



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**Board for International Food & Agricultural Development  
2011 Summer Public Meeting Minutes**

June 24, 2011

National Press Club (Holeman Lounge)  
529 14th St. NW, Washington, DC

***“Higher Education: A Critical Partner in Feed the Future”***

**Contents**

Swearing-In of New Members & Charge to Board by USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah ..... 2

Welcoming and Opening Remarks (Brady Deaton, BIFAD Chair & Chancellor, University of Missouri). 4

    Recognition of Previous Board Members & Resolution ..... 4

Feed the Future Panels ..... 5

    Feed the Future I: Research Agenda & Forum Report – Overview, Challenge & USDA REE  
    Perspective..... 5

        Overview (Montague Demment, Associate Vice-President, APLU) ..... 5

        FTF Global Food Security and Research Strategy (Saharah Moon Chapotin, Acting Director,  
        Research, Bureau for Food Security, USAID)..... 6

        USDA Global Food Security Research Strategy and Support for Feed the Future (Anita Regmi,  
        Senior Advisor, Office of the Chief Scientist, USDA) ..... 8

        University Response (Irvin Widders, Director, Dry Grain Pulses CRSP, Michigan State University)  
        ..... 10

        Panel Conclusion (Montague Demment) ..... 12

        Discussion ..... 12

    Feed the Future II: Overview and Interagency Coordination – Whole of Government Efforts ..... 13

        Overview (Moderator: Julie Howard, Feed the Future Deputy Coordinator) ..... 14

        USAID (Paul Weisenfeld, Assistant to the Administrator, USAID Bureau for Food Security) ..... 14

        State Department (Cindy Huang, Senior Advisor, Office of GHFSI, Department of State)..... 15

        US Treasury Department (Dan Peters, Director, Africa Office, US Treasury Department) ..... 16

        USDA (Lona Stoll, Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary, USDA) ..... 17

        University Respondent: Dr. Elsa Murano, President Emerita, Texas A&M University ..... 18

        Discussion ..... 19

Public Comment Period ..... 21

USAID Forward, Littleton Tazewell, Senior Advisor for Implementation and Procurement Reform,  
Procurement Reform, Office of the General Counsel, USAID..... 22

    Discussion ..... 24



## BIFAD 2011 Summer Public Meeting Minutes

*Board Members Present:*

*Brady Deaton, Gebisa Ejeta, Marty McVey, Jo Luck, William (Bill) DeLauder, Elsa Murano*

### **SWEARING-IN OF NEW MEMBERS & CHARGE TO BOARD BY USAID ADMINISTRATOR RAJIV SHAH**

Administrator Rajiv Shah conducted the swearing in of new members Brady Deaton, Gebisa Ejeta, Marty McVey, and Jo Luck, with the following oath:

*I do solemnly affirm that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservations or purpose of evasion; that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office of which I am about to enter, so help me God.*

In comments following the ceremony, Administrator Shah recognized and thanked the new members of the Board, noting the following:

- **Brady Deaton**, the Chancellor of the University of Missouri, has had long and illustrious career in agricultural development and was a former Peace Corps volunteer as well.
- **Jo Luck**, a World Food Prize winner, has been a personal source of inspiration to the Administrator, and he appreciated her wit and wisdom on both how to implement this program and also how to encourage opportunities for Americans to express their values through partnering with us in this effort.
- The research of **Gebisa Ejeta**, also a recent World Food Prize winner, has been groundbreaking and has helped numerous agricultural organizations around the world do a better job serving those in need. The Administrator stated that he learned from Gebisa Ejeta the importance of listening to the people that they are trying to serve – usually women, mostly small farmers and small holders in sub-Saharan Africa – and of really understanding the needs and aspirations that they have and then pursuing science in a rigorous way that supports those aspirations.
- **Marty McVey** brings private sector expertise and a financial management background to the Board; his participation reflects USAID's interest in making it easier and more effective for the private sector to work with and partner with the types of organizations that they do the work on the ground in Africa and around the world.
- He also welcomed back returning Board members (**Elsa Murano, Bill DeLauder, and Catherine Bertini**) and expressed his appreciation for continuing on the Board.

Administrator Shah then shared his desire for people to understand just how important this work has been and will be, emphasizing the absolutely critical role that BIFAD will play in helping USAID guide and manage their portfolios as they move forward. He has received letters from BIFAD, through Bob Easter and his championship and leadership of this effort; and in every instance, when he has received feedback from this group, he has taken it very seriously.

He explained that when the members of BIFAD come to a consensus and recommend something that needs to be done differently, he felt it was USAID's obligation to take that very seriously, and to start with the presumption of the desire to address the challenge that has been identified, and to recognize that by doing so, by being humble to this group, USAID can craft better programs, bring on a broader variety of partners, build capacity in a more fundamental way in all of the regions around the world, and also bring much better results.

He then provided a brief summary of what the President is hoping to get done with their efforts in food security. President Obama launched the Feed the Future initiative at the L'Aquila Summit in 2009. At that time, the G20 world leaders came together to address the global financial crisis, and, in that context, they recognized that the food and fuel price spikes that were in part a manifestation of that financial crisis, had for the first time in decades moved 100 million people around the world back into a condition of extreme poverty and hunger.

The Administrator emphasized that it was a remarkable observation to see this real reversal after decades of steady progress, and that the President believes that this is not how globalization should play out. The US embraces globalization, but we are responsible stewards of how these issues affect the most vulnerable around the world. President Obama joined with the other world leaders assembled there both to make a commitment of \$22 billion, as well as to take a new approach to addressing global hunger and food security. While the resource investment was critical – the United States committed \$3.5 billion to that and will meet that commitment – what was really more important than the actual dollars is a commitment to do things differently.

In this context, he reviewed the basic commitments made by the US government to do the following:

- They would follow and support country owned plans; not just country government owned plans, but plans that were genuinely developed in participation with private sector, civil society, women, farmers groups, etc.
- They would take a fundamentally private sector approach, recognizing that every country or region that has sustainably solved their food security challenges has done so in partnership with the private sector.
- They would mobilize capital, promote investment, and be very focused on tying agriculture into a future of regional and global economic trade for the countries that they work with.
- They would focus on and measure outcomes for women, because they know that a dollar invested in women or in women's incomes has much more impact than the alternatives on improving the health and welfare of children, communities, and families, and on poverty reduction.
- They would take a comprehensive approach and through that comprehensive approach highlight the importance of universities, research, science and technology; but they cannot just create scientific breakthroughs that sit on shelves in African research facilities and that do not get out to the people who need them the most .

