and that will be it.

MR. HEWITT: I think there’s an appreciation that there has to be something that comes out of this, I mean lots of things that come out of this rather than just empty rhetoric and hopefully this process, I think,
or this summit could I think catalyze, mobilize attention. But I wouldn’t get into any specifics at this point but we think that this is something that would be seized that we would hope to see some things grow out of this.

MR. WILLIAMS: My point is that unless the Administrator said you will plan to put this amount of money into this are we going to wait two or three years before anything ever materializes?

MR. HEWITT: Well, again I wouldn’t want to speculate in the near term but I can say that I think this -- I think that this is a significant event and I think hopefully what will come out of it will be significant in many respects so again without getting into the specifics, I don’t think that we would be putting something on like this if we didn’t think that this wasn’t going to prompt or catalyze or put on the screen the work and the relationships.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: George Wilson, USAID, EGAT, and North Carolina State University. Martin, maybe you said it and I missed it, but how does this relate to the Global Development Commons?

MR. HEWITT: The Global Development Commons, as I understand it, is a place where it’s an outcome --
the Global Development Alliance program has been ongoing for a number of years. I was part of that program. And it’s looking at traditional and non-traditional partners, looking at orchestrating comparative advantages from various -- from the communities, from various communities. And I mean I had a matrix that I developed that looked at the image of our agency in terms of missions that we have, knowledge that we have, evaluating programs, other characteristics of our agency. Characteristics, motional characteristics of foundations and corporations, what do they bring to the table besides resources and acumen, managing and resources, et cetera. And then higher education, the attributes of higher education in terms of knowledge and skills and language and commitment. So each one of those elements in and of itself is probably limited in terms of what it can do but when you combine these partners each one can probably get more than each single one that’s putting into something. The outcomes can be greater than the sum. So the Global Development Commons is a place I think we’re proposing to map potential partners or existing partners and to then try to orchestrate relationships to make activities more robust, scaleable, replicable, sustainable. So I see this as a way of brokering information and ideas from
some partners that have already been in the dialogue but others not. I mean we’re hearing from some of the corporations that we’re inviting, we’re hearing they’re intrigued by this and they want to participate and they want to bring something to the table.

MR. WILSON: It just seemed to me that Steven Gale just gave us the presentation about the Global Development Commons and I also expected you to say and now this will be a segway into building some of those partnerships.

MR. HEWITT: Well, I’m trying to convey that but I just haven’t done it explicitly, but I think that’s kind of what it is. I think implicitly that’s what it is and I think it needs to be made explicit that that’s what this is.

MR. WILSON: Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: I’m John Thomas at USAID. I wanted to follow up on Tim Williams’ question and a little bit on George. I think the idea of the Global Development Commons is to bring in all the partners, everybody involved in development, the foundations, the private industry, the universities, and the idea is for this higher education summit to help leverage the power of the universities, mobilize the power of the universities to leverage funding from other
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organizations. And, you’re right, it is going to require resources and lots of money to follow up on whatever recommendations or ideas come out of this but it’s not going to be led entirely by USAID, I don’t believe.

MR. HEWITT: No.

MR. THOMAS: It’s sort of catalyzing, this event is catalyzing the ability of all these partners to bring their resources together.

MR. HEWITT: Yeah, and the way to somehow link them through a dialogue through either virtual or actual to keep the channels of dialogue and communication open so it’s not just a one stop thing or an ad hoc. Hopefully there’s a dynamic that goes into effect.

MR. DEMMET: Yes. Martin, I know you’re aware of this but NASULGC has been very active in developing a similar initiative for Africa, focused on Africa, in part because it’s a place of great need and often when you get global programs Africa often has been left out so we focused on Africa but we’re doing this in a sense in coordination with what you’re doing at the summit, and we will be working with African leaders as a satellite to that after they’ve attended the summit. And NASULGC with its member institutions is working very aggressively on legislation and appropriations to
support the effort in Africa. And I think I would hope that there would be a similar plan that would emerge in the larger university community that might support the larger global initiative. But there is a portion of that that’s actually happening and being planned down the road.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anything else from the Board? Let me ask as we’re drawing to a close on these two presentations from the agency, are there any thoughts, comments that we want to transmit as a board to the Administrator on either of these issues? You might think about that. We can come back to it at the end of the day or we can have a bit of a dialogue here.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Allen Christensen. I just have one thought, Mr. Chairman, and that is I think this is an important thing but the turnaround time for getting busy presidents there is a little short. Some of them may already be blocked out, and one of the things if you’re going to do that sort of thing you really need to allow them time to get it on their calendar because some of them are -- the list is not even firm yet.

MR. HEWITT: We have a list. We have a firm list. We’ve sent e-mails to all them and now we’re following up with phone calls, and so this has been in...
process, we’ve been doing this for at least a month, so we know that we’re -- this is a very ambitious undertaking, as you know, and to get on people’s calendars especially the chancellors and presidents is a very difficult proposition. So we’re actively involved with this, and we’ve been doing this, as I say, for at least a month now. And we’re going out to the foreign institutions. We’re setting up a web site. There’s a number of things that we’re doing but we got our work cut out for us, no doubt about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it’d be fair to say that there’s a number of us in this room and this community that would very much like to see our senior officer, chancellors, presidents, and if we’re on the list I would frankly appreciate a phone call and an opportunity to engage my person and encourage attendance.

MR. HEWITT: I’ll take this message back to our group too to share your thoughts and questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good.

MR. HEWITT: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Martin. Well done. At our meeting in October the BIFAD discussed several issues, and came to the perspective that we needed to use the rather limited resources we have available to us.
to bring a couple of consultants in to help us unravel these issues. And the first one is Title XII, and I have been involved with this Board now for a couple of years and it seems that from day one there was a conversation around what is a Title XII university, what defines a Title XII project, and that issue is fundamental to much of what we need to do as a board to understand fully our mandate. And so we engaged Deborah Rubin, which is Director for Cultural Practice, and she’s done a very thorough evaluation, and she’s going to present to us a summary of some of the thoughts that come out of the report. Deborah.

MS. RUBIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want before I start my formal presentation to make a comment about the previous presentations because what I heard after working on this Title XII activity for several months now is many of the really important parts of Title XII being applied in a much larger context and across sectors other than the agricultural sector so I think it might be helpful for people in thinking about the previous statement by Martin Hewitt and the work on the global summit in considering what I’m going to say with Title XII. Okay. As the Chairman said, I was asked to look at a number of questions surrounding the implementation and definitions of Title XII and its
institutions and its activities. And in doing so, I was able to speak to a number of people, some of whom were involved in the original formulations, some who were involved in the revised formulation of the Title XII, people within AID, people in university communities, and I’m very grateful to all of those of you who have already spoken to me and those of you who have not spoken to me. Please don’t feel that you’re off the hook because this is a partial report and I hope to be able to continue talking to a number of you to get a fuller picture. I also was able to review the documentary record, the Title XII reports, the legislation itself, and a number of evaluations that have been carried out on Title XII over the years. Very briefly, Title XII, as I think most of you know, is part of the Foreign Assistance Act. It was originally passed, the amendment, in 1975, and it was significantly revised in the year 2000, passed in 2000 with three accepted definitions -- not definition, I’m sorry, three accepted changes, a broader definition of agriculture, a wider set of eligible universities included, and also a definition of the idea of partners. Well, as I worked on this study, I began to feel that I was in a game of Jeopardy, which I think all of you may have watched at some point or another in your lives. I had two answers.
sitting in front of me in the legislation. One answer was that of the bold vision of really mobilizing the scientific expertise of the U.S. academic community as I have written there and the importance, as you heard from Martin Hewitt, of really working with the universities, higher education to improve development. I also had the answer of the creation of a federally appointed board to advise on this coordinated program for agriculture, and that that program would have multiple components. So these were the answers that I had in front of me coming from the legislation. But the sorts of things that I heard as the questions struck me as the wrong questions, questions that divided the communities, not questions that really worked to get the answers that would bring a partnership about. I heard often not only from AID but also from the university community that question that what AID wanted was to get the universities to act more like contractors. I am a contractor, and I don’t think that being a contractor is necessarily the best thing for providing scientific expertise to the agency. But this was a question that kept coming up. I also kept hearing the question not only from the university community but also from those in AID. There was no strict division. How can we get AID? How can we, the universities or what the universities want is to get AID
to fund more long-term research. Well, yes, that’s part of what’s important but to focus only on that piece of the question ignores the fact that Title XII talks about a lot more than research, and that there are many ways in which the universities can contribute to development, not only with long-term research although that is a key and very important part. So I saw those two questions not so much as being unimportant questions but as being inadequate questions or incomplete questions for really benefiting from Title XII. So what are the right questions? We’re not entirely sure what the actual right questions are but certainly one of them is to ask what is the strength of Title XII, and in asking that question you get to this importance of the vision, the vision of mobilizing scientific expertise, of drawing on the university community, and really being able to achieve those very desirable but difficult goals of preventing famine and ending hunger. And you also have the question of what assistance does Title XII provide to help USAID make the most effective use of the academic community’s contribution and that’s BIFAD. BIFAD is a mechanism to make that happen. As we know, there have been ups and downs with the importance of BIFAD in developing the coordinated program of USAID’s agricultural efforts but this is a moment when I think
we can revisit that. So a win-win situation would be
one in which USAID really gains the expertise that it
needs, particularly at this moment when it has said that
its technical expertise is declining, its funding is
declining. It’s in a difficult position of being able
to provide that why not draw on these universities that
have this kind of experience. And for the universities
there are so many benefits to working with AID. It’s
not only being able to get some funding for its projects
which is the one point that always comes up but it’s
also internationalizing the campus. It’s influencing
the course of development which is a very powerful role
as well as creating those long-term associations with
students and faculty overseas. Title XII speaks to a
coordinated program. It’s not clear to what extent the
agency seeks to have a coordinated program but this is
what BIFAD is supposed to be assisting with. And as
described in Title XII a coordinated program has
multiple components to it. It includes contract
research, it includes collaborative research, it
includes grant programs, educational exchanges, and the
work that’s done through the IARCs [ph]. This graphic
tries to describe to give you a picture of the overview
in which BIFAD and the USAID Administrator have a
relationship, a dialogue, about this coordinated program
which is what is contained within the bold navy blue line, and the work of the universities is the core of that program under Title XII, but there’s also a lot of work that’s done by the partners that are spelled out in the legislation. So BIFAD’s role again is to advise and assist in the development and monitoring of Title XII’s coordinated program. So the idea here is that there is a program. BIFAD has had a role in influencing it and shaping it and that then sets the stage for the work of the universities as well as the other players. Who are these eligible universities? The lists are spelled out in the Title XII legislation. They include the land grants, which is something that in my interviews everyone was quite aware of, but they also include a number of other possible universities. The later groups, HBCUs, historically black colleges and universities, the C-grant colleges, and the tribal colleges listed with the appropriate legislation. In addition, there’s a paragraph that states that other colleges and universities including private universities if they have the demonstrable capacity in these areas and can contribute effectively to the objectives of the title are included under Title XII, and the inclusion of the private universities very explicitly was one of the important ways in which the revision of the legislation
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was changed. I would argue that the lists, and I’ve prepared a draft list for distribution, it’s been given I think to members of the Boards, runs about ten pages when you put together all the universities that fit the different categories on the previous slide those to me would be a set of eligible universities as is described in the legislation. I think it becomes a second question about what constitutes qualified universities for particular activities under Title XII, and that’s something that BIFAD needs to take into consideration, what would be the ways in which you can actually determine whether or not a university has a demonstrable capacity in these three areas that are listed. In the past it seems that there was an unwritten process at least for establishing whether or not a new university could be added to a roster that BIFAD is tasked with keeping, and it seems to me useful to re-establish that roster and then re-establish this time a written process so that it can be transparent so that people can know what it is to join this roster of universities and a set of criteria to measure these categories. You have your institutions then. You have your list, what constitutes a Title XII activity. To me the range of possible activities is infinite and the ways in which it can be described are spelled out fairly elaborately in the...
legislation, but I think at the core is that the
activity has to be carried out by the Title XII
university. Now of course it can’t be just any
activity. If we go back to my earlier statement that
BIFAD has a role in shaping this coordinated program
then what the Title XII activities are have to be part
of this coordinated program. They have to have been
identified as part of the program in advance of
implementation. This doesn’t mean every specific
project but it does mean the larger program such as the
one that we are all quite familiar with out of the CRSP,
so if there’s a new CRSP it would be discussed by BIFAD
and it would become part of the coordinated program and
be a Title XII activity. There are other elements of
Title XII activities. The list actually goes on for a
very long -- more than I could possibly put here, but
from the ADS 2.16.3.9, which is the key piece of the ADS
speaking to Title XII. It lists these five elements
that characterize Title XII activities as well.
Finally, there’s reporting on Title XII. Annually there
is a requirement for a report to be made about Title XII
activities. In my interviews there was a lot of concern
about what the content of that report was. In the more
distant past in the 1980s and early 90s the report was
fairly small and fairly targeted. More recently it has
become, more recently meaning since the year 2000, it has become a broader discussion about the agency’s work in agriculture, and in the last two years it has gone back to being a slightly narrower report, and I think that we have a copy of the 2006 one being presented here today later on. I think after looking at a lot of this work that there is great value to having the report include information about the larger coordinated program of Title XII but again I think that the university led programs and the dollar level support to them need to be clarified because that’s the requirement in the legislation to really highlight the university activities. So to summarize, the preliminary recommendations to BIFAD, and I do think these are preliminary because I’m interested in hearing discussion from the community and modifying the recommendations as needed but to begin I believe that it is important to re-establish the eligible university roster. I think it’s important to initiate a process for engaging the universities and AID on this question of what would constitute an application to become on the roster, to join the roster, and what would it mean to take a university off the roster, as well as the criteria for determining the basis of this qualification. I think it might be useful to develop a new guide to Title XII and...
BIFAD. There was one in 1983. I haven’t seen one since. That was actually used as part of the agency’s effort to enlist the missions to use the Title XII mechanism, various mechanisms under Title XII as part of their programs, and I think it’s very important to initiate a discussion between USAID and the universities on the scope and content of Title XII so that we can come to some agreement about what are the important things to be reported to Congress. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: First let’s take questions, and then I’d like to have some conversation on the Board about where we might want to go with this report. So questions first. Dr. DeLauder.

MR. DELAUDER: Yes. Thank you for a very interesting report and the way you laid it out. One correction as you listed the eligible institutions. As I recall, first you listed the institutions -- and then you listed those institutions under the second -- those really should only be the 18 historically black land-grant colleges and not all HCBUs. The other HBCUs you should list in a separate category.

MS. RUBIN: Thank you. It was a way to try and condense things, but you’re correct.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Allen Christensen. In the original submittal of those Title XII university
reports, I think it was the Title XII officer that had
the responsibility to submit those reports. My question
is was it the BIFAD staff then that had the
responsibility to correlate those reports and make the
final submittal?

MS. RUBIN: Yes. It seemed that the project
office, the BIFAD office, when it was in existence and
more fully staffed worked on the development of the
report, the writing of the report and the submission of
it.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: And so did the Title XII
university reports tend to die away when the BIFAD staff
tend to go into remission?

MS. RUBIN: There was a period of time in the
mid-90s when there were no reports and there was no
staff or very limited staff, and, yes, the short answer
is yes, though a longer answer is I don’t have all of
the Title XII reports throughout the whole period. And
it is a work of significant effort. Those who have been
involved in it over the last few years have tried very
hard and it requires support and it requires funding to
be done adequately.

THE CHAIRMAN: Remind me, a Title XII officer
is at each university the individual that’s designed to
be the Title XII contact, is that...
MR. CHRISTENSEN: That’s correct. Is that appointment required in the statute of a Title XII institution?

MS. RUBIN: To have a Title XII officer? I don’t believe so.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: We used to have it pretty well identified. In the 80s and 90s each university knew who their Title XII officer was. If BIFAD or if USAID staff wanted to get a hold of a university on a particular matter they generally came to the Title XII officer. If there were particular initiatives they wanted to undertake or if they wanted to be responsive to particular requests they came to the Title XII officer, who was generally appointed by the university president.

MS. RUBIN: Two points if I may. The original roster that I saw from 1994 did list the Title XII officer at the universities for each of the eligible universities that it listed. The second point is I think I misheard your question originally in asking who was responsible for putting the report together. I was referring to the Title XII officer within AID.

MR. RABON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Tim Rabon from New Mexico. It was a wonderful report.

MS. RUBIN: Thank you.
MR. RABON: One of the items I guess that
struck me the most was the guide for BIFAD and Title XII
activity. And I have a great appreciation for that
because I’ve been on the Board for two years now and the
whole time we have been trying to re-establish the
relationship between BIFAD and USAID. A guide would be,
I think, a great tool for us to use to educate ourselves
on what our objective here is and how to best achieve
it. So we’re going to have some additional discussion
later in the program this morning with the direction of
BIFAD and possibly we could add some discussion during
that time. But I would like to possibly entertain the
idea of an additional meeting time just to discuss the
guide and the implementation of it and bring it up into
today’s time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we can hold that
discussion until we come to that other section. Any
other comments or questions from the Board? Bill.

MR. DELAUDER: Bill DeLauder again. You
talked about the concept of a coordinated program. I
know that we have a lot of activities, but I’ve never
seen it presented as a coordinated program.

THE CHAIRMAN: Underlying that question is
have we as we’ve transitioned apparently away from that
become less effective in the delivery of the program.
Let’s turn to the audience. Any questions or comments?

Yes. John Thomas.

MR. THOMAS: John Thomas, USAID. Deborah, in your reading of the Title XII legislation does that give BIFAD, the Board, the opportunity advise on the much broader agriculture program from USAID? I’m talking about the programs that we do with the NGOs that might be financed with the food aid program, programs that were maybe even public-private partnerships, programs that don’t necessarily involve the universities, but it’s the broader picture of agriculture. Can BIFAD have the responsibility to advise the Administrator on the much larger agriculture program?

MS. RUBIN: I think that’s a really important question, and I’m not a lawyer, and I think that the central part of Title XII is about the universities and their partnerships with their partners and the kinds of activities that take place there. One of the areas that has been raised in my interviews as a key and controversial issue is the support to the IARCs but Title XII legislation clearly discusses the work of the IARCs, and recent Title XII reports have reported on the IARCs. I would certainly see BIFAD’s role as advising on those aspects of agricultural research, training, and education and outreach that include institutions such as
the IARCs. I do not see Title XII speaking necessarily
to independent work on areas outside of the research,
education, training outreach and policy implementation,
some of which is done by some of the partners
independently. But I think that this is indeed a very
important question for BIFAD to look into.

MR. THOMAS: If I can follow up. That’s very
good. The important thing is that we have a strong
voice that we can rally around to promote agriculture in
the agency and BIFAD has the opportunity to play that
role, and we should work on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Other comments from the
audience? Tim.

MR. WILLIAMS: Tim Williams from the
University of Georgia. I think that the BIFAD
legislation doesn’t mandate that the universities and
BIFAD will advise on agricultural implementation, but I
do think that this is, as John Thomas said, a really
important opportunity and service that the university
community can provide particularly given where USAID is
at this point in terms of its expertise. I really think
that this is what we have to offer in terms of a
partnership. We can do things and we can help them make
those decisions, I don’t want to say for free, but for
close to free.
THE CHAIRMAN: Tim, let me follow up on your comment. When you say expertise basically it refers to the fact with the loss of staff in the agency there’s no longer in some areas the expertise to actually advise and direct programs, is that the point?

MR. WILLIAMS: I think when you go to missions now, they hold missions that have got no one that is agriculturally an expert.

THE CHAIRMAN: Other comments from the audience? Yes.

MR. HANSEN: David Hansen, Ohio State University. Thank you very much for an excellent report, Deborah. I’d like to raise one other issue here that I think might be something that the Board might want to look at. One goes back to the creation of Title XII. It seems to me that it was relatively obvious what Title XII activities were. They were the strengthening grant programs for the university to better enable them to participate in the development assistance overseas and then secondarily there was a research objective as represented through the joint research committee. And I think as one looks back to the BIFAD office within USAID you had regular communication there between the USAID representatives and the university community to define what were Title XII activities. They are relatively
easily defined because it was research, as you
mentioned, through the IARCs. It was the research
programs as represented today by Tim Williams and John
and others, and there were the strengthening grant
programs. But there were also Title XII designated
projects which only Title XII institutions were eligible
to compete for. Who defined those Title XII designated
projects? In essence, I think that that was something
which emerged out of a consensus in dialogue between the
university community and USAID. I guess the point I’m
making now is that I think we’ve broadened the
definition of what Title XII is, but we really haven’t
really grappled with what are Title XII eligible
activities. And I think that one of the real things
that needs to be looked at here is how we define those
activities in the future and what might be the role of
BIFAD or its related committees in helping to define
what are these Title XII activities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Other comments? Deborah,
thanks very much. This has been very helpful, and we
look forward to the final report and the opportunity to
continue this conversation. Thank you very much.

MS. RUBIN: You’re very welcome. Our next
report before the break is in some sense a follow-up on
this conversation, the question about Title XII. And
over the past year we’ve had a number of conversations within the Board about how to engage in a very substantial and significant way the deans and colleges of agriculture and beyond that have an interest in these topics in a conversation about how best to fulfill, if you will, the obligations under the title. And to that end the BIFAD board agreed in October that we should pull together a Conference of Deans. That’s now set for April 29. And we engaged a firm to facilitate preparation for and execution of that conference. And Elizabeth Robinson from Encompass is here to give us an update on planning for the conference. Elizabeth.

