Board for International Food & Agriculture Development (BIFAD)

159th Meeting Minutes

Higher Education: A Critical Partner in Global Agricultural Development

March 3, 2010

National Press Club,
529 14th St., N.W.,
Washington, D.C. (13th Floor)

Prepared by EnCompass LLC

July 9, 2010 draft

Table of Contents

BIFAD Programs and Initiatives **4**

Welcoming and Opening Remarks (Robert Easter, Chairman and Provost & Interim Chancellor, University of Illinois, Champaign) 4

Discussion: Next Steps to Mobilizing Unique International Development Capacities of Minority Serving Institutions (MSI): Follow-up to MSI panel at BIFAD's October meeting, Des Moines, Iowa (Board's MSI Program Chair: William DeLauder, BIFAD Member and President Emeritus, Delaware State University) **4**

Establishing BIFAD Task Force on Haiti—Regional Development/Context of Haiti **5**

Remarks: Haiti and Transitioning Emergency Response to Development (Karen Turner, Director, USAID Office of Development Partners) 5

Introduction (Board's Task Force Chair, Elsa Murano, Professor and President Emerita, Texas A&M University) 6

Transitioning Emergency Response to Sustainable Development in Post Earthquake Haiti (Henry Bahn, Senior Advisor, Country Implementation, Feed the Future Initiative, Office of the Undersecretary for Research, Education and Economics, USDA) 6

Walter Bowen, Director, International Programs, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida 7

Dennis Shannon, Professor of Agronomy, Department of Agronomy and Soils, Auburn University 7

USAID Respondent: Ben Swartley, Agricultural Environment and Economics Officer, Broad-Based Economic Growth Division, Latin American & Caribbean Bureau, USAID ... 8

Next Steps for the BIFAD Task Force on Haiti Reconstruction and Development (Elsa Murano, Task Force Chair) 9

Discussion 9

Keynote Presentation **10**

Revitalization of Agricultural Sciences to Achieve Global Food Security, Dr. Gebisa Ejeta, 2009 World Food Prize Laureate and Distinguished Professor of Agronomy, Department of Agronomy, Purdue University **10**

Discussion **15**

Public Comment Period **16**

Message from and Commendation to Paul Findley, Author of Title XII **16**

Agricultural Capacity Building Through U.S. Long Term Training: Observations and Results of USAID LTT Program Evaluation **16**

Overview (Andrew C. Gilboy, Team Leader, Evaluation and Capacity Development Specialist, Associates for Global Change, Takoma Park, Maryland) 16

Findings and Recommendations (Cornelia Butler Flora, Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Sociology & Agriculture and Life Sciences, Iowa State University)..... 18

Discussion 19

Board Resolution: Alignment of BIFAD's sub-committee the Strategic Partnership for Agriculture and Education/SPARE (Tim Rabon, BIFAD member)..... 22

Updates: Title XII Report & Plans FY 2009 and on the Bumpers Amendment (John Becker, Senior Agricultural Policy Advisor, BIFAD Secretariat, USAID) 23

Update on the FY 2009 Title XII Report 23

Title XII Report Requirements 23

Prior Title XII Reporting 24

FY 09 Report – A New Baseline 24

Schedule of FY 09 Title XII Report 24

The Bumpers Amendment Update..... 25

What is the Bumpers Amendment? 25

What is new?..... 25

Implications for Title XII programming and BIFAD's role 25

Discussion..... 26

Status Reports: University Engagement in Afghanistan—Agricultural Strategy 26

AF-PAK Trilateral Proceedings, USAID and USDA Actions (James E. Hill, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, California) 26

Otto J. Gonzalez, Senior Agricultural Advisor and USDA Liaison, Office of the Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, U.S. Department of State 27

Discussion..... 29

Operational and Management Issues—Reports (continued)..... 30

Looking Back and Looking Ahead: The USAID/BIFAD Partnership (Carol Grigsby, Deputy Director, USAID, Office of Development Partners)..... 30

Closing..... 32

Board for International Food & Agriculture Development (BIFAD)

159th Meeting Minutes

March 3, 2010

National Press Club, 529 14th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. (13th Floor)

"Higher Education: A Critical Partner in Global Agricultural Development"

Board Members Present: Timothy Rabon, Elsa Murano, Robert (Bob) Easter (Chair), William (Bill) DeLauder, Catherine Bertini, H.H. Barlow
USAID/ODP representatives: Karen Turner, Carol Grigsby, Ron Senykoff, John Becker
APLU: Kerry Bolognese

BIFAD PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES

Welcoming and Opening Remarks (Robert Easter, Chairman and Provost & Interim Chancellor, University of Illinois, Champaign)

Chair Robert Easter thanked the Board members for their work and their efforts to be here; he also thanked all others for coming. After Board members introduced themselves, he emphasized the importance of the business of BIFAD as could be seen recently in through the disaster in Haiti. He then introduced Bill DeLauder, noting that the Board is of the view that they need to continue conversations about Minority Serving Institutions.

Discussion: Next Steps to Mobilizing Unique International Development Capacities of Minority Serving Institutions (MSI): Follow-up to MSI panel at BIFAD's October meeting, Des Moines, Iowa (Board's MSI Program Chair: William DeLauder, BIFAD Member and President Emeritus, Delaware State University)

Bill DeLauder briefly reviewed the MSI panel that was held at the last BIFAD meeting in Des Moines. MSIs are an important untapped resource as USAID seeks to address important issues of food security. He stated that they also want to reach out to institutions serving other minorities. These institutions will also bring great strength. He then presented the following motion:

MOVED: That BIFAD appoint a Task Force with the charge to plan and implement a series of forums involving faculty and/or administrators from 1890 land grant universities, Hispanic serving universities, and tribal colleges; and appropriate staff from USAID with the charge to identify areas of mutual interest and to increase the participation of MSIs (minority serving institutions) in USAID programs, particularly the Food Security Initiative.

Elsa Murano seconded the motion, which was then discussed briefly. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Establishing BIFAD Task Force on Haiti—Regional Development/Context of Haiti

Remarks: Haiti and Transitioning Emergency Response to Development (Karen Turner, Director, USAID Office of Development Partners)

Karen Turner thanked BIFAD both for the role that they are playing in the revitalization of interest and activity in agricultural development, and for their interest in Haiti. She shared information about USG activities related to the needs in Haiti, and described the online system set up at USAID to handle donations, needs, and volunteers, and the overwhelming immediate response within the US.

There were already a lot of NGOs on the ground in Haiti in the past. These service organizations have turned into relief organizations, and it has stressed their systems. USAID has tried to help facilitate a smooth flow, given the countless offers of assistance, providing goods and help for people going down there. Karen Turner emphasized that the effort to rebuild Haiti is a long term response. She reviewed a few aspects of the role that BIFAD might play, noting the hope that the private sector can play a role that might help.

A multi-donor needs assessment is expected to be completed around March 16, with discussions to follow in the Dominican Republic about that assessment. Haiti has expressed the desire that the assessment take an approach that will really help set the vision for the future of Haiti. A donor pledging conference is scheduled for end of March, and a number of other conferences and meetings are being held by InterAction, the private sector, France, Organization of American States (OAS); and by Haiti.

USAID has formed the Haiti Task Team, led by Paul Weisenfeld, to work with the Mission in Haiti and play a significant role here in Washington until August; then the work will flow back into the Mission. There will be more information about USAID's plans about Haiti based on the assessment and the discussion about division of labor about what needs to be done.

With BIFAD and the community it represents, there are a number of opportunities for engagement. She emphasized the importance of agriculture in this, along with the involvement of the private sector and large firms with agricultural products. There is also interest in seeing if economic growth can be brought to areas outside of Port of Prince so that growth can be more diverse.

In closing, Karen Turner emphasized several points:

- Opportunities exist through the Diaspora within the institutions that are related to BIFAD; and agricultural will be an important part of that.
- There will be a clearer view of what is needed and where the opportunities are when the assessment is completed, in a couple months' time.
- The Agency is trying to look at decentralization.
- BIFAD can play an important role in the agricultural area, and in bring in the university community to play a role through that community.
- They will look to BIFAD to see how they can connect those dots.

Introduction (Board's Task Force Chair, Elsa Murano, Professor and President Emerita, Texas A&M University)

Elsa Murano thanked Karen Turner, noting that they will find that all are coming together with some similar ideas. She introduced the members of the BIFAD Task Force on Haiti and their topics.

