

# BIFAD 147<sup>th</sup> Meeting

11 May 2006

The Board for International Food and Agriculture Development (BIFAD), under Chair M. Peter McPherson, held its one hundred and forty-seventh meeting from 8:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at NASULGC located at 1307 New York Ave NW, Washington DC in the Ground Level Meeting Room.

## Agenda\*

The following is the agenda for this meeting:

- 8:30 a.m. **Welcoming and Opening Remarks**-M. Peter McPherson, Chairman
- 8:45 a.m. **Title XII Analysis**-Richard Bissell
- 10:00 a.m. **Levels and trends in USG Funding for African Agriculture 2000-05, Key Recommendations and Options for Updating and Expanding the Assessment**-Julie Howard, Partnership to Cut Hunger and Poverty in Africa and Michael Taylor, University of Maryland
- 10:45 a.m. **Break**
- 11:15 a.m. **U.S. Universities' Role in Supporting the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP)**-Jeff Hill, USAID/AFR
- 12:00 p.m. **Enhancing MCC and University Interaction**-Kerry Bolognese, NASULGC
- 12:30 p.m. **Lunch Break**
- 1:30 p.m. **USAID and University Partnerships: IPA Lessons Learned and Recruitment Status for New IPA**-David Sammons, USAID/EGAT/AG, Purdue University
- 2:15 p.m. **Status of the New CRSP Portfolio**-John Thomas/Jeff Brokaw, USAID/EGAT
- 2:30 p.m. **Report on the Pre-Application Conferences**-Charity Benson, USAID/OAA
- 3:00 p.m. **Crop Substitution: Replacing Opium in Myanmar**-Ed Runge, Texas A&M University
- 3:15 p.m. **SPARE Report on Issue on University as Subcontractors**-Winfrey Clarke, Chair, SPARE, Virginia State University
- 3:45 p.m. **CRSP Guidelines Revisions**-John Thomas, USAID/EGAT
- 4:00 p.m. **Other Items of General Interest and Summary**-M. Peter McPherson, Chairman
- 4:15 p.m. **Adjournment**

BIFAD Members present:

Peter McPherson (chair), William DeLauder, Sharron Quisenberry, Tony Laos, Stuart Iverson

---

\* The original order of presentations was changed over the course of the day to make more efficient use of time.

## **Title XII Analysis, by Richard Bissell**

Richard Bissell gave background on himself and noted that he was chosen to do the study because he represents the middle ground.

The first of his tasks was to look at the roots of Title XII to ground the current study in an historical context. Mr. Bissell explained that USAID was the premier leader for development assistance 30 years ago. Technologically, agriculture was building on the momentum of the green revolution, and there was an agreement to attack poverty at its rural roots. Generally, people agreed that the path to development had to go through the countryside. Several strong forces coalesced to strategize the approach: powerful leadership in Congress, vocal and articulate commitment of land grant universities, institutional expertise, technical expertise with AID to manage the agriculture programs.

Title XII reflects an offer by the university community to make their expertise available, and the expectation was that the universities would participate, from start to finish and at all levels, in planning and programming agriculture interventions to alleviate poverty. Title XII represented a melding of university and AID resources. The plain meaning of the Title XII legislation was implemented, and the Agency and the university worked together as partners.

Since then the profile of agriculture in international development has fallen. In the year 2000, there was an amendment passed to update Title XII to reflect the new realities. The subject matter was expanded to be more interdisciplinary and tied to other areas of development, such as child survival and health. Additionally, land grant universities were no longer operating on their own. Rather, they were working with partners in the public and private sectors, and that needed to be reflected in the new legislation. In the amendment, there was also a re-emphasis of the dual mandate of strengthening US agriculture in conjunction with agriculture in developing countries. The amendment was passed without a formal hearing and never had a formal endorsement by USAID. As a result, lots of senior people and key stakeholders never read it, and were not even aware that it had been passed.

Mr. Bissell summarized the second of his tasks, stakeholder interviews. He noted that there is really no pattern that emerges regarding opinions of Title XII, and there was an incredible plurality of views. Some of the broad issues he identified included:

- There was some difference on whether Title XII should apply to US agriculture. For the most part, interviewees agreed that the central issue is food security in developing countries. Some saw the objective of dual benefits as onerous and sometimes incompatible, and perceived that they could be penalized if they did not show results that provided a benefit to US agriculture.
- Regarding the strategy paper to implement Title XII, it does not appear that it drives programming. Mostly, it is useful if you had already made your decision that was aligned with the document, and then could use the document to explain the rationale for programming.

- USAID has a “Policy Determination-4” (PD4), which almost no one had heard of, but which still exists within ADS. PD4 refers to the Memorandum of Understanding between the Agency and BIFAD, and is on the books as a non-mandatory policy. Key operational sections of the PD4 were carried over into the higher education policy, which is mandatory. Thus, it is not clear cut that PD-4 is mandatory as it relates to BIFAD.
- There are lots of different views about BIFAD and SPARE and what their role is, which, overall, results in a lack of clarity on the status of BIFAD and SPARE. It is clear to most, however, that the true partnership relationship no longer exists.
- Several other issues which surfaced include definition/perceptions of partnerships; the process for using Title XII to carry out projects; the overall role of research in AID programming, which has been decried by some decisionmakers as a “bottomless pit.”