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Dean Easter. Good morning. I’m Elizabeth Robinson from a company in town called Encompass. We work with groups like BIFAD and NASULGC to plan creative and productive meetings. And I want to say to the Board that we are thrilled to be working with you to help U.S. universities resume their historic role in working with the U.S. government to meet international ag development needs. In the last three months, my colleague, Sheila Ramsey, who some of the Board members met in November in Des Moines have been working closely with the steering committee for this program to plan the details of the conference. And I want to say that the more people we talk to about it
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the more excited we have become about the ideas and the
desire that’s expressed by university leaders for
building stronger involvement and partnership with the
USAID. Some of the steering committee members are here.
Of course, Dean Easter, Dr. DeLauder, Ron Senykoff in
the back there. I don’t think Fred Schullic [ph], Randy
Wilson or Dean Oberian [ph] are here today. I haven’t
met them. But they’re also part of our committee. As
many of you already know, the impetus for what we’re
calling the Conference of Deans: Universities in
Partnership includes the decline of federal funding for
international ag development and the creation of the
transformational development framework which minimizes
the role of agriculture and of university involvement.
BIFAD’s leadership in acting now to bring the Title XII
community together will make sure that the community is
at the table to influence federal policy and
international ag development now and in the future. The
focus of the conference is to produce some new ideas and
thinking that can be shared with a transition team of a
new administration about agricultural development
priorities the U.S. government should be focusing on in
the coming years. I want to share a few quotes with
you, six quotes, that have become sort of the markers of
our objectives for the conference. They come from the
steering committee members themselves and other international ag leaders who we interviewed about their vision for the conference. Number one, because of the conference there’s a better understanding of the land grant system’s ability to serve in an advisory role and as a key actor in ag development in the 21st Century. Two, BIFAD has a product or a paper to share with the new administration that describes how universities can use their expertise to advise the agency on global ag development strategy. Three, we should identify no more than three to four strategic needs the U.S. government should focus on in global ag development and describe how universities can leverage the work of the agency in meeting these needs. Four, the conference is a catalyst for empowering increased engagement with the agency. Five, we must not get caught in the way we were. Six, we need to be visionary and bold. So while BIFAD’s needs are essential to this meeting there’s a lot of positive energy among the people we interviewed that this conference will contribute to re-energizing a wider partnership and engagement with the Title XII community. I can share some of the planning, the nuts and bolts where we’re at right now. We’ve set the date for April 30, a one-day meeting here in Washington, D.C. There will be a reception the evening before on the 29th.
We’ve worked with the steering committee to define an invitation list of over 60 deans and other academic leaders in international ag, people who have passion for the topic who are in decision-making positions in their institutions. In devising the list, we also had an eye on the diversity of institutions, geography, and gender, minority-serving institutions. Invitations were mailed three weeks ago. Up till today we have 20 RSVPs. I think we’ll probably have 30 by the end of this week. The steering committee is currently calling other invitees that we haven’t heard from just to make sure everybody knows that their participation will really insure dynamic process and outcome. Our target number is between 20 and 30. If people start beating down the doors, we could go to 40. Our aim is to get the right people in the room, people who can roll up their sleeves on the topic, produce new thinking and action steps, and actually commit to follow through. Now that the definitions for the meeting are in place some of our next steps include meeting with USAID folks to get more input from them about the conference, and we may start that with meeting with the system administrator, Jackie Schafer. By mid-March we expect to have close to a final list of our participants. By the end of March we’ll be sending out our pre-conference materials, and
we’ll begin to draft our design on the specific activities for the meeting. What people here who are listening might do for us if you find the initiative compelling you could be in touch with your deans or deans that you know and encourage them to come and make a difference to BIFAD and our work to position U.S. universities as key actors in ag development policy. So we look forward to seeing those of you are here at the April 30 meeting, and to afterwards meeting again with the Board to report any actual outcomes and to consider what the next steps will be to keep the momentum going and support the university partnership in action.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Is there a list of those that we could have that are on your proposed invitees?

MS. ROBINSON: Yes, there is a list, and I think there’s one in your binder. I could get Tori to help me find exactly where that is.

THE CHAIRMAN: I might just comment that for the steering committee this was one of the difficult questions that we grappled with, and who should be invited, should it be come all, and there was a sense that if we opened it up and that we might not be able in the short period of time available to really focus on having productive conversations, and so there was a deliberate effort within the steering committee to
select leaders that were believed to be ready to engage in this conversation, and that’s not to suggest that we were trying to eliminate anyone in the process. We tried to get representation from broadly across the spectrum. Dr. DeLauder, do you have any further comment on that?

MR. DELAUDER: No. I think that is correct. It was difficult. But I gather though that if there are people in this room who were going to suggest others that maybe we should invite that we would be open to considering.

MS. ROBINSON: Yes, and during the break that we’re going to have now, I have cards if anybody wants one for more information or if you want to suggest someone who should be invited. I’d be glad to take that.

THE CHAIRMAN: And we have across the spectrum, I think we’ve invited at least one university president who has real experience in this arena, and we’ve invited some specific individuals who are not necessarily deans either because of their expertise.

Comments from the audience or questions? Yes, Ron.

MR. SENYKOFF: Ron Senykoff, EGAT agriculture. Just one additional point, Elizabeth. It has been envisioned that on this Conference of Deans it would not
be a one-time type of activity but that depending on how the first one goes and the type of commitment that we achieve from it the vision is to look toward a repetitive thing. The dates and times and all would be set of course with the conference. But to follow on so that this process begins to develop a true engagement with senior administration within USAID and other partners throughout the community so that it opens up the dialogue because there’s a desperate need for that and this conference can help serve that need.

MS. ROBINSON: Absolutely. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Other comments? I think if one looks at the changing environment particularly today with commodities prices fundamental, food, you can’t help but be concerned about are we going to have an adequate supply in the years ahead particularly in those most stressed areas of the world. And I don’t think it’s beyond realism to suggest that there is a need for a second green revolution and we’ve talked about that. And if one things about how you engage the scientific expertise broadly in the U.S. higher education community particularly in colleges of agriculture the conversation has to begin somewhere, and how you take that expertise and advice to the Administrator and the formulation of policy the conversation has to begin somewhere. And
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maybe we’ve overly ambitious, but we think this is a very timely event and hopefully a start of what can be a long-term and very productive conversation. I’ve been very pleased, Elizabeth, with your organization and how deliberately you’ve gone about this process. I think some of us grew weary of those phone calls and interviews but it has done a very good job to frame the context of the conversation, and I think that’s to your credit.

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no other questions, thanks. Thanks very much. Well, we’re well ahead of schedule. Let’s take a few minutes for the Board if there’s any discussion that we need to have before we break. Any items that -- we’ve got several that will come up I think afterwards fairly quickly.

MR. DELAUDER: To go back to the previous presentation that I raised the issue of the coordinated program and it would be good to sort of look at all of the activities that might fit into that coordinated program so that perhaps all the pieces should fit together.

THE CHAIRMAN: I very much agree. We’ll have conversations about CRSP this afternoon, and as I’ve reviewed this issue it’s been very difficult for me to
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get around it because of not knowing what is going on in other areas of the agency. You can’t consider this independent of the CGIAR and other areas.

MR. WILLIAMS: I would just like to add that there is this feature of the ADS is that each mission is meant to have a Title XII person that evaluates their plans and programs and is able to do this. Now to my knowledge that just doesn’t happen, and I think that that’s one of the things that needs to be activated through discussion and dialogue with the Administrator to make this thing happen because on one side we’ve got the university saying we want to do and help, the other side we’re going to have people saying where can we help?

THE CHAIRMAN: John.

MR. THOMAS: John Thomas. Tim sparked a thought in my mind that I wanted to share with you. It’s true, and you know that staffing has gone down in the agency especially technical staffing but I think it would be a good idea at a future BIFAD meeting to invite someone from our human resources office, HR, to present the plans now to upgrade to increase the staffing in the agency. The Administrator has made a commitment to increase staffing I think by 300 technical professional staff, foreign service, and many of them will be
agriculturists and specialists in economic growth, and
that’s going to be -- that’s going to help us to be able
to design the programs and look at the options such as
implementing ADS-216, which asks the missions to
whenever they’re designing new activities to think is
this an activity that could be implemented by a Title
XII university. So I think it would be a good
presentation for a future meeting to hear about how the
agency is upgrading its technical staff.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be helpful. That’s
good news, by the way. Other comments? Before we take
a break, I’m going to take privilege as Chair and
introduce Dr. Mary Ann Lila [ph]. Mary Ann, if you’d
wave your hand. Illinois has been somewhat removed from
this scene for a number of years, and Dr. Lila has
agreed to serve as Director of International Activities,
and we’re back, and I’m delighted that she’s here
representing us. So those of you that are in similar
positions at other institutions, I’d appreciate it if
you’d introduce yourself to Dr. Lila. And Dr. Hamish
Gowell [ph] is with us from Michigan State. Welcome,
Hamish. Let’s take 30 minutes, which means we’ll
convene again at about 15 after.

***

[Off the record]
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[On the record]

***

THE CHAIRMAN: I either need a gavel or I’m going to ask Allen Christensen to bring the group to order. I think many of you are aware that the BIFAD ceased to exist for a period of time or existed in a very minimal way in the 90s, and under Chairman McPherson’s leadership several years ago there was an effort to re-engage and reconstruct the organization. And one of the key elements of that early conversation was what really should be done to implement Title XII, and a gentleman by the name of Richard Bissell, Rich Bissell, was commissioned to do what has now become the famous Bissell Report. And many of you have seen that. He delivered it to the Board in June, 2006, and it was a document that talked about the legislation. It’s a document that talked about some of the history and made a number of recommendations. And what we’d like to do for the next several minutes or probably 45 minutes or so is have some conversations about kind of where we are in some of these. And I’d like to make a few comments here at the outset, and then if the Board members have some comments that they would like to offer. And if you read through the Bissell Report, one of the first things that’s mentioned is that the Administrator should become
personally engaged, and I feel that we’ve made very
significant progress in that regard. Administrator Fore
in her remarks at the NASULGC meeting essentially turned
in front of an audience of 300 university presidents and
said, Bob, I want you to contact me directly. And we’ve
done that, and she’s responded in a very positive way,
and we think that we made progress on that. Another
comment by Bissell was that the scientific leadership of
the agency can be strengthened, and there is now a
scientific advisor, Nena Fedderoff, who also has
responsibilities in the State Department, but that has
brought a conversation about science into the
leadership. More attention can be given to defining
current development problems and challenges. From my
perspective quite a lot of our conversation here this
morning in fact has been around that. It’s an area that
we continue to need to do development in. Build a
barter partnership between USAID and universities, and
particularly in ways that compliment the ongoing CRSP
and other programs. And I think one of the goals of the
deans conference is to dialogue about how some of that
might be done. So with that kind of background, I want
to open the floor and I’ll sit down, and we’ll have some
conversation. Who on the Board would like to begin the
discussion? Tim, would you like to lead this? Mr.
Rabon.

MR. RABON: Yes, sir. Thank you. I hope you all will bear with me. I’m not as polished as the Chairman, and I’ll do the best I can. I passed around, I apologize I didn’t have enough for everybody, but I passed around a little handout here. I think our objective here is that we have to re-establish BIFAD back into its original state that it was in when it was established in 1975. I think in the mid-90s BIFAD became disconnected from this organization and we’ve yet to regain that position, and that’s what I’d like to talk to mostly this morning. Our web site, this front page is the home page for the BIFAD web site, and specifically says our primary role, the primary role of BIFAD is to advise the USAID Administrator on the agricultural development priorities and issues. For a little history the second two pages are the USAID organizational charts. The current chart is the first page. It indicates the make-up, the structure of USAID, and if you’ll notice BIFAD is not even listed on it. We’re not shown. Located an aide structure that dates back to the 70s and 80s, and you’ll see on the left-hand side the BIFAD support staff is connected at the upper level at the Administrator’s office where I believe it belongs. It’s where in my belief it should be today so
that will be the basis of the conversation. We have --
BIFAD does have a charter. If we had just a few minutes
it was recommended last night possibly we’d read that.
Could we be given the latitude to read that? I think
that would help kind of give everybody -- re-inform
everybody of where we’re at. The BIFAD charter, Article
1, the Board’s official designation is Board for
International Food & Agriculture Development, henceforth
referred to as the Board. Article 2, Board’s objectives
and scope of activity. The primary mission of the Board
is to advise and assist the Administrator of the United
Stages Agency for International Development, USAID.
With regard to programs and activities relating to
agricultural and food security as set forth in Title
XII, Chapter 2, Part 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of
1961, as amended. Article 3, Board membership and
appointments. The Board shall consist of seven members
appointed by the President, not less than a majority of
whom shall be selected from the universities as defined
by Section 296(d) of Title XII. Terms of the members
shall be established by the President at the time of the
appointment as provided by Section 298(a) of Title XII.
Article 4, period of time necessary for the Board to
carry out its purpose, indefinite. Section 298 of Title
XII provides for a permanent board. Article 5, agency
and official to whom the Board reports. The Board shall report to the Administrator of USAID as provided in Section 300 of Title XII to the Congress. I think that's a significant article with regard to this charter. Article 6, agency responsible for providing necessary support to the Board, USAID. Article 7, description of duties for which the Board is responsible. In discharging its duties the Board will, A, consult with, provide information to, and furnish advice to the Administrator of USAID in all aspects of programs included under title XII and on such other matters as directed by the Administrator, B, provide universities with information on USAID programs and activities that may be of interest to the university community, C, participate on a selective basis in the development and implementation of USAID policies that affect programs and projects in which U.S. universities are or could be involved. Article 8, subordinate units. The Board is authorized to create such subordinate units as may be necessary for the performance of its duties and the discharge of its responsibilities. USAID provides support services to the Board’s subordinate units subject to availability. Article 9, estimated cost for the Board, work years, one staff, one total. Dollars, $250,000. Article 10, estimated number and
frequency of meetings. The Board will meet at least twice a year. Article 11, records availability. The records, reports, minutes, agenda, and other documentation of the Board shall be made available in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, and other applicable laws and regulations. Article 12, charter amendment. The Board may amend the charter as necessary consistent with applicable laws and regulations with the approval of the Administrator of USAID. That pretty well explains our duties and responsibilities for the Board which brings me to my next point is that I feel like it’s essential that our representation, our staff, be relocated back to its original location at the Administrator’s level. And I think it’s going to be essential for us to carry out our duties. I think we need to define the duties and requirements of that staff. If the staff is going to be a USAID employee that’s going to be representing BIFAD, I think that it’s essential we have an agreement and some well defined duties of that employee, that staff. I feel like there’s a little bit of a conflict right now the way the system is set up where we have an USAID employee representing BIFAD and being located in the lower section in EGAT. That creates some problems. So in my opinion, I think we’re going to have to define
those duties of that staff, get the staff relocated back into the Administrator’s office where we have some direct lines of communication, and I think that will help free us up to move this Board forward. The report from Deborah was very well done, and I greatly appreciate that, very informative. The Bissell Report was a very good document as well. I think that we as a board, part of the reason I feel like we need to move the staff back to the level that it was, one of the first actions that we took when I came on the Board two years ago was we passed a resolution to send the Bissell Report to the Administrator with the recommendation, at that time it was Administrator Ambassador Tobias, to try to implement the Bissell Report, the activities that were recommended within it. Today, two years later, to my knowledge the Board has not even received a response back that that report was received to date. I may be wrong, but that’s my knowledge to date. I believe that what we need to do as a Board is take action and represent the Bissell Report now along with Ms. Rubin’s report and a resolution back to the Administrator and ask for her consideration of those reports, and I would also like to move that we engage the Administrator at our earliest convenience to make the recommendation of relocating the staff back to her office level to try to
re-establish our link with the Administrator’s office.

And one last -- I’m sorry. One last comment. Mr. Thomas made the comment that really struck me and that was that BIFAD has got to become a strong voice for agriculture for all of the Title XII activities to rally around, and I think that’s exactly right. That was right on point, that comment was, and I believe the only way we’re going to achieve that is for BIFAD to become a viable, operational board that’s plugged in at the upper level of USAID.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I would second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Discussion?

MR. DELAUDER: I think it mentioned transmitting the Rubin report. I understood that her report is not complete.

THE CHAIRMAN: It’s not at this point, but I believe that’s correct. But, Tim, Mr. Rabon, if I understand, it would be when it’s complete?

MR. RABON: When it’s complete. I understood it was nearing completion possibly before our next meeting. And so we can -- I’m not sure how relevant it is if the two go together. If we could re-engage the Bissell Report along with the request to consider the relocation of the BIFAD support staff.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I really think that we could
do a supplementary report and that can be transmitted later if necessary.

MR. RABON: Yes, sir. Very good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Another thought would be to ask Deborah to make her presentation to the Administrator. That would be another way of approaching this.

MR. RABON: And I guess one more comment there. One of the great ideas that Ms. Rubin had was the BIFAD guide. I didn’t even realize there was one. That would be a great tool for this Board, as I mentioned earlier, and I believe that we touched on it a little bit last night at the meeting that if we could set aside a half a day. A meeting such as this is not the arena to have any form of training for the Board but I think it’s essential that with some new members on the Board and a new direction that we’re trying to move this Board that we conduct some form of training, update the BIFAD guide, and come to a consensus on how we’re going to move forward.

THE CHAIRMAN: That’s a great idea. Other comments? Mr. Barlow.

MR. BARLOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Being a new members, I’m obviously behind the learning curve today but when I was interviewed for this position by the White House, I was assured that BIFAD had a
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significant role in the past and it was their desire to
create a significant role in the future so I feel like
that Tim’s comments here in his presentation is
absolutely essential if we get to that point again.
Therefore, I fully support it and I just want to go on
record as supporting that situation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Further comments? Dr.
Christensen.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Allen Christensen. I think
that there is represented on this Board as there have
been previous boards a level of expertise and
understanding that could be of service to the country.
I think most of us have come to this particular
assignment with the anticipation that we would be of
service to the United States in terms of the overall
international development policy and advising and
assisting the Administrator. However, we do this, as
you know, without compensation. This is done out of
love of country, and in order to get things done in a
timely fashion, we need support staff that through the
Chair can be directed to certain things and this becomes
the priority of that person to get accomplished.
Because there is much that this kind of activity can do
to strengthen the image of America abroad, there is much
that the agency and the university, the Title XII
university community in particular, can do to build a condition that could lead to a more peaceful world in face of these unsettled times, it is clear that we are now facing a food crisis the likes of which we have not seen since maybe the early 1970s, and so there’s much to be done. I don’t think there’s anything to be gained by keeping this Board at arm’s length, and I think this would be a way to fully engage the talents that the Board has and the Title XII community has in a more meaningful way with the agency to bring about what the American people feel like we’re supposed to be all about.

THE CHAIRMAN: Further comment? Let me restate the motion if we’re ready for the question.

MR. THOMAS: Can I...


MR. THOMAS: This is John Thomas. I think there are sort of two sides looking at this. On one side there’s the staff that provides the follow-up to implement BIFAD resolutions, to implement and carry through with Title XII related activities. That staff was a 12-person office that used to exist. The other side, the other issue is the advisory role of BIFAD that direct communication with the Administrator requesting us how to get from point A to B. Right now we’re at
point A where there’s no staff, and there’s limited
advisory so we want to get to the point where BIFAD is
able to provide the recommendations to the
Administrator, and that there’s the capacity to
implement those recommendations. I think we have a long
way to go before we have the staffing built up to do
that. On the advisory I think there’s been progress,
and I know that you’ve had direct communications with
the Administrator. I think it’s important that BIFAD be
able to go to the Administrator with an important
message. The Administrator has identified some key
issues, food price rises, bio-fuels, things that we’re
not really working on too much right now but they’re
important issues. And at the point where BIFAD can go
to the Administrator and say this is what I think, this
is what we think USAID should do in the area of
addressing these food price increases or commodity
prices, and it’s important for BIFAD to develop its
message to go to the Administrator. I think the
Administrator is not going to say, okay, I agree that
BIFAD should be there but the Administrator needs to
have something that BIFAD brings to the agency. So what
I’m saying is the staffing is a separate issue. The
advisory is a separate issue, but we’re making more
progress on the advisory and the staffing is going to be
very difficult. It’s way beyond where EGAT can intervene.

MR. RABON: Well, I guess the biggest issue that I have today, Mr. Thomas, as you know, that it’s very difficult for this Board to communicate with the Administrator given the point of contact of our staff. Ms. Fore has definitely opened some doors for this Board, and we’re excited about that. And she’s done a great job and I think she’s going to be an outstanding Administrator and she is going to give the opportunity for this Board to get back to the level that it needs to be at, that it deserves to be at because it plays an important role in the overall structure of USAID. And the issues that we’re faced with today is having our support staff whether they’re USAID support or NASULGC or whoever they are being so many layers down through the structure, and it’s been validated recently that the time frame from asking a question or submitting a letter and getting a response back is just -- it’s unacceptable. We can’t take 60 days to respond to a letter. We just can’t function at that level. And that’s why it’s essential, and you’re exactly right, we’re not going to go from the lower ranks of EGAT to the Administrator’s office tomorrow. That’s not going to happen. I don’t think any of us expect that to
happen, but we have to start somewhere and that starts today in my opinion. We’re going to start today making the request and asking for the consideration, and hopefully within the near future we will have the BIFAD staff, support staff, increased hopefully at some point and relocated back where it belongs, so that is a request we’re making here today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are we ready for any public comment? Dr. Christensen.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I would make one more, and that is it’s my perception that a Title XII community and the agency itself expects this Board to give leadership to the whole matter of economic, agricultural, nutritional development of those particular things across the broad spectrum of American public policy as it is forwarded through this particular agency. And this is at least a symbolic gesture that we’re attempting to do that by having someone who can do the background work for us that needs to be done and have a frequent interaction with the Administrator herself so that these things get done in a more timely fashion. If we forward, for example, a document requesting action on a particular part the person who has the responsibility in the interim to forward that becomes the BIFAD staff person, and that person has to
have direct access to the Administrator in order to get
answers to those questions in a timely fashion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Other comments from the Board?
Let’s take some public comment, and then we’ll bring
this to the floor for vote.

MR. WILLIAMS: This is Tim Williams from the
University of Georgia. I would urge that the Board
consider its constitution and actually request that as
the new office is relocated that they actually upgrade
the staffing so that there’s at least one person
represented from each bureau so that you have a person
that is going to in that office provide the liaison and
the staff work for Africa, for the Caribbean, for Latin
America, for East Europe and so on. I think that that
is a minimum requirement. To try and do this with one
person is not realistic and it’s just going to frustrate
the Board down the road.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there other public comment?

Mr. Rifenbark.

MR. RIFENBARK: My name is John Rifenbark.
I’m with EGAT/AG. I was the former designated federal
officer for BIFAD before Ron Senykoff. And I want to
make sure the Board is aware of the FACA Act, the
Federal Advisory Committee Act, which governs the
structure and the procedures for the BIFAD. Every two
years your charter is renewed. The charter will expire in I think September of 2008, and this would provide you the opportunity to revise the charter and the charter needs to be approved by the Administration of AID so this would offer you the opportunity to rearrange, negotiate the new charter. The charter is effective when filed with Congress, and that is the date that the current charter will expire, two years after the date that it was filed.

THE CHAIRMAN: That’s useful information.

Other comment?

