

## SUMMARY OF THE 141<sup>ST</sup> BIFAD MEETING

May 27, 2004

Extracted from Transcript

### BIFAD Members Present:

M. Peter McPherson, Chairman  
William DeLauder  
Mike Deegan  
Anthony Laos  
Stewart Iverson, Jr.

-----

Mr. McPherson welcomed guests and participants.

Emmy Simmons, AA/EGAT welcomed guests and introduced Tom Hobgood, Director of EGAT/AG, to make additional introductions. He introduced Drs. Phil Steffan who will work on post conflict and crisis centers, and Jim Yazman, who will work on dairy programs, particularly agribusiness and marketing programs.

Emmy Simmons introduced Dr. Roslyn Hobson, a AAAS Fellow serving as liaison with the National Academy of Science, coordinating the ongoing review if international science and technology. Also introduced was Gary Alex, Manager of the Farmer-to-Farmer Program. USAID and partners recently celebrated the 10,000<sup>th</sup> volunteer assignment and launched Volunteers in Economic Growth Alliance (VEGA). Highlight of the event was Mr. Damon Shemanski who had make 64 volunteer assignments on dairying.

Emmy commented briefly on the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) that will have nearly a billion dollars in FY 04. Work of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, (MCC) the implementing arm of the MCA has begun working and has a CEO, Mr. Paul Applegarth, recently approved by Congress. On May 6<sup>th</sup> the MCC announced the 16 countries initially selected to be possible recipients of the MCA. The countries are: **Senegal, Mali, Ghana, Mozambique, Albania, Georgia, Armenia, Mongolia, Sri Lanka, Benin, Madagascar, Cape Verde, Bolivia, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Vanuatu.** Criteria for selection were: ruling justly, investment in people, and economic freedom. USAID is not assisting the 16 countries put their proposals together for submission to the MCC. It is anticipated that as MCA funding goes to countries, USAID support to those same countries would be reduced.

PPC took leadership in preparing a "White Paper" which is a discussion paper about the way USAID could conceptualize its relationship with various countries and to better define its goals. Many said that one of the reasons that MCA was created was that USAID is not focused, that we have too many goals, and way too many purposes, too

many expectations, way too many partners, etc. A recent article in “Foreign Affairs” indicated that USAID has 368 Objectives and 59 Congressional Earmarks. While the MCA, in the words of Congressman Colby, is expected “to focus with a laser-like intensity on economic growth “ and for USAID therefore, to focus on things other than economic growth.

McPherson: “In those countries?”

Ms. Simmons. “No, in the rest of the world. In the not-selected-for-MCA-support countries.” Our own analysis is that many of these countries not selected for MCA also need to have economic growth, and also need to have agricultural-led economic growth in many cases. John Becker will cover more on the White Paper and Tom Hobgood will cover the Agency’s Agricultural Strategy including White Paper language, MCA language and BIFAD language on long term training.

Ms. Sherry Kraham of MCC recently joined the MCC from the State Department. She worked in Baghdad last year with Peter McPherson, overseeing the US allocation process for the CPA for U.S. appropriated and Iraqi funds.

I will cover: Why the MCA was established, where we are in our activities, and then leave time for Q and A’s.

MCA was created out of the Monterey Conference in Spring of 2002. It was officially established in January of 04 by Congress. The MCC was established to implement the MCA. It currently has a staff of about 30 but will increase to from 150-200 when fully staffed, and will be a mix of public and private sector individuals. They will report to Congress on the criteria and the methodology to be used. It is a small staff to administer a large fund. It is built on the principle that government assistance will be most successful if it is invested in places that have a sound policy framework. (see website for MCA.gov)

The MCA established 16 criteria to measure policy performance in: 1) governance, (2) economic freedom, and (3) investment in people. Sixteen countries have been selected to receive the initial allocation of funding from 63 candidate countries considered. The MCC Board met on May 6<sup>th</sup> with Sec. State Powell as chairman, Sec. of Treasury Snow as Vice-Chair, and USAID Administrator Natsios as a member. The new CEO of the MCC is Mr. Paul Applegarth.

MCC staff are now traveling to the MCA selected countries to discuss the principles and the conditions of the compacts they hope to enter in to. Those principles are (1) a suitable policy framework with government ownership – driven by the country, (2) no earmarks, MCA has more freedom and sizeable funding, (3) Flexibility to cut program if performance slides, and, (4) policies and priorities are homegrown and developed through a broad consultative process in the country.

## A Compact for the Partnership.

The compact will be a commitment from the countries participating. It will build capacity to address obstacles to economic growth and will be sustainable over the long term. Accountability and performance will be required. Robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms will be a part of the compact. MCA and MCC will also monitor to see if goals are met in support of the country's strategic vision. The Compact Proposal guide is on the web site. The hope is to have some Compacts (agreements) ready by the end of FY or CY 04.

New selections for countries will be announced in Fall of 05.

Question. by David Hess. Do you see a role for USAID in implementing programs in countries?