The last section of the report focused on options for taking action:

- Need to engage the USAID Administrator in agriculture issues
- Need to strengthen staff expertise in agriculture
- Need to rebuild the constituency behind agriculture as an engine for development. BIFAD could play a role in conveying these ideas to the American public.
- There should be a broader participation in Title XII across the Agency
- Universities need to demonstrate their comparative advantages

## ***Discussion of Title XII***

*Sharron Quisenberry, BIFAD Board*-What do you consider a best first step in building partnerships and communication?

*Richard Bissell*-Look for transitions to make inroads.

*Morris Whittaker*-From our university, there was a disengagement that was purposeful. We had just invested a lot of money and staff, and then the decision was made to eliminate the strengthening grants. At that point, we saw AID as an unreliable partner. To re-engage would take some sense of security, and some assurances by the Administrator and Congress. On the part of the university, I think that there was the idea that the university could do it all, and this finally resulted in us doing too much not very well. We should have limited our scope and concentrated on doing it at a higher quality.

*Peter McPherson, and others in audience*-Agreed that the first 10 years of Title XII were very productive because there was a staff associated with BIFAD and agriculture was generally well-funded.

*Ed Price, Texas A&M*-With the amendment, there was an intentional decision to widen the scope because the resources were in other sectors. It seemed that at the end of the paper, the focus was mainly on CRSPs. However, Title XII is a much broader mandate, and in the revision, attention should be paid to seven or eight other programs. Thus far, there has been no hearing on the revision and no discussion outside of Congress.

*Richard Bissell*-Currently, Title XII is associated mainly with the CRSPs.

*David Sammons, USAID and Purdue*-That is because the CRSPs are practically the only thing left that is associated with Title XII. The perception in the Agency is that universities think only about where they will get their money, and that there is a sense of entitlement among universities. I have found this to be untrue. Rather, universities recognize that there are federal sources of funding that are up for competition, and that excellence is requisite. The relationship between USAID and universities has been poisoned by this word “entitlement,” and it has not allowed universities to participate on the basis of excellence. The other thing that is problematic to establishing relationships is that the university, by its nature, is concerned with long-term research and degree training. Without the educational platform, the sustainability of development is called into question.

*John Thomas, USAID*-The conditions that allowed the collaborative, productive relationships between the Agency and universities no longer exist. Richard Bissell notes that the Agency needs to more widely convey the message about agriculture, but what is the message that we can deliver? That needs to be defined.

*Woody Navin, USAID*-My colleagues spend 80% of their time on CRSPs. It is a misuse of time, because we fight over a pie and don't try to grow the pie. We need to show how our work is accomplishing Agency objectives. For example, the formation of agriculture cooperatives is demonstrative of Democracy and Governance. With regards to PPC, that has been taken over by State, and there is no room to do that right now. It is essential that we gain the attention of the Administrator.

*Tim Williams, University of Georgia*-BIFAD, with the resources it has, has a limited ability to change its position. In terms of appropriations, they should focus on Title XII, rather than focusing on the CRSPs.

*Peter McPherson*-The draft paper will be placed on the website, and is open for comments. This is a time of transition so perhaps it is a good time to move forward on this, and for the university and BIFAD to articulate a broader vision that has its roots in history, but is modern, too. In terms of resources, we can minimize the fighting over them if we find some new resources. Right now is a good time to think creatively and broadly, and to revitalize a new way of collaborating.

## **Levels and Trends in USG Funding for African Agriculture 2000-05, Key Recommendations and Options for Updating and Expanding the Assessment, by Julie Howard**

Dr. Howard presented a PowerPoint. Highlights of the presentation follow:

## **Investing in Africa's Future: US Agricultural Development Assistance for Sub-Saharan Africa. Levels, Trends, and Effectiveness.**

### Background & Objectives

- Why did we undertake this report? Why is agricultural development important?
  - 70% live in rural areas, and agriculture led development is key to poverty reduction.
  - By 2003 it seemed as if agriculture was returning to U.S. and Africa policy statements. NEPAD began to formulate CAADP. Heads of State committed 10% of national budgets to agriculture. USAID launched a new Presidential Initiative to End Hunger in Africa and the World Bank pledged increased attention to agriculture and infrastructure.
  - But, focusing now on U.S. assistance, something wasn't right. We were hearing the right policy pronouncements, but we were hearing from our partners in the field that agriculture assistance was NOT increasing.
  - In 2004, with support from Rockefeller Foundation, the Partnership and Resources for the Future agreed to collaborate on a project which would: (5 points of slide)
    - Define agricultural development assistance
    - Summarize policy-level commitments to African agriculture
    - Document levels and trends in U.S. assistance to African agriculture
    - Describe the system of institutions and funding mechanisms through which U.S. assistance is provided
    - Analyze how political and governance features of the U.S. aid system influence the effectiveness of U.S. assistance
    - Present conclusions and recommendations