Transitioning Emergency Response to Sustainable Development in Post Earthquake Haiti (Henry Bahn, Senior Advisor, Country Implementation, Feed the Future Initiative, Office of the Undersecretary for Research, Education and Economics, USDA)

Henry Bahn began by recognizing that this is an incredibly important time for BIFAD; this is a time when the university system and its representatives can play an important role with the skills that few others have. He commended the Board for taking the role that it is. The U.S. has been engaged with Haiti for quite some time, and the intensity of that has really increased. He emphasized that if we want to be light on our feet, there is a need to look across the government and beyond, as broadly as possible to get what is needed.

He reviewed the recent background of involvement before the earthquake and agriculture and food security gaps and opportunities he found related to science and extension when he went to Haiti the first time. He then outlined post earthquake conditions and needs, with no reduction in underlying problems and needs. The voluntary depopulation of Port-au-Prince presented some conditions in terms of alternative economic growth, related to the opportunity to decentralize the economy; this will require quick turnaround activities to attract displaced populations, as well as sustained development to retain displaced populations. There was also the question of where the population will end up – in their homes, or in permanent refugee camps.

Facilitating growth in Haiti involves the capacity to improve human resources, sustainability and Haitian ownership. An agriculture rural sector vision, with the low education level, clearly will not happen quickly; it is a long term vision and will involve the need to accelerate infrastructural investment. Two groups that could use their long-term investment are the Ministry of Agriculture, and the universities. (The Ministry lost significant numbers and capacity.) The U.S. university community can help in comprehensive institutional productivity improvement, by equipping the Ministry and universities with the capacity and facilities to position Haiti for the future. The comparative advantage is the science-based focus on all appropriate areas that it takes to build a viable agriculture sector.

Henry Bahn concluded by stating that if they look at the comparative advantage of the institutions that they have, linked with those in Haiti, the university system could make a tremendous contribution, not just to the transition but as a long term contribution to the country.

Walter Bowen, Director, International Programs, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida

Walter Bowen explained that he would give just a broad picture of the commitment that his university and others in Florida have toward Haiti, noting that they have in Florida a large number of the Haitians that are in the U.S. Haiti has been important at the University of Florida, which has language, regional studies, health, and other programs directly involved in Haiti.

Walter Bowen then described just some of the ongoing projects, funded through various sources including USAID, including the Global Health Institute for Community Health and Development; the U.S.-Haiti Higher Education Partnership Program; and the Haiti Watershed Initiative for National Natural Environmental Resources (WINNER).

Walter Bowen emphasized the need to keep in context the tremendous tragedies such as the hurricanes of 2008 that have affected Haitians, and provided numbers to the tragedies and damages. This earthquake hit just as Haiti was getting back on its feet after the hurricanes of 2008. It is hard to imagine the lives of those in that country, in terms of trying to providing for their families; there is a great deal of suffering. He emphasized the importance of keeping that in context that as we move forward.

Walter Bowen concluded by recognizing Henry Bahn and Dennis Shannon, who were both in Haiti when it happened, and who immediately set up triage after escaping their hotel; their efforts should be recognized.

Dennis Shannon, Professor of Agronomy, Department of Agronomy and Soils, Auburn University

Dennis Shannon explained that he first went to Haiti in 1970 as a volunteer for 2 years, where he learned Creole; this inspired him to go back to US and study agriculture. He provided some background on the environment, geography and agriculture in Haiti. He then provided an overview of Auburn's related activities in Haiti, including details on the following:

- USAID
    - Agroforestry Outreach Project / Agroforestry II – 1987-1991
    - Productive Land Use Systems (PLUS) Project – 1992-2001
    - Soil Management CRSP Project: Soil Management Practices for Sustainable Production on Densely Populated Tropical Steeplands – 1987-2001
- Technical Assistance for the Protection of Parks and Forest (ATPPF) - World Bank Project– 1998-2001
- Fisheries Project - Rotary Club
- Haitian graduate students

Lessons learned in these projects include the following:

- Concept of farmers growing trees for economic benefit was very successful
- Large number of PVOs & NGOs in Haiti are asset
- Consortium model works very well
- Success of PLUS project due to continuity with AOP/AF II
- Research & technical support added value to USAID projects

- Changing objectives resulted in poor utilization of research results
- We have not done a good job of utilizing research results or Haitian graduates

Based on the premise that the value gained from research extends beyond individual project, recommendations presented by Dennis Shannon included:

- Plan to ensure that research results are extended to farmers, preserved for future use, and include improved germplasm being maintained in country; otherwise, we will be starting over with each new agricultural project
- Need longer planning horizons; long-term research should precede project implementation
- Work more closely with Ministry of Agriculture
- Need to find the right mix between Ministry of Agriculture and PVOs and get them to work together
- Need to keep PhD and MS graduates involved in research

He concluded by discussing opportunities for land-grant universities to participate in Haiti's recovery:

- Types of involvement
    - Graduate student research in Haiti
    - Educational exchanges
    - Expert consultancies
    - Student projects
- How to organize
    - Working groups of experts with language capabilities and appropriate technology
    - Consortium to act as clearinghouse and handle administration & logistics
- Working groups - Agriculture & Environment
- Health sciences (medicine/nursing/pharmacy)
- Building sciences/engineering/architecture
- Institutional development & management

USAID Respondent: Ben Swartley, Agricultural Environment and Economics Officer, Broad-Based Economic Growth Division, Latin American & Caribbean Bureau, USAID

Ben Swartley spoke on what is going on in Haiti as a respondent from the perspective of USAID and the task team. He noted that the presentations covered a lot of topics. In working in Haiti, it has been brought to his attention that there are many projects and much good work being done, with results being attained; but it is not clear where a lot of those results go. Haiti has been described as pockets of green in a vast brown background. There is a long history of pilot projects being done in Haiti.

He emphasized the importance when planning projects to think in terms of a whole systems approach. Systems include a physical system – not working on these pockets of green, but focusing on watersheds instead; the value chain, going from the inputs all the way to the consumer and exports of agricultural products to benefit the community; and a system of research, education, and governance. There is a need to look at how research gets used. How does a project or intervention play into helping the entire system go from research to

development to extension to support and sustainability – how does work survive on its own? This means bringing in the private sector when the private sector is usually isolated.

Ben Swartley recommended that the university community think in terms of those systems; for example, how can USAID collaborate with USDA? How will USAID and USAID work together to bring Haiti's agricultural system into a modern functioning system that provides the best expertise, systems and results that are needed to move the country forward.

Looking at the process, one will see that the government and other agencies seem interested in projects. This projectization of Haiti is very damaging to the further growth of the Haitian system, particularly when the focus is on the restoration of a sector without taking into account how it impacts on the community

That's what would be very helpful to the planners at USAID, USDA, and the Department of State going forward in planning for the long term.

Next Steps for the BIFAD Task Force on Haiti Reconstruction and Development (Elsa Murano, Task Force Chair)

Elsa Murano reviewed BIFAD's charge to the Task Force, to develop recommendations for BIFAD to deliver to the USAID Administrator on the long-term Haiti reconstruction and regional development, and on the role of land-grant universities. She reviewed the membership of the Task Force and then discussed the framework for the report that they will produce, covering five points: examples of the role land-grant universities have played, lessons learned, the case for a regional approach to maximize resources and impact, a systems approach to reconstruction and development; and the establishment of a sustainable structure in which land-grant universities could work with federal agencies.

She outlined the tentative timeline and next steps; as part of this, the Task Force will host a face-to-face mini conference in Florida to obtain further input from the academic community, including regional universities (Haiti, others) in April. She emphasized that this is tentative and may need to be accelerated – but they are committed to providing recommendations that USAID can use. Comments and suggestions are greatly appreciated.

Discussion

Bob Easter thanked Elsa Murano for an incredible session, and exactly the type of sessions that BIFAD should be having. He then opened floor for Board comments.

Bill DeLauder noted that there is often a lot of talk about country-driven, country-led approaches to development, but he did not hear much about input from Haitians. Elsa Murano agreed and stated that they will seek to get Haitians' input. Bill DeLauder emphasized that when we talk about development of a country, it needs to be in the direction that the people of that country want it to go, not where we think it should.