Administrator Shah concluded by offering several charges to the Board. He asked the Board members to feel a broad sense of responsibility to the commitment that the President has made, and to address this issue successfully, inspire others to generate real results, and work with them

to make this as successful as it can be. He also asked BIFAD to play a unique role, both in continuing the traditional functions of the BIFAD work to help to oversee the university partnerships, research, science, education and capacity building; while at the same time, going back to those principles, and helping USAID make sure that it is living up to the President's direct expectations that they do, in fact, do things differently, and that they live up to those high and very important standards that the President and Secretary Clinton laid out.

He then thanked the Board for the opportunity to be there, and to come back and hear from the Board after they had the chance to deliberate.

BIFAD Chair Brady Deaton expressed his appreciation to the Administrator for giving BIFAD this charge to embrace the posture that he and the Administration has taken, and stated that the Board is very excited and energized by his words and by the challenge that is out there before them.

### **WELCOMING AND OPENING REMARKS (BRADY DEATON, BIFAD CHAIR & CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI)**

Brady Deaton introduced the agenda. Jo Luck moved to approve the agenda; this was seconded by Bill DeLauder, and passed unanimously. Brady Deaton then acknowledged the very noble calling of serving on BIFAD and that the Board was fully committed to their charge, and are ready to move forward to work with the Administrator and those present at this meeting.

### **Recognition of Previous Board Members & Resolution**

Brady Deaton then introduced Bill DeLauder who presented the following motion recognizing the work of the former Chair Bob Easter.

*The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development appoints former BIFAD Chair Robert Easter as BIFAD Senior Advisor through 2011. In this capacity he is welcome to attend BIFAD executive sessions and to participate in BIFAD working groups. We believe that the BIFAD will benefit from Dr. Easter's recent term as BIFAD Chair, and [from] his in-depth knowledge of global agricultural development.*

Elsa Murano seconded the motion which was unanimously approved. Brady Deaton read and presented to Bob Easter a plaque which stated "*In recognition of your exceptional national leadership for advancing the cause of higher education and development as Chairman of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development and in your life's work, June 24, 2011.*" On behalf of the BIFAD and Executive Director Susan Owens, he thanked Bob Easter for all of his past work and his continuing work with BIFAD.

Bill DeLauder then expressed his appreciation for Bob Easter's leadership. Elsa Murano added that Bob Easter had led the Board through a very important time; she appreciated his mentorship and the fact that he would be with the Board for the next year as an advisor.

## FEED THE FUTURE PANELS

### Feed the Future I: Research Agenda & Forum Report – Overview, Challenge & USDA REE Perspective

---

Brady Deaton welcomed the panelists who would present on the Feed the Future research agenda and Forum held June 21-23, and introduced Montague Demment as moderator.

#### **Overview (Montague Demment, Associate Vice-President, APLU)**

Montague Demment reflected on what went on in the Forum process held that week, with 400 representatives from US universities, NGOs, the private sector and the US government. They had been invited to this process by which the research community could have input in to the Feed to the Future Initiative. He found this process to be a strong, interactive experience, among the most dynamic and intensive interactions of his career, and he thanked USAID and USDA for their leadership in this.

He reviewed the goals of the process, how they got started with the establishment of a working group, and the process by which they reached out in order to address the challenge of bringing a country driven concept to this work. They developed a white paper to lay out a framework for broader consultation and to identify preliminary key issues. An e-consultation examined and critiqued the Feed the Future Research Strategy, and identified major research challenges and specific research questions and projects under each challenge.

Some key themes included sustainable intensification, the support of research on key problems, and capacity building needed. A series of research challenges identified will be included in the summary of findings to be prepared by the working group.

Montague Demment then described a few personal observations, focusing on the following.

1. There were three dimensions of tension:
  - Spatial scale: How to deal with small holders with a broad and sweeping scale in an agricultural environment of great heterogeneity
  - Time scale: By focusing on the short term, they ensure long term problems; there is a need to find a way to balance this with long term solutions
  - Public vs. Private: The need to engage the private sector with some predictable gains
2. The challenge of how, as a focused group, to coordinate a centrally determined research agenda with a country driven process
3. Capacity building was one of the strongest themes that came out of the process.
4. The strength of the FTF concept and its emphases on nutrition in the first thousand days, and on the development of human capital
5. Follow-on: the working group will compile results and produce a working document, which the Agency said they would take very seriously and respond to it

**FTF Global Food Security and Research Strategy (Saharah Moon Chapotin, Acting Director, Research, Bureau for Food Security, USAID)**

Sarah Moon Chapotin described the overall FTF Global Food Security and Research Strategy, illustrating her presentation with specific examples. She noted that the research strategy was developed jointly as just one part of the FTF initiative. After reviewing the global challenge that FTF sought to address, she presented the FTF goals of accelerating inclusive agriculture sector growth, and reducing child undernutrition. She noted that the comprehensive strategy included attention to the entire value chain and enabling environment, including research, extension, information and policy analyses, and the leveraging of strategic partnerships.

She identified three crosscutting themes in fostering inclusive sustainable agricultural productivity gains and improvements in child nutrition: Resilience to climate change, sustaining the natural resource base, and Gender awareness/inclusivity.

The agricultural research is one key element of the FTF strategy. The specific objective of the research is to define problem-focused agricultural research topics that meet the FTF objectives to build a global research agenda and complement the agenda with national and regional investments in FTF focus countries. In building a research portfolio, it is necessary to:

- Identify research about constraints
- Establish criteria for selection of priorities
- Build pipeline of short, medium, and long-term impact
- Manage risk with a portfolio approach, and fewer high risk, more low-risk investments

After describing a number of disciplines across which agricultural research cuts, she listed the investment criteria used to develop the research strategy. In defining FTF research priorities, they used a nutrition and poverty lens to determine what are going to be the important areas of focus, including looking at the key production systems where hunger and poverty are significant, child stunting, and farming systems.

The outcome of this process was the identification of several regions of the world where they could have impact, as well as a focus on sustainable intensification that requires component technologies. A focus on specific focal agro-ecologies would have spillover effects to other regions. Finally, this would be accomplished by leveraging partnerships with US universities, international ag research centers, national agricultural research systems, and the private sector -- both local and international.

Sarah Moon Chapotin then described three FTF research themes with examples.

**1. Advancing the Productivity Frontier** included:

- Overcoming major crop, farm animal, and fish productivity constraints: increase yields and incomes
- Breeding and genetics for major crops, livestock, fish
- Livestock & small ruminant infectious diseases
- Animal feed improvements (availability/quality)
- Technology adoption

- Policy

She described the example of the work that USAID has done around climate resilient cereals in the target environments of South Asia and Africa, how they address major emerging climate challenges, their potential for enormous impact, and the private sector partnerships involved.