### Methodology

- Extensive review of publicly available documents
- Interviews and information provided by U.S. & multilateral agency personnel, other U.S. experts, stakeholders
- Data-gathering trip to Ghana, Mali, Mozambique, Uganda and meetings with broad cross-section of stakeholders. Country selection note: These four countries were purposefully selected. They have some of the best prevailing conditions for agricultural and rural sector development on the continent. Like most of SSA, they are predominantly rural and poor. But they stand out because they are among the continent's top economic performers, they have made important progress on political decentralization, and their political leaders have made significant personal and institutional commitments to agriculture and rural sector-led economic growth. We were guided by the excellent efforts of four National Consultants. Stretch geographically across the continent
- National consultants: Dr. Sam Asuming-Brempong, Ghana; Mr. Bakary Kante, Mali; Mr. Victorino Xavier, Mozambique; Dr. Peter Ngategize, Uganda
- Interim report discussed at stakeholder workshop in April 2005
- Final report released in September 2005

Key starting point is to define what we mean by agricultural development assistance

- Construed broadly for this report to include: Activities and investments that foster agriculture-led economic growth and reduced poverty and hunger. Ranges from natural resource management and improved farming practices to rural roads and trade policy. This reflects the recognition that agriculture's contribution required improved productivity and linking farmers to markets.
- Our broad definition is consistent with the new recognition among African leaders and the global development community of the role that market-oriented agricultural systems can play in leading economic growth and poverty reduction in Africa

Summary of Key Findings on Levels of U.S. Agricultural Assistance 2000-2004

- **USAID funding in 2004: \$353 million**, an *increase of 9%* in real terms, despite funds available to Africa Bureau being flat
- **Total U.S. funding in 2004: \$514 million**, an *increase of 2%* in real terms reflecting declines in funding through some other channels
- **Total U.S. and USAID funding declined slightly in 2004**, in absolute terms, from 2003 peak
- **U.S. funding for health grew sharply**, 51% in real terms for Africa Bureau alone

Key Constraints on USAID Funding Level: Flat Funding of DA Account and Earmarks

- Africa Bureau manages 65% of USAID agriculture assistance for Africa
- Two key Africa Bureau accounts are Child Survival and Health (CSH) and Development Assistance (DA)
- Africa DA account funds education, democracy, *agriculture, economic growth, and environment*
- Total DA for Africa gained <2% in real terms from 2000 to 2004, from \$443 million to \$494 million, while CSH grew 51%
- Education consumed \$33 million of the \$51 million DA gain and grew 25% in real terms, driven by a tripling of the Global DA earmark for education from 2000 to 2004
- **Result:** *3% decline in real terms in funds available for African agriculture*
- **Policy consequence:** The President's Initiative to End Hunger in Africa (IEHA) boosts focus on agriculture but not available funding

Findings Related to Effectiveness

- Congressional earmarks limit USAID's flexibility to respond to local needs, undermining local ownership of the development process
- Fragmentation of program funding spreads aid thin, raising doubt about long-term sustainable impact
- Pressure on USAID managers for short-term results is at odds with long-term investment and growth strategies
- Domestic interests impose a substantial "political overhead" cost on U.S. assistance programs

Recommendations

- Congress and the administration should make African agriculture a budget priority by

- Doubling the level to 10% of total USAID-managed assistance
- Developing an Africa-focused funding vehicle that builds on MCA principles but more widely addresses rural economic growth in qualified countries
- US should make local ownership of development a higher priority and ensure this is reflected in program and funding strategy
- Congress should reform policies that impose a political overhead on U.S. assistance
- USAID should take the lead across U.S. agencies and internationally to reduce fragmentation and improve coordination of resources in accordance with a long-term agricultural development strategy

*Peter McPherson*- This is an important study since it also gives clues for priorities in Africa, e.g. projections for food and water requirements, interaction between HIV/AIDS and agriculture.

Resolution proposed and passed that BIFAD supports the continues work of data gathering and analysis of U.S. agricultural funding in Africa not necessarily by Partnership and that there was no expectation that AID would provide funds.