Answer. MCC has relied on USAID in the past and will work with them more throughout implementation. The formal role has yet to be established and will be decided after counterparts have agreed on the complexity of the programs. The country, not the MCC, will be the implementer.

Question by Dr. DeLauder. Has the process to evaluate proposals for compacts been worked out? Also, those countries not successful, can they try again?

Answer. The process is being worked out. Quality is expected and we are staffing up to be able to be responsive. The process is iterative and negotiations will take place. There are no set deadlines by which countries can submit a proposal to apply for a compact.

Comment by Chairman McPherson. BIFAD is statutorily set up to advise USAID and other pertinent government agencies on development. I have a letter for Paul (Applegarth) describing what BIFAD does. MCA has a quandary - - you want to give countries the opportunity to assume responsibility - to gain maturity, knowledge, perspective and volume, while on the other hand, you have a situation. Its too bad that we have to totally invent the wheel again and again and again. There are so many lessons that the development community has learned. How do you get benefit from that perspective? Where does technical assistance come in? There will be pressure to be more engaged. If countries can't do it, I doubt you will just move on to another country. That is not how it works. You will want some engagement, to give advice, not directions.

Ms. Kraham. Thanks. Our thinking is similar to that. We want to incorporate capacity building, trading, technical expertise and to increase financial accountability. Donor coordination is also important for monitoring and evaluation.

Question. By Mr. Deegan. Is the agriculture sector getting any emphasis at the MCA or the MCC?

Ms. Kraham. We have not yet identified any sectors. We want countries to identify priorities, their obstacles to growth.

Question. By Joe Dever of Land O' Lakes. What are MCA's internal systems and what might they require for M. & E and how will they oversee the grants?

Ms. Kraham. Those systems are still in formation, and countries will take the lead. MCC will focus on M. & E and have the countries get M & E systems in place. Most of the staff will be in the M & E unit and there will be audits by the USAID IG. We will also use local auditors when possible. Check our web site for detail. Thank You.

John Becker presentation on the "**White Paper**".

The White Paper and its linkages are on the Agency web site. The purpose is to stimulate discussion of major policy issues surrounding development and foreign aid. Not a USG policy paper, but rather a discussion piece intending to clarify goals of foreign aid and align resources with goals and then to manage resources strategically.

The five operational goals: (1) promote transformational development, (2) strengthen fragile states, (3) humanitarian relief, (4) Support USG Strategic interests, and, (5) Global transnational issues.

The principles underlying the White Paper. (1) separate resources for separate goals, (2) separate approaches for separate goals, (3) separate yardsticks for measuring results, (4) country based programming when appropriate, and (5) field missions are core strength.

The paper does not argue for more resources.

Changes are in place to achieve greater effectiveness in policy coherence. (1) USAID-State coordination of Joint Strategic Plan. (2) USAID – MCC Cooperation and coordination. (3) Fragile states strategy, and (4) resource rationalizations

Derived from the National Security Strategy, Three Ds. Defence, Diplomacy, and Development.

The Plan has Four Strategic Objectives. (1) Achieve peace and security, (2) advance sustainable development, (3) promote international understanding, and (4) strengthen diplomatic and program capabilities. For sub-activities see paper on website.

A Big Question is how will the White Paper and its links affect USAID Agriculture and sector programming? Another is how does USAID relate to the MCC?

Question. Dr. D. Rubin. Can the public be involved in discussion and on proposals?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Dr. DeLauder. Was there an opportunity for developing countries to have input into MCA criteria?

Becker. To some extent. Numbers used to evaluate are from international data.

In discussions on how to support those countries that did not quite qualify to be selected, it is anticipated that in the range of \$40-100 million will be available for USAID to assist them to move closer to selection; to cross the threshold.

Tom Hobgood, EGAT/AG Director, Presentation on Agriculture Strategy.

One of the main things to emphasize is that under the new Title 12 Legislation we're talking about a much broader definition and a much broader array of activities in agriculture, not only production, but including the processing, the rural industries that are related to agriculture, the integration of natural resource management, including agro-forestry, pastures, etc., the whole sort of rural landscape, in that definition of agriculture. We look at the role of agriculture as being pivotal in a number of areas. There are links to health and nutrition and to conflict mitigation, and to poverty reduction and economic growth as well as to natural resource management and utilization. We are doing this to contribute to achieving the Millennium Development Goals of reducing hunger and poverty and also the G-8 summit goals to bring developing and transition countries into the global market. We have spent a lot of time looking at our own experience, mission programs, cutting edge research, a lot of which has come from the university community. A lot of stakeholder input to the development of the State – USAID Strategy, Foreign Aid and the National Interest (FANI), and in the State-USAID Strategy it explicitly talks about agriculture development as a key means for increasing economic growth, so it is in there (the strategy).