2. **Transforming agricultural systems** through sustainable intensification emerged as an overarching framework for their research work, linking various aspects. She noted the four systems in which research is integrated with development interventions:

- Rice-Wheat system of **South Asia**
- **East Africa** highlands system
- **Southern & East African** maize-based systems
- **West African** Sudano-Sahelian systems

She described the Indogangetic Plains as an example of an area where USAID is already taking such an approach. After she presented background to the issues involved, she explained how USAID has been working with the Cereal Systems Initiative for South Asia and noted how the experiences there can be transferred to some situations in Africa. In reviewing the outcomes of this work, she emphasized the importance of looking at the entire agricultural system, where the technologies are needed but cannot be introduced on their own; this dovetails with policy work at the local national and regional levels. This project also looks at what are the right public-private partnerships that are needed to get technologies adopted. This cannot only happen through the public extension services; wide scale adoption of technologies will rely the local private sector. She reviewed three systems in Africa that each support a large number of people, where they believe there is high potential for the kind of transformation that is happening in Asia.

3. **Improving nutrition and food safety** included:

- Nutrition research – understanding food based approaches
- Grain legume productivity
- Animal sourced foods
- Biofortification of staple crops
- Reducing/eliminating mycotoxin contamination
- Reducing post-harvest losses

Sarah Moon Chapotin reviewed the experience of the Insect resistant cowpea work as one example under this theme. This is a very long-term project with high potential for impact.

She then reviewed partnerships, starting with national partners in the individual countries, and including research institutions from all over the world. They work with global research partners in all of their research efforts, and look forward to working with them to get valuable feedback in designing their strategy; these partners include the following:

- US University-based programs (CRSPs and others)
- CGIAR
- USAID-funded competitive programs including private sector and universities

- NARS partners in focus countries
- USDA/NIFA and USDA/ARS
- USDA/USAID Norman Borlaug Commemorative Research Initiative

In moving forward they will be seeking to implement the research strategy using the lens of each of these production systems. They will look for the areas where they can have entry points within the systems and where can they have the most impact; they will also seek to identify the technologies and the management practices that need to be developed in order to have an impact in these systems. They will work closely with their partners on the ground in the missions to explore how US investments at that end can be leveraged with what is being done at the global level, in order to ensure that these technologies and management practices are being adapted in all of the Feed the Future countries around the world.

### **USDA Global Food Security Research Strategy and Support for Feed the Future (Anita Regmi, Senior Advisor, Office of the Chief Scientist, USDA)**

In discussing the need for the USDA Research, Education, and Economics (REE) Global Food Strategy, Anita Regmi reviewed the societal challenge and opportunities presented. In developing the priorities and strategy, they created a white paper reviewing the literature that has come out on the state of the science on global food security. The key takeaways from that white paper include:

- Food insecurity, food scarcity, and food price volatility will escalate without significant improvements in agricultural productivity.
- A comprehensive approach to agriculture development is required.
- Scientific breakthroughs must be adapted into economically, environmentally & socially sustainable practices.
- Investments to improve agricultural productivity must be long-term and complemented by efforts to improve human capacity in agricultural research, extension and education.
- Agricultural research, education, extension, and development need to focus on women.

She noted that what REE brings to bear on this is USDA science combining strong research capability with expertise in institutional capacity building, education and extension; specifically:

- Ongoing dual-use research & economic analyses
- International research partnerships
- Agricultural development programs under reimbursable agreements
- Institutional knowledge
- Historical relationship university system
- Industry partners

The three goal areas that have been identified for this REE strategy include:

- Research, development, education and extension to sustainably increase productivity, quality and nutritional value
- Research, development, education and extension to minimize human and environmental health risks from agricultural production

- Data development, analysis and dissemination to improve the understanding of agricultural markets and policies

These goal areas focus on dual-use, and have inherent comparative advantage that can be leveraged to enhance the strategy, both through FTF and through other ongoing international partnerships. The FTF research strategy embraces a comprehensive strategy that is based on strategic partnerships at the global level as well as where resources can be leveraged at the country level.

The FTF research strategy will be implemented through:

- Norman Borlaug Commemorative Initiative, with collaborative research on:
  - Wheat rust
  - Grain legumes
  - Livestock Disease
  - Post harvest/food safety
- Improving agricultural statistics
- Leveraging resources to help improve in country capacity (extension, SPS, youth development, post harvest, policy environment)

The Forum input is very important for USDA, and they will respond to Forum challenges in the following ways:

- Coordination in research will be key: The Office of the Chief Scientist (OCS) enables close collaboration among senior advisors across climate change, global health, food safety, nutrition, bioenergy, and others
- FTF coordination across USDA: Weekly management meetings across mission areas
- Better aligning and leveraging their existing programs
- Accountability and measuring success

Areas for advancing the productivity frontier include:

- **Expand Genetic Resources Information Network (GRIN)** to cover information from other countries, and make the information available for crop/livestock improvement in FTF countries.
- Seek appropriate **collaborations on biotic and abiotic stress tolerant/resistant** work to transfer/adapt our innovations when relevant in FTF countries.
- Explore our suite of ongoing research, extension & education material to **educate on proper stewardship and enhancement** of soil, water and other natural resources.
- Examine ways of leveraging our knowledge, innovations and research to **reduce post-harvest losses**

In transforming key production systems, Anita Regmi emphasized the following:

- They are looking for ways to make the **wealth of information and expertise in USDA more accessible** to other researchers, extension providers, and educators around the world. USDA funds intramural and extramural researchers to enhance the productivity, societal & environmental benefits, and economic viability of food/agriculture systems; and they fund extension providers and educators to transfer knowledge and adapt research to make it applicable for producers and future producers

- Working across the USDA, they are currently exploring how they can knit together their existing programs and resources to have a transformative impact on a few selected areas and countries under the **USDA Action Plan** (focusing specifically on five regions).
- **USDA Office of Technology Transfer** offers a model of transferring technology that is demand/market-driven and sustainable (requires broad partnerships).
- **The National Agricultural Library (NAL)** leads a cross-USG initiative to organize and provide access to transparent, internationally-compatible, quality-controlled, life-cycle data on sustainability in food, agriculture, and forestry supply chains that will benefit producers & global markets.