## **US Universities Role in Supporting the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP), by Jeff Hill, USAID/AFR**

Jeff Hill presented a PowerPoint on Role of US Universities in the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP). Highlights of the presentation follow:

The regional actions for CAADP Implementation are:

- Strengthen the Capacity of Regional Economic Communities to Coordinate the Regional Implementation and Mutual Review of CAADP
  - AU/NEPAD recognize five regions in Africa: Eastern, West, Southern, Central, North.
  - Initial efforts focused on Eastern (COMESA) and West Africa (ECOWAS)
- Establish Regional CAADP COMPACTS in Two Regions, supporting an integrated portfolio to meet CAADP Objective
- Support and Complete Strategic Analysis to Identify Regional Sector and Pillar Policy and Investment Priorities
- Complete joint donor supported regional program design for priority programs in
  - Science and Technology
  - Trade, agribusiness development and infrastructure,
  - Chronic food insecurity
  - Land and water management

The four CAADP pillars outlined by NEPAD are:

- Extend the area under sustainable land management and reliable water control systems
- Improve rural infrastructure and trade related capacities for market accesses

- Increase food supply, reduce hunger, and improve responses to food emergency crises
- Improve agriculture research, technology dissemination and adoption systems

#### The US Commitment to CAADP

- To accelerate the CAADP strategy, (USAID) will align specific programs in support of this African vision of sub-Saharan Africa's transformation and economic growth.
- Back the African-led implementation of the integrated agricultural framework that is CAADP, USAID will allocate agency resources over five years to support the ongoing Presidential Initiative to End Hunger in Africa.
- USAID will program approximately \$200 million in fiscal year 2006 for the first year of a five-year effort that will span from 2006 to 2010. USAID expects similar commitments over each of the next five years.

#### How USAID will operationalize support for CAADP

Working closely with the African Union's New Partnership for Africa's Development (AU/NEPAD), USAID and other donors will:

- Establish a CAADP process and investment plan in those countries that are meeting their pledges to increase support for and attention to the agriculture sector. In 2006, USAID will work with NEPAD and other donors in up to six countries to support CAADP;
- Establish multi-donor efforts in hunger hot-spots – countries consistently threatened by famine. In addition, donors will develop a process and plan to address the policy and technical barriers that are making countries famine prone and ultimately integrate them into the CAADP. In 2006, we will work with two or three countries;

#### US University Support for CAADP

- Three Areas of Engagement include:
  - CAADP Partners Forum;
  - Strategic Analysis assisting regional organizations and countries develop strategies and shape priorities;
  - Implementation of Technical Programs.

### ***Open discussion/question period***

*Tag Demment*-How do universities engage on this, and how is the point contact person at USAID?

*Jeff Hill*-Identifies himself as point person, and are working to establish other contact point people to facilitate a wide range of engagement.

*Tag Demment*-If we want to ensure that any proposal we draw up is supportive of CAADP, how do we do that?

*Jeff Hill*-We are at a formative point. Expert reference groups have been established...so those ensure that if you are working in eastern Africa, you work with that reference group. If the concern is science and technology, you should work with those people. We need to ensure that stakeholders feed into a common process.

*John Thomas*-What mechanisms, besides CRSPs, have universities found to work with missions?

*Jeff Hill*-work that is aligned with IEHA. Country missions are working with individual universities. SEEDS program is in southern and western Africa. At Iowa State, they are working on different contracts. There are various capacity building initiatives, and direct one-to-one agreements.

*Representative from University of Missouri*-Black universities are historically left out. How do we get involved?

*Jeff Hill*-We are working with the Danforth Center, for example. One of the issues is the normal way we make information available. Is the agenda being put out for broader competition?

*Unidentified questioner*-Are universities represented on forums already?

*Jeff Hill*-The partners forums are just beginning to get formed. No one has been left out of anything, because we are just forming. We are asking how to get groups to talk to each other and define how they want to participate. Different interest groups are being invited and asked to organize.

FARA is the lead organization for the science and technical document. It is a public document, and as moves through the policy processes, it will be asking for alignment of various science and technology efforts.

*Allen Christensen*-How do we actually get this working at the farmer level, and the transfer to happen at the farmer level?

*Jeff Hill*-That is the ultimate point. The various technical organizations will have to figure out how to deliver the services. African governments are being asked to accept responsibility. The local capacity needs to be developed to do what you are talking about.

*Tom Hobgood*-Suggests that people refer to NEPAD.org to learn more.

## **Enhancing Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) and University Interaction, by Kerry Bolognese, NASULGC**

1. Through NASULGC, the university community has been active in trying to engage the MCC.
2. All sectors, including research and international programs, have been engaged
3. MCC has been reluctant to engage with the university community
4. We need to penetrate the MCC with on the ground efforts

We have had about 2 dozen meetings to discuss what is the university role in MCC implementation, MCC internal operations, evaluation, etc. Thus far, most interactions with MCC have been *ad hoc* short term services, and no real relationship has been fostered. We had an interesting meeting with MCC this week, and the ambassador to MCC have us his commitment to see if we can work in country. Collins and Company submitted a bid to MCC, which had enormous university participation, and the award went elsewhere.

*Peter McPherson*-The next key step is to think about small teams. The ambassador to MCC was intrigued with the idea that Minnesota had such a long relationship with Morocco....the MCC is much like the World Bank, where so many of the decisions are made in the field. The bottom line is that following on this meeting, we need to propose small teams for half a dozen countries. The ambassador was gracious and engaging, but I don't want to be too optimistic. We need to entice them with some of these historical relationships.