The four themes of the strategy are: 1) Expanding global, regional and domestic trade opportunities, including sound policies to expand rural finance, and improving quality standards demanded by growing markets. This includes new trade agreements like the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) 2) Improving the social, economic and environmental sustainability of agriculture. Competition for resources, declining productivity and decreasing productivity due to land degradation, the effects of climate change, and poorly functioning markets all come together. We will be working with communities to better manage their own resources and control their own decision making. 3) Mobilizing science and technology and fostering the capacity for innovation. In this we will work with university and international partners on a wide range of technology development issues. Finally, 4) Broadening agricultural training, education and outreach and adaptive research. This includes of course, time, and a we are working with BIFAD in re-engaging the Agency in long-term training, but also looking at the application of communication technologies and getting information to the actors whether it be producers, processors or marketers, getting them access to information and enabling them to use the information in decision making.

We hope to roll out this strategy in the next couple of weeks.

Chairman McPherson. Tom, To what extent can we have a baseline set of numbers allocated to Agriculture and perhaps even broken down within it? I know this is a problem and we've really got to do this otherwise our programs will be too error laden.

Hobgood. It is an important issue and we are trying to resolve it through a more accurate coding system that will capture all we are doing in agriculture. We know, for example, that agriculture funding declined from a high of \$1.2 billion in the mid 80s down to \$247 million by 1997. Those numbers and that downward trend have been reversed and we're now up around \$480 million a year for agriculture from all sources.

Emmy Simmons. There is little I can add. We are trying to come up with an analytically based system that enables us to look more carefully at agriculture and natural resource management, including nutrition, and to be able to understand how our resources are actually flowing. We also need to be able to crosscut what we're doing in agribusiness, and how we pull data out from that area. Do we code, for example, trade capacity building for AGOA as trade investment and report it that way, or do we code it agriculture, agribusiness and code it that way? We are trying to tell a fairly complicated and fairly sophisticated story and our system has not kept up with that need. There is still debate on the Hill regarding what should be agriculture and what should be natural resources management, and where does biodiversity fit? Does biodiversity include gene banks? (We think it does.)

McPherson. I know it's a combination of both the capacity to produce the numbers as well as the politics of the numbers. It is like the earlier debate whether biofortification is health or agriculture.

Simmons. Right, exactly.

McPherson. Emmy argued that it should be both and I, being involved in the issue, I was a big proponent of a little health money going into this. I don't mind a couple sets of numbers as long as we can make some sense from them.

Simmons. We look forward to your support in this area. We are pushing hard and we're engaging with PPC.

McPherson. And the more you can tell us the happier we'll be.

Hobgood. As we role out the strategy and we look at how the strategy relates to the fragile states and other categories within the White Paper. You will also notice that the latest version of the strategy has language from the White Paper and there is a lot attention and integration of women in development issues. This conforms more closely with millennium development goals.

McPherson. Do we have any role in commenting to USDA on Title 1?

Simmons. No. In the 1993 legislation AID was given virtually total authority over Title 2 and USDA was given total authority over Title 1 and the area of discussion has to do with the use of Section 416 Commodities/surplus commodities. One of the issues in fact that came up – is the extent to which we include non-emergency programs that are funded with non-emergency food aid funds, because many of them agriculturally focused. The question is to what extent are those really strategic?

Becker. The big issues with USDA are the McGovern/Dole school feeding and Food for Progress Programs. And the Food for Progress Program is where they're monetizing a fairly large amount of commodity but are going out supporting Borlaug Fellowships right now and this sort of thing. The role of food aid is factored into and will be focused on in the strategy.

Ms. Jackee Schafer. I am one of Emmy's two Deputies and I supervise the Offices of Agriculture, Natural Resources Management, Science and Environmental Policy, and Energy Information Technology. I have quite a lot of experience in developed world irrigated agriculture and now am going to focus on the developing world. The presidential initiative on water is one of 19 presidential initiatives during this administration. This one was rolled out at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg in 2002 and the U.S. committed to provide \$1.6 billion over a three-year period to serve the goal of moving towards halving by 2015 the number of people who are underserved in the water sector.

Components of the initiative are: 1) providing water and sanitation to the underserved, 2) integrated water resources management, and 3) water productivity – less drop per crop or more crop per drop.

Currently 70% of the world's fresh water goes for irrigated agriculture.

Peter McCornick - From USAID's Water Team in the Natural Resources Management Office of EGAT. Alan Hurdus is the Water Team Leader.

We are talking about water with respect to Agricultural Sustainability.

Overview. With a global population over six billion increasing by 80 million per year the demand for water is 64 billion cubic meters per year. With such growth an amount equivalent to the flow of the Rhine River needs to be added to the available fresh water supply each year to meet those growing needs. It takes 2000-5000 liters of water to produce enough food for one person per day. The World Health Organization (WHO) says folks need 50 liters/day for life. Currently, over one billion people get less than 50 liters per day.

To achieve Millenium Development goals still more water will be needed. In some areas – like the Middle East - they average less than 1000 liters per day and rain fed agriculture is important in many areas. In developing countries, 90% of water is used for agriculture and the trend for more irrigated agriculture is growing, especially in Asia.

Africa has very little irrigation developed. By comparison, in North America we store about 7000 liters per person for use during dry times. In South Africa it is 750 liters per year, but places like Ethiopia and Kenya have much less.