Catherine Bertini asked for more information on how the coordination is working, particularly regarding the roles in reconstruction of USAID, the military, the UN, Bill Clinton. A USAID

representative in the audience explained that the cross-governmental emergency humanitarian assistance part is winding down. There are still many units and resources on the ground there, including DoD, State, and others. Regarding reconstruction, there is the Haiti reconstruction task team, headed by Paul Weisenfeld. That team is made up of sub-teams include essential services, economic security, and justice. That is the organizational structure for USAID, and there are members of USDA and others who are involved in that team. There is overall an overall strategy development group that is being coordinated by State, called the Haiti 2020 group in which Paul Weisenfeld is a member; there are about 6-7 other agencies represented on that team. We are waiting for some information on what is being discovered by the assessment that is going on, and basically being prepared to respond to the Haiti 2020 group as needs arise.

The USAID representative clarified that Haiti 2020 is responsible overall for the U.S. position in rebuilding Haiti, but was not able to clarify what the role of former President Clinton was. Catherine Bertini also asked who was calling the shots in Haiti. He responded that a lot of direction was coming from here in Washington. There is a Special Representative for Haiti Reconstruction, which has a parallel structure to the Haiti Mission. There is the U.S. Ambassador, the Mission Director, and then a special group set up to handle reconstruction. Catherine Bertini asked if that meant that there are three entities coordinating reconstruction or one. He was not able to answer that question.

Discussion about who is leading these efforts then followed. Carol Grigsby explained that the USAID Administrator was put into the coordinating role, during the emergency phase. As part of the relook and assessment, they are looking for the best way to approach this coordination, with guidance coming primarily from the State group Haiti 2020. Elsa Murano stated that clearly Paul Weisenfeld is someone the BIFAD Task Force needs to work with, as he is the common denominator in all of these efforts.

Catherine Bertini asked if the U.S. government is doing something in Chile. Carol Grigsby explained that Chile, being more prepared to deal with this, has not yet made large requests for assistance. The Secretary will be discussing this with their government. She added that part of the problem in answering the questions that are being asked is that there are not the right people in this room; and that they will make sure the Board gets that information.

KEYNOTE PRESENTATION

Bob Easter introduced speaker, emphasizing the impact of the hybrid that Dr. Ejeta introduced.

Revitalization of Agricultural Sciences to Achieve Global Food Security, Dr. Gebisa Ejeta, 2009 World Food Prize Laureate and Distinguished Professor of Agronomy, Department of Agronomy, Purdue University

Gebisa Ejeta expressed gratitude for USAID, explaining that he has had a very unusual relationship with USAID; it is uncommon to have this kind of support for so long. He was only 14 years old when he had the opportunity to attend an agricultural technical school that was supported by Oklahoma State University. Being taken from the villages to this school run by

Americans was paramount to being taken from the village to the U.S., from sleeping on the floor to sleeping on a bed with clean sheets, and having three meals a day. That was truly the end of poverty for him. He attended for four years, then went to a collage of agriculture that was again supported by Oklahoma State University. He was then admitted to Purdue University and received an assistantship on a project run by USAID. He spent only five years away from USAID, working on a UNDP project, during which time he developed the hybrid plant; during that time he still consulted with CRSP people. He then came back and worked on CRSP.

Over the last century, the U.S. agricultural sector has become one of the most productive in the world, thanks in no small part to agricultural research conducted at land-grant universities. Citizens of the United States as well as the rest of North America and Western Europe have become accustomed to a safe and relatively inexpensive supply of food.

Agricultural research in genetics, crop and animal husbandry, week, pest, and disease control through chemical inputs and integrated pest management approaches, modern farm machinery, development of post harvest technologies and value-added products spurred the nearly 10-fold increase in commodity yields in the United States over the last 100 years.

The success of modern agriculture is reflected in how much we pay for food in the United States as compared to other countries. The U.S. percentage is 6.1 percent. The highest percentage among the high-income countries of the world, such as the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, France and South Korea, is only 13.6 percent. In contrast, the poorest nations of the world spend 70% or more of their disposable income on feeding their families.

It was the success of U.S. agriculture that spurred the advent of the Asian Green Revolution, converting nations such as India from “basket cases” to “bread baskets”. This successful venture to eradicate hunger and reduce rural poverty in these densely populated regions of the world was made possible through agricultural sciences. But it would have remained just another brilliant research finding as an end unto itself without the sustained investments of governments and foundations in agricultural education, research, extension, infrastructure development and the support of local governments for credits, markets for inputs and outputs.

The early achievements of the Asian Green Revolution were dramatic enough to create a false impression that the world’s food and farming problems had mostly been solved. As a consequence, the international donors who had provided strong support for agricultural innovation and investment in the 1960s and 1970s began pulling money and support away.

The last vestiges of mass hunger linger in Africa and South Asia, where millions of people live in abject poverty and are regular victims of hunger and occasional famine following nature’s calamities. Hunger and poverty are humanitarian flash points. Only three years ago, the world lamented that some 800 million people suffered from chronic hunger. Today, some 25,000 people die each day from malnutrition and more than one billion people—nearly one-sixth of the world’s population—suffer from chronic hunger; and another one billion people face intermittent hunger.

Global hunger is a moral issue and a fundamental problem too big to ignore. It limits the potential of individuals, communities and nations—for generations. It also undermines all other development investments by and on behalf of poor nations. The political and social stability of all nations, poor and rich, can be compromised by national, regional, and global hunger.

Farming became a profitable undertaking in the developed world where breakthroughs in the science of agriculture dramatically transformed production practices and increased farming efficiency. An unfortunate result of this was that society began to take agriculture for granted. Equally troubling are sharp cutbacks in research into new technologies, farming techniques, and seed varieties that could increase yields, cope with changing climate conditions, battle new pests and diseases, and make food more nutritious.

The decline in funding for agriculture and agricultural research both here and abroad led to less and less scientific interventions to production agriculture and more to address the emerging problems of natural resources and the environment.

We know that rural hunger and poverty decline dramatically when education, investment, and new technologies give farmers better ways to be productive.

I believe that the glut of agricultural production in the western world and the declining cost of food kept our societies blind for the last few decades until recent events gave us our rude awakening. The initial shock may have come from the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that delivered the message that the warming trend felt in the last few years will continue and may endanger hundreds of millions of the poor in developing countries as early as 2020.

The global economic recession and sky-rocketing costs of energy around the world made things worse as higher energy prices directly drove up the cost of agricultural inputs such as inorganic fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides. The ability of small farmers in developing countries to respond to the incentive of higher food prices through increased production was much more limited.

The 2008 food price crisis showed us that global food shortages could bring about disruptions in life that would resonate to the far fringes of the planet.

Families in the United States and Western Europe felt the effects, as did the masses in developing countries, but of course with dire consequences. It became evident that without the general balance between food demand and supply to which we have been accustomed, scarcity and volatility of food prices will pose a critical risk to global food security.

In spite of *and possibly because of* its proven success, U.S. investments in agricultural research have dramatically declined in recent years.

It is only recently that we have seen the beginnings of an end to complacency and revitalization of agricultural research toward alleviating hunger and energizing science-based development. The first initiatives that emerged on the topic included the report developed by the Chicago

Council for Global Affairs**;** the Lugar-Casey Global Food Security Act; and the L'Aquila G8 Summit in July, 2009, where global leaders pledged more than $20 billion to support a renewed global effort toward food security and established principles to follow including comprehensive approach, investments in country-led plans, local, regional, and global coordination, involvement of multilateral institutions, and delivery of accountable commitment.

Agriculture's renewed status as a vital resource to the sustainability of human civilization and the stability of peace and prosperity in the world brings great opportunity to the agricultural sciences to build on its legacy of success.

It is critical that these investments are made to purpose-driven science.

Provision of technical assistance to developing countries has been the basic foundation upon which the U. S. Agency for International Development has been built, and a primary function of BIFAD is to provide wise council and guidance to the agency in its noble agenda. After more than a century of helping develop U.S. agriculture and elevate the educational level of rural Americans, land-grant universities began taking their expertise to impoverished countries around the world. Capacity building became a leading function of the USAID.

Institution building is a necessary foundation in nation building. Universities in the United States have played significant roles in the development of many such foundations. The history of U.S. Foreign Assistance is replete with several such experiences, and with varied levels of success.

I am a product of this partnership in Ethiopia.