*David Sammons*-The activities under the MCC are country-led. How do we connect in a way that is helpful to the MCC. NASULGC working group found that there is ignorance about how the MCC works, so we are developing a primer that will go out to universities.

*Kerry Bolognese*-The MCC also has a good website and a good outreach program.

*Morris*-It would be helpful if someone could put together a portfolio that shows the country contacts, and of the places where the MCC is.

*Peter McPherson*-We don't know here in NASULGC. We have to go and find this....this should not just be NASULGC. Rather it should also be a broader effort by universities, and done in a transparent, open way.

## **Status of the New CRSP Portfolio, by John Thomas and Jeff Brokaw, USAID/EGAT**

CRSP Portfolio Implementation -- Summary of status since February 3<sup>rd</sup> BIFAD Meeting

The recent EGAT AG/NRM portfolio review, which was requested by BIFAD and carried out in consultation with the CRSPs, identified CRSP topics of continued relevance to the overall Agency portfolio and development priorities for the next five years (2005-2010).

We plan to do similar reviews every 5 years to set the agenda for the next 5 years. The lessons learned from this exercise will improve the process.

The new CRSP MEs:

- Sorghum, Millet & Other Grains (compete 2006)
- Peanut (compete 2006)
- Aquaculture & Fisheries (compete 2006)
- Assets & Market Access (to replace BASIS) (compete 2006)
- Dry Grain Pulses (to replace Bean/Cowpea) (compete 2007)
- Horticulture (new) (compete 2007)
- Global Livestock & Poultry (compete 2008)
- Soil, Water & Ecosystem Services (linked to evaluation of SANREM in 2008)

With regard to the current IPM and SANREM CRSPs, reviews of these programs during their fourth year (2008) will determine their status in the new portfolio.

In the case of the SANREM CRSP, the review will evaluate the performance of the CRSP ME and research program over the first four years and also look at how that CRSP has taken on, and might, in the second of five years, take on a more focused global research program to align it with the portfolio's "Soil, Water and Ecosystem Services CRSP".

In the case of the IPM CRSP, the review, in addition to evaluating the performance of the CRSP ME and research program over the first four years, will determine whether the new commodity-oriented CRSPs have taken on substantial IPM issues related to their CRSP topics and whether there are issues that warrant a stand alone IPM CRSP that broadly deals with IPM issues apart from the IPM activities of the commodity-oriented CRSPs.

When USAID awards a CRSP ME to a university, the initial Agency commitment is for 5 years. But there is "some assumption" that a 5-year extension will be provided based on three criteria: (1) a record of good performance during the first 5-year period, (2) availability of Agency funding; and (3) continued relevance of the CRSP to the overall Agency portfolio and development priorities.

The principle of "some assumption" regarding extensions is applicable to the recently-awarded SANREM and IPM CRSPS, just as it is to all new awards that are being considered for extension beyond the first five years.

In developing the global research program, the new CRSPs will include five Core Program Components:

- A Systems Approach (to make sure research results are implementable in the cultural, economic and political context)
- Social, Economic & Environmental Sustainability
- Capacity Building & Institutional Strengthening
- Outreach, Dissemination & Adoption
- Intellectual Leadership

There are also Eight Focal Areas for Development Results that will inform the selection of program outcomes and areas of intellectual leadership:

- Improving nutrition and health
- Maximizing water and soil quality and productivity
- Broadening market access
- Mitigating post harvest constraints
- Enhancing productivity and livelihoods in marginal areas
- Advancing integrated pest management practices
- Increasing incomes
- Improving food quality, processing, and food safety

With regard to the current IPM and SANREM CRSPs, reviews of these programs during their fourth year (2008) will determine their status in the new portfolio.

In the case of the SANREM CRSP, the review will evaluate the performance of the CRSP ME and research program over the first four years and also look at how that CRSP has taken on, and might, in the second of five years, take on a more focused global research program to align it with the portfolio's "Soil, Water and Ecosystem Services CRSP".

In the case of the IPM CRSP, the review, in addition to evaluating the performance of the CRSP ME and research program over the first four years, will determine whether the new commodity-oriented CRSPs have taken on substantial IPM issues related to their CRSP topics and whether there are issues that warrant a stand alone IPM CRSP that broadly deals with IPM issues apart from the IPM activities of the commodity-oriented CRSPs.

When USAID awards a CRSP ME to a university, the initial Agency commitment is for 5 years. But there is "some assumption" that a 5-year extension will be provided based on three criteria: (1) a record of good performance during the first 5-year period, (2) availability of Agency funding; and (3) continued relevance of the CRSP to the overall Agency portfolio and development priorities.

The principle of "some assumption" regarding extensions is applicable to the recently-awarded SANREM and IPM CRSPs, just as it is to all new awards that are being considered for extension beyond the first five years.