Regarding the Presidential Initiative. Expenditures for water programs were to be \$970 million over three years, mostly for sanitation. So far we have helped over 90 million people obtain access to safe water and sanitation. Nearly 400 government groups receive support for improved watershed management and over 3000 local water users groups have been established. We obligated \$400 million in FY 03 and will obligate \$700 million in FY 04.

Experts predict we will need 70% more water for irrigated agriculture and food production. In many areas, like China, water productivity for crop production has increased substantially. But, conversely, the amount of water available for agriculture is declining sharply. Competition for water is rapidly increasing. As a result, China is expected to become a major grain importer in the not so distant future. China and India are over extracting ground water, so at some time in the future they will need to import food.

So, USAID's water activities in agriculture fit with the new strategy, that is – water re-use, quality management, pollution reduction, fisheries, and agriculture. Water management also ties in to other agricultural programs promoting commercial agriculture and high value crops in places like Mali and Romania. Jordan is over-pumping its ground water, and they are also using treated waste water for irrigation and more of that will be happening elsewhere. Infrastructure is an important area that is needed to support efficient use of water for agriculture.

McPherson. What are the three or four things that you think are critical?

McCornick. Efficiency, infrastructure – where lacking, engagement of the private sector for high value crops using drip irrigation and other water conserving technologies. Also to develop local industries that adapt irrigation technologies such as desalinization.

Deegan. Where do resources come from to increase efficiency – like the repairs or replacement of infrastructure in Mali?

McCornick. That is a valid issue because irrigation infrastructure has traditionally been public sector. That might not be sustainable. Water use associations can help.

Hess. An issue also important is the management of watersheds, particularly in the upper-reaches.

Break in Meeting.

Stewart Iverson, Jr. In October (the 13<sup>th</sup>) we will have our BIFAD meeting in Des Moines, Iowa in conjunction with the World Food Prize (WFP). Jayson White is with the WFP and will tell us more.

Jayson White. I direct communications for the WFP. It is a \$250,000 annual award inspiring and recognizing outstanding contributions to the quality and quantity or availability of food in the world. Informally it is known as the Nobel Prize for Food and Agriculture. Nobel Laureate Dr. Norman Borlaug is a founder of the WFP that began in 1986. Since then over 20 individuals have been given the award. The award recognizes a wide array of accomplishments in everything from science and nutrition, crop breeding, soil science, micro enterprise development, and emergency food aid distribution.

Two WFP Laureates were called upon by the UN to work on the Millennium Development goal on hunger. A program and many activities take place to celebrate the WFP each year. A two-day international symposium and a three day youth institute has become an important regional and national event. 2004 has been declared by the FAO as the international year of rice, so it is fitting that this year our WFP will be shared by Professor Yuen Long Ping of China and Dr. Monty Jones of Sierra Leone. Both of these men have contributed a great deal to rice science. This year's theme for the WFP is Rice – From Asia to Africa. We are excited that BIFAD will hold its next meeting in Des Moines in conjunction with the WFP. The WFP Foundation looks forward to working with BIFAD to make your meeting a success.

McPherson. Stewart and I were just talking with other BIFAD members that perhaps we could be responsible for a small portion of the program, a panel or something, consistent with our mission here.

White. Great.

### **Long –Term Training**

Howard Gobstein. Michigan State University. Look to the future to a time when leaders from developing countries work with AID missions and have available to them an opportunity to patch together a package in which they can draw upon resources of U.S. agencies, foundations, maybe the private sector, to meet their specific needs in building scientific capacity and training people. Information is readily available on faculty exchanges, short courses, training programs, fellowships and funding is available for match-making visits between institutions in developing countries and the U.S. Funding mechanisms are transparent and facilitative and timely. This is possible.

When we began on this activity, Emmy Simmons charged us to think not only about putting more people through a training system, but to build a more effective system that trains people and that lures them back to their home countries with opportunities to contribute productively in their fields. We would add a third and that is to re-engage U.S. universities and renew long-term personal and institutional engagement and relationships.

So today we provide an update on how USAID is beginning to implement this initiative. Also we have asked representatives from the NSF and the USDA to describe how their programs compliment those of USAID. Our challenge is to build more collaborations to interlink in ways appropriate to better serve the needs of developing countries. We would also like to grow the resources available for this endeavor.

John Thomas. EGAT/AG. Please refer to the two page hand-out with a matrix on where we are on the long-term training initiative. We started with needs assessments in various countries followed by pilot projects based on those assessments. The objective of the pilot projects were to identify creative, cost-effective ways to do long term training and to hope that Missions would fund it. Now we know it is more difficult than that. We have to be more proactive and more aggressive in getting this long-term training initiative to be an integral part of what we do. We want to see long-term training develop as an integral part of mission programs as they develop their strategies. We have to develop alliances with the private sector, and with other agencies so we can compliment each other. We need to develop the capacities in developing countries so that when graduates return, they have meaningful jobs to come back to, and jobs by which they can develop their economies. As I said, our goal is for long-term training to be integrated into Mission programs, not as add-ons. To do this we've developed a mission statement as shown at the top of the matrix, and its main point is to build on Mission strategies and priorities. Getting Missions and Bureaus buy-ins is critical for the sustainability of long-term training.