Today, "Institution Building" is considered a good but a very expensive undertaking. But is it really?

The U.S. Land Grant University model brought the best in our Colleges of Agriculture in the pursuit of mission-oriented science. This was true both here and abroad. The model was responsible for the success of the agricultural revolution that laid the foundation for the subsequent advances made. It produced great results and succeeded wherever it was given real chance.

As the agricultural landscape of the United States has changed, there are debates on if the model is still relevant or if there is sufficient stakeholder base that is broad enough to justify the necessary resource support to keep it as functional as it once was. I argue that, yes, it is. But, we may need to examine the classic Land Grant Model and look for ways to modify it in light of the changing landscape.

It is a profound and timeless concept. What we teach has changed with time and society. But the concept of "discovery with delivery" that is central to the Land Grant University model, and the expectation of service to humanity from our colleges and universities should remain alive and well.

In light of the current reemergence of the need and stature of our great tradition of public service in this country, we need to repackage the model to fit the needs of today and not replace it with the assumption that the concept is obsolete.

As the global food crisis continues to grow, so does the importance of land-grant institution—and all of higher education—involvement in international agriculture.

Today, science is changing rapidly and new findings and new technologies are emerging at a fast pace. New knowledge is emerging from the traditional powerhouses, such as universities in North America and Western Europe. New knowledge is also coming from the newly emerging economic and scientific powerhouses of China, India, and Brazil. The opportunities for partnerships in educational programs, scientific research, as well as public-public and public-private partnerships with collaborators from around the world are becoming readily available. The justifications for building these partnerships are strong.

Today, we are being faced with a series of seemingly intractable grand challenges. These include the imposing problems that the issue of climate change, and as well, the existing but growing challenges such as increasing demand on our energy supplies, the impact on our environment of our use of energy sources, the looming water crisis, and the added complexity to international trade. We have, seemingly unanimously, and perhaps appropriately, dubbed these challenges as "global challenges". These problems are growing and looming to be grander than ever before both for their relevance to agriculture and for their ramifications on the natural resources and on our environment.

As scientists, we have the additional challenge of the extent to which we can assess and model how real these challenges in climate, renewable energy, and lowering of the aquifer have become. We have the additional challenge of the nexus between and among the grand challenges and agriculture, and by extension with food security.

We have the additional challenge of developing the skill sets to develop adaptation and/or mitigation measures to counter them.

We have the additional challenge also of whether and how to develop a more holistic and integrative approaches to tackle these series of emerging and growing grand challenges.

And particularly, we have the additional challenge of imparting to policy makers, the urgency for increased investments in science of agriculture and the science of natural resource conservation and management of our environment now, and not after these problems worsen and get out of hand.

Meeting the grand challenges will require revitalization of the Land Grant ideals and the commensurate resolve associated with them.

A revitalization of the agricultural sciences is badly needed to avert another food crisis and to assure global food security.

I am certain that, with some rethinking, the available talent can be mobilized to effectively address these complex problems with current and future breakthroughs in our sciences.

I am hopeful that these commitments being made for international technical assistance will be met by commitments from national governments for domestic agricultural research both in the U.S. and other countries.

Let me conclude by reiterating an important nugget of my message. The problems of agriculture and global food security are becoming increasingly complex, requiring more holistic and integrated approaches to solving them. First and foremost, they will require that we recognize the need and the urgency, that we reaffirm our commitments to science-based solutions, that we revitalize the agricultural sciences at our public institutions, and that we rekindle the sense of purpose espoused in the wisdom of the Land Grant University model, and---suffuse these with the highest level of policy advocacy that we can muster.

Discussion

Rather than responding to the keynote address, Bob Easter asked if they could first ask some questions.

Scott Christensen from USAID noted that it was mentioned that India has made a lot of progress, yet there are still 200-300 million people there who are still in dire poverty. He asked Gebisa Ejeta how he would go about addressing that need in India. Gebisa Ejeta maintained that agricultural research and development evolutionally proceeds in an organic way depending on the country and culture. He was impressed with advancements in India. He then stated that the constraints to agriculture can be divided into, on one hand, problems that can be addressed with conventional sciences; there are also some of the more intractable problems that require a higher level of science that India is grappling with. Then, on the other hand, there are the social political issues that arise, and as seen here and in other countries, as part of the growing development processes there are going to be some divides in the economy where the poorer level of society is going to take a longer time to get out of. Gebisa Ejeta stated that he would like to focus on the more positive that has taken place in India rather than the hanging problems.

Walter Bowen expressed concern about the lack of trained people in the pipeline. Gebisa Ejeta stated that nothing bothers him more than the declining human capacity in developing countries. The cost of providing social education has increased. It is not like the past, in that they are making significant investments, but the infusion of students is just so large, but it is happening with a much weakened faculty. A lot can be done alone, but one thing that cannot be done is to build capacity – there needs to be found a way to do that. One myth that he is trying to break is about the cost; it is not as expensive as it is thought. All universities want to be global universities; there must be benefits, creative ways of engaging, so that the cost to funders is not as great – ways to make it more beneficial to get involved. The perpetuity of the mediocrity that exists is one danger of not doing that; also, our own capacity will decline.

Bob Easter then presented a USAID medallion as a small token of appreciation for coming today. He then strongly encouraged Gebisa Ejeta to use every opportunity to share that message that he shared with them today. Bob Easter echoed the importance of a delivery system, the

application of science, moving into technology beyond the laboratory into application that was mentioned in the presentation. He also noted the importance of what Gebisa Ejeta said about the complexity of the case today, even in comparison to the 1960s; urbanization has added a whole dimension to this complexity.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

David Hansen of Ohio State University and APLU raised the question of how to approach assistance in Haiti, and in particular how to engage the land-grant universities in the process. He suggested considering how to also incorporate into this framework the institutions that reside in the neighboring country of the Dominican Republic. They also have institutions such as Universidad ISA (created by Texas A&M with involvement from other U.S. universities), which has a large number of Haitian students there who have done technical assistance in Haiti. He emphasized thinking through from a regional perspective how to engage Dominican institutions as well.

Elsa Murano added that not only is it important to get Haitian input, but there is also a wealth of regional knowledge.

The meeting then adjourned for lunch, during which time the Board met in a closed executive session.

MESSAGE FROM AND COMMENDATION TO PAUL FINDLEY, AUTHOR OF TITLE XII

Bob Easter opened the afternoon session by introducing Ron Senykoff, who explained outreach efforts they were taking on behalf of BIFAD. He then read a message from Paul Findley who was the principal author of the Title XII legislation. The former member of Congress appreciated the contact from BIFAD and the invitation to the meeting, and hoped to attend one in the future; he also mentioned in his note Dr. Jiryis Oweis, who was with BIFAD program and who recently retired from USAID. Ron Senykoff recommended that BIFAD take a decision to recognize Mr. Findley.

H.H. Barlow moved that BIFAD commend Mr. Findley and what is his creation of the Board. The motion was seconded, voted on, and passed unanimously.

AGRICULTURAL CAPACITY BUILDING THROUGH U.S. LONG TERM TRAINING: OBSERVATIONS AND RESULTS OF USAID LTT PROGRAM EVALUATION

Bob Easter introduced the team involved in the USAID Long-Term Training (LTT) Program Evaluation.

Overview (Andrew C. Gilboy, Team Leader, Evaluation and Capacity Development Specialist, Associates for Global Change, Takoma Park, Maryland)

Andrew Gilboy noted that team involved in the USAID Long-Term Training (LTT) Program Evaluation was an unusual team, with two USAID staff, a professor, and a capacity building specialist. The team's task was to review the features of different long-term U.S. graduate degree training programs in agriculture for Africans in an effort to identify those elements that are particularly effective in building the capacity of African agricultural institutions. He also noted that the keynote presenter that morning, could not have laid better groundwork for what this team has done. USAID anticipates using the results of this work in planning capacity-development activities under the new food security funding.

The team developed some best practices based on their review of a number of programs, which will be shared today. They did not conduct in-depth evaluations of these programs – although they will include comments about them in their report. They also recognize that the findings and recommendations are relevant and applicable to other parts of the world and even other sectors, although the focus here was only on African agricultural institutions.

Andrew Gilboy first reviewed the background to the study, looking at what happened to LTT and the rise and fall of USAID LTT for Africans. He then reviewed the task of the study as a multi-program assessment to identify effective design elements, establish best practices for program design, and build a toolkit to help USAID missions incorporate best practices into implementation designs for local capacity building.