Similarly, to address the cross cutting challenges, she explained that they will make sure that they will:

- Work across mission areas and initiatives (FTF, GHI, CC, LEDS, PFG and others)
- Work with partners beyond USDA to create synergies and do more with less.
- Work with their partners (particularly US universities) given their track record of very successful models: extension, youth development, education, market information and others.

She concluded that they all share a common goal: a path forward that brings all of their collective powers to bear, focused on the best science available for improving/ensuring global food security. They know that research and its application take time. Going forward, USDA will continue to look to working with universities, with USAID and with all in-country stakeholders. This work is important but won't always be easy. They have much to offer and to learn from each other and they will explore together the best mechanisms for leveraging their collective resources.

### **University Response (Irvin Widders, Director, Dry Grain Pulses CRSP, Michigan State University)**

Having experienced all three events, Irv Widders offered his University perspective in response to the Feed the Future Research Strategy and Forum Report. He affirmed that most in the University community believe that the report is an excellent document that provides compelling themes, has an innovative implementation strategy, and is structured to ensure accountability. There is agreement on the need to do things differently, and on the fact that there is too much research that is just sitting on the shelf. He also emphasized that the strategy is more a framework for guiding future decision-making; as a very ambitious document that will require much more discussion, it is useful in moving forward.

He highlighted that universities are well positioned to play an active role in providing this support to the government, given their multi-disciplinary, cutting edge research capacity; internationally engaged and networked faculty; and access to private sector partners. He also stated that their predominant technical capacity in strategic areas should be exploited to provide leadership to research initiatives.

He emphasized that a sustainable commitment is needed to achieve FTF research goals, noting that in many cases, they are dealing with long-term, wicked problems such as degraded soils. There is a need for sustained solutions, long-term investments, the capacity to take risks, as well as interdisciplinary approaches. There is general excitement within the University community about the Whole of Government approach, and to the extent that there can be coordination of efforts, this will only contribute to long term success in these initiatives.

Irv Widders then congratulated and thanked USAID, USDA and APLU for the consultation and Forum. It brought this research strategy to the attention of people around the world, particularly through the e-consultation. It was exciting to see the number of people at the meetings over the last few days, and there was enthusiasm and excitement about how these various organizations can work together. As a result, universities are in an excellent position to work together.

He then added that it is important, however, to understand its purpose and constraints. The consultation provided a sounding board for feedback on the strategy, and the outputs – the research and development challenges identified – may need strengthening. He expressed concerns about expectations of the process, particularly given the lack of both a review of evidence, as well as of the appropriate demographic of participants to identify where the government should invest – those people who are in the trenches doing the work.

He emphasized that it is important that this process not stop here. Further issues and questions to be addressed include the following:

- What is the process for further defining and prioritizing proposed focal research areas in the four strategic agricultural production systems under the FTF Themes? How will outputs of the consultation inform this process? How can university scientists contribute?
- Who will provide leadership to the inter-agency coordination of priority research initiatives? (Not only at in Washington, but also at the mission level)
- How will FTF research initiatives be integrated into and be supported by USAID country and regional missions and their strategies? Who will be providing input about the diverse areas involved?
- Will national agriculture research systems and universities in FTF countries provide leadership to and be participants in country-led efforts? How can CRSPs support these efforts?
- How can long-term research initiatives effectively achieve intended development outcomes if focus countries might change over time?
- Who will provide leadership to and what will be the mechanism for ongoing performance assessments, determining what does or doesn't work and why, and providing technical input on the need for redirection of research investments if justified?

Being on the ground doing the work, universities can play a role.

Irv Widders concluded by providing thoughts on future steps:

1. Follow-up forums involving international communities of scientists should be convened to provide guidance on game-changing or transformational research approaches to address the complex wicked problems.

- Involve US and developing country university, NARS, CGIAR, and private sector scientists
- Evidence-based ex-ante analyses to inform the process

The Pulse CRSP will be doing a workshop, bringing together a selected group of bright young scientists (only a third of whom are CRSP scientists) to ask what needs to be done to move the bar up; they are bringing in young people because they are the future.

2. USAID should renew its commitment to proven and effective models for university engagement (e.g., the CRSPs)
  - Scholarship and productivity expectations consistent with university performance assessments of faculty
  - Competitive awarding of research projects to investigators and institutions with the best scientific talent, capacity and ideas
  - Long-term partnerships with HC NARS, agricultural universities, and IARCSs
  - Integration of research with building is effective

He emphasized that new programs may be very worthy, but don't throw out what is tried and proven. The CRSPs build institutional capacity as part of their work with national programs in countries, providing a worthy return on investment.

### **Panel Conclusion (Montague Demment)**

Brady Deaton thanked the panel and asked for final comment from Montague Demment.

Montague Demment did not think that food issues will get better in the next few years. He noted that as attention increases significantly, particularly with climate change, Feed the Future will become a major program. He then raised several points:

- The question of how this Whole of Government effort will be organized is important. He referred to recent DOD work on photosynthesis and what can be done to improve biomass production that could have a major impact on food plants.
- He also emphasized focusing on the development of technologies on where there is a real need and good evidence; there is also a need to distinguish what is good evidence.
- While there is a need for continual refinement of their thoughts, they do need to take action. They can make decisions on strategy now, while at the same time, continue to refine the data.
- At a recent CADA meeting in Kampala, there was a resolution to incorporate more university input into the agenda. The CADA process is a wonderful process, and it needs to be refined; the Africans should be congratulated for this work.

### **Discussion**

Brady Deaton asked if there were questions from the Board members.

Bill DeLauder asked about **the next step after making the document available**. Montague Demment did not want the process to end at this point and hoped for some kind of continuity and continuation; he hoped that BIFAD would be part of furthering that discussion. Irv Widders thought that it is vitally important to have follow-up discussion to continue to refine what has

been discussed, and particularly to ask what areas have been overlooked. There needs to be an ongoing discussion that involves different groups, particularly with greater participation of host country scientists and of new CTIR scientists.

Gebisa Ejeta asked for responses from the two agencies represented. Sarah Moon Chapotin (USAID) agreed that the Forum was excellent, with rich discussion -- and that there needs to be an evidence-based process at the same time. She stated that they are looking forward to seeing the report on the Forum and noted that they will take that seriously. Anita Regmi (USDA) also found the Forum to be excellent, and agreed that while some decisions will have to be made quickly to move forward, having decisions based on evidence is very important. Brady Deaton noted that the next panel will continue to discuss this.

Bill DeLauder then asked how they build in independence and self-sufficiency – **what will be done by the agencies to improve the abilities and capacity of countries to do and use research?**

Sarah Moon Chapotin emphasized that the package of capacity building activities that the Administrator announced recently is important and will help. She noted an example of particular investments in Uganda that involved working with local organizations there to take ownership of using technology; they will strive to build that into each one of their programs, and look at how to invest in capacity.