Assessments have been done in Mozambique, Mali and East Africa. The RFA was issued for Mali, and ALO will announce the winner later when appropriate. The RFA for East Africa is drafted and is expected to go out by the end of June. Southern Africa and West Africa regional programs will follow.

Alliances with other government agencies, the private sector and foundations are under discussion and development. Jocelyn Brown and Carrie Ann Jones will cover some of the discussions we have had. Developing these alliances is relatively new and will take some time to formalize. Input from those discussions will help formulate a package on long term training options that will be distributed to missions to assist them develop their strategies and approaches in support of long term training. In the interim, we are reaching out to bureaus and missions to build buy-ins. We are doing this through TDYs, training and other information sharing. We will be monitoring and evaluating our progress along this path and adjusting our course as dictated by events and progress.

Dr. DeLauder. How much money was allocated for the Mali project?

Mr. Thomas. Last year we obligated \$1.5 million that was passed through ALO to do the RFAs for Mali and East Africa projects. This FY we envision obligating over \$1.2 million for the third pilot project, those funds coming from a pooling of Agriculture Office, Education Office, the WID Office and the Africa Bureau.

Dr. DeLauder. I was part of the Mali assessment and know the mission supports long term training, but they always are concerned about where the money will come from. They do not have it.

Mr. McPherson. How do we move beyond the pilot stage? I don't want to wait until these programs are evaluated to see whether it is a good idea.

Mr. Thomas. We are not waiting and are working with missions to advance programs in support of long term training.

Mr. McPherson. It is important to incorporate innovative ways to do training, too. I am still concerned about how far along we will be a year from now. I will be unsatisfied if all we have a year from now is our pilot efforts.

Mr. Hobgood. One of the constraints is that missions have a relatively short term time frame and a pressure for quick results and is driven by the Government Performance and Reporting Act. We are looking for ways to meet short term needs but to expand the support for long term development activities, including long term training.

Ms. Christine Springett. The monitoring and evaluation of the pilot programs will be ongoing so will not delay implementation of future programs, but will provide input to ensure their responsiveness to needs. Does this address your concerns?

Mr. McPherson. It shows good will, but doesn't address my concern. We have some things in Africa, we have got Egypt, and we're going to put a lot of money in Iraq. When I was over there we got three university presidents to look at the Iraq university system and there are a number of ways we can keep pushing this. When will the next set of pilots get going? Egypt is an interesting question, as resources are available and deliverables in the short term are not. I think connecting with other agencies, like the old USIA, that is now in State, but does a bunch of work that in its nature doesn't have immediate deliverables. We have had traditional technical training, and USDA does a range of things there.

Mr. Laos. I was on the Mozambique assessment and understand that mission objectives are often short term, but I think Peter is trying to say is what is the next step in the process?

Mr. McPherson. It makes me wonder if we shouldn't have some Congressional language that says this is okay in the context of otherwise short term objectives. It really is a problem in many agencies today, the Accountability Act. It has turned into what you get done in three to five years when we know development is a 20 year proposition. It is hard for universities to play the role we used to play because the work we do is in short term deliverables that we do best.

Mr. Grayzel. I represent the Education Office, so my experience is somewhat different. We are tasked with patching together a tailored process. You have to weave a tailored

process and the problem facing us is we are trying to patch and we have no weaver. There is no weaver between what's being proposed in the long-term training and overall concerns about education in developing countries in the whole forum of education systems. Almost all of our support for education is for basic education. Domestically, globally, constituent-wise, in Congress, in the Senate, basic education is a winner. There is no identifiable support or understanding anymore for the systematic role of higher education and overall educational advancement of a society. Unless that problem is addressed I think these other solutions are going to be patches and we won't get the tailored document. We do have some things going on. We have an evaluation of the Atlas Program and the NAS is doing the study of science and technology, and we are doing an evaluation of our AMO programs. These provide opportunities to demonstrate the needs and benefits, but I ask who is going to weave these things together? Our missions unfortunately have been so downgraded in terms of technical capacities that they are no longer able to weave things together. So they focus on short term results because the larger vision is no longer there. The weaver is no longer there. Congress is supporting and talking about basic education. The higher education people are not there to explain the incomplete picture and as a result we will get a tremendous increased earmark for basic education. Now we have no funds. We are paupers as far as higher education is concerned. We have cobbled together a few programs to train people but we have no funds to really bring forth the ideas that actually build a long term constituency.

I am concerned about where is agriculture? Education is moving ahead, but the agriculture sector is not taking any responsibility for education in agriculture. There is a failure of agriculture communities to weigh in on the larger issues related to education in all agriculture sectors. This is because there is no constituency to bring the resources needed. The one point of light is the community college movement done by the ALO with linkages in South Africa and India where community colleges are active and are proving themselves responsive and of value. They appear to be a replicable model in developing countries. For higher education in agriculture to be successful it needs to be a part of the overall vision for the educational system reforms. As such it can avoid the competition for resources that plagues it today.