The U.S. degree training programs assessed included:

- USAID Initiative for Long-Term Training & Capacity Building (UILTCB – MSU)
- Long-term Training for Regional Agricultural Development in East Africa (MSU & OSU)
- Linking Biotechnology/Bioengineering with Mali-based Agribusiness (Montana State)
- Strengthening Agricultural and Environmental Capacity through Distance Education (SAEC-DE – Univ of Florida)
- Borlaug LEAP Fellows Program (UCDavis)
- Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSPs)
- Other Training Programs

The first three were the BIFAD-initiated pilot programs; the next two were innovative programs that were also reviewed. The team was glad that the CRSPs were included in the programs reviewed for best practices, given their decades of activity in this area. Other training programs reviewed included bilateral, regionally-funded & non-USAID-funded USG programs.

After reviewing the sources of data collected, he noted that for this effort the term "capacity building" meant included: looking at systems rather than individuals; an institutional approach, using Human and Institutional Capacity Development or HICD (Performance Approach); and a long-term perspective.

Integrating HICD has to begin in the planning process that may be the purview of USAID missions within AID; but the U.S. partner institution should know the framework within which long-term training will be occurring. HICD involves:

- Performance-based approach to guide capacity-building interventions

- Institutional gap analysis drives program design and implementation
- Participant training is one tool in institutional capacity building

Findings and Recommendations (Cornelia Butler Flora, Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Sociology & Agriculture and Life Sciences, Iowa State University)

Cornelia Flora stated that the findings were highly integrated. She first reviewed the value of U.S. Graduate Study:

- Availability of courses outside research focus – much broader that gives them a greater perspective to address complex problems
- Course work requires interaction with other students and class presentations (and at professional meetings) – need to anticipate what others will have to say; graded on participation
- Critical thinking encouraged (they did not use this term but we summarized it)
- Problem solving through team work
- Learning environment includes farmers, industry and advocacy groups - a real world environment

There are three types of participants in LTT programs: African institutions, African participants, and US partner universities. African institutions involved included NARS, faculties of agriculture, Ministries, and NGOs; for a university to be included they need to meet several conditions. Also, if the missions decide to support capacity building in a particular institution, the institutions should be willing to undertake a Performance Gap Analysis with help from the Mission.

She then described characteristics of African Participants that maximize institutional capacity building, as well as findings on what makes a good US partner university. She emphasized the importance of USAID promoting institutional linkages, outlining specific ways for this to happen. Pre-departure support to participants is also important to ensure equity in selection and sufficient pre-departure preparation for graduate study. There is a need to ensure that francophone (or lusophone) participants are selected based on their ability to succeed in graduate study (strong science and math) rather than their current English competency.

Regarding whether training should be at the Masters or PhD level, the balance between PhD and MS varies, and depends on the African institution's strategic plan, build institutional capacity, and legitimate institutional function for MS.

Cornelia Flora emphasized that for discussion today, what they are particularly interested in is other questions that they need to answer. The goal of this is part of USAID's attempts to increase food security. The team believes that many of the findings are true for parts of the world other than Africa as well. Attention to these three parts of the reflection process – the Mission's institution, participant, U.S. institution – becomes an important prelude for setting up creative programs that will do this purpose-based education, research, and outreach to increase food security in Africa

Discussion

Bill DeLauder stated that long-term training is an issue that has been brewing in the minds of the Board in all the years that he has been on it, and it is also a point of frustration because of the need for sustainability. For Africa to become self sufficient there is a need for institutions that allow them to train their own people, and get away from countries in Africa needing other countries to train their people. He asked if this was just the first part of an evaluation, and whether the team will actually look at some programs and do an evaluation.

Andrew Gilboy explained they were really looking for best practices. He also commented on having institutions built so they can train their own people. When they went to these institutions, while in the past there had been a stigma against receiving a degree in Africa, they found among young people (anecdotally, not as hard evidence) that there was much less stigma; this is a very important change. To what extent can we add value to that with our investments? Linkages and partnerships between US and African universities are what they hope to see built.

Bill DeLauder noted that there were some elements mentioned that he and some others recognized as essential: making sure they could use that research; recognizing that they need that support back home; that they work on relevant research; that they are able to come back and have the resources to work on it. He then asked the speakers to comment on the CRSPs and their mode of training.

Cornelia Flora stated that the CRSPs have granted the most masters and PhDs than any other program. Many were awarded from African institutions – and every student was in a partnership with an African and a U.S. university to do that. Through that pattern CRSPs were able to make sure the research was linked to an African problem, were able to give the student the kind of mentoring needed, and even if they got their degree in Africa, the participants still spoke proudly of their trips to professional meetings in the U.S. where they could keep building that education, given that science knowledge changes so rapidly. Also, their mentors would be there in Africa often. These were the real strengths, both institutional and individual.

Bob Easter stated that his understanding was that that was not a primary mission of the CRSPs, to train and do capacity building. Tim Williams said that one of the foundations of the CRSPs is to do institutional capacity building integrated with the research. Evaluation Team Member Bhavani Pathak (Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor) explained that in their annual report, CRSPs do have to report how many are trained at the local level, in terms of local capacity building; how many are trained at the various levels, at workshops in country, to various kinds of graduate degrees in-country and in the U.S. or in third countries. Bob Easter commented that this sounded like a persuasive argument that the CRSP model is a very effective mechanism and perhaps should be considered for expansion in terms of doing capacity building.

Bill DeLauder asked if the team looked at the "sandwich programs" where individuals are partly trained in the U.S. and partly trained in their own country. Andrew Gilboy stated that the concept appeals to them a lot. When an African participant travels to the US, there needs to be ways built in to keep that participant grounded in their own home institution. It is not even a cost issue; it is essential to keep up, do research with, and understand the politics of that institution. Another evaluation team member noted that from the Borlaug LEAP program, participants are

much more likely to finish the dissertation if they are in the US, rather than if they are at home with so many distractions. They are allowed to do research on their own, spend time with their advisors, and write up the research in the US.

Bill DeLauder noted first, that another reason for looking at innovative approaches was to address the issue of cost – it did cost too much to bring individuals to the U.S. for the full five years. Regarding the institutional context, there was a slide that said "that PhD training in itself will not build capacity," that they also cannot build capacity without PhD training. Andrew Gilboy responded that occasionally they felt that there were requests for more PhDs to replace outgoing, but there wasn't a strategic plan. Cornelia Flora added that USAID is not going to support their research for the rest of their lives, that they have to be self-supporting, and that is where the PhD training and institutional partnerships come in.

Evaluation team member Ron Raphael (Evaluation & Capacity Development Specialist, EGAT Bureau) noted that regarding cost they are always wrestling with quantity vs. quality. The strong message that the team is going to send is that there is a need to look at capacity issues, and at quality over quantity. Now the purpose of the study is to convince the Missions that they need to take as broad of an approach as possible with these institutions; the team is also are ready to suggest that solutions can come from broadening the training programs, so a person comes back with not just a Masters and PhD, but also some other skills. This used to be done a lot in the 1980s, when holidays were used to bring together participants to give them training; this has fallen away and needs to be brought back.

Cornelia Flora commented that some of the things that saved money were also best practices. Another piece of this is to make sure that a well-designed program actually gets the funds needed to implement it.

Tim Williams appreciated the recommendation that programs looks at capacity building elements, and added that a good program also needs to address the technology.

Deborah Rubin thanked the team for a good articulation of what seems to be working, and asked if, within the scope of the study, they had been able to look at design features related to women's participation. Andrew Gilboy stated that the sandwich programs allow flexibility and enable women to participate more frequently. They had interviewed a lot of women, and the stories were quite moving of the sacrifices made. Programs need to allow for those needs and come up with the extra funding to do so. Cornelia Flora gave an example of a woman in Mali, where the Mission had the funds to pay for child care, but there was no mechanism within USAID for them to pay for it. Part of the team's recommendations will be that if there is a willing payer, with all other things in place, that there needs to be a mechanism for doing this.

The team was amazed at some of the incredible women they talked to. In Anglophone Africa, the AWARD program brings women together with both men and women for increasing their science, increasing their ability to work in a team. So many of the people interviewed were either mentors or participants. One person said that as a participant of this specific program aimed at her ability to work in teams, when she disagreed, this helped her say so. The male

mentors also undergo a leadership part of the mentor program. This is an exciting part if more could link to it.