MR. DELAUDER: I wanted to ask John a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MR. DELAUDER: But I’m going to hold it until after we pass the motion. It’s not needed for the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to do this on voice or roll call?

MR. RABON: I would like to add one component to that if we could. I’m not sure exactly how to do that but I would like to add a time frame to meeting with the Administrator. I think we need to act on this hopefully within the next 30 days, 30 to 45 days. I think you had mentioned last night you’ll be back on
BIFAD business mid-March, and if we could add a
component in there that requested a meeting prior to the
end of March.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Bolognese.

MR. BOLOGNESE: Kerry Bolognese, NASULGC. My
question is to John. There is another advisory
committee that advises the Administrator, the Advisory
Committee on Voluntary Foreign Assistance. I’m
wondering if John might be able to comment on its
position, its relationship to the Administrator, its
staffing as a comparison to what role BIFAD plays.

MR. THOMAS: John Thomas. I think if BIFAD
was going to be located as close as possible to the
Administrator -- ACVFA is now with the Office of
Development Partners. It’s not exactly in the
Administrator’s office, and I think realistically if
BIFAD wants to have -- elevate its position up to the
Administrator that’s where you would be. I don’t see it
on this chart because I think this is old because this
still includes the Bureau of Policy Program and
Coordination, which doesn’t exist any longer. And this
new office, Office of Development Partners, has taken
some of these functions. Now this Office of Development
Partners not only contains the ACVFA staff but it’s also
the Global Development Alliance, the GDA. And I
believe, I’m not sure, but the presentation from Steve this morning, Steve Gale, on the Global Development Commons, I also think is part of that -- may be in that office as well. So to answer your question, Kerry, that’s where I think BIFAD would be located if you were successful to move up to the Administrator to get her ear. It wouldn’t be directly in the Administrator’s office.

MR. RABON: Then I don’t believe it was directly in the Administrator’s office previously, was it? It was close to -- I’m sure it wasn’t in her office but it was in the general location.

MR. THOMAS: Probably, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Further discussion? Let me just restate the motion as I understand it, Mr. Rabon, and correct me if I didn’t get this -- there’s three elements to it. And that was re-present the Bissell Report to the Administrator, present the Rubin Report to the Administrator, and then request the relocation of the secretariat to the Administrator’s level. Those are the three elements, plus you added that these actions be initiated within 30 to 45 days.

MR. RABON: Forty-five days I think would be good. That gives us plenty of latitude.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that acceptable to you?
MR. RABON: Absolutely.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor, aye. Opposed, nay. The motion passes, and we’ll proceed with that. Thank you. Did you have anything else, Mr. Rabon?

MR. RABON: The only other thing I’d like to touch on here is that once again our federal officer has done us an outstanding job, and we appreciate all of his hard work and support that we are getting because I firmly believe it’s more than one man can do, and he has done a great job of keeping us informed and up to date, and so, Ron Senykoff, on behalf of the Board we appreciate all of your efforts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Dr. DeLauder.

MR. DELAUDER: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask John one other question, kind of a historical question about the structure when BIFAD was first created in 1975 and up to I guess about 1990 or so when it was active as I understand it. And then we had a period of inactivity. I don’t remember how long it was inactive before it was reconstituted but it appears as though the change in the relationship between BIFAD and within USAID occurred during that transition period. Is that a fair statement?

MR. THOMAS: I’m going to have to ask one of my colleagues who have been following this longer than...
me. Jerrish [ph] is here who has a good history of
BIFAD, how it has evolved through the agency. There may
be others.

MR. DELAUER: As part of that there was also
a period when the universities were active in long-term
training, and we did a great deal of work in terms of
producing PhDs in developing countries and so forth.

MR. OWEIS: In 1994 the Board submitted their
resignation because they were appointed by a Republican
administration, and they resigned. Then there was a
period of almost one year, year and a half, the agency
did not have the opportunity to decide what they were
going to do to BIFAD. Then in 1995 BIFAD was
reconstituted, and the staff was located then at the
Bureau of Science and Technology. And the chairman was
Ed Chu [ph] from the University of Minnesota, and the
staff of the Board was located in that bureau. It was
one man, federal officer. The first was Ron Cummings
[ph] and two other persons. So that’s what happened.
Essentially the structure of BIFAD during the Bush
administration and the Clinton administration was the
same with no significant contribution for you guys to
come and advise us in AID, so now this is a new ball
game and we want to re-establish the relationship, and
also the BIFAD legislation was revised in 2000, and
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expanded beyond the landscape of production agriculture
to follow what is called now the value chain, and then
Mr. Chu resigned when the Bush administration came, and
Mr. McPherson took over the chairmanship of the Board.
But essentially the substance, the structure, and the
staff is the same. It was located in the Bureau of
Science and Technology then, and now it’s called the
Bureau of Economic Growth -- this is in a nutshell. I
don’t want to go into details. We have distinguished
Americans like you. We have a distinguished person from
Illinois, the founding father of the legislation,
Congressman Findley [ph] and other distinguished people.
I don’t want to go into details but the structure and
the staff are almost the same. And I used to have the
same job like Ron has but the staff was, as John Thomas
said, was much larger. We had staff from the university
community and from AID. The executive director was a
dean. The last one was Ralph Smutler [ph] from Michigan
State University, and we have the deputy mission
director from AID and several people, deans, and so
forth. They used to come and go. There was no people
from the university...

MR. THOMAS: Jerry, before you sit down, so
the 12-person staff that was USAID staff?

MR. OWEIS: Both. From the university and
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USAID.

MR. THOMAS: Plus the universities.

MR. OWEIS: Yeah. They come from IPA or
detailed from the Department of Agriculture. We had
people from the Department of Agriculture. And we have
a separate program officer, and we have a budget and so
forth, and it was not in the office of the Administrator
but it was attached to the office of the Administrator.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: In fact, Mr. Chairman, David
Hansen from Ohio State was one of those BIFAD staff on
an IPA if I remember correctly. And you might get an
interesting perspective from him.

THE CHAIRMAN: We’ve taken action on this item
and we’ll proceed with implementation of that action.
The title of this section is strategic direction for
BIFAD in 2008, and it’s an opportunity for us to give
some thought to what we want to address over the next
several months, and there are several issues that come
to mind. The guidelines, the 216 document, what’s the
status of that? There was a proposed revision. Is that
still in process?

MR. THOMAS: It’s still in process. There’s a
draft and it’s the same draft that I shared with you in
October. The changes were made to update the language
to be consistent with the foreign assistance framework,
and it said that USAID missions should identify Title XII activities as they develop their operational plans. There’s still opportunity for BIFAD to comment at any time actually, but the text of the 216, the ADS, hasn’t changed since October, the draft. It’s still an issue really of implementing the language rather than the text itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this something we want to take up in our next meeting? In anticipation of that, could we ask you to have someone be prepared to engage in discussion with us about that?

MR. THOMAS: Okay. Dr. Hansen brought up a very interesting -- he made two very interesting comments. He introduced himself as being from not the Ohio State University but Ohio State University, and that’s a very important distinction, and I’m concerned that when he returns to his campus he may be in real difficulty because of that. So I just wanted to make the point. It’s still The Ohio State, isn’t it, David, it hasn’t changed? Okay. The serious point is the question of defining Title XII activities under the amendment that was passed in 2000. Is that something -- and I would appreciate, Ms. Rubin, your comments. Is that something we need to spend some time on or do you think that’s clear?
MS. RUBIN: I think it would be helpful to hear what the Board has to say on this point because I think there are a number of areas that are unclear, whether now or if you discuss it among yourselves later.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I’m not prepared to discuss that at the moment. We need to have some background and perhaps we can again make that an agenda item.

MR. DELAUDER: Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the questions I raised earlier when we talked about this coordinated plan was to have someone before we do that to identify all the activities that are now going on within USAID that would be considered...

THE CHAIRMAN: Thoughts on how we might want to proceed?

MR. DELAUDER: Maybe John can maybe give some suggestion.

MR. THOMAS: How to identify all of the Title XII activities?

MR. DELAUDER: That would be considered Title XII activities that are now going on within USAID.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you. We tried to do that in the Title XII report, and to the extent that we received the information from our USAID missions we can do that. Certainly we know in the central bureau what...
programs we fund that are Title XII, and we can list those but we don’t always know if a USAID mission, Egypt, Afghanistan, whatever, is an activity that’s Title XII. One thing we can do now with the foreign assistance framework and the way our budget is developed is that we can have key -- we can identify key areas and we could include a key area called Title XII activities. And then when USAID missions develop their budgets they identify specifically if this is the Title XII activity. I think we have to give some education to the missions so they know what a Title XII activity is. But right now we don’t have a good system to capture everything the agency does in Title XII. It requires a lot of effort just to go contact each office individually explaining do you have an activity of this nature and follow up to make sure you get a response.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rabon.

MR. RABON: Now are you coming up with the Title XII activity list to file the Title XII report? How do you gather that information?

MR. THOMAS: Well, last year we -- like I say, in our office we know which activities that we fund that are Title XII so the difficulty is finding out what’s going on outside of Washington. Last year George Wilson contacted -- there’s two ways. We can contact the
missions or we can contact the universities. Last year
George Wilson contacted all of the universities to ask
them to provide information on work that they’re doing
with USAID funds on agriculture.

MR. THOMAS: Is this -- maybe I’m behind the
curve but this funding is typically a year or two in
advance. Is that not -- is that funding not allocated
per Title XII in advance? It appears to me that it
should be fairly easy to come by because we’re a year or
two ahead of the game. It almost sounds like what
you’re saying is we’re a year or two behind the game.
Maybe I just don’t understand.

MR. RABON: Well, the Title XII reports are
always a year behind so right now we will be doing the
Title XII report for 2007, and that will capture the
money that was obligated in 2006 and implemented in
2007. It identifies all of the fiscal year 2007 funding
for agriculture that we can identify. Now we don’t know
-- we’re not able to know at this point of all the USAID
agriculture money how much of that is Title XII. We
don’t have a system to capture that information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me see if I understand this
correctly. There’s not an actual appropriation for
Title XII but there are various accounts that are
created, and when a project is established that’s the
point that one can determine whether or not it would go under -- which makes it a bit awkward to know what is actually going in the title, is that the case?

MR. THOMAS: We wouldn’t know if it’s a Title XII activity until a mission designs an activity and actually contracts so it does a cooperative agreement.

MR. RABON: And that spending is discretionary? When it gets to that level they can do what they want with it?

MR. THOMAS: Not always. Most of the Title XII activities come from the development assistance account. There are several accounts. There’s the development assistance account which is our office for the CRSP activities, for example. There’s the Title II, which is the food aid programs, and that funds a lot of agriculture activities mainly implemented by NGOs. There’s also the ESF, Economic Support Fund. So we look in all of the accounts how much of that is used for agriculture activities but we wouldn’t know if it’s a Title XII activity. Agriculture activities more broadly but within that how much of it is actually a Title XII activity, we wouldn’t know until a mission actually implements a project and has done their contracting.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I haven’t seen for some years now the format for the Title XII university
report, but it occurs to me that universities who frequently are asked to demonstrate matching contributions would like to be able to report Title XII like activities that have been funded through non-USAID sources and the provision in that report should be made for that. We heard this morning from someone earlier, I don’t remember exactly whom, that substantial amounts of money are being poured into international development from non-AID sources, and the universities themselves have been able to orchestrate some of those kinds of things. And many universities have committed personnel time and other types of resources at this particular effort to support the overall program, and there needs to be provision made for reporting that. Sometimes the agency has pushed for some types of matching funds that universities have not been able to grant. I remember in the 1990s there came a push from the agency for the universities to give international students who are coming on Title XII projects in-state tuition rates, and the attitude of the university presidents that I was acquainted with or the Consortium for International Development was that that was a federal responsibility, not a state responsibility, and state universities were not particularly amused to be requested that they give state tuition grants when they could not afford to
accommodate all of the in-state students who wanted to attend their universities. So that may have been one of the sources of this disassociation in the 90s because the AID wanted that and the university community wasn’t willing to give that, and I would assume now with some degree of confidence that the universities would have a similar feeling that certain kinds of things are federal responsibilities, the state will assume others, but at least the one thing that needs to be provided is there needs to be a format in the protocols of this report that enables the university to identify all that they do and then identify which is AID funded and which is non-AID funded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let’s take two quick comments from the audience and I want to get another topic on the floor before we finish this section.

MR. DEMMETT: Bob, I think the discussion really highlights the difficulty in trying to figure out what is a Title XII funded project and what is not, and the fact that these are not defined, I mean I would suggest that BIFAD indicate that a project when funded is defined either as a Title XII project or not as a Title XII project. And if you look at the report from this year the only fiscal report which is $550 million is a report on the total expenditure for agriculture by
the agency. It really has very little to do with what
is funded under Title XII, and if we know what’s under
Title XII why isn’t the amount reported in the report to
Congress because what happens is congressional staff are
looking at this 550 number, and when you ask them how
much is spent under Title XII, which I have done, they
say $550 million. Well, the fact is that that’s the
only fiscal report in the entire Title XII report, so
it’s very misleading. And I think that it’s important
that if we’re going to deal with Title XII as partners
that, one, we define what a Title XII project is up
front and that it has certain characteristics and that
what we do is in the accounting process, then we have a
very easy job of producing a Title XII report that tells
us how much money we’re spending on Title XII.

MR. THOMAS: That’s exactly the point I was
trying to make is that we know how much globally USAID
is spending on agriculture but we haven’t been able to
pull out the amount that’s strictly Title XII until
hopefully this year with this new accounting system we
can try it out and see if we can tag amounts for Title
XII only.

MR. HANSEN: Mr. Chairman, in response to your
earlier comments, David Hansen, from The Ohio State
University, the real issue is, is it a big T or a small
T, so therefore in order to avoid that it’s better just to say Ohio State. I appreciate you to clarify that for the record so I still have a job when I get home. Thank you. I would simply like to say here that again in the past we used to have a BIFAD budget panel, and this was a group that was put together by the BIFAD staff. It was university people. We used to come in to Washington, D.C. for two or three days. We used to meet with the regional bureaus. We used to meet with the central bureaus and define what indeed was Title XII activity. And we used to look at several. We used to look at the SETH [ph] program, we used to look at the development assistance program, and I think that the Office of the Budget -- I recall Jim Pedra [ph] saying this is a really useful exercise for us as well because it really helps us get our arms around what is Title XII and what is not, and I don’t think we have to go back and reinvent the past but it seems to me that perhaps if the Board were to give some attention to attempting to develop a dialogue at that level it might be one way to help us better define what are Title XII activities.

THE CHAIRMAN: I’m going to come back to out of this conversation what would you like for us to be our next -- how do you see us proceeding?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, the Administrator
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asked for several things she’d like us to address. I think we ought to early on give some attention to that and prioritize those and decide which we want to tackle first and give her the requested feedback. That may be very helpful in building this bridge.

THE CHAIRMAN: But we have Dr. DeLauder’s request on the table as well.

MR. DELAUDER: Well, I think John has in part answered that, and that is trying to identify the activities I think was the idea and talked about the difficulties with doing that. But there are some activities that can be identified -- at least in part identify certain kinds of programs that are in fact Title XII so we have an inventory of those but then as we move forward have a plan and we can engage the mission to identify the activities that they have within different missions to address that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wanted to put two more things. You’ve identified one and I have one other. There’s an opportunity for institutions, individuals, to bring to our attention areas that should in our view be considered for research and activity, and I was contacted by Marsh Whittaker [ph] at Utah State a couple or three weeks ago and asked for an opportunity for just briefly, and I think Dr. McKee is going to make the
presentation about a possible interest and need for work in the area of water. Dr. McKee.

MR. MCKEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate just a few minutes of the time of the Board. I’m Mac McKee. I’m the Director of the Utah Water Research Laboratory at Utah State University. We for a number of years now have been concerned about what we perceive to be going prices in water and agriculture. Population growth and increased food demand, especially in areas of the world, North Africa, the Middle East, the -- and others, IFPRI and other organizations have targeted these areas as areas of concern over the next 20 to 30 years where there is likely to be a collision in terms of demand for water between agricultural demands to support food production and urban demands to support increased population growth in urban centers. And since 2005 the Congress has consistently expressed an interest in support for a Water CRSP to more seriously and scientifically explore the implications of this growth in water demand, and the implications especially for food production, IFPRI and FAO have both concluded that in the future we’re likely to see decreases in food production as a result of this pending water crisis. I know that there are plans from CGIAR and other organizations to address some pieces of this.
We think those plans are incomplete and that they do not offer the best design for engaging the best and brightest U.S. research institutions in addressing this pending crisis. We would like to propose that BIFAD consider as a regular agenda item for some future meeting at the earliest possible time to consider a planning grant for a Water CRSP for addressing these issues. I have made available to the Board a short three-page summary of some of our concerns on some of the issues, and we’d certainly be available between now and whenever this might come up to offer more information and thought.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Dr. McKee. We will consider that as an item for discussion at a future Board meeting. The other item that I wanted to bring to your attention, and I think the Board is very much aware of this because we had earlier received copies of this, I wrote to the Administrator a couple weeks ago and asked if there are issues that she would seek our advice on, and just for the audience to be aware of what the response was it’s a daunting list, science programs, public-private partnerships, the GMO issue as it relates to food aid and also as it relates to food production. The consequences of the Farm Bill, which most are aware is in negotiation at the moment,
and there are significant elements of that that have to
do with food assistance and other things that may have
impact. Another area that was mentioned a moment ago
was this question of Global Development Commons, and
also the issue of rising costs of commodities and the
impact that has on food prices. So we’ll consider that
hopefully later on our agenda today. We’ve been joined
by Assistant Administrator of USAID, Jackie Schafer.
Thank you, Jackie, very much. I know this is a busy
day. The Administrator is on the Hill testifying. Any
word on how that’s going? Not yet. We’ll find out
soon. Okay. And we’ve asked you, and you very
graciously agreed to come and spend some time with us
discussing budget and other issues that you may want to
bring to us. For those that don’t know, Ms. Schafer is
responsible for EGAT, and has direct responsibility
currently for a lot of agricultural activities, and
that’s where the BIFAD is managed. So welcome.

MS. SCHAFER: Good morning, Chairman Easter,
and members of the BIFAD Board. For the record, my name
is Jacqueline E. Schafer. I’m the Assistant
Administrator for the USAID Bureau for Economic Growth,
Agriculture, and Trade. I have been in this
presidentially appointed position for a little over two
years now. I originally joined USAID in 2002 as a
Deputy Assistant Administrator with responsibility for four programs, only one of which is actually named in our title. Those include the Offices of Natural Resources, Management, Environment, and Science Policy, Agriculture, and Infrastructure and Engineering. We also are responsible to the agency for technical leadership and field support in those areas as well as the areas of economic growth, development credit, micro-enterprise development, and interestingly enough education, both basic education and higher education.
The bureau came about as a result of reorganization plan implemented by the previous Administrator by two terms, Mr. Andrew Natius [ph]. So our work has evolved over this past five years and one way to look at how that has changed, and it’s been quite significant, is to look at our budget which after all is a plan, an expression of policy, and although it’s a bit dry and sometimes very confusing if you look at the way the foreign assistance budget is put together, which is what we’re going to try to do this morning, I hope that I don’t leave the Board members, the audience, and especially the new members, in a more voluted state than they might have been before we started this exercise. But there have been some very significant changes in the way that the Administration has aligned its foreign assistance budget, and I hope
that I’ll be able to illuminate that for you so that as
further discussions take place in the field in which
you’re interested you have this bigger picture of the
foreign assistance framework to have as a reference.
I’m going to walk through some slides here, and I’m
going to do it a little bit slowly because we do have
the time to just give you an opportunity to let this
sink in. I guess not all the -- can others see the
slide? Oh, you can. Okay. Very good. Thank you. Let
me just -- could you go to the next slide, please? This
is not as big as I had hoped and so the members have a
handwritten -- but for you all that’s still an eye test,
and you have a set of those slides in the folder in
front of you. If you look at the biggest, biggest
picture the international affairs budget for fiscal year
2009, which begins October 1, 2008, the official start
of our fiscal year, October 1, and what’s called the
international affairs function or function 150 account,
the budget for foreign affairs agencies, all of them, is
about $39.5 billion. Of that foreign operations and
related agencies, and a related agency might be, for
example, the Challenge Corporation, the total budget
according to the -- when the State Department puts
together its fact sheet is $26.1 billion. If you look
at foreign assistance though the foreign assistance
number as testified by Secretary Rice on the Hill on February 13, shortly after the President’s budget came out, the foreign assistance budget for fiscal year 2009 is $22.7 billion. These funds support the strategic purposes of diplomacy and development securing peace, supporting democracy, advocating our principles and ideals, meeting global challenges, and aiding our friends and allies. This chart in front of you, bar chart in front of you, is intended merely to illustrate the very great number of accounts that we have to account for as our budget is put together and explained to the Congress. And I want to draw your attention because we’re going to go from -- we’re going to funnel down and go from sort of the biggest, broadest picture right down to agriculture and eventually down to the budget for our bureau. But I want to call your attention to the first bar, the orange bar, which is development assistance. The third one over, which is kind of a cream-colored, which is economic support funds, and moving over almost to the light green you’ll see a dark blue bar which is Public Law 480. There’s a key at the bottom of this for the members to look at, but as you can see the largest accounts in the overall foreign operations budget are the economic support funds, military financing, which is the yellow, and the
Global HIV/AIDS Initiative, and that’s in the light green. That is an important program which really was developed during this Administration. Several years ago that might have been a very slim bar on a chart like this but it’s grown in increasing importance, and the President is truly committed to wiping out this scourge, particularly in the focus countries and particularly in Africa so that’s a reflection of the Administration’s policy. The next slide, please, is another way to display the same information but what it does is focus on the major accounts, and we define major here as those accounts that account for more than 5 percent of the total budget. The largest accounts, therefore, are the economic support funds, which are mainly deployed in the Middle East and strategic countries in the Asia Near East region although there is some money like this, this color of money, as they say, spent in strategic places in Africa. The Sudan comes immediately to mind. Foreign military financing is also a very large share of the overall foreign assistance budget, and you can see also that the HIV/AIDS program is right up there with that form of military financing. Child survival and health, my colleagues in the Global Health Bureau are mainly responsible for implementing or for the leadership in implementing programs in that account.
It’s very large. Public Law 480 comes to us for implementation but it comes through the Department of Agriculture to our bureau and then out to the field, but that’s important for agriculture so I wanted to include that in the picture that you’re seeing here.