Anita Regmi commented on being limited by what is in USDA's budget. FAS does have a program that many are aware of, and they signed an MOU with AGRA to see how they can leverage their strengths.

As a CRSP director, Irv Widders stated that CRSPs give a lot of attention to helping to build capacity, usually through degree training. What is not in this program is having a conversation about where countries want to build capacity. **They need to work with countries to help build personnel development plans.**

Montague Demment noted that APLU has been working on partnership programs at APLU, and over the last two years they have worked with Africans, talking about what they needed. He emphasized first that African universities are under great stress for resources and overwhelmed with an enrollment that is five times higher than previous years. In the process over the last two years, they have been talking with Africans about what they needed. At the same time, a lot of donors are involved with academics in Africa, but this is not very well coordinated. The question is **how to bring together donors into a coordinated strategy.**

## **Feed the Future II: Overview and Interagency Coordination – Whole of Government Efforts**

---

Brady Deaton thanked the panel for being there and presenting on interagency coordination for Feed the Future; he then introduced the moderator, Julie Howard.

**Overview (Moderator: Julie Howard, Feed the Future Deputy Coordinator)**

Julie Howard explained that Feed the Future comes on the heels of the need for a different type of response to the global food crisis seen in 2008, and reflects President Obama's commitment to recognizing not only the need for food aid but also the need for a longer, sustained impact on food security. She emphasized that it is not just about the financial resources; it is also about doing things in a different way.

She then presented five ways in which FTF is different.

1. **Investing in country-owned planning:** Countries' priorities are at the center of sustainable development.
2. **Strengthening strategic coordination at different levels:** Country-owned plans are used to coordinate across donors.
3. **A comprehensive approach to agriculture:** This approach looks across the whole system beyond agricultural production to include areas such as nutrition, infrastructure, post harvest, and value chains.
4. **Leveraging the benefits of multilateral institutions:** Aside from agreeing at the country level that they should work together, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) is the type of fund that helps them pool their resources to do so.
5. **Delivering on clear and accountable commitments:** They are committed to, over the course of five years, lifting 18 million mostly small holder farmers out of hunger and poverty; reaching 7 million undernourished children with the nutrition interventions; generating \$2.8 billion in agricultural GDP in their target regions through research and development activities; and leveraging \$70 million in private investment for agriculture.

Finally, she explained that they will be focusing their efforts in 20 countries, 12 of which are in Africa. As she turned to the panelists for more detail about the interagency work, she noted that they have seen this work in action in the last few days, and that they will be looking for comments on the report and results of the Forum.

[Between the following panel presentations, she also noted that there were other US government partners that were involved in Feed the Future who were represented here, such as MCC, Peace Corps, Office of the US Trade Representative, and others. Such partners contributed not just in country implementation activities; for example, Kristen Penn at MCC has been central in helping to develop the results framework for FTF.]

**USAID (Paul Weisenfeld, Assistant to the Administrator, USAID Bureau for Food Security)**

As he introduced his presentation on the role of the Bureau for Food Security, Paul Weisenfeld expressed his appreciation for having BIFAD to advise them. He explained that USAID has been given a lead role in coordinating this Whole of Government effort for Feed the Future, and that the Bureau for Food Security was established as a means to coordinate this initiative.

He then explained the organizational chart for the Bureau, and how the four offices reflect the approach of the program.

- The Country Strategies and Implementation Office reflects the critical importance of programs having country-led efforts, allocating human resources to support this, and being set up to understand the results; the heart of this is the field support.
- The Office of Markets, Partnerships and Innovation reflects the emphasis on sustainability through a focus on markets and private partnerships.
- The Office of Agriculture, Research and Policy focuses on research for the long term and seeing agricultural productivity turn around.
- The Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management works across the Bureau, but also houses monitoring and evaluation, with an emphasis on thinking initiative-wide on what the learning agenda is.
- The Office of Communications and Outreach ensures that they are disseminating what they are learning, so they can generate support for this core area of the Agency; it is necessary to ensure we have the capacity to do that.

He concluded by emphasizing that an important part of the initiative is in demonstrating that they can eradicate food insecurity in countries, and that this has guided their decision-making on where they focus activities in the 20 participating countries.

**State Department (Cindy Huang, Senior Advisor, Office of GHFSI, Department of State)**

Julie Howard introduced Cindy Huang to speak on the State Department's role in FTF. Cindy Huang also congratulated the Board for their participation in this work.

After President Obama announced the US commitment to food security, Secretary Clinton created the Office of the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative. As was noted in the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), the State Department sought to ensure that diplomacy and development efforts are working well together. With an emphasis on “Development diplomacy”, the QDDR also mentions efforts to make diplomats more educated about development.

Cindy Huang then described the many ways that the State Department is supporting FTF and encouraging missions to think about how they bring their resources to bear on this as well.

- **Multilateral Engagement:** In addition to encouraging increased partner support for food security and multilateral and bilateral fora, the State Department works with other US government agencies to coordinate positions on policy issues impacting agricultural development. State also works with potential donors to achieve tangible contributions through the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) a multilateral trust fund managed by the World Bank, with the Department of Treasury as the overall USG lead.
- **Donor Coordination:** As one of the biggest areas of State's support, their office is charged with promoting transparency and tracking L'Aquila \$22 billion commitments. As a look at how they align with country plans, this has helped push countries to articulate these plans.

- **Trade and Agriculture Policy and Implementation:** An important issue coming up is around land tenure and property rights; they are hoping to get consensus this year around the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of the Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests. In discussing trade and agriculture policy considerations, Cindy Huang briefly reviewed key interest areas and other policies considered for Phase 2 decisions; they are tailoring that to the FTF policies.
- **Policies to Support Enabling Environment:** Examples of how State is working to support an enabling environment include trade policy in Tanzania, regional integration in Kenya, and land tenure in Ghana. She also mentioned the Partnership for Growth as an effort to work with governments to identify overall priorities.
- **Strategic Dialogues and Partnerships:** The State Department in collaboration with the FTF team is developing strategic partnership initiatives with India, Brazil, and South Africa on food security initiatives in third countries. State is also leading agriculture dialogues with non-FTF countries such as Switzerland, Nigeria (FTF but not focus country), and Angola.
- **Nutrition and 1,000 Days:** At the UN General Assembly last year, the Secretary launched the 1,000 Days partnership, which focuses attention on the 1,000 day window of opportunity from pregnancy to age two, when adequate nutrition has the greatest impact on saving lives and on a child's lifetime cognitive and physical capacity. Cindy Huang described one example of high-level advocacy around this issue in Tanzania.
- **Outreach:** In its outreach work, the State Department is engaged in promoting inclusive stakeholder consultation, facilitating private sector linkages, and advocating for meaningful consultation around investment plans. In terms of public diplomacy, State seeks to encourage prioritizing agriculture, nutrition and food security efforts. Cindy Huang described the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) as a way to keep returning to the principles.