In developing the global research program, the new CRSPs will include five Core Program Components:

- A Systems Approach (to make sure research results are implementable in the cultural, economic and political context)
- Social, Economic & Environmental Sustainability
- Capacity Building & Institutional Strengthening
- Outreach, Dissemination & Adoption
- Intellectual Leadership

There are also Eight Focal Areas for Development Results that will inform the selection of program outcomes and areas of intellectual leadership:

- Improving nutrition and health
- Maximizing water and soil quality and productivity
- Broadening market access
- Mitigating post harvest constraints
- Enhancing productivity and livelihoods in marginal areas
- Advancing integrated pest management practices
- Increasing incomes
- Improving food quality, processing, and food safety

The CRSP MEs will also identify a focal area(s) or focal area sub-theme(s) for which they will undertake intellectual leadership.

Also, at BIFAD's request, the CRSP MEs will be held accountable for a small number of clearly defined and measurable outcomes within Focal Area sub-themes that the CRSPs themselves select, and which contribute to USAID priorities for development. These deliverables will include research, training, outreach/dissemination, and institutional strengthening outcomes.

When CRSPs are evaluated in year four of their first 5-year award, the evaluation of good performance will include both the ME and the global research program. The ME will be evaluated on its implementation of the global research program including incorporation of the core program components and on its intellectual leadership in an identified focal area or focal area sub-theme for development results. The evaluation of the research program will be based particularly on progress on agreed upon measurable research, training, outreach/dissemination, and institutional strengthening outcomes.

In terms of the schedule to compete the new CRSPs in 2006 and 2007:

- Assets and Market Access draft RFA was issued on the USG Grants.Gov Web site on March 17 for a two-week public comment period. There was a public Q&A session on April 12. An award for this new CRSP is expected by September 30, 2006.
- RFAs for Peanut, Sorghum, Millet & Other Grains, and Aquaculture & Fisheries are expected to be released soon. As with the AMA RFA, public comment meetings will be set up for potential bidders to receive responses to questions or requests for clarification. Awards are expected to be made by January 1, 2007.
- RFA for Dry Grain Pulses will be released in the October 2006.
- RFA for Horticulture will be released by April 2007.

Requests for proposals to extend the four CRSPs ending in 2006 (Peanut, Sorghum/Millet, Aquaculture and BASIS) were sent by OAA in March. Proposals have been received from all four CRSPs. All but one proposal exceeds available funds. OAA will be sending a letter requesting proposal revisions soon. The original request and the revision request asked the CRSP MEs to prioritize on the following:

- Complete training
- Maintain critical research
- Synthesize lessons learned from research
- Provide a smooth transfer of documents and data to a new ME
- Allow an overlap of up to 6 months following the award of the new CRSP ME

Other changes that I would like to note:

USAID Application Review:

The proposals for new awards will be reviewed by a Technical Evaluation Committee composed of:

- Four or more members
- At least one of the members will be an external technical expert from the U.S. university community, other U.S. agencies, the private sector, or donor organizations

USAID Management of awards:

USAID substantial involvement will consist of:

- Review and comment on annual implementation plans for the Leader Award
- Approval of key personnel (CRSP Director)
- Agency and ME joint participation on:
  - Collaborative involvement in selection of members of advisory committees. USAID may also choose to become a member of these committees. Advisory committees would concern themselves only with technical or programmatic issues and not routine administrative matters;
  - USAID will review and comment on the solicitation for research activity sub-awards;
  - USAID will participate with voice and vote, but not veto, in the selection of sub-award recipients; and
  - USAID will approve the recipient's monitoring and evaluation plan.

*Peter McPherson*-Clarification on the current MEs, and the wording of the rebid. After 10 years, there is no presumption for the current ME...rather, it is an open competition? Will the resource materials, and materials, be available to the winning ME from the losing ME?

*John Thomas*-This is a procurement issue. The ME could request a briefing from OAA, the Office of Procurement.

*Tag Demment*-In the original, it was a five year draft.....it was a presumption of a 10-year grant, as long as performance is acceptable.

*Lena Heron, USAID*-It is a five-year award, with some assumption of a five year renewal based on performance. It is not a ten year grant.

*Tim Williams*-However, the technical content cannot be limited to a five year horizon, because it will change. The 10 year horizon needs to be explicit in the RFA.

*Peter McPherson*-If the research agenda could not be worked out upfront, there would often be a horizon that would go beyond five years, but there has to be a five year horizon because it is a five year grant. You can't wait for 10 years...there have to be benchmarks along the way.

## **Jackee Schaffer, Awards of Appreciation**

Ms. Schaffer, in conjunction with Mr. McPherson, awarded Stuart Iverson and Tony Laos plaques and statements of gratitude for their service on BIFAD.

Participants broke for lunch

## **USAID and University Partnerships: IPA Lessons Learned and Recruitment Status for New IPA, by David Sammons, USAID/EGAT/AG, Purdue University**

Dave Sammons, outgoing IPA, provided a review of his work at USAID and provided some ideas for future direction. Highlights of his presentation follow:

Principle responsibilities included:

- Provide leadership for rebuilding the partnership between the agricultural university community and USAID.
- Participate in discussions within the Agency pertinent to the interests of the agricultural university community.
- Respond to inquiries and requests from the university community relative to the partnership with the Agency.