Development assistance, which is the key account for agriculture in Africa, Latin America, and my own bureau. It is the development assistance account that we mostly think about when we construct our budget in my bureau. The next slide is actually a reference to the foreign assistance framework, and there are copies of the foreign assistance framework. Many of you have seen this because you have been briefed before on the foreign assistance framework that was devised almost three years ago now. There is a handout that really shows how we are trying to deploy all of our foreign assistance resources to carry out the major objectives of foreign assistance to meet the over arching goal, which is the Secretary’s articulated goal of foreign assistance which is to help build and sustain democratic well-governed states but respond to the needs of their people, reduce widespread poverty, and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system. And this slide is merely an attempt to show you that all of those accounts, those 21 different accounts that I showed you on the first
slide are deployed or used to meet the objectives that
fall into five categories. The five objective
categories from left to right on this chart and also
reflected on the one that’s projected on the screen are
peace security, governing justly and democratically,
investing in people. That’s mainly health and
education. Economic growth, there are eight program
areas in economic growth. I’m going to run through
those because it’s extremely important to us in EGAT and
I think in the agriculture community as well and
humanitarian assistance. Economic growth includes eight
program areas and they range from the Macro Economic
Foundations for Growth, which in this day and age we
don’t spend a lot of money on because we solved most of
those problems 20, 30 years ago, 20, 25 years ago, but
in economies or in countries that are rebuilding getting
the fundamental Macro Economic Foundations for Growth in
place is still an issue and we still find ourselves
spending money in that area. Trade and investment is
extremely important from the point of view of the
Administration’s overall approach to economic growth and
globalization and we are in support of trade capacity
building efforts to support the U.S. trade
representatives initiatives to secure free trade
agreements wherever possible. And we’ve had quite a bit
of success during the Administration in doing this, and that’s an important effort for us. Financial sector reform is included in the economic growth program areas. Infrastructure, we have not done as much infrastructure in recent years as we had done in the past although there are pockets of that and particularly in rebuilding countries such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan. They have large infrastructure programs, and you’ll see that reflected in one of the budget charts that’s coming up. Agriculture, program area of 4.5, you’ll be learning to talk in that kind of language, is where the agriculture funding is located. Private sector competitiveness, economic opportunity which is our micro enterprise programs largely and related programs to that, micro finance, business development services, the enabling environment to bring people out of the informal sector and into the formal sector of an economy. And finally the environment funds are also included under the economic growth rubric, the economic growth objective. Again, if you look down at the country types, the countries are categorized into five main categories, rebuilding countries. Those are states that are emerging from and rebuilding after internal, external conflict. Developing countries, those are states with low income or lower middle income but not yet meeting
the millennium challenge corporations performance
criteria to be included in that program. Transforming
countries, these are states with low or lower middle
income meeting MCC performance criteria and criteria
related to political rights as well. Sustaining
partnership countries, these are the states with upper
middle income or greater and which support -- U.S.
support is provided to sustain the partnership’s
progress in peace. These are full partners with us as
we craft our relationship with the set of countries.
Restrictive countries or states of concern where there
are significant governance issues. An example of that
might be Cuba or Zimbabwe or North Korea. And then we
have global or regional activities that are cross
cutting. The countries that actually...

MR. DELAUDE: Can I ask a question?

MS. SCHAFER: Yes, certainly, Dr. DeLauder.

MR. DELAUDE: I don’t see military financing
on that chart. I don’t know if I missed it.

MS. SCHAFER: Let’s see. I was thinking it
was the first one under peace and security. If it
didn’t get put up there then we made a mistake on that
chart, but you’ll see it on this chart. If you look...

MR. DELAUDE: Under peace and security?

MS. SCHAFER: Yeah. It’s under peace and security.
security, and it says accounts within state USAID. The
very first one under peace and security is FMF, foreign
military financing. And there is also in your material
if you want to take a look at the definitions every one
of these 21 accounts is listed and defined. This comes
out of materials that are available of course on a web
site having to do with the foreign assistance framework.
One more word, most of the countries that are in this
taxonomy are developing countries. The next largest is
our sustaining partnerships although we don’t have a
presence in many of these countries. The transforming
countries would be the next and rebuilding would be the
last, would be the smallest subset. The identity of
those countries was last published as part of the FY
2007 operational plan guidance, and I have a list of
those if anyone is interested. However, that may change
over time and we’re waiting for announcements of any
changes that the Secretary chooses to make and how to
characterize those countries. The reason it’s important
is it affects how we do our programming. You can do
different things when you have a country that has a
fairly significant level of governance and stability
than you can say in a place like Liberia that is almost
starting from scratch where you got excellent leadership
and governance that really wants to move ahead and
really improve the lives of their people and has the right policies in place but really has almost nothing on the ground to work with as they try to rebuild their education programs and economic programs and infrastructure. So what we do will change depending on the level of sophistication of the country. Moving on to the next slide budget by objective. This is an attempt to look at the entire DA account. That’s all accounts. I got my DA account, which is the next slide, out of order here. That’s all accounts, so what that should show you if I’m seeing it correctly is the entire request for FY 07 at 22.7 million. Is that right? Can you see that? Billion, excuse me. 22.7 billion. My own slide is out of order. Again, this gives you a very good picture of how significant peace and security is in the overall foreign assistance budget. Most people speak of foreign assistance as humanitarian assistance. That’s out there on the far right but you can see that it’s a relatively small part of the overall foreign assistance budget. Peace and security in particular in the light blue, and that’s dominated by the HIV/AIDS program, our health and education programs are an extremely robust part of our foreign assistance effort. If you take out the President’s emergency plan for AIDS relief just to give you a little bit of flavor for what
our more regular programs are this is the picture you have. Actually the way the math works it actually shows that peace and security is an even larger proportion of our foreign assistance budget. And again the second group is democratic governance. The light blue is health and welfare -- health and education, and some welfare programs. Economic growth would be humanitarian assistance and the program support is out there on the right side in red. Now looking at the development assistance account, which is the one that mainly EGAT, this bureau, is involved very little of the money is spent on peace and security. Much of it is spent on economic growth and democracy and governance, and that’s what that illustrates. And then by program area this is a little hard to follow but I did this for a reason so that you could see these are major accounts, the ones that are mostly concerned with agriculture and economic growth. And the first, if you look at the color the solid bar is development assistance. The hatched bar is economic support, and then there is one checkered bar out on the right there with the light green, agriculture activities, so this is the major accounts, these three major accounts that have to do with economic growth and agriculture are displayed here and you can get a sense that our agriculture effort is smaller than
infrastructure but infrastructure is almost always going
to a relatively few number of countries. In this case,
probably that middle bar for FY 08 is Afghanistan.
Again displaying the major accounts by regions, and our
functional units, which we call our agency or bureau
functional unit or pillar bureau which strikes me as
very significant having a pillar bureau be presented in
a room that is dominated by pillars, so I hope all of
you can see this. First is the Africa bureau, the
second is the Asia Near East bureau, the third one is --
you can’t see it. There’s almost an imperceptible line
in there for the Eurasia bureau. It’s not shown because
their source of funds is segregated to FSA and seed
money which were accounts devised to help us provide
assistance after the fall of the Soviet Union and in
Eastern Europe so they do not use for the most part
development assistance funding. The yellow is the Latin
America Caribbean bureau. And you also aren’t going to
see much there for democracy conflict and humanitarian
assistance. That’s an imperceptible line. The next one
to the right of that is the Bureau for Economic Growth,
Agriculture, and Trade, and then there’s some State
Department programs that are also displayed on there
that compliment our programs because they get funds from
ESF. Climate change programs come to mind in particular
that would account for the State Department’s activity.
So when you put ESF into the picture, economic support funds, some of that money, as I mentioned, goes to places in Africa but the vast majority of it goes to the Middle East and the key security countries, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq, and that accounts for why those numbers are so large, and they tend to have large infrastructure programs as well.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: A question.

MS. SCHAFER: Yes, sir.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Allen Christensen. I look at this and have a question, I suppose, that you won’t be able to answer, but you may, and perhaps there’s been thought given to it, but one of the things that’s constantly on the political agenda is the illegal immigration problem. One of the reasons in my observation that we have an illegal immigration problem from Latin America into this country is they can’t feed their families at home, and they’re leaving. I’m not sure that I understand a rationale that overlooks the fact that we need to be vitally engaged in Latin America to improve the health of that because that would represent in my judgment a major stepping stone to addressing a problem that is constantly on everyone’s mind in this current political conversation that
occupies our country.

MS. SCHAFER: Our support to the Latin America-Caribbean region is dominated by our work in Colombia, as a matter of fact. One-quarter of the funds spent in Latin America and the Caribbean region is spent in Colombia. Part of that is security and anti-drug work, but it also is a country that is very promising and emerging as a major economic player in Latin America and in the Western Hemisphere generally. Our main focus in Latin America, and I don’t pretend to be an expert so I won’t say too much about it, is in strengthening democracy and governance in Latin America. Generally the income is there and some places anyway are higher than they may be, for example, in Africa and some other parts of Asia. But they have a well-rounded program there. I’m not sure I can explain all of the reasons for immigration but clearly if an economy is able to grow, I remember famously President Fox when he was elected said Mexico needs all Mexicans to be in Mexico working for the growth and development of our country. So to the extent that there are opportunities for reform that will stabilize the economy, stabilize the financial markets, expand growth opportunities which we are trying to do through the North America Free Trade Agreement first, the Central America-Dominican Republic Free Trade
Agreement, the free trade agreements that we’re entering into in Peru and Colombia, and integrating Latin America more with the global economy that should allow the continent to grow, and people will be able to find jobs at home. Meanwhile, we do have a significant amount of fund transfers from the United States back to Latin America and other developing countries. India probably is actually the largest which accounts for a very different but a change in the way that foreign assistance has evolved over the past 20 years. Twenty years ago as I have mentioned to people before, and you’ve heard this from previous administrators, perhaps 70 to 80 percent -- U.S. resource flows to the developing world came from official development assistance, foreign assistance. Today that picture is very, very different. Official development assistance using numbers in 2003, I was trying to get some more up-to-date ones to bring to this meeting, but it shows that 15 percent of flows to the developing world come from official U.S. government development assistance. The U.S. private capital flows to the developing world, foreign direct investments and net capital markets, is 45 percent, much larger, three times as large as development assistance. U.S. civil society that gives grants and otherwise engages through foundations or
faith-based organizations in providing assistance to the
developing world accounts for 15 percent, just about
equal to domestic -- to U.S. assistance. And finally
getting to your point a surprising number is that
personal remittances from the United States to the
developing world account for 25 percent of the overall
$113 billion of financial flows from the U.S. to the
developing world. I’m not saying how much of that is
legal versus illegal but it’s certainly an important
picture in terms of financing development in the
developing world.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, my point is simply
that it seems to me that there ought to be some strategy
for addressing economic development across the broad
spectrum of Latin America. A lot of the illegal
immigration flow in my experience, in my observation,
particularly the last six years, is because people are
leaving there and coming here most illegally because
they can’t survive and take care of their families
there. And if we began to address that, and in terms of
the opportunities with those particular people, we could
take care of what’s becoming a major social political
emergency in the United States that is causing a great
deal of anything but compassionate conversation about
people who are not here legally.
MS. SCHAFER: Thank you, Mr. Christensen. And on that, Mr. Chairman, if the Board would make time at its next meeting, I would like to come back and make a presentation or have some of my staff, some of them are much better presenters than I, make a presentation on an economic growth strategy that we are about to present to the Administrator that’s been under development which I think you will find very interesting and on point to some of the comments that Mr. Christensen had made.

We’re almost finished with these slides here. So again why don’t we go to the next one. This is the next slide. I’m sorry. This just takes the agriculture program budget and also displays it in these three combined accounts, and gives you some idea regionally where we actually do our agriculture work, and as you can see that is mainly in Africa and it is also in Asia and the Near East as well. But the President’s initiative to end hunger in Africa, the Africa Global Competitiveness Initiative, which is very much oriented to the agriculture sector are areas that we are working very closely with our Africa bureau on. We have some representatives here from the Africa bureau today, and certainly most of the work that is relevant to the -- the advice that you’re giving to us would be deployed in that area. It’s the area where we need the next
revolution, and we’re certainly making an effort to deploy funds in that sector in Africa. Just a couple of slides that give the picture for the Bureau of Economic Growth Agriculture and Trade. As I mentioned earlier, our bureau is largely concerned with eight program areas in economic growth, and the green bars there describe that. We do also the place that houses the leadership programs for basic education, higher education. The Higher Education for Development Program is managed out of that bureau. We do have some -- our Women in Development Program accounts for the two left-hand slim bars on the peace and security and the governing justly and democratically. Also, a small amount of urban money would be under governing justly and democratically. Primarily we are concerned with those eight program areas that I described earlier. The next slide should show you how the -- this is just the DA account, and this is by program area. What this shows you for those eight areas is in green we show you agriculture. I didn’t say this at the outset but now maybe it’s time to take a little bit a look about the differences between the three bars. The FY 07 is the actual and EGAT bureau’s budget for FY 07 ended up being $155 million. For FY 08 the request for EGAT -- the request for 07 was 139 million, by the way and we ended up with 155. Let
me step back a minute or two here. When I first came
into the agency the bureau received about $183 million.
In 2004, 2005, we were at about 165 million, 155
million. We tended to be about 10 percent of the
development assistance account. In 2008 the President’s
request was cut significantly in development assistance.
The overall request to the Congress in 2008 was 1.041
billion, so EGAT’s request of 104 million was about 10
percent. However, it did mean that we really had to
start taking some serious measures to make our program
to fit the budget that we had been given. In 2008
Congress enacted an appropriation level of 1.624 billion
so that was significantly more than the President
requested, which is often the case, but EGAT’s share of
that 1.624 billion did not go up commensurately to that
10 percent. We are kept at -- the initial budget
allocation we’ve been given is 116 million.
Furthermore, Congress in 2008 significantly earmarked
our budget. Now you hear a lot about earmarks. Most of
the earmarks are legal in the statute. They are must-
do, and they are sectorally based. For example, the
basic education earmark, development assistance, for all
accounts basic education we must spend $700 million
worldwide on basic education. Of the development
assistance account, we must spend $400 million on basic
education. Those broad sectoral earmarks have been layered over the money that EGAT has been given, and as a consequence our flexibility, our discretion, has been severely constrained. And we are now -- the budget that we’ve been given to start with for this fiscal year is 85 percent earmarked in six categories. The basic education by diversity, micro enterprise, water and sanitation, which is a new earmark this year but it’s in the statute, are all having a major effect on how we would normally spend our funds. There’s also an earmark for the collaboration research support program at the level of $28 million. When the Director of Foreign Assistance Office gave us additional funds we didn’t even get quite enough to cover the increase between our budget request and the actual earmarks, so we’re taking that out of other programs, other agriculture programs, other economic growth programs, other programs that might not be protected by an earmark. The picture improves a little bit in 2009. I’m here to talk about the President’s 2009 budget. The request for EGAT in 2009 is $122 million. There are some plus-ups but they are mostly for presidential initiatives, one in basic education and communities of opportunity, which is after school, education for at risk youth, the age group 8 to 14, to try to acquaint them with English, science, and
math skills and computer training and that those programs will primarily be conducted in Asia Near East countries although there are some in Africa which expect to benefit from that new program. Also the President has really placed additional emphasis on basic education and meeting the goals of what’s called fast track initiative countries and has requested additional funds for four countries in Africa in basic education, as well as Yemen and Honduras and elsewhere in the world. The four countries in Africa are Ethiopia, Liberia, Ghana, and Mali. There also is an increase in our budget request of $10 million to be part of the President’s overall increased request for global climate change. We are particularly going to work with developing countries that aren’t part of the major economies process for those that are in the climate change business. That’s an attempt to try to get the eight largest growing developing countries that would count for greenhouse gas emissions to work with the OECD countries to come up with a voluntary program for really working hard to reduce greenhouse gases, but there are many other countries that are not major emitters of greenhouse gases or major economies that need to have worked on an adaptation and response to climate variability and climate change, and so we’re being given a little extra...
money for that in FY 09. And finally in FY 09, and this will have some bearing on our ability to improve that agriculture economic growth interface we’ve been given a small amount of money to work on systemic policy changes especially in Africa where leaders really want to make economic reforms and improve their doing business profile that’s tracked by the World Bank. We hope to make some strides through this additional funding in registering property, in gaining access to credit and in trading across borders. Many African countries are land-locked and the barriers to trade across borders and then getting out into the global economy are significant in many of those places. And most of the products, of course, other than mining and oil most of the products that are exported in the market are in the agriculture sector so this should improve the overall picture there as well. That is the extent of the slides that I brought with me. I again hope this is a lot of information but I hope that it gives you a context or a perspective to consider in any of the further discussions that you have over the state of our budget the resources that we have to do the important things that you want us to do, and I’m happy to try to answer any questions that you have, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Questions
from the Board? I think the thing that has impressed me both in my conversations with you and your staff over the last several months has been the impact that earmarks have on constraining other areas of your budget, and again those are congressionally dictated to there’s not a lot that can be changed.

MS. SCHAFER: There’s an old line in Washington that when the President proposes the Congress disposes, and the President did sign this budget. Now as the Administrator reminds all of us the budgets evolve over the year, and the budget that was presented here today does not include the supplementals, for example. FY 08 money included the supplementals, and the FY 07 did, but those numbers that you see, the reason that bar is shorter for FY 09 is that generally as the year moves on there arises assessments and needs for supplemental budget requests and that changes the picture and that might provide some modicum of relief. And, furthermore, because Congress very often either earmarks or directs or urges us to do more things than we actually if you add them up we have the money for there’s an iterative process that the Director of the Foreign Assistance Office engages in with the Congress staff on the Appropriations Committee, and the budget that I described here for EGAT may not be the final
budget that we get but that’s the situation we’re facing right now is that that process starts forward. Last year people involved in our business will recall that we did not get a final approval for expending FY 08 funds until the middle of August, and the picture changed considerably from the President’s initial request, which was the prior February to August of the actual fiscal year in which we were operating, so you can expect to see some changes. I can’t predict right now whether they’ll be more or less onerous than the situation we’re facing now frankly. There are some very good programs that we would like to fund. We’ve entered agreements with organizations. We think they make a great contribution to agriculture but they just can’t be done this year under the constraints that have been so far placed on us. We will be happy to update the Board at the next meeting because I think there will be a lot more clarity about what we’re actually able to fund this fiscal year but that’s the situation we face at this time.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Allen Christensen. I know this does not impact this budget presentation, which I appreciate, but it seems to me philosophically in the consideration of all of these kinds of things that we should ever bear in mind that humanitarian assistance
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ought to be considered as a means to spare life, not as 
a means of life or becoming a way of life whereas 
agriculture and economic development becomes a means 
leading to nutritional and economic self-reliance that 
is sustained. And I guess I would as a citizen would 
hope that that kind of a philosophy would override that, 
and that’s one of the reasons why I always push for 
agricultural development because that enables people to 
take care of themselves. And we’re talking about 
depending on whose estimate you read somewhere around 
800 and 900 -- maybe a billion people who are poverty 
stricken, 75 percent of whom live in the rural areas, 
for which the first steps in agricultural development 
are the layout. And we have to step in in these 
tragedies and spare on it. We don’t ever want to create 
a situation where it becomes an expectation of a way of 
life for people that we will be able to do that forever. 

MS. SCHAFER: No argument with you there. Mr. 
Christensen, you would be more than happy to know that 
the Secretary and the Administrator would be more than 
happy to try to shift everyone from the categories of 
rebuilding, developing, and transforming into full 
sustaining partners with the United States because they 
are in fact able to sustain democratically governed 
states to take care of their people and help reduce
poverty, which is the over arching goal. So the whole
purpose of the program that’s been laid out here is to
try to reach the very goal that you’re describing.
There are going to be crises in the world and there are
going to be unstable situations where the American
people are more than happy to step up and help where
they can. But as you can see, we have a comprehensive
program that hopes to wok us out of any kind of
dependence over the long term.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to take a question
or two from the audience?

MS. SCHAFER: I can try.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any comments or questions from
the audience? We very much appreciate your willingness
to come and share this. I like these colored bars.
They really help make one -- make it visible, make it
understandable, and that’s been very helpful.

MS. SCHAFER: Thank you very much, Dr. Easter
and I’d like to thank Susan Thompson in our agriculture
office for working very hard to help me put these
together. She’s done all the heavy lifting here on the
display. And it’s a high art form to be able to
actually go into the system called the FAC system and
pull out this information and display it, so we thank
Susan for her contribution today too.
THE CHAIRMAN: Let me also publicly thank you for the other support that we get from your office. We very much appreciate Mr. Thomas’ involvement and Dr. Senykoff’s assistance, and then other people who come in at various times to help us.

MS. SCHAFER: Thank you very much, Dr. Easter. Thank you, Board members.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That does bring us to the end of our morning agenda, and we’re indicating that we’ll resume at 1:15 with a swearing in of our new Board member, and then we have quite a lot of business to do yet today, so we’ll see you back here about 1:15.

***

[Off the record]

[On the record]

***

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a really important piece of business to do, and I’m absolutely delighted that the Administrator for USAID, Ms. Henrietta Fore, has been able to join us today. It’s quite a privilege to have her with us. And we’re going to do the swearing in of Mr. Barlow back over on this side of the room, the rear of the room. So, H, if you could go in that direction, we’ll join you and get this business underway.
MS. FORE: Gentlemen of BIFAD, if you would be
good enough to come to join me, and I will say a few
remarks and then we will do our swearing in. I am
delighted to join all of you for the 153rd meeting of the
Board for International Food and Agriculture
Development, what we affectionately call BIFAD. I
understand that you’ve had a busy morning. I looked at
your schedule and feel that you are advising us in areas
that are current, that are going to lead us in the
future for decades to come. Thank you very much for an
interesting discussion over lunch. Since your creation
in 1975, BIFAD has provided critical advice and
assistance to USAID on agricultural programs and higher
education. Through BIFAD, USAID has been able to
maintain and strengthen our collaboration and
partnerships with the United States land grant
community. USAID recognizes the special relationship
that we have developed with the higher education
community under Title 12, and we welcome the opportunity
to work closely with BIFAD and to strengthen its
relationship. So on behalf of our entire agency for
international development, I want to thank you as a
board for your service to USAID and individually for
your service to our nation, so thank you. And now I
have the pleasure of swearing in our very newest member.
Our newest member is Mr. Harman Howard Barlow, III, of Cave City, Kentucky, but I think that you can imagine that somebody called Henrietta Hoogentobler Holsman [ph] would be proud of somebody who is called H.