Gary Bitner of USAID said that the timing of this assessment is very good, with the HICD policy passed in January of 2009; this assessment helps them understand this. He asked the team that, in the interviews of 132 people, did they come across the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa (PHEA) a foundation-funded program really focused on faculty development? Do they bring something to the table that is really useful for us to use? (Sue Grant Lewis is a contact person with PHEA.)

Andrew Gilboy replied that this was a good suggestion, and that they will make sure to contact them. The team did talk to Rockefeller participants, and Gates, and they did visit the Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture (RUFORUM), a BIFAD-linked organization, coming together with foundations – a perfect opportunity to build cross-African alliances. It is based in Kampala, linked to 13 or more faculties and is a fascinating institution that does African based training only.

Bhavani Pathak stated that this whole issue of providing support afterwards is not only recognized internally, but some of the other foundations are doing this, understanding the importance of providing financial support and linkages. This is something that USAID has recognized but has not acted upon as much as others.

Jim Hill of UC Davis asked if the team explored dual degree programs, recognizing that there may be concerns about quality. Andrew Gilboy responded that one program is a Cornell program with the degree granted in University of Ghana, Legon but with Cornell's curriculum intervention; this is run in South Africa as well – though this program is not a dual degree. Jim Hill stated that Cornell does have a dual degree program in India.

Bill DeLauder asked if there was a regional program supported by USAID. Andrew Gilboy said that one of the BIFAD pilots was associated with the RUFORUM program in East Africa, for Ghana, Kenya and Tanzania faculties of agriculture.

In terms of next steps, Ron Raphael explained that after the evaluation team submit their report, Missions will need to decide how they will use these findings in their programs. They have the money coming down and they have the tools to make it easy to apply. The Missions are already very eager for their help in implementing this. Bob Easter asked if BIFAD action would be helpful.

Ray Miller commented that CRSPs have spent a lot of time building institutions, and one of the key factors was when they passed money to those institutions they would have to learn how to manage and use that money. There needs to be attention given to building the institutions as you are training people. Andrew Gilboy stated that LTT is but one element of capacity building; there is also what role that individual will play in building the institution back home, looking at the knowledge skills and behavior changes, to make sure those can be actualized back home in building institution.

David Hansen stated that his responsibilities related to the African US Higher Education Initiative, where they sent out an RFA that received 300 applications for planning grants for building partnerships between African & U.S. institutions. The starting point was building a strategic plan. Six of the planning grants that were funded have to do with agriculture and food security. Those have been funded. He mentioned this because USAID has substantial funding for food security issues. It would be interesting if they were to do another solicitation for proposals dealing just with agriculture and food security – and if they could engage the Missions in identifying the partnerships. He also brought it up there to give momentum to the Lugar Casey Bill. This may be something they want to explore, and BIFAD can help with this.

BOARD RESOLUTION: ALIGNMENT OF BIFAD'S SUB-COMMITTEE THE STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP FOR AGRICULTURE AND EDUCATION/SPARE (TIM RABON, BIFAD MEMBER)

Tim Rabon stated that the past three years has been a period of revitalization and reflection of agricultural development assistance for USAID and U.S. agricultural universities alike. The 2007/2008 food crisis has underlined the importance that global food security holds to U.S. national security and economic interests. Funding levels for international agriculture development have been increased and USAID is now operating under a "whole of government" development programming paradigm. U.S. agricultural universities on the other hand are operating under stringent budget constraints and are reevaluating the role that international agriculture S&T cooperation will play in their future. Hence, clarity of BIFAD purpose to mobilize the capacities of U.S. agricultural universities to strengthen agricultural economies in the developing countries as called for under Title XII is imperative. A first step is to return to basic BIFAD subordinate unit structures that call for a separation of programming policy and programming operations.

After extensive consultation and reflection, the Board has decided to begin to move in the direction provided for in Title XII. Accordingly, he moved the following:

MOTION: The Strategic Partnership for Agricultural Research and Education be dissolved and that, consistent with Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act, the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development consider the establishment of a Joint Operations Committee "to assist in and advise on the mechanisms and processes for implementation of activities described" in the Title XII legislation.

He further moved that:

Within 120 days of passage of this resolution, BIFAD staff, including those in the Office of Development Partners and those available through the BIFAD Cooperative Agreement, provide a draft framework for a Joint Operations Committee to the Board for review so the Board can present a proposal at its next public meeting. Staff shall consult widely and may include several options for the Board's consideration.

On behalf of BIFAD, he thanked current and past members of SPARE for their hard work and outstanding achievements. SPARE has proved to be a valuable asset to the Board and has

conducted CRSP reviews, provided recommendations on the Subcontractor rule, conducted analyses on Title XII and Title XII institutions, provided support for food security reviews, and helped in meaningful and tangible ways on many, many other activities. He also extended a personal thanks to Sandra Russo who has provided strong leadership to SPARE over the past several years.

H.H. Barlow seconded the motion, and it was opened for discussion.

Ray Miller stated that he has been involved with SPARE for several years. Initially he and Deborah Rubin were involved in reviews of CRSPs, and then he served on SPARE for several years. SPARE was structured with a focus on agriculture. Today they were talking about whole government; they also need to be talking about whole food security, not just agriculture. However BIFAD restructures, it has to include all of the factors needed to address food security. He suggested to BIFAD that they have a good background on this, starting with the Rubin report and other reports.

Bill DeLauder clarified that the action will dissolve SPARE, but does not created the new committee, but when the report comes back the Board will decide on whether or not this is where it want to go. Tim Rabon stated that this will provide for creating a draft framework for that Joint Operations Committee.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

UPDATES: TITLE XII REPORT & PLANS FY 2009 AND ON THE BUMPERS AMENDMENT (JOHN BECKER, SENIOR AGRICULTURAL POLICY ADVISOR, BIFAD SECRETARIAT, USAID)

Update on the FY 2009 Title XII Report

Bob Easter introduced John Becker's presentation, noting the impressive effort he put into understanding Title XII. John Becker explained that some of the slides repeated the presentation made at an earlier BIFAD meeting in Des Moines. This update on the FY 2009 Title XII Report would cover:

- Title XII Report Requirements
- Prior Title XII Reporting
- FY 09 Report – A New Baseline
- Process Schedule

Title XII Report Requirements

John Becker first reviewed the Title XII Report Requirements. Section 300 of Title XII requires an annual report to be provided by USAID to Congress due September 1 of each year; a separate view from BIFAD may be included. The report details activities in the preceding fiscal year (e.g. the September 1, 2010 report covers Title XII activities in FY 2009); and is to contain a projection of programs and activities in subsequent five years (e.g. the September 1, 2010 Title XII report will cover the period FY 2010-2014).

In terms of the Title XII BIFAD report requirements, the report shall contain a summary of the activities of the BIFAD as established pursuant to Section 298 of Title XII; this section spells out that the report may also include the separate views of the BIFAD on the programs that were conducted or being proposed.

Prior Title XII Reporting

Prior Title XII reporting was on section 103 and 103A (all agricultural activities and programs). Because there was an ag program, not an earmark, the way USAID communicated on agriculture was through the Title XII report. Title XII Section 297 activities and programs are identified, and of all Title XII Section 297 categories, with a clear emphasis on CRSPs. The Title XII proportion of annual agricultural funding remained ambiguous because there really was not a sense what Title XII activities were. FY 09 was a Title XII transition period, with USAID responsibility for the report was moving to ODP; increasing funds; a new food security strategy initiated; and BIFAD activities continuing to expand.

FY 09 Report – A New Baseline

John Becker emphasized that the FY 09 Title XII report is an opportunity for a new baseline. Title XII activities and programs could expand substantially in the near term if Title XII performance is demonstrated. The 2009 Title XII report provides an opportunity to establish both a resource and a performance baseline to measure future year activity and program growth.

What is required in this baseline included clarification of Title XII in terms of its activities and programs by ends, ways and means; its funding levels in relation to total agricultural funding; and its contribution to the global hunger and food security initiative and climate change strategies. Title XII defined by ends focused on achieving mutual goals among nations as well as the mobilization of the capacities of U.S. land-grant universities and their partners. Title XII defined by ways related to implementing program components through U.S. universities that meet specific conditions. Title XII defined by means referred to sources and types of funds received. John Becker noted here that the basic point is what denotes a Title XII activity and how it is tracked depends on how this is viewed; they are going back to General Counsel to get a reading on this.