Mr. McPherson. The Board's position is to support the broader approach of from K-12 and higher education.

Ms. Jocelyn Brown. I represent the USDA and will focus more on some nuts and bolts issues. I will focus on three training programs. The first is the Borlaug and National Science and Technology fellowship that arose from meetings that USDA, State, and USAID held in June of 2003. At those meetings Dr. Borlaug challenged government agencies to come up with a way of improving human capacity in developing countries. We are working together on this, because none of us have adequate resources to move forward independently. USDA programs are more of a short term in nature. We believe this short term approach will complement the long term approach Mr. Thomas mentioned earlier that is of keen interest to USAID and BIFAD. We have worked with USIA - now with State- to have them add agriculture to their short-term Fulbright scholars program.

Mr. McPherson. Good.

Ms. Brown. Somehow these three agencies with our own bureaucracies are going to have to be forced to come together with a common set of criteria, a common degree of evaluation, and a common goal.

Mr. McPherson. You see the Borlaug idea as helping do that?

Ms. Brown. That is what it is doing right now. All three agencies have agreed that the CGIAR is an important element to the Borlaug Fellowship Program. They are also working on the Cochrane Fellowship Program to ensure that it includes more of the emerging democracies. For example, they are bringing 12 women from Afghanistan in June. They will be studying rural finance and entrepreneurship. This is a shift from more of a trade focus to one with a broader program. Biotechnology is also a key element in the Cochrane program. The last program I want to emphasize is the Faculty Exchange Program. It started in the former Soviet union countries and originally focused on curriculum development, but now has shifted to include food sciences. USDA recognizes that there has been a decade of drought for long-term programs, but we are trying to positively affect change to overcome that past shortfall.

Dr. Winfrey Clarke. I am with Virginia State University. How about the other agencies within the USDA?

Ms. Brown. That is a good point. Without CSREES, The Economic Research Service and the Agriculture Research Service we would not be able to put together these programs. It is fundamental to how we work.

Mr. McPherson. Thank You.

Ms. Carrie Ann Jones of the National Science Foundation, Director of the Office of International Science and Engineering. The NSF is not a development agency nor does it deal with sectors, but we do deal very closely with the U.S. research and education communities. We increasingly recognize the need to internationalize our research programs. We don't do agriculture, but we do bioscience and we do plant genomics. We do agriculture research through a more fundamental science perspective. We are also trying to improve graduate education in the world and in the U.S. So we have much convergence of programs and interests with USAID and USDA. We are encouraged by our board to do more with developing countries. We are working on capacity building in developing countries under World Bank auspices. The approach suggested to strengthen long-term training is of very much interest to us. We have the intellectual capacity to help and we at NSF can mobilize the U.S. intellectual capital. We also believe it is important that U.S. institutions need to be able to turn out students who can work globally. We are active in plant genomics and are eager to include developing country scientists in our dialogue and research programs.

Mr. McPherson. Very Good. In summary, we appreciate the work going into the pilot projects and understand that getting the researchers for these projects was not easy. I think there may be some areas with more funding flexibility that we could pursue and I urge USAID to do that. I agree with USAID's Administrator that we need to extend the practical and that integration is needed. However, as it is integrated, we still need to keep count of what we have done. We need to keep track of what we did this year vs what we did last year. Over the past 10-15 years agencies have been held to a high level of measurable outcomes. The result has been to shift more on inputs and a short-term focus rather than with a long term focus. These days development issues are much more dispersed throughout the government. How to pull together the diverse programs into a common vision is an interesting question. Our colleges of agriculture are science based and driven.

Dr. DeLauder. I appreciate the work that has already been done and the difficulty in securing resources. I am not sure a piece-meal approach will achieve what we are hoping for in getting our people and counterparts trained.

Mr. Mike Deegan. I believe there is a great opportunity for alliances that bring the private sector into higher education. Have we taken any action to get the private sector to step up to this?

Mr. Thomas. Yes. We have had discussions and have received training on the GDA. It takes 18 months to two years for a GDA to become operational. In discussions I have had with the private sector, Proctor & Gamble to be specific, there is strong interest in sharing, market development and working together to market products. There are many companies that fall into the same category as Proctor and Gamble, which have a strong interest in international development. They need to be brought into alliances, and their resources tapped to promote long term training.

Mr. Gobstein. I wonder if, as USAID plans its next assessments in the regions, if the role of other agencies can be included, in addition to what USAID might be doing. For instance, in Southern Africa, what are USDA and NSF doing?

Dr. Joan Claffee. ALO. I want to comment on Mr. McPherson's efforts with legislators for directing resources toward higher education. Dr. Grazel commented that efforts by private firms got this years earmark for education to \$350 million, but that it is for basic education. It would be good to know the total amount the agency has for education for a better understanding.

Dr. Grazel. There is an earmark in place this year and we expect it for next year, but for basic education. But within the agriculture coalition they have a lot of private companies and higher education is not on their agenda. It is because higher education is not at the table when they are discussion their agenda.