She concluded by stating that this has been a process of building relationships and figuring out where and how they work together.

#### **US Treasury Department (Dan Peters, Director, Africa Office, US Treasury Department)**

Julie Howard introduced Dan Peters, noting that this is the first time that Treasury has been engaged with them in this way.

Dan Peters explained that the involvement of Treasury, as a charter member in the development of FTF, has been in linking with multilateral organizations. After an early decision to look at multilateral sources to leverage resources, the US with a number of other donors established the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP). The purpose of GAFSP was to help bring in resources aligned with the country-owned plans.

Setting up GAFSP allowed them to work at the global level, with countries such as Korea, donors such as the Gates Foundation, and other less known donors. It allowed them to provide clear incentives through periodic calls to countries that require a robust food security strategy. GAFSP also helped as one way to concretely account for money donors put in for food security effort.

Dan Peters then described how GAFSP worked, including the eligibility of countries to apply for funds; the process and criteria through which the technical advisory committee reviewed proposals; and how the steering committee made final decisions. He also noted the strong overlap with FTF countries.

They have established a monitoring and evaluation framework, requiring all those involved to come up with a common set of results indicators and, for many of these countries, to have in-depth impact assessments. There is a high level of transparency with program records accessible on their website, including proposals and minutes of steering committee meetings. The steering committee consists of three Countries Support Program representatives; these currently include a representative of Action Aid, one African and one Cambodian.

In terms of complementarity with FTF bilateral activities, GAFSP has been able to leverage limited development resources (though there are some challenges in going forward), bring additional resources to FTF focus countries, help align donor resources with country investment plans, and overlap results indicators with FTF (with Kristen Penn's assistance here as well).

He concluded with explaining GAFSP's next steps including the first private sector call for proposals, the third public sector call for proposals, and work on existing grants.

#### **USDA (Lona Stoll, Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary, USDA)**

Lona Stoll began by reflecting on USDA's role in the future. She offered a quote from Secretary Tom Vilsack that demonstrated how USDA leadership has embraced the same message and level of importance of FTF. USDA is looking at not only how they can be a partner, but also how to align their long-existing programs with these efforts.

Specifically what partnership means is that USDA will align investments to support FTS in three areas of comparative advantage:

1. **Research:** While USDA's significant in-house research expertise has a primary interest in US farms, much is relevant to others. USDA is seeking to align this basic and applied research expertise where it can be of use.
2. **In-country capacity building:** USDA is looking at ministry-to-ministry work, where those relationships can contribute to the FTF strategy.
3. **Data/analysis/market info:** USDA can provide global support and data and economic analysis.

Lona Stoll emphasized that USDA's resources and programs can contribute a lot, particularly through their global investments in basic and applied research; in data and economic analysis; and in trade facilitation. While they do not have the same footprint as other agencies at the

country level, they do have country level investments where they will focus in Bangladesh, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Kenya, East Africa (Tanzania, Rwanda, Uganda), and Central America.

**University Respondent: Dr. Elsa Murano, President Emerita, Texas A&M University**

Elsa Murano explained that she was speaking not as a member of BIFAD but as a representative of the University community, from Texas A&M. While she felt it was more important to engage in dialogue, she first made several points in response to the panel.

All recognize there are costs and benefits of better inter-agency coordination.

First, in terms of costs, it is a difficult thing to pull off, because agencies tend to get upset when others get in their turf. This makes allocation of credit for a job well done more difficult. People like credit, and tend to have a problem when they do not get full credit for efforts. Also, inter-agency coordination diminishes control of the outcome. There are those realities that are faced in the federal government.

She commended them for doing the work of doing each others' activities, though, because there are benefits. First, this coordination diminishes the opportunity for duplication of effort. Second, there is a synergistic effect, where the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Third, the results tend to be more meaningful and more substantive. For people to work together there has to be a driver beyond just working together. This driver has to be compelling, and one that minimizes the costs mentioned.

As seen this week, universities are very eager to participate in FTF, and that is because universities have the expertise and the science. Universities have experience in working in many of these countries, and in working with many of these agencies. They also have the structure; they are educators and researchers, but they love to translate that into use. The land grant University community stands ready to work together with FTF.

Elsa Murano then offered three thoughts on behalf of the University community, as just the beginning of how to work together

1. As they structure themselves to work together, she suggested that agencies take the advice of entities such as BIFAD. BIFAD can act not just as an advisory board, but also as an accountability partner; for example, they can not only ensure keeping to the objectives, but they can also ensure they include all the agencies involved.
2. Through BIFAD, agencies can avail of groups such as APLU to help with common deadlines, joint RFPs, etc.
3. The leaders of the government agencies involved need to make a commitment to not care about turf. She noted that it has been her experience that when leaders act selflessly, they end up getting the credit anyway. Referring to her experience at FSIC of offering assistance to FDA, she found that because it was a worthy cause, even as competitors they came together. She urged the leaders to collaborate, stating that the University

community saluted them for coming together around one of the worthiest causes. They all had the opportunity to fully address this and make a difference in people's lives and they needed to seize the moment and marshal all of their resources and talents, in order to get the most bang for the taxpayer's buck, who is ultimately playing the bill.

She concluded by restating that the University community stands ready to work with them, and that the universities are also committed to working together within this community, which can also be difficult. Quoting Dr. Norman Borlaug (who ended his career at Texas A&M) as saying that man seems to insist on ignoring the lessons of history, she asked that they not ignore those lessons, and that they commit to learning from these lessons.

## **Discussion**

Julie Howard thanked Elsa Murano for her comments and especially for the commitment from the University community, noting that the US government cannot do this alone, and that this commitment, along with their partners in the private sector and NGO community, is critical. She also emphasized that they had four very important drivers in President Obama, Secretary Clinton, Secretary Vilsack, and Administrator Shah, and that this is at the top of their agenda.

Brady Deaton asked for Board comments.

Bill DeLauder asked the panel to say more about **coordination and the relationship with the Millennium Challenge Grants**. How are those efforts coordinated?