***

[Swearing in of Mr. Barlow]

***

MS. FORE: Let me also take a moment to congratulate Mr. Keith W. Eckel, our other new member of the Board for BIFAD. I was looking forward to swearing in Keith this afternoon but I understand that he was unable to attend but I would like to thank him in absentia for his willingness to serve and to wish him best as he discharges the duties of his new office. May I also just take a moment to acknowledge two reappointments to BIFAD, Mr. William DeLauder as a member. Thank you very much for serving again. And Dr. Robert Easter as our chairman. They have both provided us with outstanding service, and I look forward to continuing collaboration because this group is one that I feel very affectionately toward. They are my advisors. So thank you on behalf of your Administrator. Thank you. Jackie, would you like anything else? All right. We’d like to take a picture then of everyone.

***
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[Off the record]

[On the record]

***

THE CHAIRMAN: Back to business here. We have a full agenda for the afternoon, and we need to get down to work. The first issue that we were to discuss this afternoon was to be presented by Jean Horton. Is Jean Horton with us? I don’t think so. So we’ll move on and perhaps there will be an opportunity later to come back to that. That particular issue just for those in the room concerned a resolution that the Board passed almost 18 months ago or something like that concerning contracting and the notion that when a contractor put together subcontractors for a proposal that the Board recommended or asked that there not be a changing of those subcontractors after the proposal was awarded and this was just to be an update on what the status of that is in the procurement process, and I’m going to now startle Dr. Wilson. Are you ready?

MR. WILSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good. And we heard a bit mentioned this morning about the Title XII report that we’re obligated to deliver to Congress, and George Wilson who is here on loan to USAID from North Carolina is involved in preparing that. George, I apologize for
bringing you up abruptly but when you’re ready we’ll proceed.

MR. WILSON: Good afternoon. In 15 minutes we probably can’t spend a lot of time talking about the Title XII report to Congress but by now I hope that all of you have been able to pick up the 2006 report to Congress. And you also hopefully have picked up the one-page set of notes which I’ll be speaking from, and that will give you an idea of what we hope to accomplish. Just a minute. All right. Mainly I wanted to just quickly review the 2006 report to Congress with you, and then we’ll talk a little bit about what we’d like or what we think we’d like to have the 2007 report be. Basically we’re going to be following the same format unless comments come from you either now or after this meeting indicate that we really ought to make some changes because mainly our goal is to end up with a useful document, not just for Congress but for BIFAD, for USAID, for the university community. So in March we will be soliciting the inputs from all of the Title XII universities on activities for October 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007. That’s the fiscal year 2007. And hopefully the budget tracking system that was mentioned this morning by John will help us to be able to segregate out the activities that are indeed qualifying
for Title XII because you heard Deborah Rubin’s report this morning. And generally in last year’s report we reported on any activities by Title XII universities that were funded by USAID. I know that’s a controversial point but as we walk through the report, and I’m just going to be looking at an outline. You’re looking at the report. We started out with an executive summary which I think helps anyone who is looking at it to understand basically what’s in the report. And as you go on to the first item which Dr. Demmett brought to our attention as generally misrepresenting the amount of money in agriculture through Title XII universities. On page 5 you see there’s a half a billion dollars of funds which are -- certainly they’re agriculture but they’re not EGAT agriculture. They’re not Title XII agriculture. So we will -- John and I haven’t talked about this but I think we’ll probably find a way around that this year to more accurately represent the contributions of the universities to Congress because like TAG [ph] says Congress looks at that and they say what are you worried about, you got a lot of money. So I think we need to be more precise on that. Now we got feedback from 32 universities and that means that not everybody reported back. We got about 120 activities reported from last year which we considered as qualified
to be included in the report, but if you add up the
number of illustrative activities that are included in
the report you’ll only count I think it’s 34 or 35 so it
was not intended to be all inclusive. It was intended
to be representative or illustrative of the kinds of
activities that we’re all involved in at the
universities. But we broke them down into various
categories. One was Title XII programs that support the
agency’s priorities and initiatives, and the President’s
initiative to end hunger in Africa. So that was one set
of illustrations. And then because so many of the Title
XII activities actually end up serving as seed money to
encourage others to invest in those programs we talked
about a section on leveraging, and again these are
illustrative of the partnerships that have brought about
additional investments in Title XII or USAID funded
programs. Now we also included programs that are really
administered through the CGIAR, and these are in --
these are funds used -- USAID funds used by CGIAR to
partner with Title XII universities for activities, and
so we included some of those activities too, again
illustrative. We then included long-term training
programs both degree and then different degrees, and
then institutional capacity building examples and
outreach and training, and then pilots on emerging
constraints and then illustrations of activities in the various regions of the world, Africa, Asia, Near East, Europe, Eurasia, and Latin America and the Caribbean. And then the next five years, the CRSP portfolios, in anticipation of the kinds of things that we’re talking about developing even now. And then of course the all important BIFAD activities, SPARE activities, and then observations of BIFAD. Now as we look at the 2007, I wanted to point out to you that as you can see in my notes here that the quality and value of this report will really depend solely on the materials that are submitted by the universities. I wish that we could say that we can track them all and we know everything that’s going on. It’s just not always the case. And so we’re going to try to make it as easy as possible to get as much information as possible, and so we’re going to try to use a template, an Excel spreadsheet for each activity, one page, one activity. And in that you would have again like we did last year the activity title, the amount of USAID funding for this activity for this fiscal year, and indicate whether you are a prime or a subcontractor or grantee and then the USAID operating unit that supports the work and it may be EGAT agriculture. It may be education. It may be a mission or it may be one of the regional bureaus. And then the
host country partner or partners involved, the activity purpose, the number of people trained reporting by gender because I’ll be honest with you, in the report that you’re looking at from 2006 we could not include activities which did not specify gender. So this is only a partial list but it’s a relative mix of gender, I think, that represented the kinds of activities that were funded. So anything which does not have a general breakdown, we’re not going to include this year either. The same for long-term training and short-term training, then in the case of the short term obviously the training is going to involve extension professionals, private sector people, farmers, whoever these people are, they need to be identified. And I don’t know that we’ll break it down by category so you can just click them off but maybe we will, and this is where you can help me. And then in the funding leverages, USAID funding leverages, we’re talking about private sector in the U.S. and in the host countries. We’re talking about in-kind support of your institution, and we have many good examples of this this last year, but I think we could do better on that. And then other financial investments of your institution, and you know better than I do what that will be. There may be some other things which come through your institution but they’re
not necessarily coming out of the President’s office or
the provost office or the dean’s office. And then of
course the results and achievements. I know that a lot
of these last year were pretty lengthy and we had to
sort through to pick out something that would fit into
the report. So we’re asking for achievements and
impacts, no more than 50 words for each one. Now that’s
negotiable. You might say, well, we don’t need that.
We can do that in 25. Well, that would be better. And
then of course BIFAD. I propose that we engage BIFAD,
the Board, during the preparation, not after the report
is done -- and, John, I don’t know of any legal thing
that says we can’t, but as we get a draft prepared
hopefully we can have the Board review it with us and
help us to refine it rather than saying, well, no, it’s
ready to go. Now you get to look at it. That would
give you a limited amount of time to respond so
hopefully we can do that. And then of course the
written observations I think will probably -- well, I
won’t say they’ll be better because I liked what you had
last year, Bob. But I think you’ll have a sense of how
to respond or what your observations would be earlier on
so there won’t be, okay, now we got to digest this.
You’ll already know what’s going on. And of course
we’re still restricted to a 25-page limit for what we
send forth to Congress. And that may be a good thing but it is what it is. So you’ve heard Deborah Rubin’s report this morning, and I think that I’ve incorporated some of her comments into this outline that I’ve given you here. We do have approval from legislative and public affairs from LPA to make changes as we see appropriate so they’re amenable to any changes that we might recommend. So usefulness of the content, I put this in as sort of the last thing. This is not a CRSP report. It includes the CRSP but it includes a lot of other activities, and I’ve included just examples here of the HED and the CGIAR. Now it’s your turn. I’d appreciate your feedback on this. Any questions, any comments?

MR. DELAUDER: Let me first ask the members of the Board if they have any questions or comments. No one on the Board has any particular comments?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER. I don’t have any at this point.

MR. DELAUDER: Then we’ll receive comments from the public.

MR. CHOWDHURY: George, you made some very nice comments. Ikbal Chowdhury from Lincoln University, Missouri. Any time we have more breakdown, those breakdowns tell us the real story. So what would be
very helpful because there is a perception, and I would like to commend the agency because most of the agency’s RFA and RFP narrative clearly states the agency’s concern on the equity and the fairness issues are imbedded in the RFA and RFP documents. But in reality as an -- institution, we face different kinds of circumstances. I’d like to suggest and perhaps recommend for concentration by the Board and the agency that in the volume of business how much volume of business is going to MSI or -- institution. It would be very, very useful. And if you do so, if you see the record, you will see a clear picture of what is happening to the -- institution. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Last year we went out to the universities as our prime thing, and I would like to for a reason that I’ll explain -- actually reverse the process and let’s look at it from the mission perspective, and gather the parts of the agency and see let’s see what they think they’re doing with this Title XII. And I say this because strategically BIFAD needs to get ADS to 16 respective and that means there needs to be a person identified in each mission to respond to Title XII. And I think that there’s a letter that goes out to them saying please identify who is your responsible officer so that we can collect Title XII.
information from the missions is an appropriate approach to this time out. I’m not staying that we want to -- we certainly need to get that other perspective, and I think that we shouldn’t just go and follow up exactly how we did it last year because there’s a whole lot of strategic opportunity that is being missed when we do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Other comments from the floor? Yes, please.

MR. THOMAS: This is John Thomas. I’d like to thank the 35 or so universities that responded to George’s request. We’re trying to make this report as useful as we can to the audience. The audience is Congress. The audience is the Title XII community so everyone who did send in information, thank you very much. We do want to make it easier this year for you to provide the information that we can use because as George said we have 25 pages, and he probably received about 100 pages worth of input and it’s hard to narrow that down. Tim, you’re absolutely right. We do need to get information from the missions, and we tried -- that’s what we did in the past before last year when George went directly to the universities, but we didn’t get responses from everybody. Now maybe the thing is to do is for the agency to go to each mission and say who
is your designated Title XII officer, who’s going to report on university implemented activities. So that might help but we have to give them also very clear instructions on what would be a Title XII activity that would be included in the report. And many of the missions come back and say, well, we got Texas A&M which is implementing -- which is already under a contract with Tobias [ph] and so they send us that kind of information. They send us everything that universities are doing. But I know there’s not agreement on what constitutes a Title XII activity, and so I think we have a lot of work that we have to work on together before we go out to the missions to tell them exactly what we want to count as a Title XII activity on this report.

THE CHAIRMAN: And Deborah has the answer.

MS. RUBIN: No, but I have another idea. One of the things that struck me, John, as you were speaking and as George was talking about the additional information that you received which doesn’t fit in the report, the official report, it seems to me that one of the issues has been being able to collect the information on what the universities are doing and making a good narrative out of their examples, and I’m wondering if it would be possible to somehow showcase those additional examples either through the sort of
success story element which is on the USAID web site or simply listing some of that information in some other form on the web site or even having BIFAD do some kind of shadow report as NGOs often do to speak to the same issue as an official report because it seems a shame to collect the information, to go through the work of having the universities provide it and then not having it be able to be shared with the wider community.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good suggestion. Please.

MR. THOMAS: John Thomas. Another suggestion is if we have a theme for the report, and maybe the theme would be something like what we were discussing at lunch, food price, the rising prices of commodities and inputs, and highlight what the Title XII universities are doing to contribute to solutions to dealing with food price increases and that would be -- each year there could be a highlighting of different development problem and the role of the universities to deal with.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any additional comment from the Board? How do we -- our process last year was the report was developed, and then we had an opportunity to comment. Unless something changes that’s the way it will proceed this year, is that -- that’s okay?

MR. THOMAS: Well, George was suggesting that we find a way to share the report before -- maybe we can...
try to work that out.

MR. WILLIAMS: Tim Williams again. I think that if we do have a thematic approach to it, we need pretty soon to have a list of possible options that can be considered and some indication what might come out underneath a different thematic thing because if we go thematic, we stand the chance of missing some really good stuff. We never might pick on the -- in Indonesia but that might be really important. So if we do have a thematic thing it can’t be just something that, well, some person sitting back in USAID says we’re going to do this this time because there might be a whole lot of other much better stories.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Allen Christensen. I only have one real reservation about the thematic approach, and that is that when you come to reporting research, research doesn’t necessarily get geared up and started quickly in response to an emerging theme which could be seen as an opportunity but could also be viewed as opportunistic, and so I think that if we have approved agendas that bear on the problem long term those are the things that really deserve the focus in the report although there are certain kinds of things I suppose that could be highlighted as an addendum that have been anticipatory and have addressed an emerging issue that
maybe hadn’t been foreseen that could get John’s
suggestion of a theme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Jean Horton has
joined us, and if you would come forward, from the
Office of Acquisitions and Assistance, and bring us up-
to-date on the issue of subcontractors. Thank you very
much.

MS. HORTON: Good afternoon. Can you hear me?
I’m glad to be here, I think. I’ll find that out after
I finish. If you remember, probably about a year ago I
reported out on the key subcontractor clause, and I’m
assuming that everyone here knows what that is.

THE CHAIRMAN: It might be helpful to just
give a background.

MS. HORTON: Okay. Why don’t I do that. It
has been historically a problem, not just at USAID but
at other agencies as well. Subcontractors being
included in a prime contractor’s proposal probably doing
significant work, NISH [ph] work, if you will, or other
significant portion of the work, and they have been
evaluated as a part of the proposal and after the award
has been made they didn’t receive the work. Sound
familiar? Okay. We have been asked if we would try to
come up with some means of hopefully eliminating this
problem but at least we do see the problem, and so we
decided that we would get together in our office with
the policy, general counsels, the Office of Acquisition
and Assistance, and come up with some policy that would
be trying to, if nothing else, monitor the situation and
reduce this type of issue. So we came up with what we
call the key subcontractor clause, so let me just tell
you what that clause says. The clause says nothing
really new that isn’t already in federal acquisition
regulations. However, there is one portion that it new,
and that has to do with if the contractor is going to do
the work themselves after they have proposed another
organization as a subcontractor. The clause says in the
solicitation that the offerer must name their key
subcontractor, the contractor that’s going to be doing a
significant portion of the work or the NISH work for
which we are evaluating that proposal and making an
award based on the partnership of those organizations
doing that work. We’re saying to the offerer you must
identify that organization by name, tell us what work
they’re going to perform. We’re going to put that
information if you get the award in the contract making
it a part of the contract so therefore it is a term of
the contract. If you choose, Mr. Prime Contractor, to
change that you have to come back to the Office of
Acquisition and Assistance, talk to the contracting
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officer and the technical officer with an explanation as to why you are making that change and how it is going to impact the program. There’s nothing new about this in terms of getting a new subcontractor or proposing a subcontractor to do the work. What’s new is putting it in the terms of the contract so that it becomes a legal term and thereby binding to the contractor, and the other part that’s new is that if the prime contractor decides they’re going to do the work then they have to come back and tell us that they’re going to do the work. They have to tell us why they’re going to do the work as opposed to using the subcontractor that’s in their contract, and also tell us the impact on that. So basically that’s what the clause says. What have we done so far? Last summer around May or June we issued into the Federal Register and advance notice that we intend to have this kind of a policy. We needed comments, and to be perfectly honest we got one comment, and it was from BIFAD, and the comment was let’s not take too long to get this done. Where are we now? We put the clause in two pilots. One of them was a global health solicitation, and that was awarded approximately a year and a half ago. That was the global health logistics and commodities contract. That got awarded without any issues or any problems, and so far according
to the contracting officer there’s been no issues
associated with the key subcontractor clause. We also
put that clause in the DG -- engage RFP, which has not
been awarded yet, and a significant problem with it not
being awarded yet is the key subcontractor clause. And
what was that problem? To give you a summary of what
the real problem is, it’s around the definition of who
or what is a key subcontractor. When my team was
sitting and we were developing this clause, we did not
want to dictate to industry who their key subcontractors
should be so we didn’t put any parameters around it, and
general counsel was insistent that we shouldn’t get
involved in the teaming arrangement for private industry
organizations. So we didn’t put parameters of any kind
including percentages of work to be performed by the
subcontractor. The global health procurement was not
nearly as complex as the DG procurement. The DG
procurement probably had, I’m not sure of the numbers, I
think it was 10 or 11 different components in the RFP
for the work that needed to be done. And as a result of
that contractors had various interpretations of who the
key subcontractor is to be. Some contractors proposed
for each one of those components key subcontractors.
Some contractors proposed for the overall solicitation
key subcontractors. Some contractors proposed all of
those subcontractors as key subcontractors though they may have been doing only 1 to 4 percent of the work. And a couple contractors didn’t propose any of their subcontractor as key subcontractors. I can’t talk a whole lot about the details of the DG RFP because it is still an open procurement. It has not been awarded yet. I can tell you we did get a protest. Part of the protest included the key subcontractor issue, and so we’re working towards trying to figure out to define what a key subcontractor is in a way that is acceptable to our general counsel’s office so that we’re not seeing this interfering in the teaming arrangement of private industry. There’s a couple of ways to go with that. Okay. One of the ways is to put a percentage on the amount of work that’s going to be performed. That’s one way. Another way would be to allow the technical officer and the contracting officer -- well, let me step back. Put a percentage on the amount of work that’s going to be performed by the subcontractor and have that percentage work across the board regardless to the type of program it is and what office it is. As long as the percentage is there then we, the government, have identified for you that’s going to be your key subcontractor. The other way is to look at the programs on a case-by-case basis and have the CTO and the
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contracting officer determine based on the type of
program it is what percentage of work should be
identified as the key subcontractor. Along with that is
another issue, and that is under our IQCs, indefinite
quantity contracts, we have a provision that talks about
major subcontractors, and we say that any major
subcontractor or subcontractor that does 20 percent of
the work is considered to be major, therefore, we want
to evaluate their indirect costs, their proposal, all of
that. So there is somewhat of a discrepancy and some
confusion between the major subcontractor and the key
subcontractor so we have to bring that together as well.
That’s where we are currently in terms of trying to
figure out how to alleviate the interpretation of the
clause and what we mean by key subcontractor. Where do
we need to go from here outside of clearing up that
interpretation? I talked to our policy office to see,
okay, what are our next steps once we decide how we’re
going to define key subcontractor or change the name to
major subcontractor, and this is what I was told. We
need to go out to the Federal Register with the language
that’s in the I’m going to call it key subcontractor
now, that’s in the key subcontractor clause for
everybody to look at and comment on. Then we have to
deal with the comments. I asked when will we be able to
do that and she said the way it’s looking right now it
would be later in the calendar year of 2008, possibly
not until the first quarter of fiscal year 2009. After
that it will take another six months, eight months or
nine months to get it through the policy approval
process in USAID so we’re kind of looking out at a year
and a half to two years before it actually becomes a
policy in USAID. So that’s where I am. Now I guess
I’ll find out whether I should be glad to be here or
not. Any questions?

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well done. From the
Board?

MR. THOMAS: Yes, I have a couple of
questions. First of all, thank you for being here and
explaining that.

MS. HORTON: Sure.

MR. THOMAS: I was one of the Board members
that had some questions with regards to this, and maybe
I didn’t fully understand it originally but the original
issue was as you laid our prime contractors were listing
key subcontractors I guess because it’s a weighted
proposal basically so using their experience and
resources hopefully be the winning contractor as a
result of that. And then after the award they would
substitute without any kind of authorization they would
just substitute a different key sub.

    MS. HORTON: Well, they would substitute a sub
that was not -- that had already been approved, yes.
The federal acquisition regulations requires any
contractor who’s going to have a subcontractor to get
contracting office’s approval. That’s what I meant by
the part of the key subcontractor clause that’s not new.
That’s not new.

    MR. THOMAS: Right. Okay. But what we’re
talking about is a prime contractor is submitting a
proposal with key subcontractors for your evaluation to
say that’s the best team, that’s the best value, so
we’re going to select that contractor.

    MS. HORTON: Correct.

    MR. THOMAS: Then once the award is made, they
may substitute one or more of the key subcontractors
with possibly some other pre-approved subcontractors.

    MS. HORTON: What we’re saying is once the
award is made those subcontractors that were a part of
that proposal that were accepted and successfully
affected the award of that contract will be listed in
the contract along with the work that they’re going to
be doing and become a part of the contract. So if they
want to make a change that’s a modification to the
contract then they have to go through the contracting

MR. THOMAS: Okay. And what you had indicated was that the prime can come back to the contracting officer and request the change and justify why.

MS. HORTON: What I’m indicating actually is if they decide that they want to do anything any different than what’s been in the contract, they have to come back to the contracting officer.

MR. THOMAS: Okay. Does the subcontractor that’s being replaced, they were named in the solicitation or in the proposal, they were named in the contract and award, now they’re going to be replaced, have they got the opportunity to come in -- is there some consideration on their behalf -- what I’m hearing is that the prime can come in and justify to the contracting officer that I need to replace this key sub because he is consumed otherwise and doesn’t have sufficient resources now. Well, is the key sub contacted and said -- is he a part of that process because if he’s not the intent here is basically null and void. It’s going to serve no purpose.

MS. HORTON: Okay. I can appreciate where you’re coming from but here’s the issue. We don’t have a relationship with the subcontractor.

MR. THOMAS: I think once you name them in the
contract you do.

MS. HORTON: No, we don’t. Legally we do not have a contract with the subcontractor. Our contract is with the prime contractor. And this is one of the issues that our general counsel also brought up when we were talking about the language for the clause because we cannot interfere in the relationship between those two organizations. What we can do is look at the work that we need to have performed and the promise that was made to us and our expectation for that promise, and we can look at that. But we can’t get involved in the relationship between the prime and the sub. So what will be important for us and particularly for the contracting officer and talking to the technical office is whether or not there is sufficient support that the agency’s work and objectives are not at jeopardy for that change to be made, and that’s all that we can do. Legally we can’t do anything else. I would say this to you though. When this was brought -- I also coordinate the Department of State for USAID. When I took this issue to the Department of State they had no issues with it. They thought it was fine. They felt that it would vindicate them in many instances and they felt that it was appropriate that we identify for them who we think the key subcontractor should be but my general counsel’s
office didn’t agree with that. So now I have to go back and work through that issue. Otherwise, it would end up like it was with this one procurement that I’m talking about where everyone has a different interpretation, and you can’t do an evaluation if you can’t compare apples to apples. If you’re comparing apples and oranges then the evaluation is flawed so in order to do that everyone needs to have the same understanding of what the government’s expectation is.