He then provided details about current and future Title XII funding and discussed reporting on Title XII performance.

Schedule of FY 09 Title XII Report

John Becker detailed the schedule of FY 09 Title XII report, and the processes involved. During the second quarter, the outline of the report will be prepared, and data collection and analysis conducted. The third quarter would involve drafting and clearing the report, with the roll-out of the report completed in the fourth quarter. He emphasized that the important things was to establish a baseline with this report and then to get it out there.

The Bumpers Amendment Update

What is the Bumpers Amendment?

John Becker explained that the Bumpers Amendment is an Amendment to a 1986 Appropriations Act (PL 99-349) by Senator Dale Bumpers from Arkansas. It is based on the principle that U.S. taxpayer revenues should not be used in a manner that results in their own injury. Major grain and oilseed commodity groups led the effort to pass this. The Bumpers Amendment is specific language that requires no foreign assistance funds to be made available to increase agricultural commodities that will compete with U.S. crop exports except for specific conditions related to food insecurity.

Bumpers is implemented through the introduction of Bumpers language is introduced each year as part of the annual appropriations process. USAID introduces the language into the annual checklist that serves as a trigger to identify if a Bumpers analysis for potential injury is required. The analysis that is required is complex.

The Bumpers Amendment does not stand alone. USAID in 1978 introduced PD 71 that requires analysis of potential injury anytime USAID supports sugar, palm oil or citrus for exports. USAID in 1986 (in response to Bumpers) introduced PD 15 that outlines the specific analysis required prior to any assistance to support agricultural export development.

When a reference is made to Bumpers, the initial response to Bumpers is statutory and must adhere to the law as written each year. The subsequent response to Bumpers is USAID policy and must adhere to PD 71 and/or PD 15 as appropriate.

What is new?

- Global Food Crisis of 2007/2008 has triggered commitments to agricultural development.
- U.S. Commitment calls for $3.5 billion over a three year period (FY 2010-2012).
- The increase is substantial and has again raised concern about potential injury.

Implications for Title XII programming and BIFAD's role

Important implications for Title XII programming include

- Investments in agricultural STI while critical to domestic food security must also be examined in the context of regional and international trade
- The range of agricultural commodities to be considered by Bumpers will increase (e.g. The Catfish War)
- Title XII research collaboration should include close collaboration with U.S. private sector partners to head-off problems a priori.

The problem is that analysis can be complicated and time-consuming and out of proportion with the magnitude of the issue itself – an issue of costs and inefficiencies. Solid projects will be avoided by risk adverse program managers. The issue is that of loss and reduced program effectiveness.

John Becker then outlined what BIFAD can do to address the issue:

- Analysis of the current Title XII programming subject to potential injury to clarify current policy and rules.
- Increased recognition of sensitive commodities that might be subject to potential injury inquiry.
- Identification of policy changes for Bumpers analysis (de minimus and green box exceptions)

Discussion

Bob Easter noted that he was familiar with the Bumpers Amendment, having been in the crossfire with soybeans in the 1980s.

Deborah Rubin appreciated John Becker's presentation of Title XII issues. She suggested that clarification of Title XII include the actors in addition to the ends, ways, and means. One of the Board's responsibilities includes a roster of Title XII universities; this is a good question that they will have to address it. Title XII talks about land-grant universities, but others do a lot of agriculture work, and that will need attention.

Tim Williams asked if the Title XII report will count universities that are subcontracted to others. John Becker stated that they have so many funding issues (e.g., with CG funding around 80% goes back to universities); they will have to go to them and ask what obligations they have made. They are currently taking a position that a subcontract to an individual at a university without an MOU would not count; but if the host country gets a grant that goes to a US university, they will count that. They will have to chase after that – that will not be recorded in the Phoenix system, so it does get a little dicey, the idea is to count as Title XII anything that meets the ends, the ways, and the means and is not precluded by that. For example, WINNER through Chemonics is tougher to determine.

One person in the audience noted appreciating the Bumpers presentation, there is a time factor involved; over the next the next six to twelve months, many of the missions will be trying to lay out plans with those country partners on how to spend the greater part of the food security money for the next two to three years. So if we are extremely risk adverse in the next six to twelve months because of what has been raised on Bumpers, this may have very serious implications for the future.

Bob Easter noted that this was an important point and that while they as a Board may not be prepared to take action on this now, they may need to do that before the next regular meeting.

STATUS REPORTS: UNIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT IN AFGHANISTAN—AGRICULTURAL STRATEGY

AF-PAK Trilateral Proceedings, USAID and USDA Actions (James E. Hill, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, California)

In reporting on the AF-PAK Trilateral Proceedings, Jim Hill explained that he was a member of the AFPAK Subcommittee on Food Security, which was part of the fusion group of USAID/USDA/DOD and one of the Trilateral Working Groups; other related groups included one on Agricultural Trade Corridors, and one on Water Management and Water Rehabilitation. They held a good meeting in Qatar in January of 2010.

There is a common thread here with what has been discussed today in terms of capacity building and opportunities for U.S. university involvement. Clearly, looking at some of the priority areas, the U.S. universities can play a very important role.

He listed the co-chairs and some of the U.S.-based members of each of the three groups, explaining that he and others are there in an advisory capacity, and that there are members from the private sector as well as the public sector. He noted that the lists of members provided in his slide only show the U.S. representatives; not listed are approximately four members each from Afghanistan and from Pakistan.

He then talked about themes from country presentations, explaining that their charge was to understand the priorities of those from Afghanistan and Pakistan. It is important to note that the critical issue was capacity building, particularly from Afghanis. The needs highlighted were for capacity building, institutional strengthening (physical structures, equipment and technology), and outreach to rural areas. Also important are the connections between Pakistan and Afghanistan.

He described the priority areas for strengthening for each of the three groups. For the Agricultural Trade Corridors group, these are to improve educational resources and human capacity that will facilitate trade development, and improve sanitary and phytosanitary services to ensure safe food; and to facilitate the development of commodity trade associations. For the Food Security group, priority areas are crop production and protection, livestock production, and extension services. For the Water Management and Water Rehabilitation group, these areas are the efficient use and conservation of water for agriculture; soil and water conservations practices; and demonstration projects and capacity building (on-farm work/extension**).**

Looking at the priorities in all three groups it is obvious that there is a critical role for universities. The question is, can we be there?

He then talked about their short-term vs. long-term goals. The immediate task of the food security working group is to put together a plan for 2010; however, building food security is a long term process. While their immediate work plan is for the next year, the group will continue to map out longer term approaches. In conclusion, he strongly recommended that APLU and BIFAD continue to be involved this group.

Otto J. Gonzalez, Senior Agricultural Advisor and USDA Liaison, Office of the Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, U.S. Department of State

Otto Gonzalez explained that the overall idea of having these trilateral groups is really twofold:

1) To actually have Afghanistan and Pakistan cooperating and collaborating on these positive activities, given the existing tension, and
2) To have on the ground achievements that they can both point to and feel good about.

The US role is to facilitate and make sure that they have a way to come together. There are funds to support the tri trilateral group process – one million now and three million in the next few years. The idea is not to do large programs, but to provide information for these large programs. For both Afghanistan and Pakistan, the vast majority of funds are being programmed for USAID, though there are funds coming to USDA; now that there is a whole of government approach, USDA is playing a larger role.

The trilateral activities really serve as a way to provide useful activities to influence some of the upcoming programs. Probably one of areas that will rise to the top in sequencing will be to provide border procedures on the movement of goods back and forth.

What is coming up next is that Pakistan will be hosting the Afghan participants and some US participants at certain sites in Pakistan where they may pilot water saving activities. In the case of strengthening food security, there will be a conference on foot and mouth disease, and another on protecting wheat.

With respect to capacity building, there is a commitment to capacity building, and a large amount of that has been there in the past. With Afghanistan, the focus is on increasing jobs and increasing confidence in the government. Still to be determined is how best to build the capacity. It seems that this would be a very strong area of collaboration for US universities. He had a recent meeting on that with Mike McGirr at the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA), who was there in the room; Otto Gonzalez asked him to comment on this.