Julie Howard explained that MCC is set up in a different system, with a different proposal. Especially as new compacts are being considered, they have been very active in looking at this as an opportunity to see how this fits together. Also, where are there are compacts together, like in Tanzania, some of those involved have offered to take on some of the work still needed.

Dan Peters noted that he did not see a lot of linkages now between GAFSP and MCC, although the MCC process informed some the GAFSP design principles. Cindy Huang noted two areas: working to align the results frameworks, and in the overlap of investments (e.g. in Tanzania, the focus on south is harmonized with where MCC has built roads).

Marty McVey asked **how donors are working together, and how that can be increased** (beyond just the US government, such as the private sector). Julie Howard explained that one of the interesting things is that, as they think about what country driven strategies mean, it has given them the opportunity to consider at country and regional levels what are the key strategy areas, and to define, within the country strategies, what the US wants be working on. For example in Ghana, the focus is on simple value chains.

Once the focus is defined, it becomes easier to define who will provide what, both within the government, and for the private sector. Feed the Future does have a portal for private sector inquiries, for potential and existing partners to email them directly.

The NGO community was instrumental in creating a support base for this overall initiative. They have urged and facilitated NGO involvement in the country level consultations so that both local and international NGOs have had a voice defining both the priority areas at the country level, and those areas which the US is pursuing. They recently committed at the Cameroon meetings of the DAC community to facilitate 10 different civil society roundtables within FTF focus countries, in order to have civil society be much more involved as they move into implementation and the accountability phase.

Cindy Huang agreed, emphasizing that the main mechanism to align has been the development of the country investment plan, which has been critical. Also of a critical nature is the enabling environment, which is another strong link with MCC, in that they have the 13 areas in which they are measuring. Other efforts like the World Bank's Doing Business Report and similar efforts in agriculture lead to looking at how to bring together advocacy around that to unlock private sector investment.

Dan Peters emphasized that the joint planning process is important, and gave examples of work with the World Bank, and working in Tanzania. The investment side is important, as is the policy side – for example, looking at what are the policies that prevent farmers from using specific tools. To go in only from the US to talk to these countries about input subsidies is not as powerful as entering into dialogue in a joint process with other donors. Julie Howard gave an example this, having just come back from Zambia, where the Embassy and the Mission set up a meeting with the donors and the key government officials, where they did talk about key agricultural policies in Zambia. Exploring options in the future is now on the multi-donor agenda.

Gebisa Ejeta thanked the panelists for their presentations, and especially for the possibilities of coordination. He appreciated the vision expressed by top leadership in the US, and noted that what has not been addressed in the FTF research strategy discussions is policy advocacy such as what is already seen in the involvement at the top level in this country.

He emphasized the challenge to those who are going to be participating in this visioning, both at the national level and at the university level, to be very creative in putting in place a results based framework for the implementation of this project, where they will need to recognize the different levels of institutional capacity particularly at the delivery stage. In this results-based initiative working with a capacity that is not as developed, how will they ensure that the livelihood chain is implicit in the results of the Feed the Future initiative? That is the task.

Jo Luck thanked both panels. She expressed concerns over reluctance of different groups to work together, emphasizing the importance of bringing together the different sectors and groups involved. While the NGO community had concerns about the impact of agribusiness on small farmers, she felt that there is a way to bring together doing the research in business and private industry, with those in the NGO community, or bringing together the organic farmer with DuPont. She stressed that it is important to understand each side. She took exception to the idea that “this is just for those farmers who will not be the biggest customers” and pointed to a Chinese example of empowering people to go beyond being subsistence farmers, to becoming those bigger customers.

Jo Luck also expressed concern over trying to show results so quickly. While she understood why, she emphasized that they were planting seeds that will not show results for decades.

Brady Deaton thanked the panel for all they have done and for the points raised.

## PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Brady Deaton invited public comment from those present.

Ray Miller, University of Maryland stated that first, while they have learned a great deal over the last few days about research on how things are changed, they have not heard anything about **maintenance research**. He noted that it takes a huge effort just to maintain where they are. He also stated that there has been a lot said about capacity development in other countries, but **little about capacity in this country**; there is a need to be worrying about US capacity.

Brady Deaton stated that that resonated with the Board. Gebisa Ejeta appreciated the comments, and offered a vision of delivering technology that is already there (the adaptive research techniques that they already have) for the short-term, while using that to build capacity for that adaptive research. At the same time, where there are significant research advances that have been made, this centrally located research can also be used to build capacity. He has spoken on numerous occasions on the erosion of skills here in this country; he noted, for example, the difficulty in finding a program to send people to in order to study crop physiology or plant pathology – the kinds of subjects that are so integral to bringing about the agricultural revolution as was seen in this country. There needs to be a focus on this kind of capacity building at the national level as well.

Marshall Matz, as an attorney who specializes in agriculture, expressed his excitement about the events of that week, and particularly the goal within Feed the Future to actually improve production agriculture both in quantity and quality, and then to link it directly to people who need food, such as with child nutrition in the first thousand days. He pointed out that within the world of child nutrition, which he has spent 30 to 40 years dealing with around the world, there are two subsets of experts: the nutritionists that understand what micronutrients and macronutrients should be in the food (for example the people at Tufts who did the report for USAID that was used last week); and those who focus on how to deliver that food, to get those calories into the mouths of children. The latter is a very separate silo, with a huge category of experts on that at World Food Program, at the World Bank, at CADA, and at the Global Child Nutrition Foundation here in Washington. He emphasized that if they are actually going to end hunger and focus on the first thousand days and on schools, they must **bring in those experts who know how to work with the institutional structures that can deliver the food**.

Michael McGirr of NIFA CIP USDA, noted that primary goal of returning Peace Corps volunteers used to be development education. He emphasized that **FTF offers the opportunity to engage the wider public in the US in understanding food security**. They need to give some consideration to how to engage in building the constituency who understands what they do.

Bill DeLauder agreed that this was an excellent point, but would add that **they need to educate the American public about what countries themselves do to improve the situation**; they do not do that enough, and it gives people the idea that countries themselves are not doing enough.

Irv Widders commented that over the last several months they have been focusing on an agricultural research agenda to achieve a worthy end. He heard that morning some reassuring comments that the Administration is committed to spending/investing \$3.5 billion to achieve these goals. His concern was about the need to make some hard decisions about where to make these investments, and about **what priority agriculture research really has within this Administration**. Looking at the Foreign Appropriations Bill for next year, he emphasized that there is no language regarding the CRSPs; and that the current level of funding for CRSPs for CGIR is not a lot of money out of these \$3.5 billion. He appealed to BIFAD to think about the costs and the need for greater investment; this is an opportunity to change direction.