MR. THOMAS: No, I agree with that, and as a prime contractor myself I appreciate that greatly and a key subcontractor in a lot of cases so my only reluctance here is you gained the low ground but you still haven’t solved the problem in its entirety because there still is the opportunity for the prime to substitute another key subcontractor without bringing up the original subcontractor in as part of that negotiation.

MS. HORTON: Yeah, there is, and unfortunately there’s not much I can do about that.

MR. DELAUDER: I assume that institutions that are a part of a prime’s proposal will know whether or not they’ve been designated key or not?

MS. HORTON: I would hope that you would know if you were designated key or not. Maybe that’s a
discussion that I need to have with you all to find out how this happens because you should know -- if you know that you haven’t gotten the work and you were being proposed then hopefully you will know that you got the work and if not maybe we need to work through some process whereby we need to have -- normally what happens is there’s some kind of -- in the proposal process there’s some kind of verification that you have agreed that you’re going to do this work, and I would imagine, and I may be wrong, so please tell me if I am, but once the contract has been awarded that you know the contract got awarded. I’m assuming that you know that, and if you don’t know that one of the ways that I can help in that manner is for the publication of the contract award. In other words, X, Y, Z contract was awarded to this person or this organization. I mean we should be doing that anyway and so I can help along those lines.

MR. DELAUDER: I think that would be important to address that because I’m worried about small institutions that may come in as a part of the contract but their portion of the work may not be sufficient to meet your criteria or a prime’s criteria of what is a key contractor. And I worry about those institutions being more vulnerable to being eliminated from the contract, and I would worry about that.
MS. HORTON: Okay. I can tell you right now if they’re not identified as the key contractor they won’t be listed in the contract. We have to start somewhere.

MR. DELAUDER: I think that would be helpful.

MS. HORTON: Okay. We have to start somewhere but what I can do is I can insure that I am encouraging, which we should be doing anyway, the publication of who got the award so that that should be public knowledge.

MR. RABON: Can they be listed in the proposal as part of the evaluation process and not be listed as a key subcontractor?

MS. HORTON: Certainly.

MR. RABON: And they will be part of the weighted average if they’re not listed as key subcontractors?

MS. HORTON: Actually the way I understand it when we were working through this is that during the evaluation what is usually -- what the CTOs or the technical evaluation team is counting on are those contractors that give significant contribution to the work. In other words, if they don’t have those subcontractors doing that work they can’t meet the government’s objective, and basically that’s along the lines which I’d like to go along with the definition as
opposed to just the 20 percent but I’d like to add that
with it or the 10 percent or whatever they come up with.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let’s take one comment and then
we need to move to our next topic.

MR. CHOWDHURY: Ikbal Chowdhury again from
Lincoln University, Missouri. We’re the nation’s oldest
historically black land grant institution. And we do
participate quite significantly but because we are small
most times, not all times, most times, we go as a
subcontractor. I thought in the RFP document that we
respond to if we had part of an initiative and by an
initiative is the general term I’m using contract,
application, whatever it is, even if I am playing a
minor role the major institution that is serving as the
lead, they need an official letter of intent from my
institution which we submit, and that becomes a part of
the document. Here you are saying we are invisible and
you do not even know who we are. I just don’t
understand.

MS. HORTON: I didn’t say you were invisible, sir. What I’m saying is that letter of intent is
required for the proposal. That’s a contracting
officer’s determination as to whether or not the letter
of intent has to come from the key subcontractor or the
major subcontractor, if you will. In this case the way
that I can see policy is written it has to come from the major contractor, the major contractor who is identified as doing 20 percent of the work. We’ve already defined that. That is what we’re saying. At the proposal stage we the government are not necessarily asking for a letter of intent from minor subcontractors. And I don’t mean minor to take away the value of what it is you are doing. I’m only saying that the people that we have to be concerned with are those that from the perspective that has been presented to the government are necessary in order for the government to reach its objective. That’s who we really have to – that’s who we’re looking at when we’re looking at an evaluation for proposal. We’re trying to figure out if that organization isn’t there will this prime contractor meet their objective, and that’s really how it’s presented to us in the proposal. If there is NISH work that is -- it may not be that you’re a minor subcontractor. It may be that this work that you’re doing is not a major part of the program. Okay. Then we’re not asking -- the government is not necessarily asking for a letter of intent. The letter of intent might different in different solicitations because COs do things differently. That’s something that we can address across the board in terms of encouraging COs to be consistent which we’re trying.
to do already anything. The letter of intent that’s required by your prime contractor is not something that is necessarily required by USAID.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. I think I would like to pause the conversation at this point. Thanks for coming over. We weren’t all that bad.

MS. HORTON: No. You guys are great actually.

THE CHAIRMAN: We’ll probably ask you to come back again.

MS. HORTON: That’s fine. That’s fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: And bring us up to date. The next topic is one that I think will be of significant interest here.

MR. THOMAS: I assume we’re going into the part where we’re talking about the proposed -- the concept papers. I just want to make a few comments here. We have the CRSP earmarks this year, the $28 million, and this is an opportunity, it gives us an opportunity that we didn’t have five months ago because when we were going into looking at our planned budget for this year we didn’t know that we could do new activities so we’re trying to catch up. And we’ve developed two concept papers, one on horticulture and one on livestock. And these are a point of discussion. We selected horticulture and livestock because two years
ago we did the portfolio review with BIFAD and we agreed on a list of priority topics for future CRSPs and both of these topics were on that list. And we’re trying to develop some activities now that responds to the new challenges that we have since two years ago, and the challenges are as you heard Jackie Schafer talk this morning about the priorities in foreign assistance, priorities going to peace and security, investing in people, humanitarian issues, and less for economic growth, and also changes in the way the funding is shifting to the missions, and the missions are really implementing the activities more than the central bureaus. The central bureaus are supposed to develop the activities that the missions can use. And the third challenge would be our requirement to report to Congress on results, and results yearly. So we’re trying to look at ways that we can respond to these challenges with some new CRSP activities. The ongoing CRSP activities, they are doing what was asked and what was expected, and there’s no proposals to touch them at all. We’re talking about some ways to go forward with some new CRSP activities. So if we are to start these activities this year we have to start a process of discussing what type of activities, what type of management structure, and that’s where we are right now. It’s a point of we just
developed the concept papers to get feedback and comments, and what we hope to do is our best to incorporate the comments and listen to what you have to say and to make these good activities, make the best activities we can possibly do. And we’ll take the time to do that, so that’s all I wanted to say. Now I lost Joyce.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ray, did you intend to say something at this juncture or come up and make your comments at the end?

MR. MILLER: I will...

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. But the title -- I pointed to the task force, so I wanted to be sure you didn’t have something prepared. Okay, so, Joyce, if you’ll come up.

MR. THOMAS: It’s all yours, Joyce.

MS. TURK: Mr. Chairman and the BIFAD Board, thank you very much for this opportunity and to my colleagues and friends. I would like to begin my presentation at the end. Now we will go back to the near future. We’re very aware that climate change has been happening for over some period of time, millions of years really. However, it’s impacting us in our lifetime today. Temperatures are warming above the global mean with an average rise by 1.8 degrees
Fahrenheit. Precipitation is either increasing or decreasing with uncertain changes and established patterns and extreme events are occurring, either increasing in frequency and/or intensity as well as occurring in new areas. We are most sensitive to the impacts of climate change but agriculture as a sector is the most vulnerable. Higher temperatures and erratic rainfall patterns are causing changed growing seasons, and this includes range and pasture decline in terms of growth, nutritional quality, and botanical composition. Among the sectoral vulnerabilities one of the most critical is water stress. This is comprised of run off and water supply, decreased water quality, and decreased river flows and other watering points. This is starting to and will result in more conflict in migrations, and also we have flooding in various areas. The decreases in crop and livestock yields are due to reduced soil, moisture evapo transportation and as agricultural or grazing lands are subjected to increased decertification, salinization, erosion, and degradation. Heat stress and the changing patterns in the occurrence of disease vectors will increase the risk of endemic morbidity and mortality for both humans and livestock. And this is where our zoonotic diseases come into play. Livestock contributes 25 to 50 percent of agricultural
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GDPs in developing countries and 1.3 billion poor people depend on livestock, and this ranges from two-legged chickens, poultry of all types to your camels out in the desert. Livestock are mentioned in most climate change studies but really only in relation to methane production and basically anything you read about, livestock points to cows and all the methane they’re pouring into the universe. But in comparison methane for ruminate digestion contributes only 2.5 percent of total global greenhouse gases whereas wetlands rice production produces 100 million tons of methane annually or 29 percent of annual greenhouse gases, so you tell me which is worse. The indirect or direct climate change impacts are similar on the different livestock production systems. In the extensive system which is the pastoral or grazing land system you have greater aridity, less water, less forage, increased conflicts and increased livestock deaths. In the intensive systems or the factory farming industrial systems, we will find less water available, lower feed crop availability, and this is already happening with our bio-fuel production. We’ll find then also the movement of disease pathogens, and in the mixed crop livestock systems we’ll find greater stress on natural resources used for livestock, that is feed, water, land, and again...
movement of disease pathogens. Our major concerns are the severe budget limitations for USAID’s agriculture programs. A change of the U.S. government political focus, that is, transformational diplomacy, the D in AID stands for development that we are now lumped into, diplomacy, development, and defense. And USAID over the past 20 years has lost its critical technical mass of people and particularly in agriculture including livestock. What is our vision? A livestock climate change CRSP will address critical food needs of development countries and USAID will partner with U.S. universities to build its leadership and extensive networks in international livestock capacity. Now we’re not asking anyone here to think outside the box. Actually we’re giving you a new box to think in. Picture it as a frame, a picture frame. We’re giving you the frame within this concept note. And we’re asking you put in the livestock and draw the landscape, and it will be different ideas coming from every individual here as to what that picture within that picture frame is going to look like. We all see the world in a different way. The livestock climate change CRSP is a synergistic cross-cutting design focused on public-private sector partnerships and building on the successes of the global livestock CRSP. It will also be
a drive towards goals of the Global Development Commons. The objectives of this CRSP are to research climate change impacts on livestock production systems, to build host country sustainable capacity responsive to climate change impacts on the livestock issues of national and regional importance in our developing countries, and to identify and resolve critical livestock value issues related to climate change impacts. The expected outcomes are to develop and implement methods to adapt livestock production systems to changing climate scenarios, to reduce or eliminate zoonotic disease transmission, improve food safety and marketability of animal source foods, reduce the impact of livestock production on the environment, and to strengthen or build local and national scientific development capacities. The future was then. The future is now.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you don’t mind staying perhaps there’s some questions or comments from the Board. Any comments?

MR. DELAUDER: I assume that this means that the global livestock CRSP will be replaced by this CRSP that you’re talking about?

MS. TURK: The global livestock CRSP and grant ends September 30, 2008, this coming year. The next
livestock program is not meant to replace it or substitute for it but to build on its successes. However, we’re not going to slice the data in new ways because the contents of every database already built are structured to correspond with insights that are already recognized. We’re looking for innovation, creativity. We’re looking for a three-dimensional shape or form rather than a series of events where livestock health, environmental health, and human health are synergistic and impact on each other. And health includes resources and nutrition as well as disease. Claimant change impacts all of them, and so what we’re looking for is an innovative way of addressing the future, which is now also.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you indicated, Mr. Thomas, that there be an opportunity for comment and then there would be a request for applications. Do you have a time line? Will we have a chance at our next Board meeting to give other consideration to this or is this something that’s moving quickly?

MR. THOMAS: Well, I would like to see -- we have two weeks for comments, and when we get the comments back, I’d like to see how far we are from where our thinking is to what the views are coming in from the universities. We would like to do this quickly because...
it makes sense if we’re going to build on the success of the global livestock CRSP to start a new livestock CRSP soon. And if we find that the comments correspond with what we’re proposing we can go ahead and develop a more detailed program description with a request for applications and have a review of those. But I think we should be really -- it’s always good to have a face-to-face discussion on the comments, and I think the closing date for the comments are March 7. I don’t think we can wait until the next BIFAD meeting to have another -- to review those comments at that time, not if we want to obligate the funds this year and have immediate succession on CRSP. So we may have to organize a separate meeting to discuss the comments.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Are we saying that the global livestock CRSP has completed all the work it was established to do, and this then goes beyond that? In other words, the agenda is finished insofar as the perception of what that CRSP was established?

MR. THOMAS: Yeah. Correct me if I’m wrong, Joyce. Ted can also chime in. But the global livestock CRSP was a 10-year program and the researchers, the principal investigators, had developed their research proposals to complete their work by September, 2008, so that program should be completed and there wouldn’t be a
need to continue the ongoing work.

MS. TURK: May I please add a comment though?

Unfortunately, Mr. Christensen, thank you for that question, unfortunately the violence, the political violence and the social violence of the civil society in Kenya has impacted a tremendous number of the activities that are occurring in the global livestock CRSP, and very unfortunately we’ve had to stop those activities due to that violence. People cannot work in the field. They can’t go to the field. The scientists cannot go. The students at the universities can’t go. The work is basically stopped completely because of political violence and therefore, and therefore it’s going to be held back. This program needs the time to complete. It would have done it but something happened.

MR. THOMAS: Everything else would have been finished under the CRSP, is that...

MS. TURK: A good portion of the activities. And, Tag, you may wish to comment but a good portion of the activities were due to be completed this year but because it is a regionally-developed program, Kenya being a sort of hub with many activities not only in that country but related across the border, they’re all being impacted.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: One of the problems as a
group of universities gears up to solve some of these kinds of problems, and this is not -- you can use this with this CRSP or with others, and then all of a sudden there’s a change in direction or somebody says, well, you know, we’ve done enough of this, and these very fine groups that have been put together suddenly are in the job market. One of the things that these CRSPs were supposed to do, if I understand them correctly, they were supposed to build the capacity both at the university and internationally, and these stop, start, and go signals if you can make them consistent it’s a lot more effective for solving the problems in the long run than the kinds of things that we say, well, this is as ten-year thing. Well, okay. It’s a ten-year thing and if everybody understands it’s a ten-year thing, and there’s no possibility of repetition or extension, that’s one thing, but if it’s a situation where there was implication that this is going to do on, that’s something different.

MS. TURK: That’s right. Do you have something to say, Tag?

MR. DEMMETT: Our project was designed to be a ten-year project, and that’s not to say that there aren’t a lot of things we’ve learned and developed along the road in that process that we wouldn’t like to
continue but we understand that it’s a ten-year program. That said, the points that Joyce brings up, we have a very interesting HIV/AIDS study going on in Eldoret with Moore University that’s looking at the effect of meat consumption on the trajectory of anti-retro viral drugs and reaction to -- in the trajectory of the disease. That’s with mothers and infants. That’s closed down. Eldoret has been one of the centers of that. We have two major projects with Egerton University in Nakuru. That’s also -- and you know I had worked with Ron in developing a BIFAD trip that was cancelled. And we don’t know when things are going to be starting up again but presently we can’t work in the field in Kenya, and we have five projects, five major projects. I mean I accept, and I think all of people accept, that this is a ten-year program we plan to end. We want to end. I would think if we carry on with some of these projects that may be delayed for six months or so that would be terrific. My concern is not so much the fact that we’re ending. My concern is that what we do is we, first of all, devote sufficient resources to the livestock which is a major component. The call that went out had a ceiling or a basement -- a minimum number of $1 million and a maximum number of $10 million. That means that what was a $3 million program is now going to be a $2
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million program at max. I don’t think that’s right, and I think BIFAD should say the livestock sector is a very important sector and deserves to have some attention. And $3 million a year in today’s -- I mean the euro is worth 1.5 dollars today. Our overseas budgets are going down dramatically. And BIFAD has actually -- if you look at the Title XII report there’s a paragraph in there in the response by Dr. Easter which basically says, and the agreement was made that CRSP would be funded at $3 million a piece, and that’s really the minimum amount you have to have a substantial program and to get a lot of buy-in and be at least sufficiently active in these regions to be a player so I’m concerned more about that, and I’m also concerned as I spoke yesterday to SPARE about the model that is used for the organization of CRSP, and I think it would be very good for us to have a discussion with USAID and with BIFAD about the efficiency of different management models in different CRSPs, and we have some rationale as opposed to going -- as the concept paper is now written, we go back to the model we got rid of 12 years ago because it wasn’t the model that AID wanted, and it really wasn’t a good model. That was the consortium model. And now we are in a position where we’ve had ten years in the global livestock CRSP of a model that other CRSPs have...
as well that is a competitive model that has an ME, that
invested in planning, and I think we have very good
programs and I would suggest that if we supplied BIFAD
with information about the work that we’ve done, I think
we could compete frankly as a program with any program
that AID has in terms of research and outreach and
generating new knowledge. So my appeal would be, one,
let’s follow the guidelines, agreed upon guidelines, for
funding, and, two, let’s have a serious look at how
CRSPs are managed and figure out what’s the best
management model. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me suggest that we move now
to the other CRSP, the horticulture. Is our speaker
here, John, for that? Yes, sir. And this is the
proposed CRSP for horticulture. There’s a concept paper
out.

MR. LEE: Before I start, yesterday at the
SPARE meeting a number of people they have not seen the
actual paper, and so I brought a few copies for those
who may want to see it. I put them over here.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you’re Jeffrey Lee,
correct?

MR. LEE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I didn’t want to have you go on
un-introduced.
MR. LEE: Before I start, I want to say thank you very much to the BIFAD Board for allowing me to come and present this paper to discuss with you some of the thinking that went into the paper, and why we made some of the choices we made in developing this paper. To the larger audience, what a group of people I’m standing in front of, but I feel honored to be here with you and I hope that what I will share with you over the next few minutes will clarify some of the issues that have been raised. In 2006, I believe it was, a group of universities and research institutions were charged by USAID to do an assessment of the horticulture sector. That assessment was very thorough. It took almost 18 months to complete, and at the end of it we presented in I believe it was July or August of 2006 -- 2005, I’m sorry, a very broad audience the findings of that paper. University of California-Davis was involved, the University of Hawaii was involved, Purdue was involved, I believe ADRDC was involved, and a number of others. From that time to now, the office of agriculture has been trying to decide how to approach what is in fact a very complicated sector, a very complicated subject, one that is not concentrated on single commodities, but a collection of commodities that need special attention and special kinds of assistance to make a goal of
improving the horticulture sector. We took a lot of that into consideration as we began to talk to different people, and we’ve come up with this -- we looked very closely at the assessment that was done and we identified of the eight areas that they decided we needed to concentrate on, three actually that were areas that we felt we had a comparative advantage working with Title XII universities to address and to support the things that we thought were important to go forward. There were few constraints that we noticed. One was much of what our Assistant Administrator talked about this morning, budget. Another was staffing. Another was the fact that because there were a number of other institutions that are doing parts of the eight or so subjects or issues that were discussed in the assessment, we felt we could better use our resources in the four or three areas that we have identified in the paper. Just to refresh your memories the eight or so areas that were discussed as being important that we should be looking at are the following. Now that I’m looking for them I can’t find them, but one was, for example, market systems. Another was research in the germ plasm, I believe. And let me get them so I don’t misspeak and so that we can move forward. The constraints that were identified were market systems,
post harvest systems and food security, genetic resource conservation and development, sustainable production systems and natural management capacity building, enabling environment, gender equity, nutrition, and human health. These we understand are very important and in many of the comments that we have received from you after we sent the paper out for comment, many of you mentioned the fact that, well, this program would not really do very well unless we were allowed to do some of those other things that have been identified. We recognize that, and we recognize that genetic resource conservation development, for example, is very important but we also recognize given the constraints that we have both in finance and in staffing that we do not have the capacity to manage that. We also recognize that there are a number of other institutions that are doing that kind of work and as you read through the paper a major focus of this paper is to try to get differing groups to work together. Where we do not have the strength to do it individually maybe some sort of -- maybe the wrong word is consortium but maybe a partnership of folks who can do that that are pulled from the various institutions that can do some of this work would help us to reach our goals. Another point that was made was that, well, you know, this is not really a research
program. Well, you may be right. In fact, it may not be a traditional CRSP research paper. In fact, we are suggesting that it is really not, it is a new way of looking at how we do research. What can we do given our resource constraints that would allow us to have an impact at improving livelihoods, what can we do to support a point that our Assistant Administrator talked about, the support that we must provide to our missions overseas. How do we look at their programs in agriculture that are based on agricultural programs that are looking at market access and improving opportunities for regional, domestic, and international trade, how do we get some research done that supports them that allows for those communities and those groups of people to actually begin to sell their products and begin to improve their livelihoods. And so, yes, you’re absolutely correct. The program has not been designed based on the old systems of the horticultural programs. It is an opportunity, we hope, to look at something a little bit broader to allow us to take the information that we have collected both from work that you already have been doing, work that other AID programs have been doing like our PFID [ph] programs and try to match the strengths of our university academic agricultural university systems to meet and address the challenges.
that we have today. Those challenges, as I’ve mentioned, will help us to deal with reduction in marketing of horticulture products in a vertically integrated system. Those programs -- that relationship will allow us to create mechanisms for program coordination, knowledge sharing, and adaptive research. Those programs will also help us build public-private partnerships that will be critical enough to the equitable development of horticulture enterprises.