Major activities during tenure included:

- Liaison with the Land Grant University community (and others on occasion)
- Agricultural research priority setting
- CRSP portfolio review and rebidding
- Rewrite of the CRSP Guidelines
- Revision of the SPARE Charter
- Staff support to BIFAD and SPARE

Additional activities included:

- Long term training initiatives (Borlaug Program)
- Global Horticulture Assessment
- Participant in CG system wide activities
- Informal USAID liaison with multiple external university stakeholders: USDA/CSREES; ALO/HED; NASULGC; MCC

- Assist with responses to Congressional inquiries: university relations, agricultural issues, CRSPs

The purpose of university visits was to launch a dialogue with the agricultural university community pertinent to the University-Agency partnership through visits to selected Land Grant institutions.

Principle findings of university visits include:

- The visits provided evidence of an internationally-engaged and energized faculty and university administration.
- Increasingly, Land Grant institutions view themselves as “Global Universities” with responsibilities beyond state borders.
- Agency priorities, especially as expressed in the Agriculture Strategy, resonate with what Land Grant Universities do well.
- The themes of the Agriculture Strategy are consistent with the strategic foci of many Land Grant institutions.
- Numerous concerns and issues relative to the University-Agency relationship emerged during the visits, largely due to problems with miscommunication and/or incorrect information. We neither know nor understand each other very well.

Good ideas for initiatives to strengthen the partnership also surfaced during the visits:

- Student internships with the Agency;
- Re-engagement in long term training;
- Leverage university strengths with Congress on behalf of the Agency’s priorities vis-à-vis university partnerships;
- “Tag Along” programs to build international competence of young university-based scientists (like NSF program);
- Novel uses of university strengths in IT for development.

Principle insights from IPA tenure

- Although there is clear interest in revitalizing the University-Agency partnership on both sides, the goals for such are not clearly articulated by either the university community or the Agency.
- There continues to be a lack of mutual understanding and trust between the Agency and the university community in the context of partnerships, international engagement, and the capacity for participation in development efforts.
- The term “partner” is used quite differently by the Agency and the university community:
  - **Agency view:** Partners are principally implementers of Agency-defined programs.
  - **University view:** Partners work together across a spectrum of activities of common interest. Partners trust each other, share common goals, have mutual interests, and recognize/draw upon one another’s strengths.

Where do we go from here? Future University-Agency efforts to revive the partnership must focus on:

- joint clarification and/or redefinition of the meaning of university partnership with the Agency;

- identification of the most desirable roles for university participation in Agency development priorities;
- goals and expectations of each party for a more productive partnership;
- resolution of impediments, miscommunication, tension, and mistrust that constrain the partnership;
- needs and goals of each party for recommitment to a creative, dynamic, trusting, and productive partnership in the 21st century context.
- The utility of the IPA mechanism for representing university interests within the Agency, raising the Agency's profile within the university community, and improving dialogue with university partners is an effective mechanism for rebuilding the partnership.
- A successor IPA must be identified and appointed

With regards to elements of the USAID agriculture strategy

- Expand trade opportunities and improve the trade capacity of producers and rural industry.
- Improve the social, economic, and environmental sustainability of agriculture.
- Mobilize science and technology and foster the capacity for innovation.
- Strengthen agricultural education, outreach, and adaptive research.

## **SPARE Report on Issue on University as Subcontractors, by Winfrey Clarke, Chair, SPARE, Virginia State University**

The issue is that the university community has become increasingly concerned about the use of their names on contracts as subcontractors, but not the use of their people if the contract is awarded to the prime contractor, i.e. bait and switch. Peter McPherson raised the issue in 2005, and since then, there have been a number of meetings with megacontractors. Predictably, there are two sides to the issue, and the megacontractors have raised some of their own concerns about universities. David Sammons put together a paper on the issue, which has been used as the basis for BIFAD's deliberation. At the SPARE meeting in April, we talked about this again, and Jean Horton from OAA informed us that the Agency was working on a Key Subcontractor Clause.

*Jean Horton*-OAA looked at the issue and took the concerns seriously. This is also a concern for small businesses, though we can't say how often it occurs, since we don't collect data. We decided that we needed to come up with something similar to the Key Personnel Clause. If the Key Subcontractor is a term of the award, they have to use that subcontractor for the specific work they have specified in the proposal. If they do not use that sub, they have to tell the agency why they are not using that sub. The change to the rules, which is what this should be, is a lengthy process, but we are going to pilot the change in some pilot RFAs.

*David Sammons*-I made the inquiry and wrote the paper. At the time, I was told that when an award is made, the Agency is, for the most part, just concerned that the work gets done, and not about who does it. What you are doing is an enormous step in the right direction.

*Peter McPherson*-The clause will be used in the pilot contracts?