Handy Williamson, University of Missouri-Columbia, stated that he is a supporter of BIFAD, and he expressed his concern that over the last year that they have gone through a period of being adrift. Many of those present originally committed to working with USAID 20 or 30 years ago, back when the handshake on the logo meant something when it says from the American people. He felt that they **needed to seize this opportunity to recommit**. Old wine in new bottles is not good enough, and so while they are all excited, there is a longer term that they are concerned about. He expressed his hope that this Board can lead that charge.

Handy Williamson also offered a comment about the media, noting that there was a school in the Midwest that happens to have the world's oldest school of journalism. One of Missouri's grand initiatives with which they are working is on media and the future, and they are hosting a series of forums bringing in experts from around the country to discuss food issues, such as Feed the Future, food and fuel. He suggested that a mechanism like that can **engage constructive media involvement that will deliver the message**.

Brady Deaton expressed the board's appreciation for the public comment, stressing that he Board is very sensitive to continuing in its advisory role at USAID on every issue that is out there, including the expansive commitment to communicate the nature of the financial situation that they are in today. He thanked those members of the public who made comments and assured them that these comments would be taken seriously. He then introduced the final speaker.

**USAID FORWARD, LITTLETON TAZEWELL, SENIOR ADVISOR FOR  
IMPLEMENTATION AND PROCUREMENT REFORM, PROCUREMENT REFORM,  
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL, USAID**

Littleton Tazewell explained that the Implementation and Procurement Reform is just one of the seven elements that make up the USAID Forward reform agenda. He felt that the importance of the procurement piece cannot be overstated. The other portions of USAID Forward include:

- Talent management
- Rebuilding policy capacity

- Strengthening monitoring and evaluation
- Rebuilding budget management capacity
- Science and technology
- Innovation

What he has been responsible for and has worked on for the last year has been looking at how they spend the money. The overarching goal of procurement reform effort is to create the conditions where aid will no longer be needed in countries where they work by delivering assistance that strengthens local actors and institutions that are ultimately responsible for transforming their countries

He reviewed the six different components of procurement reform.

**1. Strengthening partner country capacity to improve aid effectiveness and sustainability:**

Where USAID can work through host country financial management systems, they would like to do so in a financially responsible manner. They are focusing on the Public Financial Management Risk Assessment Framework (PFMRAF), which is working with some of countries that they have found to be accountable. The first stage of rapid appraisal included the countries of Rwanda, Peru, Liberia, Nepal, Tanzania, Ghana, and South Africa; Rwanda, Tanzania and Peru are in the second stage of appraisal. This is expected to be expanded, and several training courses are being developed to do so.

- 2. Strengthening local civil society and private sector capacity:** USAID is looking at how they can expand working with local partners and, as they work through organizational intermediaries, how they can strengthen the organizational and technical capacity of these local partners. As an agency, they have had a lot of examples of capacity strengthening technical assistance that has focused on inputs rather than results. A significant part of this component is to look at their capacity development interventions, and hold their intermediaries accountable, but also to look to where USAID can work more directly with local organizations. Part of this is looking at existing rules, and how they impact global organizations, and where it makes sense to align USAID's accounting with local systems. They have brought together five interdisciplinary local capacity development teams, relying heavily on FSNs and new officers to provide capacity development technical assistance in Peru, Egypt, South Africa, Kenya, Philippines, Senegal, and Ghana.

They have also used the following:

- Fixed Obligation Grants
- Source/Origin/Nationality Waiver
- Delegation of authority for issuing awards to indigenous organizations
- Delegation of authority to settle claims

- 3. Increasing competition and broadening USAID's partner base:** They just released their USAID Small Business Goals for 2011. They have also recently put into place approvals for non-competitive extensions or follow-on awards.

4. **Using USG resources more efficiently and effectively:** The Contract Review Board is a mechanism by which USAID maintains quality control and ensures that large contracts are in accordance with USAID policy. The threshold has increased from \$10 million to \$25 million. Related to this is the Board of Acquisition and Assistance Reform (BAAR). Also related is there current review of the policy of the reliance on IQCs for reliance for implementation. They are also providing guidance on the Leader with Associate Award and on the Pharmaceutical Waiver and Revised ADS
5. **Strengthening collaboration and partnership with bilateral donors, multilateral and international organizations:** In the past they have been reluctant to use basket funding mechanisms because of restrictions; they are now looking at using existing waivers and a blanket waiver for procurements by Public International Organizations (PIOs) – those who do not have US membership – and bilateral development partners. Templates for grants to bilateral development partners are being used. In the revision to ADS 308 – Grants to PIOs, they expand the definition of PIO to those who don't have US membership; establish the Delegated Cooperation Secretariat, and delineate three types of awards (Cost reimbursement, program contribution or multi-donor pooled funding arrangements, and general contribution. They are really seeking to strip away restrictions to leave only those that are absolutely necessary.
6. **Rebuilding USAID's internal technical capacity and rebalancing the work force, working with the Talent Management Reform initiative:** They have expanded the system of warrants for Contract and Agreement Officers to 6 levels. They have also increased civil service positions to support IPRI throughout the Agency.

Further **cross cutting activities** include revision to the chapter rule on Source/Origin/Nationality, as well as this the Source/Origin/Nationality Waiver for Vehicles.

Next steps in procurement reform include plans to do the following:

- Develop policy guidance on the use of partner country systems
- Review and simplify RFP and RFA processes and documentation;
- Require that prime contractors use local nonprofit/private business and US small or disadvantaged businesses as subcontractors for not only administrative support but substantive programmatic components, and have enforcement procedures in place to ensure compliance;
- Increase the number of fixed price contracts where practicable;
- Break up large IQCs into smaller ones – by region, by sub-region and by country; and increase the number of stand-alone contracts and grants awarded by operating units; and
- Establish pilot program to give FSNs and TCNs warrant authority.

## Discussion

Brady Deaton thanked the speaker and noted the potential for gaining efficiencies that will free up some of the money that is so constrained right now.

Gebisa Ejeta commented that he served as a board member of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), where USAID is a major funder. In the past,

USAID provided 2 million dollars overall as a target fund to build relationships between the scientists at the centers, and at those at the universities. He expressed concern over how they would continue to get this funding given that USAID is considering putting that into the blanket funding. Littleton Tazewell felt that this was more a programmatic issue on the use of funds rather than a procurement reform issue.

Brady Deaton thanked Littleton Tazewell, and adjourned the public session of the meeting.