These are the areas that AID today is faced with trying to address, and we hope that you will help us to be able to craft this paper and craft this effort so that we can do that. I’d like to also mention there was a comment made about what is in it for the United States. Well, this gray hair on me would suggest that I’ve been around a little bit, and I can remember when we did -- I think Dr. Christensen was talking about long-term academic training programs. We spent enormous amounts of monies in the 60s and the 70s and early part of the 80s bringing people from all walks of life, all countries around the world giving them Master’s and PhD programs with the hope that we would send them back and they would then participate in building the capacities in their own countries. Well, we were partially successful in that. We were not totally successful in that.
would suggest that of ten students that came to the United States probably only four went back. The other six stayed here in the states or became involved in our university system to our benefit, thank you very much, but not too much to their benefit, and so this program, we are suggesting, would allow us to focus on strengthening the capacity of partner universities, partner institutions that we work with through this CRSP to strengthen their capacity to sort of help level the playing field so that people or scientists on both sides of the Atlantic that are involved in this program will benefit. That is not to say that America will not benefit. We will be able to have university students coming from all corners of the world where we see a need for this kind of horticulture intervention come to the United States, do some of their course work, but insures or hopefully will insure that the actual research they do will be done in their country with an advisor from one or more of the universities that are part of this horticulture effort. I believe also that it would be useful to mention at this time that there was a time, and many of you will remember, where we had American universities of, American University of Beirut, American University of Cairo. I’m sure there were American universities in other parts of the world. I know those
two. I don’t know of the others. But surely those capacities are still there, and part of what this program is going to try to do is tie into all of these friends, all of these relationships, relationships that you already have with various universities abroad to see if a particular horticulture research issue, whether it is an agronomic research issue or whether it is a business issue or whether it is an agricultural value change issue. If there’s a horticulture research topic that can be developed to address that issue that is decided by a relationship and a discussion between the host country, agriculture ministries, or agricultural institutions and our group, whether you call it a consortium or whether you call it a group of universities or a partnership amongst our universities. These parties will get together, hopefully be able to define what the research topic will be. If it turns out that the research topic should be something that is what I like to call basic university research which is laboratory trials or various kinds of other kinds of horticultural science research then so be it, but if the real issue and the real interest is trying to support the value chain, improve the efficiency of the value chain, improve the policy environment to allow for private sector horticultural interpreters and processors
to better enter the market more effectively then that is
also -- that I submit is also research. I also believe
that we can do research on post harvest issues. We can
research on food safety issues. There are a number of
research topics that we can come together on to actually
allow for this program although not in the typical sense
of the kinds of CRSP programs that you have now would
allow us to be a bit more responsive to some of the
issues that we are trying to deal with in USAID. I hope
that I have been clear. I’m a little nervous. I got
all this power in front of me so you’ll have to forgive
me but this is really where we’re trying to go. We are
very happy for the work that you all have done in the
past. We hope to continue that work. We think that you
have an awful lot to offer us in terms of what is the
best way to go about doing this. We want to try to
involve as many land grant universities and Title XII
institutions that we have so that we can get the best
kind of horticulture research program. Thank you very
much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Questions from the
Board?

MR. DELAUDE: Bill DeLauder. So it’s your
understanding then and your belief that the CRSP you
have described and communicated does meet the spirit of
the CRSP guidelines in terms of what is expected of a
typical CRSP since it is called a collaborative research
support program?

MR. LEE: Dr. DeLauder, yes and no, and that
is the dichotomy that we find ourselves in. In the
strict sense of the guidelines that are defined for
CRSP, the current CRSP family of programs, no, it does
not fit that. What I am suggesting is that given the
other constraints that you’ve heard us speak about today
from the ID side that there may be an opportunity for
some latitude to allow us to still get to where we’re
trying to go but open it up a little bit to make it not
as confining to just horticulture departments and
universities but looking at horticulture and business,
horticulture and relationships that will allow us to
support what we’re trying to do in the field which is to
support or agricultural economic growth programs that
are trying to use horticulture as an engine for growth.

MR. DELAUDER: Yeah, I understand there are a
number of issues that you would like to get some help
with and some assistance. The question that was
stressed was the way to approach getting solutions to
those. That’s why I guess I raised the issue.

MR. LEE: Well, what was said...

MR. DELAUDER: If there was some other
mechanism that could be used to address that and still
have a focus more on research.

MR. LEE: What we found today was that our
resources are tied almost exclusively to the CRSP
earmark, and so we come to you with the biggest part of
money and say is there some latitude, is there some
opportunity for us to discuss because failing to be able
to figure out a way to work through the CRSP to do this,
other monies to be able to do something is very
important to our missions and also to strengthening our
relationship with our university colleagues is limited.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: One of the things I suppose
as I read this and particularly the comments I’ve heard
from the university community is there is concern over
the marketing aspect. I must say at the outset that I’m
not so worried about the fact that there’s a need to
look at marketing. It doesn’t necessary fit biological
research but it doesn’t necessarily mean that it’s not
really significant either. In fact, as we start to
improve local production in the less developed
countries, we are going to have to give more attention
to some sort of an orderly marketing situation or the
peaks and valleys of production and consumption will
cause all kinds of grief for those local economies.

Maybe what we’re not as used to as colleges of
agriculture is reaching out to our colleagues who could
maybe be drawn into the agri-business net to make a
substantial contribution in that regard, and that’s
maybe where we have to think a little differently.

MR. LEE: I really do appreciate that comment
because that is exactly the kind of relationships and
interrelationships I would hope that would come to the
table to deal with this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Other comments from the Board?
Let’s take a couple from the floor, then we need to move
to our next presentation. Yes, sir.

MR. YO-AY: I’m John Yo-ay from the University
of Nebraska with the sorghum millet CRSP. You mentioned
grey hair. I wish I had as much black hair as you have.
However, over the years as I’ve been working with the
CRSP program there’s a couple of indications you made
about impacts back to U.S. agriculture implying that the
benefits have been back to the U.S. land grant
community. Maybe from the training that we’ve done of
students who -- 60 percent of the students who decide to
stay here and do something else. I think that’s a bit
misleading with the CRSP programs. I think if you
really understood the training that the CRSP programs
have done over the years and our program, the sorghum
millet CRSP, has trained over 1,100 students to MS and
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PhD degrees over a 28-year period of time. I would
guess, and this is true with other CRSPs, between 85 to
90 percent of our students go home. If you would
evaluate the sorghum millet research in the developing
world and Africa, you can look at the countries of Mali
and look at the country of Niger and Zambia in Southern
Africa and realize that these are some of the
outstanding organizations now who conduct research. We
had a review panel which indicated that the sorghum
breeding program, for instance, in Mali in West Africa
was one of the outstanding sorghum breeding programs in
the world today. And then if you want to talk about
reverse benefits, and this is something I think that one
of the issues that was made about reverse benefits back
to U.S. agriculture, as an example the cost of the CRSP
programs, germ plasm, which was achieved, obtained
through collaboration with host country collaborators,
introduced bio type E resistance to green bug and grain
sorghum and back in the mid-90s we had an impact
evaluation of that which indicated that there was a
social welfare benefit back to U.S. agriculture of $325
million a year to that characteristic. Those are the
kind of reverse benefits we talk about, not about the
training which comes back to staff universities or
anything like that. So I think I’d like to just raise
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that as an issue.

MR. LEE: Thank you very much, Dr. Yo-ay. I am very familiar with many of the wonderful successes we’ve had. I was not trying to belittle that or speak down to that. In fact, I am very familiar with them. I was involved with SAFRAD [ph] and a number of other things, so I am aware. I’m also aware that many of the people that are now ministers and senior people across the world that have had an opportunity to come to our country and get advance degrees are partners and our friends across the waters. That is the kind of ground swell of information and access that we now have and I’m just trying to suggest that given that here we have another opportunity to go to the next step which is how do we help strengthen those markets to allow people to begin to talk to us on a level playing field and be able to interact with us scientist to scientist on research whether it’s agronomic research or whether it’s business directed research to support market development. That’s all I’m saying. Thank you very much.

MR. WILLIAMS: I have to be concerned -- I’m Tim Williams from the University of Georgia. I have to be concerned. You talked a whole lot right now and you sort of emphasized research, research, research, research, but at the same time you’re saying that this
is not -- you want to essentially contract short-term training and that kind of stuff. That is what we read into that. And I think that perhaps the model that you need to work on is that you have a traditional CRSP to that because if you don’t do that you stand a chance of having this sort of challenged and contested within the political arena. But the opportunity to do what you’re looking at actually should come from the mission guidelines. These are associate things and where you got that market development opportunity. I think that the shorter term stuff is what the missions like and makes the great logical sense to focus them onto that part of the broad horticulture CRSP program, but the global EGAT part of it should still conform to the CRSP patent and guidelines. I think that’s perfectly possible. Most of the CRSP programs have been able to achieve that kind of thing, and we do achieve a whole lot of impact through working with partners that are semi-official partners that do the kinds of things that you do. They do the extension of knowledge and technologies but we don’t do the extension. We have this relationship by which we transfer information to them which they use in their extension, and that is how we can I think accommodate your goals and the CRSP university concerns about what constitutes a CRSP.
THE CHAIRMAN: You point to something that is a challenge for the BIFAD and it’s the issue of us not being fully aware of the programs that are going on across the spectrum of the agency, and it’s difficult to react to a single issue without -- and our role, as we heard this morning, of looking at coordination across different functional areas so yes.

MR. PIEDRASANTA: I’m Carlos Piedrasanta from World Vision. I’m currently working for Grant Acquisition and Management for Africa. My question is -- I have read the two papers, the livestock and the horticulture paper. My question is what is the rule for NGOs to be part of the partnership under this framework? I’m asking this because NGOs, we have a lot of presence. We work with farmers associations. We work with all people, people there. And we are, you know, eager to connect more with research to help these people that we work regularly to do a better job. So very simple question.

MR. LEE: My response is something that probably Dr. Williams will not agree with but my response is that the theme of our whole program is connectivity, connecting what we’re doing with the universities through the CRSP activities with programs that AID is already doing like the PFID programs, with
programs like the food security program that we have
ongoing, and a number of other programs. It is -- let
me give you a scenario. Let’s say, for example, you are
working in -- where did you say you were working, sir?

MR. PIEDRASANTA: With World Vision.

MR. LEE: Okay. Let’s say you’re working in
Kenya. We talked about Kenya earlier. And that there
is someone in the Kenya government and the Kenya private
sector that’s interested in accessing new markets for
green beans. Okay. A horticulture product. The
vision that we have through this program is that the
relationship between the CRSP lead university and the
ministry of agriculture in Kenya and the private sector
involved in the export of green beans, okay, and any
number of other NGOs that work along the value chain to
take beans from the field to the market would come
together and say, okay, we have this issue. Okay.
Green beans is a very important piece in our economic
growth activity as it relates to agriculture, and so we
need some assistance. Okay. We would then sit with our
colleagues from the CRSP, sit down and see is there a
research topic we need to look at, are we using the
right variety, do we need to know something about
resistance to whatever, whatever, or is the issue a
marketing issue, and should we be talking to the
business school at one of the universities involved in this partnership of universities that is better suited to deal with green beans. Okay. And we would like to take those folks, put them together, sit them down and say, okay, here is the strategy we need to follow to help this group of farmers of this cooperative or association of green bean farmers to do a better job of getting their beans ready for the marketplace. It is that kind of thing that we would like to use. Okay. It allows us to do research on agronomic issues in horticulture. It allows us to identify and do research on the market, on packaging, on food safety, on food security, on a whole number of issues that are related to getting that product to the market. Okay. The reverse benefits to that are maybe there’s this person who’s in the Department of Agriculture in Kenya who’s looking for a graduate program to improve some aspect of that. We say, okay, well, you can come back to the United States. You can do a university program, do your course work in university of X here in the United States but go back to Kenya and do your graduate research. That is the kind of innovation we’re trying to look for in this, just doing -- I don’t want to say just because that’s wrong too but we want to try to expand what the CRSP model has been in the past because we are facing
new challenges, new challenges that are related to resource limitations, challenges that are related to a market overseas that is trying to find new access in our market and also we’re trying to find partners that we can relate to across the ocean that can help us not only in agriculture but maybe in other things, so those are the kinds of benefits we see that would be very useful and we think that this could be a model that would help us get there.

THE CHAIRMAN: With apologies to Dr. Williams, I think I’d like to draw this conversation to a close, but I would remind you that we will be continuing this conversation about the horticulture CRSP after the close of the official BIFAD meeting. Dr. Christensen will be facilitating that conversation so I’m sure we can continue the discussion. Thank you very much.

MR. LEE: BIFAD Board, thank you very much for this time at the podium.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Back in November the BIFAD asked Ray Miller to chair a task force to look at CRSP management issues, and Dr. Miller, University of Maryland, Director, International Agricultural, is prepared to report on his findings to date.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When Bob and I first talked about this he really asked this
committee to deal with two issues. One are -- one deals with the issues that there are with CRSP, largely between the CRSPs and AID and the management organization of the CRSP. And the reasoning for this was that we seem to spend a disproportionate amount of out time dealing with some operational issues that have been talked about and in many cases have been decided as to how they are going to be handled and yet it doesn’t seem to happen that way, and that we need to get beyond those kind of things because we need to be working together and moving down the road rather than staying in these ruts that we’re in. And at the time we talked about this the concept papers and the earmark hadn’t really hit the table yet so the first part of this I’m going to talk about the issues and how we might deal with those, and then at the end if it’s all right, Chairman, I would like to come back and make some suggestions as to how we deal with the latter issues that we’ve been hearing about so much now in terms of the earmarks and concept papers and RFAs and so on because I think there is a way we can deal with these. So the chairman asked me if I could chair this to look at the issues that have been out there revolving largely around CRSP, not totally, to appoint a committee as I saw fit to deal with this and then to report back to
BIFAD as to what has been identified and how we might
deal with those things. And so what has happened is
that I went through old minutes of BIFAD, other reports
that I’ve had access to, and tried to identify a number
of issues that seemed to be there on a fairly continuing
basis or there had been recommendations or actions taken
as to who different issues were to be dealt with. We’ve
only back five years. I think the first one I cite is
2003, but I would suggest that if you would go as far
back as the Swindell [ph] report that is 20 years old,
something like that, many of the same issues that I’m
going to identify were identified in that report, and
they’re still here, and so I would suggest that we’ve
got a number of very real -- knowing that’s there that
we need to get rid of so we can move on. The committee
that has been working on this are made up of Dave
Sammons [ph] from the University of Florida, Sue Schram
[ph] from ACDI Boca who is the newest member of SPARE,
John Riftenbark from EGAT, Ray, who is a CTO from EGAT,
and myself from the University of Maryland. So these
issues with the backup documents was circulated to the
committee members. I have talked to all but one of the
committee members ahead of time trying to explain what
we were doing or what we were going to try to do, and
then we had a conference call to discuss these, and then
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out of that came this report after I had gotten feedback from the committee members. And these are really in two groups, if you will. The first one deals specifically with SPARE because there had been a number of what I call business practices that have been an issue for some time with how SPARE has or has not operated. The first of that is business practices and it really revolves around minutes, agendas, and timely notices because those have not gone out on time. In many cases the minutes have been at best very late in getting out and so it’s very hard to track what has or hasn’t happened. Hopefully this has been rectified now as we’ve had a change in the secretariat of this, and I look forward to these issues disappearing. If you go back in time with SPARE you’ll find that the appointment of members of SPARE has been an issue. It’s not as bad this time as we’ve had a number of members either leaving or their term is up. The new member from the private side has been appointed. John tells us that they have identified somebody in AID who will be coming on on SPARE so hopefully that one is not going to be a problem now. And then maybe the biggest of them is what are the responsibilities of SPARE. And as the chairman has said, there has not been enough dialogue between SPARE and BIFAD to really understand how SPARE should be
working to really provide BIFAD with the material they need. So our recommendation for that is that BIFAD review the composition and responsibilities of SPARE, and if appropriate revise its charter to clarify its responsibilities and procedures, and this review should include the structure with a goal of making sure that SPARE is functional in terms of BIFAD. Now I’d like to go on to the CRSP aid administrative and/or operational issues, and there’s a number of these. I think there’s, I don’t know, a number of them. The first one that’s been out there for a long, long while is the lack of CRSP guidelines. And I need to explain something. What I’ve given the Board is not only a list of these issues with a brief explanation of it but then I have given them the copies of the specific pages of the minutes or the documents that these issues are pulled from. And the sentence or the clause that is important has been underlined so they don’t have to read a whole bunch of stuff. They can go and find these. So everything I’m talking about is referenced back, and I’m not going to take time to say meeting 146, page 2, and so on because it’s in the material they got there. The guidelines were first developed in 1985 and revised in ’89 and those have been the approved guidelines. They were revised and a revised set of guidelines did go forward.
in 2000, and as far as we can tell it was never signed by the Administrator. In 2004 there was a lot of time spent by both the universities and AID revising them again. BIFAD did approve those in 2006 but they never did go forward to the Administrator. And so as best we can tell the only approved guidelines are the ones from ’85, ’89, even though in the recent RFAs that went forward from AID they did refer to the 2005 guidelines. I think it’s important to point out that they are guidelines. I think it’s very important that they stay as guidelines because that is really what’s given the CRSP a lot of flexibility to be innovative and do things in different ways as the need arose. And so I would think it would be a mistake to make them mandatory so we recommend that the guidelines should be revised taking into account the changes that have been in not only the AID practices but the foreign assistance framework, and that those should be revised and brought back to BIFAD for your October meeting. Now that’s a pretty tight time line. But I really think it needs to be done because this one needs to get off the table. The next issue, and you’ve heard some about this today, is ADS 216, which ADS is really operational procedures for AID, and this one deals with how AID is supposed to operate or function and collaborate with the universities.
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There’s been a lot of concern that AID in general has not followed these guidelines. Our recommendation I think maybe has already been answered today. The recommendation was that BIFAD should determine the status of ADS 216. If it is in the process of or if it is to be revised, it should be done in consultation with the Title XII universities. And you heard earlier today John said that it is in the revision process, and that BIFAD would have a chance to have input into that so hopefully that one is coming off the table and all we have to do is convince AID now to follow it. The next issue was the release of RFAs and the overlap of ME if it’s a continuing program. If you go back and you look at material -- as a matter of fact, three years ago this month EGAT made a presentation to BIFAD and they stated at that time that there would be one year allowed between an RFA release and the end of a current CRSP program. And in addition if it was the same -- pardon me, a different ME that was selected there would be at least six months overlap so that there could be a continuity and a shifting of responsibilities and if any program should be continued there would be a chance of doing that. And of course you heard a lot of discussion today that the time lines that are being talked about don’t even come close to these kinds of things. I’ll
come back to that after I finish the presentation because I think there is a way we can deal with that. So the fourth recommendation is that the agreed-upon procedures be followed for new or continuing CRSP and that if there is not adequate time for a proper process for continuing CRSP that a funded extension be implemented. The next issue is the review of RFAs and scopes of work for CRSPs. At Board meeting 146 BIFAD recommended or requested that BIFAD have input on RFAs early in the process of development. Now we’re really talking -- I think everybody knows what CRSPs are, collaborative research support programs. And what we’re really talking now about is the collaborative part of this. If these are really doing what they should be, I would submit there should be collaboration all the way through the process, the development and discussion of what could or should go on, what are the chances, what are the important things, is this a topic that really is researchable and so on. That has not happened at least in many cases. Similarly, STARE was to be involved in the development of the scopes of work for the reviews of these CRSPs. And, for example, when the IBM and the SANDRAM CRSPs were issued there was a lot of discussion about not only the process but it was also agreed that when the SANDRAM and IBM CRSPs were reviewed there was a
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specific issue in each case that was to be addressed. I don’t know, and I haven’t talked to any of the people on SPARE at least that know whether or not those are or aren’t in the scope of work, and yet it was agreed to by both BIFAD and AID that those are questions that should be answered. So our next recommendation is that RFAs and scopes of work should be reviewed by BIFAD or SPARE in all future CRSP activities, and EGAT should explain and justify to BIFAD why this has not happened for CRSP activities over the past three years. The next issue is leader with associate cooperative agreements. About five years ago when they were reissuing the RFAs for the IBM and SANDRAM CRSPs up to that time all the other CRSPs had either been just cooperative agreements or grants, and they proposed that we go with this so-called leader with associate cooperative agreement which was hopefully going to allow missions to have more buy-ins as associates in these CRSPs. When BIFAD agreed to go with this the proposal was that these two would be pilot programs and that the success, the advantages or disadvantages of the LWA would be reviewed to see if it should be used in the future and whether or not you wanted to go that way or go back to the other mechanisms. That has not been done as best we can tell is that you’re going forward with LWAs and that there
has not been a review as to the pros and cons of the LWA process. There was very real concern amongst many of the CRSPs and the universities that if LWAs really did work there was the possibility that those buy-ins, I’m calling them buy-ins, associate awards, would be counted towards the core funding or the base part of the CRSP and therefore the overall funding would not really increase. So we recommend that the use of LWAs be evaluated to determine the advantage or disadvantage to the CRSPs and their operations. The next issue is also a very current one, competition for management entities, in other words, the entity that is going to manage the overall CRSP. BIFAD 139, which was five years ago, it was recommended that the competition for the ME be for the ME only and that then after that was awarded the ME would go out with an RFA for participants to run the programs within that CRSP. The primary reason for that, and you heard this a little bit when the livestock was being discussed was that in the past the old way of doing it where the ME and the programs were bid simultaneously, in other words, a one-step process, you had by necessity different universities forming, if you will, a consortium to bid for these, and the ones that didn’t win were basically out of the running or participation in them for that first two or three or
five years or whatever it was, or in some cases ten years, and so you weren’t getting the best opportunity possible for the best programs to be participants in that CRSP. And so it was recommended, and AID actually stated in one presentation that all future CRSPs would be bid in a one-step process. And so if we’re going to follow that, that’s what should be happening, and as far as I know there has not been a real evaluation of the pros and cons of the one versus a two-step process. So we recommend that all CRSPs either be continued or new be a two-step process. I think there’s just all kinds of advantages in doing that. The next issue is response to in this case a management report. In 2003 there was a report submitted to CRSP entitled defective management for CRSP issues and opportunities. That report contains seven recommendations, six of which were ones that AID should act upon. The other one was a recommendation that the MEs should act on. As best we can tell, only two of those recommendations have been followed. The first was that AID undergo a determination of priorities, research priorities, which they did, and that was reported out and listed or identified the research subject matters that needed to be undertaken, the commodities and so on. The second one that was acted upon was by the universities where it was
recommended the university should follow the recommendations that have been made in the management reports and institute whatever the recommendations were. And as best we can tell, all or at least most of those have been done. The other five recommendations have not been acted upon, and so we recommend that since this report was based upon AID sponsored reviews and the report was commissioned by AID, AID should take action on the other recommendations or give justification to BIFAD as to why they were not followed. Continuing on with the issue of reports and reviews, there have been a large number of reviews, both technical and management of CRSPs over the number of years that they’ve been in operation. Those reports contain a wealth of information as to what works, what doesn’t work as well, what some of the better management practices and organizational practices are and so on. And yet when we start looking for some of those past reviews they are very, very difficult if not impossible to find. In some cases the reviews are still on the individual CRSP web sites but if you don’t happen to know about those programs and what not you’re going to have trouble finding them. We would suggest that those should be available as part of the AID information system, whatever that might be, and so we recommend that the
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review should be available and posted on the development experience clearing house web page. But also that BIFAD and SPARE documents have got the same problem. They need to be made available too. How can AID people or CRSP people benefit from the past if they can’t get access to this material that’s already been done. It got the real potential of reinventing the wheel all the time. Another issue is, and I’m calling it document availability but actually it goes beyond this, and that is how do people really find out about CRSPs and their successes and so on. And I would submit to you that the Title XII reports have been and should be a very large part of that dissemination of information about CRSPs, and yet in many cases the Title XII reports are either not easily available or they’re late in coming out, and we had said in this that the 2005 and 2006 reports don’t seem to have been publicly released, and we at least got half of that solved today when we got the 2006 one so hopefully this is coming off the table too, but our recommendation on that was that the Title XII report should be published and released in a very timely manner. Our overall recommendation is that BIFAD should bring these issues to the attention of the AID Administrator and determine why agreed-upon procedures and BIFAD recommendations are not being followed, and
how these deficiencies can be corrected and that the role of BIFAD on these issues should be clarified. The second part of that is that it’s urgent that this be done as soon as possible as EGAT is entering into processes different than agreed to with BIFAD or recommended by BIFAD and that could do serious damage to the CRSP and their future success. Now if I may, Mr. Chairman, go on and make a couple of observations and make some suggestions as to how you might deal or make recommendations as to how to deal with the earmarks, the time constraints that we’re under and so on. And what I’m going to suggest is if you will a three-phase process simply because there’s sort of different categories of doing things. But please, first of all, realize that if you looked at the upper limit that I understand there is in the new CRSP, the ones that have been recently issued, if you look at the upper dollar limit that’s in those that in many if not all of them the upper limit is lower than what those CRSPs were receiving in their previous agreement be it a grant or a co-op agreement. For example, you heard about the proposed livestock in there at 10 million for the next five years but before they were receiving, I don’t know, 2.8 or 3 million or something like that a year. And I would suggest that most of the CRSPs are below the
funding levels that they were three or four years ago,
and yet the expectation and the costs have gone up. So
I’m going to come back to that. I would also suggest
that if you had an opportunity to look at the material
that the livestock CRSP handed out yesterday sort of
giving some background as to what the livestock CRSP has
done, and then if you were to compare that to the
concept paper you would find that the livestock CRSP has
dealt with most of the issues that are raised in the
concept paper. Now you’ve heard a lot about the earmark
and the constraints that AID/EGAT is working under.
They’re very real. They’re very difficult. They’re
very hard to deal with, the earmarks. You’ve got the
report to Congress. You’ve got priorities. All of
these things have got to be handled. You’ve got to
worry about getting those funds committed because
Congress has the great tendency if you don’t spend money
they withdraw it and you lose it for the next time, and
we’re all familiar with that. So I would suggest one
way of dealing with this, and a suggestion I hope BIFAD
will seriously consider, is that you obtain an exception
so that all of the existing CRSPs can be funded up to
whatever the limit is that they need to, that the
livestock CRSP be issued a funded extension so that we
don’t get this one being shut down before another one
can be developed. This then should allow enough time to
back off on the time lines that there is on both the
horticulture and the livestock climate change proposal
so that it can be truly developed in a collaborative
fashion, and that many of the issues, if not all of the
issues you’ve heard about today in both of those, can be
thoroughly discussed and talked about and solutions
found as to how you deal with these issues, and we can
go forward together to develop the strongest CRSP in
those two areas as possible. Okay. So that’s one part.
That’s something that could be done essentially right
now. The second part is that as you’ve heard Congress
has identified water as an issue that should be dealt
with a CRSP type program for, I don’t know, three, four
or five years now. That a planning grant for a water
CRSP be issued, whatever the process for that is because
personally I live in the west and we’ve got enough water
problems in the Maryland area let alone what they’re
like in the west and in the rest of the world, and we
need to get ahead of that power crew. We really do.
That’s the second step. The third step is that the
upper limit for the current CRSP be revised upward so
that they at least come back to where they were three or
four, whatever years ago. I’m not suggesting that they
all be uniformly funded because I don’t think that’s
good management in any case but they do need to be brought back to more realistic levels so that would be the third phase. And if you were to take those on and I think AID would have at least an open mind to look at those to see if this couldn’t get us so we get into a more deliberate and collaborative process so we can go forward together so that we can get the kind of programs we really are capable of doing together and that we can form the alliances we need to go forward to show that these things are working and convince Congress and other people that this is a good way to go forward. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. It’s obvious that you’ve done quite a lot of work and your committee, and I certainly do appreciate the very serious way that you took this on quickly and brought us to this point in discussion. I want to open the floor first to the Board, and I might ask the first question of John. The recommendations relative to forward funding, is that within the realm of possibility?