Mr. McPherson. It is an interesting point. I do think, that, John, we ought to think about what -- How I might communicate with Administrator Natsios and the board's view that

the agency needs to see K-12 and higher education as an integrated whole as they go through their policy effort.

Mr. Hobgood. I was struck by how we seem to have a convergence of opinion here, by Carrie's comments, that higher education and training people from developing countries is critical to our own leadership in science and exposing our scientists to developing countries and overseas experience. If you couple that with the documented impact of having students train in the U.S. and they go back to become leaders in their country, I think there's an opportunity to rebuild that vision that John Grazel mentioned. By crafting a vision that supports the goals or needs of the participating agencies we could make our policy makers, both in our agencies and with appropriators that we need to re-engage in education in a big way.

Mr. Tim Resch. I think it is also important to look at the relevance or importance of certain countries, like Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Philippines or the Andean countries, and the countries identified by the MCA for support. We are in countries for a diversity of reasons and strategic interests, so extending the optic beyond Africa for Phase II might be appropriate.

Mr. McPherson. Good comment. Egypt is indeed strategic and we are there for longer term payoffs, and thus longer term investments make sense. Now lets move on to the Sherper Report.

Dr. Kenneth Sherper. I am amazed at the convergence of ideas I have heard today. My paper was to focus on the relationship between USAID and the universities and thus I proposed a number of very specific recommendations. Historically, we had a huge BIFAD Office and we had universities that had strong international departments and program offices. We had numerous consortia, and a large number of staff, both in USAID and with universities, devoted to these efforts in international development, particularly in agriculture. We had major long-term training programs with up to 9,500 long-term participant trainees, and that has declined much during the past 10-15 years. The decline in participant training parallels the decline in agriculture programs and staff, and the universities' capacity to implement international programs.

I have seen some good changes. Overall funding for agriculture programs for the Agency is again on the rise. There is an interest in expanding long-term training programs, and USAID is once again hiring new agricultural professional staff.

The key issue facing us is how do we make some changes to change perspectives on approach to the long-term capacity, and the capacity of staff within USAID, and to the resources available. We almost need a strategic effort to move Congressional decision makers.

There is convergence of views from USAID and the university community regarding the need and support for long-term training for human capacity development. We know that this is not a short-term activity. USAID has tremendous pressure to show short-term

results while contributing to long-term efforts. We need to communicate the longer-term vision of where you want to be and how to get there and to share that thinking with agencies that are working in the development business.

My recommendations largely focus on ways to improve the partnerships and procurement procedures and in long-term training. But today I will more with coordination and communication. I propose that USAID create or establish a small office or a coordinator for higher education. It cannot be large. USAID needs a focal point, a person to lead the dialogue and to work with Legislative Affairs and to advise the Administrator of the importance of this and other mandates under Title XII and related directives. An office as indicated above will promote the opportunities for engagement that we have not had in the past. The liaison office would be a catalyst to change the perspective on higher education and long-term training and draw attention as needed.

Dr. DeLauder. I share your concern about the communication/coordination problem, and I recognize that resources are always an issue. I believe the office could be crucial, if properly implemented and would help us bridge some of the challenges we face.

Dr. Sherper. I think this can be best accomplished by a push from BIFAD. It may take you Peter to meet with them and discuss this as we all know the shortage of resources and the limitations of the number of people in Washington. This needs to be taken to the highest levels in order to get it.

Mr. McPherson. I think that an office or and individual might be a good idea, but you've got Tom Hobgood there who couldn't be pushing harder. You've got Emmy Simmons who believes and works with us and who comes to every one of these meetings. I am just afraid that the issue is broader than that. I think this is the heart of what BIFAD has to do and it's not just articulating a view, its working with the Agency leadership and maybe working with Congress to shift the paradigm some. I love the participation of the other agencies here, particularly the NSF that has at least a 25 year agenda. I would like BIFAD to take this under advisement because we have to get at this. Thank you Ken for your excellent efforts.

Dr. Sherper. I did talk to a lot of people and my recommendations reflect comments from more than 40 universities.

Mr. McPherson. That is exactly what we needed. Now for the CRSP Guidelines and the SPARE Charter.

Mr. Anthony Laos. CRSP Guidelines were revised and approved in 1989 and were revised in 2000, but were not approved. I believe we are closer to having a mechanism for revising. John Swanson will comment.

Dr. John Swanson. We have worked on the CRSP Guidelines for some time and we were trying to get a person on board to do a first draft of a revision to streamline them into something user friendly and that would conform to the amendment of Title XII and to

also reflect the reorganization of the Agency, plus revised procurement procedures applicable to the CRSPs. Our procurement procedures were hung up, but we expect that hang up is now resolved and we should have a contractor on board within the next few weeks.

Mr. McPherson. Have the CRSPs worked through the guidelines?

Dr. Swanson. Yes, there has been substantial and repeated interaction with the CRSPs. John, would you care to comment.

Dr. John Yohe. INTSORMIL, CRSP Director. I have had considerable dialog with Dr. Deborah Rubin and others and we had a retreat at which other CRSP Directors had a chance to interact and share their issues and concerns, so yes, I think everybody provided input.