Mike McGirr explained that in this teleconference they actually discussed the dollar amounts that USDA would be getting to support things like capacity building, water management, etc.; and they talked about a scheduled mechanism for distributing those funds. It is premature to get into discussing the amounts but overall USDA is expecting about $40 million, but a lot of that will be spent in the field, but there are still opportunities for capacity building activities for U.S. land-grant universities.

Otto Gonzalez then explained that the center of gravity of programs for Afghanistan has shifted to Afghanistan, where it should be. The number of USDA and USAID field staff there is increasing considerably, with a greater emphasis on working with Afghan institutions, particularly the government, but also others. So the Washington role in capacity building is going to be responding to some of these needs that are identified in the field. It will be a very short focus on building the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock's capacity, and that is where at least for the present the capacity building funds will be focused.

On the educational side, there is interest in the higher education universities, but the strongest interest is more for the vocational end, but certainly there is a role for land-grant universities. Much of the population is below the age of 15, and a lot are moving into the workforce with inadequate training to build the agricultural infrastructure.

Discussion

Tim Rabon asked how much trade is going on between the two countries today. Otto Gonzalez stated that he did not have numbers but there was a whole lot; Afghanistan and Pakistan are strong trading partners, but not through legitimate entry points. Tracking and customs revenue are important issues. Pakistan is Afghanistan's main trading partner both through legitimate and illegitimate trade. Afghanistan sees India as one of its main trading partners for horticulture. Pakistan and Afghanistan are looking to have a new trade agreement soon; once signed, will allow easier transit through Pakistan to India.

Elsa Murano noted that obviously a lot of similarities between Afghanistan and Pakistan; with Afghanistan there are some main differences as well. She has heard about poppy production, and asked how do they switch them from that, and what incentives are in place to help them make that shift. Otto Gonzalez explained that part of the incentive is the improved productivity. It has often been said that you really cannot beat poppy – but you can. He provided a few examples. In early 2009, the Office of Drugs and Crime published an opium survey, where they had asked in 2008 why farmers switched from opium poppies; the main reason was that wheat prices were higher. This year, looking at 2009, they asked southern farmers why they switched, and the reason was the low price of opium relative to other crops. This past year, the Governor of Helmand launched a food zone plan, if farmers agreed not to grow poppies, they were provided seed and fertilizer; this dropped opium production in the Helmand food zone by 33%. It is known that farmers will move to the higher value products. They have made the switch. This is very important from a horticultural perspective.

Jim Hill commented that they have worked on the cold chain requirements, which are really critical.

Bill DeLauder asked about the Taliban factor, and whether they put pressure on the farmers to grow poppies. Otto Gonzalez stated that the thought is that as overall security is brought, once farmers know that they can move, then they will switch. As soon as areas are secured, they can bring in the civilian programs immediately, with activities that have the different ministries providing services.

Jim Hill showed a slide listing the US university presence in Afghanistan to include the following:

- Peace Project—UCD, TAMU; livestock
- AWATT—NMSU, CSU, UICI, UICI; Water
- A4—Purdue, KSU, UCD, Cornell; Higher Ed
- USDA FAS—UCD, Purdue, Cornell; Extension
- Afghan e-Quality Alliance—WSU, U. Hartford
- DfID—WSU; Rural Development

He did note that of all those projects, the only one that will continue after this year is the one by New Mexico State University.

Ray Miller asked what their internet capacity is like, noting that they worked in Uzbekistan and a lot in the North Caucasus, and just a few years ago did not have capacity to do teleconferences.

The Uzbekis reported that they have trained over 200 people through teleconferencing since then. They have been putting up conferences in the North Caucasus and trained over 2500. He emphasized that if there is the internet capacity, they can train many people. Jim Hill explained that with the military there, the bandwidth is increasing. They are trying to present general information on horticulture. The potential is there, but he was not sure if bandwidth is ready for teleconferencing.

OPERATIONAL AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES—REPORTS (CONTINUED)

Looking Back and Looking Ahead: The USAID/BIFAD Partnership (Carol Grigsby, Deputy Director, USAID, Office of Development Partners)

In introducing Carol Grigsby, Bob Easter thanked her for being there, and asked her to convey thanks to Karen Turner as well.

Carol Grigsby noted that she attended her first BIFAD meeting about a year ago, and it was good to be looking at how far they have come over the last year and more, to really alter the approach at USAID and BIFAD. One thing that has come through today has been the building of institutional capacity of government and of higher education institutions. Those at ODP have been working with BIFAD to reshape their partnership in strategic directions.

Once significant event was the 2008 Conference of Deans. This conference expanded participation and brought in the white paper that served as a basis of one of the more significant discussions that has taken place in the last few years. Last year the second Conference of Deans analyzed the underpinnings of the food security policy, with both policy makers and deans present. These Conferences of Deans (which they hope are now becoming an annual event) have provided input into an MOU.

Why is this MOU needed? Over the years, the relationship has not moved in a strategic direction. They wanted a document that would focus on strategic direction. They now have that document that focuses on food security and agricultural development, climate change, youth and education in the developing world, USAID technical capacity at this end, and higher education in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

The MOU was discussed at the last board meeting, and they had thought that they would be signing it then. Now that they have a new Administrator, they need to be able to get his attention and his input; thus it just was not possible to have it ready for this meeting. She did hope to have it ready for signing in the next few months.

She noted that they just heard a lot about the Af Pak work. A concrete role that BIFAD can be instrumental in is in pulling together a strategic meeting of those universities with experience in Afghanistan to provide input into what needs to be done. She hoped that will lead to a meeting later this spring that will pull in the Afghan and Pakistani university community along with the governments, BIFAD, USAID Mission in Kabul, to really look intensively beyond some of the

shorter term emphasis on greater visibility and cooperation, to those longer term capacity building activities.

These are some really formidable accomplishments to build on. Moving forward, what is very critical is for BIFAD to have the agile structure to respond and move quickly on issues. Today we have begun to build on some program structure and operational changes in BIFAD; the thought is to have a new generation in the type of structure that BIFAD needs.

She congratulated Bill DeLauder for his leadership with MSIs. She noted that on Haiti obviously, with the establishment of the BIFAD Task Force, the emphasis is going to be put on establishing higher education in Haiti not just to rebuild but to really build toward a new kind of horizon in Haiti. I was amazed to then hear Elsa Murano say they already made a certain number of decisions about how to move forward, and how organized the task force is, and in bringing in the involvement of the partners on the ground, the Haitian government, the university community of Haiti and in the region, and others. She was confident that Paul Weisenfeld and others will really benefit from the task force's input.

As Dr. Ejeta and others have put forward, there is a surge in funding and attention to really address food security issues. It is so critical that they all seize this moment to see that there is a concomitant surge in science-based inputs into food security and agricultural development. Moments like this must be seized, because there is also great attention on the monitoring and the evaluation of these sorts of efforts; hard facts will be needed to demonstrate success in these areas and show the linkages. What Ben Swartley had to say about the systems kinds of approaches will be important. They will be taking a good look at this also in the context of the Title XII report to be sure the monitoring and evaluation pieces are there.

Just as the first Conference of Deans set the tone, it is hoped that the upcoming Conference of Deans could produce a white paper or similar type of document that can begin to help on the implementation side of the Feed the Future Strategy. While they have the contours of the strategy, everything will be in the implementation; cogent input from the Conference of Deans will be very helpful in that regard. They also hope to build a more robust collaboration between BIFAD and the World Food Prize. For a long time we have been working on a collaboration in October trying to hold their events together. They would like to extend that beyond the October timeframe and push for more interweaving throughout the year.

What is sure is that there will be many more challenges to face, and this new more flexible type of approach that BIFAD bringing to the table is going to be extremely helpful in ensuring that BIFAD will be able to respond to those challenges in a prompt, effective way, so that BIFAD can serve as a very efficient gateway to the land-grant universities in this. On behalf of Karen Turner and the Administrator, ODP and USAID are looking forward to push forward this partnership with BIFAD to new heights.

CLOSING

Bob Easter thanked Carol Grigsby for her presentation. He then opened the floor to public comment; none was offered. With no other business nor announcements, he thanked Ron Senykoff for his capable leadership and John Becker in the BIFAD office in ODP; and thanked Kerry Bolognese and Elizabeth Armstrong of APLU for their efforts. The meeting was then adjourned.