MR. THOMAS: Yes. In fact, this is something that I -- this is one of the actions that I discussed yesterday at the STARE meeting. I really appreciate that Ray has come and provided some -- I think some workable suggestions on how to move forward. And it
does require if we do forward fund all of the CRSPs it will require some waivers for our procurement policies, but we’ll have to look into that and see how it can be done. I believe it could be done this year. Ray made a number of points and I was most intrigued, Ray, by your comment that the Swindell report 20 years ago raised many of the same questions, issues, and here we are still struggling with them. And there’s so many issues, and I think it’s important if we’re going to address these, and we should, that we prioritize them because we talked about BIFAD staffing issues and a lot of this requires follow up by the BIFAD staff. And so we have to look at which issues we can tackle in the next -- say the next -- before the next -- you have a suggestion to do the CRSP guidelines by October. That’s going to require a lot of work, and I think that’s one of the priorities. I think another priority that they should work on is looking at the leader with associate awards, have they achieved their objectives? If there haven’t been as many mission buy-ins as we wanted, why not? What’s the issue? And another priority on your list, Ray, is the CRSP management issues. You know, we should look at all of the alternative ways to manage CRSPs keeping in mind that we still have our challenges, that we have to respond with regards to reporting to Congress
on what’s going to be achieved and where we’re going to be working and who’s going to be benefiting. So if I were to look at this list of issues, I would put those three as the highest priority to focus on. I think funding levels, that’s a bigger issue, and we have to take a good look at what we see as our funding projections, and if there’s going to be a lower limit for each CRSP what’s a reasonable limit and can we with the existing CRSPs we have and the obligations for the next five to eight years, we have to make sure that they’re funded including any new activities. So we talked at one point about parity between all of the CRSPs, and the reason right now there’s different amounts is because we looked at our funding projections and we realized we couldn’t afford to fund a CRSP for five years at a level that we could have funded three years ago. But in terms of your recommendation, and I said this morning -- this afternoon that any new CRSPs we do, we want to do them right and we want to take the time to make sure that we do it in a collaborative way, that we consider all the options, and if it makes sense to forward fund existing CRSPs and then make sure that we have our time to do these designs the best we can then we should do that. I’ll do what I can to make that work and that includes you mentioned extending the
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global livestock CRSP. Well, the issue in Kenya is really serious in its impact. It’s not allowing the CRSP to continue their work. And it’s not just in Kenya but it’s affecting the regional program. Those are the kind of reasons that extensions are allowed. We wouldn’t just say a funded extension because we have to look at the pipelines to see if maybe there’s enough funding within the activity. We do have in our plan to -- we have the additional CRSP earmark this year that we would do an assessment for water or water CRSP and look at what are the issues in water, whether it’s small scale irrigation or wastewater reuse, clean water for food processing. What are the issues that we would do in a water CRSP, and we’re prepared this year, in fact, we’ve already started working on a scope of work to do an assessment for that. So I think if we went through each of Ray’s observations and recommendations we’d find that we probably have made a lot more progress on some of the issues than we think. And so I guess that’s all I can comment on right now.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: It seems to me that Dr. Miller has given us three recommendations at the end that make patently good sense, and probably could be put in the form of a motion that we could discuss and maybe should be put in the form of a motion that we could
discuss. The one new initiative that’s not so new is this water thing and even though money is tight it seems to me given the urgency of that question, and the fact that the Congress has continued to ask for it, that future funding requests might be enhanced and strengthen the likelihood of getting them if we were shown as responsive to what the Congress has asked. And I think that one needs to be moved ahead and the other two adopted too. And I don’t know whether you want three separate motions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, omnibus is popular in this town. Can you construct something that captures this?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I think I can if Dr. Miller would allow me to steal this language and move that we adopt them.

THE CHAIRMAN: His recommendations.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: His three final recommendations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I second that.

THE CHAIRMAN: It’s open for discussion.

Comments from the floor? Ray, would you mind repeating those just so we’re all aware of what we’re about to do here? I need to get this into the record as well.
MR. MILLER: And I might not have the right technical word from AID’s standpoint but obtain a waiver to forward fund the current CRSPs, extend the global livestock CRSP, and if funding is needed make it a funded extension, take the time necessary to have a true collaborative process for the planning of both the livestock and climate change and the horticulture CRSP so that we can go forward with the kind of programs that really are needed and will be successful from both the standpoint of AID and the universities, that a planning grant be issued for a water CRSP, and that the current CRSP be considered for an increase in the upper funding level to bring them at least closer to where they were previously. Something to that effect because -- and John is right. As I said before, I’m not recommending uniform funding because I don’t think that’s the way you fund any kind of a program, but I think they are under funded for what not only the expectations are but for what the needs are. So I think that needs to be looked at.

MR. THOMAS: Maybe I missed the last one about increasing the ceiling levels of the existing CRSPs. That is much more complex.

MR. MILLER: That’s why it’s down there in third. We can do the two while we work on the third one. I’m
trying to do -- as I understand it, if we can get those first two done that takes the pressure off of taking the funds committed for this year and allows more latitude to do things in the next year.

MR. THOMAS: Okay. You can make the recommendation but I’m just saying that when we’re talking about increasing there’s an existing CRSP program that’s authorized at a certain amount it’s very hard to increase that ceiling without violating competition rules so that one will have to be discussed.

MR. DELAUDER: Maybe it might be better then to take that one out and formulate a different motion to address that issue.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can live with that, what he said. So we’ll address the first two.

MR. DELAUDER: Address the first two.

THE CHAIRMAN: Divide the question. In other words, we’ll divide the question and vote on the first two and then there was a comment about the water planning grant, and you had indicated that there’s an assessment already in progress. Are these two in conflict or are they...

MR. MILLER: No, support of.

THE CHAIRMAN: Support of that. Okay. Let’s take some comments from the floor and then we’ll vote on...
MR. DEMMETT: Bob, I don’t know if it’s gotten more difficult to get your authorization raised but we had our authorization raised at least twice before to allow mission buy-ins. So I don’t know, John, have the rules changed?

MR. THOMAS: I’m not saying it can’t be done. It’s more complicated to do. It’s much more complex to get a procurement waiver into these ceilings but it can be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We can talk about that when we get the other motion on the floor. Are we ready to vote on the first motion, the motion that’s on the floor?

MR. THOMAS: I have one quick question, if I can. If we pass this motion, how do we implement those two recommendations once we pass -- if it passes and it goes forward as a recommendation from BIFAD.

THE CHAIRMAN: To the Administrator.

MR. THOMAS: Okay. Very good.

MR. DELAUDER: Does the third recommendation have two parts?

MR. MILLER: No, the third one is increasing that upper limit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me clarify this for the
record. The first recommendation was to extend the
global livestock CRSP. That’s correct.

MR. MILLER: Forward funding.

THE CHAIRMAN: And extend -- with additional
funding, if necessary, I think is what you said. And
then implicit with that was take time necessary to
improve planning for livestock in the horticulture CRSP,
and then the planning grant for the water CRSP. I think
that was all that we captured in this first motion.
Okay. Any further questions?

MR. THOMAS: Call the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor, aye. Opposed by
nay. Let the record indicate the vote was unanimous in
favor of the motion. Do we have another motion relative
to the...

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chair, before you go on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MILLER: I think John identified off that
list of issues two or three that are high priority, and
at least the one on the LWA and the ME, one step or two
step, become part of the planning for both the livestock
and the hort then because they are essential in terms of
how you do or don’t do those things, so these things
have to be measured there too. Maybe that’s what you
were saying, John, and I agree with that.
THE CHAIRMAN: The floor is open if there’s a
desire to have a motion in this area.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, we didn’t formally
divide the question but we did divide the question and
if it takes a second motion, I would move that the
second part of this be on the floor now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you state the motion?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Would you state the motion
for me, Dr. Miller?

MR. MILLER: That raising the upper limit of
the current CRSP be done, is that the right word, anyway
so that the current CRSP would come closer to realistic
funding levels and to the levels they were in previous
grants.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: But this does not spell
uniformity of awards.

MR. MILLER: It does not spell uniformity of
award, no.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: This term realistic funding
levels, what is the realistic funding level? That has
to be somehow decided before...

MR. MILLER: That’s why it was put off so that
those things can be talked about and worked through in
the process because I don’t -- it’s like anything else.
If you ask the participants the ceiling is the ceiling
whereas if you talk about what is possible it’s often
very different.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: That has to be figured out.
MR. MILLER: But again that’s the
collaborative process or should be.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Christensen, was that the
motion?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: That is the motion.
THE CHAIRMAN: And that’s what you understood
with your second. Is there further discussion, comments
from the floor? Dr. Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: Tim Williams, University of
Georgia. My reading of the ADS indicates that there can
be exceptions to competition and it’s just a question of
whether USAID wishes to invoke those or not. That is
the language that’s out there in the ADS for procurement
and relating to Title XII that allows this to happen.

MR. THOMAS: I know there’s -- I got my back
to the audience. I know many of my colleagues, CTOs,
that have worked on these issues and maybe if they’d
like to comment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rifenbark is approaching
the microphone.

York Stenographic Services, Inc.
34 North George St., York, PA 17401 - (717) 854-0077
MR. RIFENBARK: John Rifenbark. I have a different subject.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Does anyone from the AID staff want to respond?

MR. HEDLAND: Bob Hedland of EGAT/AG. John may send me home after I make this public but one of the things we’ve been discussing related to how we can use up this earmark this year is to issue EGAT associate awards to the CRSPs on a competitive basis and it allows the funding to go to the existing CRSP, the LWAs but without any need for an increase in ceiling so they can take on extra duties related to the scope of their work and we could use the earmarked money to the existing CRSP and we don’t have any issue with raising the ceiling because they all have the ceiling for associate awards that is separate from the core funds.

MR. THOMAS: I will not send Bob home because of that remark.

THE CHAIRMAN: Other comments on this particular motion before we proceed? Yes.

MR. RIFENBARK: John Rifenbark, EGAT/AG. I just want to make sure that we’re clear on the difference between a planning grant and a water assessment. As I understand, a planning grant is that’s actually a two-step process done by the ME where they
call out for proposals for planning grants for horticulture or for sorghum millet. Then the ME selects among those that have come in with applications the ones that they want to give a planning grant to and so it’s very different because you already have an ME established as I understand it whereas an assessment is before there is an ME selected before an RFA is issued. The other thing on budget if we fully fund all the existing CRSPs to their maximum cost right now, their ceiling, we have less money. We don’t have enough money to do it so that may not be an issue.

MR. THOMAS: Forward funding, it’s not necessarily forward funding to the maximum. It’s more than one year of...

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me just ask the question of our maker of the motion. The term planning grant, do we need to change the motion?

MR. RIFENBARK: Would that be an assessment or a planning grant?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: We’ve been talking about doing an assessment.

MR. RIFENBARK: Maybe I got the wrong words. MR. CHRISTENSEN: Whatever it is in terms of what the word needs to be, what needs to happen is it needs to move forward so if the language of the motion...
needs to be changed, the word needs to be changed to indicate what we want as something initiated now then I’m prepared to have the word changed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Assessment.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Assessment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you get that change? Next comment?

MS. EGNA: This is Hillary Egna, Oregon State University, and, thank you, Ray, for those set of excellent recommendations. The one thing I do want to mention relevant to this last one is that the CRSP -- raising the CRSP ceiling levels is a very good idea for all of us for the minimum cost of doing business especially because of changes right now and the value of the dollar. But going back and defending that on past levels, I don’t think is defensible because the programs have changed dramatically. Most of us have a new concept and a broader scope so I don’t see that resting on past levels is any more defensible than making a uniform recommendation for all programs. I would say that looking at the realistic levels and the efficiencies of doing business is what you should raise the level to. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I think that’s the language of our motion. Ready to vote? All in favor, aye. Nay.
Again, we have a unanimous vote in favor of the motion. It’s declared and passed. Thank you. We have another item of business yet to do, and that’s to hear from the chair of the SPARE committee. And Sandra Russo has been very patiently waiting to come to this time. Our apologies for taking a rather lengthy conversation around those previous issues.

MS. RUSSO: Thank you, Dean Easter. I believe yesterday you already knew we were going to run overtime so you asked me to keep my comments short today. SPARE met yesterday briefly, and has been mentioned earlier we have one new member, Sue Schram, who represents the private sector community, and John Graham, who is chair of ICOPS will be participating in SPARE. We have an agreement by Josette Lewis [ph] in AID to join SPARE but she needs approval from the Administrator to do that. We have some SPARE AID members rotating off due to retirement so we still will not have a full complement this year. We’re doing a trial at the moment on the SPARE secretary trying to let Ron Senykoff fulfill both of those roles, and I wanted to distinguish between the AID staff person who supports -- who we’re proposing to support both SPARE and BIFAD as opposed to a secretarial support that we desperately need, for example, to take minutes. We are unable to post SPARE minutes because we
don’t have anybody taking SPARE minutes to address a
point that Ray brought up earlier. What we discussed
yesterday pretty much mimicked your agenda today but I
want to talk about a couple of issues. One, operational. We need to get in front of the BIFAD
meetings so that we can better serve BIFAD. As the relationship has been strengthened with AID that serving
of BIFAD becomes more important and therefore our communication becomes more important within SPARE, with BIFAD, and with the community. We need to follow up on previous BIFAD recommendations, provide for like we did yesterday for the beginning step one of discussing a nutritional CRSP, and how we will pass that information out for comment from the community. We will work with BIFAD on specific strategies, concept white papers with an eye toward this transition administration that will be coming in. Therefore, SPARE respectfully submits and requests BIFAD for guidance on the following factors. What would be your response to the CRSP task force report that specifically talked about the SPARE charter and how do you want to handle that to prioritize previous BIFAD recommendations that SPARE is supposed to be working on if you could tell us what those might be like the long-term evaluation. That needs to happen this year. We have been asked in the past to look at a
strategy for clearer communication, and we look to work
with BIFAD on that to figure out how we’re going to have
that clear communication to handle or if you would
request of SPARE to propose a strategy and you can speak
to that strategy. We also request guidance on
assignments or tasks that BIFAD might be giving us to
undertake this year, and if possible a time line for
those requests. Our SPARE members have asked that we
lay out an agenda for meetings so that they all could
make the meetings and know about that well in advance.
What you would like us to do vis-à-vis interacting with
the CRSP task force, what role you would like SPARE to
have in the Conference of Deans, and what assistance you
would like in response to the Administrator’s requests.
That’s our report to the Board.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I move the report be
accepted.

MR. DELAUDE: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor, aye. Opposed,
nay. You will provide us with the written text of your
questions or your points.

MS. RUSSO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we come to the end of the
agenda except for it says open discussion, and I’m aware
that we have to clear this room by 4:30 so it will be a
brief discussion. I do believe, Dr. Christensen, there’s another room available for your discussions if...

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I was afraid you were going to say that.

THE CHAIRMAN: It does appear to me that there are a number of things that we need to as a BIFAD have some time devoted to working on and I think there will be some conversation over the next few days, but we may need to have a working session where we work as a group to prioritize and put our thoughts together on how we approach some of these issues so just to alert us to that. Anything else that you want to bring to the table, any of the members?

MR. DELAUDER: I think we had an excellent meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, there’s been an enormous amount of behind the scenes work, and we’ve really not given great credit to Kerry Bolognese today who has done a great deal to help us get to this point along with Ron, John, and a number of others who have been involved in this. I hope this hasn’t been too overwhelming, Mr. Barlow. We very much appreciate you joining our team and your contributions to our discussions today. Yes, Mr. Rabon.
MR. RABON: With regards to the work session, I think everybody is of the consensus that we need to do that. What would be your recommendations or is this not the appropriate time to try to set some time frame that we conduct...

THE CHAIRMAN: I do believe we need to accomplish that, if at all possible, before our next meeting. Do we have a date, Ron, set for our next meeting? Likely the May, June time frame.

MR. RABON: We need to have a considerable amount of time set aside for that. We’ve got SPARE recommendations. We’ve got special task force recommendations. We’ve got the staff guidelines we need to review. We’ve got the BIFAD guidelines we need to review. We’ve got the SPARE charter that needs reviewed. We’ve just got a considerable amount of work that we need to do, and there’s never enough time to do them within the scheduled meetings that we have so if we could set aside a day work session and if we could try to establish some time frame to do that, I’d certainly appreciate it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don’t know who to direct this to but this would need to be a public announced meeting.

MR. BOLOGNESE: That’s correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: That’s correct.
MR. BOLOGNESE: What you’re looking at is a working meeting that is open to the public but you’re not looking at an array of speakers to address specific issues but a meeting where BIFAD can address the issues that you just articulated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. We’ll work toward that within the next several days. I’m finished unless someone else has something. Yes.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I have a question. Did anything come from the BIFAD to the Lantos [ph] family at the passing...

THE CHAIRMAN: I’m sorry. That slipped my mind. We had a conversation about a resolution of condolences to the family. Would you care to offer something?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, I didn’t draft one. I just thought it would be appropriate to send it to Mrs. Lantos and maybe Kerry or someone could draft an appropriate thing for us to -- the chair could sign on our behalf.

MR. BOLOGNESE: I would be most pleased to do that.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: And we could circulate that electronically.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: The other thing is I would -
- we’ve had some people who have done some really great
staff work for us, Ray and his committee, and others. I
think thank you notes to them would also be appropriate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very much so. Are we prepared
to discharge Ray’s committee? His work is complete.
Ray, you provided your recommendations. Is there
further additional work that needs to be done?

MR. MILLER: Not with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then I think...

MR. RABON: He may need to help us work
through the recommendations with the...

THE CHAIRMAN: I think at this stage we’ll
officially discharge the committee with our very sincere
appreciation.

MR. DELAUDER: Subject to recall.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. We’re adjourned.
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