Mr. McPherson. One point I want to make is the need for periodic reviews of the CRSPs and the overall portfolio of CRSPs. Such a review process needs to be factored into the revised guidelines.

Mr. Hobgood. We have convened a group that has met twice, so far. We hope to have Dr. Sharon Quisenberry also engaged in the group, and it involves people from my office, the Natural Resource Management Office and people from Rob Bertram's shop. When David Sammons joins us we can advance the process even more. We will float the concept among the CRSP community to ensure that all have a chance to interact and we get an excellent product.

Mr. McPherson. Now lets move on to the SPARE Charter. I'd like to get out the major differences or issues.

Mr. Laos. John is going to do this with a powerpoint. The basic issues are the formation, how members are appointed, membership on SPARE, duties, and input from the board on agriculture of NASULGC.

Dr. Swanson. One change was to modernize it to build in Title XII language and that the revision is consistent with Agency reorganization. Agency general counsel suggested that we put together a package of, for example, the CRSP Guidelines, the SPARE Charter, The BIFAD Charter, and other similar documents in one place so that people could have access and have a better understanding of the whole process and the diverse partnerships. With respect to SPARE in particular, it was suggested that there be an executive committee consisting of the chair, the vice-chair and any working groups or task forces that are operational. There is a need to clarify the cost of operations. It clarifies that observers from both BIFAD and the Board on Agriculture of NASULGC will attend SPARE meetings. In the past only BIFAD had an official observer.

It is suggested that membership be expanded from six to eight persons to make it more likely to have a quorum. It is suggested that a quorum be set at five members. It is also

suggested that a public and private sector representative be appointed. It was suggested that university members be appointed by the Chair of BIFAD while Agency members be appointed by the Administrator. This would overcome the problem of vacancies currently experienced.

Mr. McPherson. One question I would have would be is should it be all the BIFAD members to vote on members for approval or something as opposed to the Chair. Also more is needed on the role NASULGC should have in this. I don't think it is wrong for NASULGC to have a significant role to help us recruit good people. Lets flag this as an issue. By doing so can we enhance the level of people we can recruit.

Dr. Swanson. Another suggestion was to broaden the functions beyond the CRSP reviews. Intent is to broaden the base and not be so caught up in only reviewing the CRSPs.

Mr. McPherson. On looking at some drafts it almost looked like we broaden the mandate it looks much like BIFAD's mandate instead of a subcommittee for specific purposes. I agree that it should be broader than looking only at the CRSPs. Fred Hutchison, formerly Provost at Ohio State and then President should be consulted on this one. Perhaps SPARE should be more of a research committee.

Mr. Laos. We tried to encompass a lot of different things and it did not look a lot like BIFAD's mandate.

Mr. McPherson. The original BIFAD had two committees and they were very active committees. One was research and the other ? It is good to have a focus, but not so narrow as to only review the CRSPs.

Dr. DeLauder. I agree with that.

Dr. Swanson. One of the concerns raised was whether SPARE has too many masters, but I think if we can define the purpose more clearly and differentiate between BIFAD and SPARE.

Mr. McPherson. And you can have a clause which says, and as other purposes assigned by BIFAD.

Dr. Swanson. Right. Our next steps will be to consolidate suggestions received and share the suggested revisions made with a wide number of stakeholders.

Dr. Tim Resch. ANE Bureau. I am raising the issue of homeland security and the impact on international students. It may be that the Office of International Programs is doing enough helping to address this, but it may also be a BIFAD, USAID role for Visas, arrival and departure dates, opportunities for third country travel to international

conferences by foreign students studying in the U.S. so I want to put this issue forward for consideration.

Mr. McPherson. I think it is a great idea. It is a hot topic. President Gates of Texas A & M University wrote a great op/ed piece in the New York Times calling attention to the issue. I know MSU international student numbers are down next fall and we expect complications and we have a huge international component. This is true across the country. We will need to get advice from ACE and NASULGC and the AAU Colleges Association to get our viewpoint to Homeland Security People and others engaged. John, I'd like to get a couple page summary out with SPARE, the issues and questions we had, for distribution within USAID and the university community.

Dr. David Hess. I just want to report on an issue that has occupied BIFAD, the Agency and the University community for quite some time. I am glad to report that Requests for Assistance (RFAs) for two new CRSPs for Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resources Management and for Integrated Pest Management were put on the fedgrants.gov website at the end of last week and are now open for competition among all those eligible bidders, Title XII Universities for the lead cooperative agreement for a five year period and that will be renewable for another five year period. The next CRSP up for bid and competition will be the Aquaculture and Pond Dynamics CRSP which is also within the Natural Resources Management Office. I mention this given the time it takes for the process to work and be developed.

Mr. McPherson. Thank you. I am glad that BIFAD was able to play a positive role in the process. Hearing a motion to adjourn I declare the meeting adjourned.

End of proceedings.

Summarized by John Swanson, BIFAD Federal Officer from 156 page transcript.