*Jean Horton*-We want to incorporate the clause as quickly as possible, and want to do some pilots. We would notify the offeror that if they are using the subcontractor for critical parts of the work, and that the proposal is being evaluated based on that expertise, the subcontractor has to be in the proposal and the amount of work has to be specified. Then, if they make changes to this arrangement, they need to notify the Agency. This would include situations where the prime has decided to do the work themselves. It needs to be even more stringent than just notification, though we don't want to cause delays in the work. The pilot is being limited to seven contracts, since there is a limitation on gathering data before we have to gain permission. We have also asked for volunteers from the field to pilot this clause.

*Peter McPherson*-We don't want to wait another two years from now to see if you will change the rules. We are talking about a standard contract process. To do it broadly, you will have to go through the process of rule change. Let's proceed to do the pilot and get it underway, while at the same time proceed to get the rule changed.

*Jean Horton*-Put that in your resolution and we will consider it. The consequences for a prime contractor under this new subcontractor clause is breach of contract.

#### BIFAD Resolution: Key Subcontractor Clause

May 11, 2006

BIFAD strongly supports the Key Subcontractor Clause and recommends that AID move expeditiously to begin the process to change the rule so it would be broadly applicable to all Agency Acquisition and Assistance Instruments ("contracts"). Simultaneously, AID/OAA should immediately implement a pilot test, as now being considered, of the Key Subcontractor Clause. It is BIFAD's understanding that the pilot test is not because of uncertainty of the change in policy but rather to get some action underway as soon as practical. In that spirit BIFAD appreciates AID's wish to promptly move on the pilot. Furthermore, BIFAD believes strongly that mere notification to AID by the prime contractor of a change in the subcontract is not nearly enough. Obviously a very good reason should be required and AID should consider requiring AID's approval of changes in identity of the subcontractor or other material change in the role of the subcontractor. Certainly the contractor should be required to notify the subcontractor of the subcontractor's rights under the contract shortly after the bid is awarded and the contractor must promptly notify the subcontractor of any changes the contractor is making in connection with the subcontractor.

## **Report on the Pre-Application Conferences, by Charity Benson\*, USAID/OAA**

The benefits of having the conference were that it gave USAID a sense of interested applicants. We were able to prepare responses, and could clear up misconceptions on other issues. We also gave feedback on CRSP RFAs in general. The conference also increased internal communications in our office and resulted in greater consistency among RFAs. The AMA RFA will be posted soon, and the tentative award date is in December.

---

\* Charity Benson was replaced by Vann Rolfson of the same office.

*Audience Member.* With regards to the CRSP guidelines revision, we are not in the process of revising the guidelines to incorporate the changes. We have done this in consultation and have been getting input from several places. CRSP guidelines need to be circulated through AID before going to the administrator. We need to prepare a revised draft, and then at the next BIFAD meeting, we want to come together and do a joint presentation with BIFAD on the CRSP guidelines and present it as a jointly approved document.

*Peter McPherson*-Introduces two new BIFAD members.

Resolution proposed and passed: *BIFAD Resolution: A New Cooperative Vision for Title XII, 5/10/06:*

BIFAD has received the draft review of the Title XII legislation and resulting function of the partnership between USAID and US universities in agricultural development. In its first decade (1975-1985), the legislation promoted a strong and effective partnership consistent with the language of the legislation. BIFAD was deeply involved in assisting the Agency in the full range of the development process. This legislative mandate was recognized and implemented by both BIFAD and USAID. Thereafter, the programmatic, policy, and funding environment changed in ways that did not favor Title XII activities and the nature of engagement between the universities and the Agency changed although the legislation remained the same. Unfortunately, the relationship gradually weakened until recently when positive steps have been taken toward greater engagement. BIFAD

## **Crop Substitution: Replacing Opium in Myanmar, by Ed Runge, Texas A&M University\***

Dr. Runge presented on a project in Myanmar to reduce opium production, and to replace it with corn. Highlights of the presentation follow.

The project was entitled Project Old Soldier and it was managed by the Committee of 101 Veterans, Inc. and Funded by Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, US State Department. The committee was composed of the following members:

- Mr. Pete Lutken, President
- Mr. Dennis Klein, Treasurer
- Dr. Ed Runge, Technical Adviser
- Mr. Oliver Trechter, Adviser
- Mr. Mickey Kaliff, Adviser
- Mr. Stuart Power, Former Adviser (Deceased)

### **Some important highlights of the project included:**

- Objective – Bring Modern Technology to Kachins & Others in Northern Burma

---

\* This presentation was very large, both in terms of slides and MBs. For the sake of brevity, only slides that were most descriptive of the essential aspects of the project were included.

- Designed in 1996 as a Corn Improvement Project by Runge & Price - approved by Myanmar Government
- Project furnishes hybrid seed, fertilizer and weed control materials and technical advise.
- First Crop in 1997 – Increase yield from 25 to 30 baskets to 100 to 125 baskets
- Jordan Caldwell was hired and stationed in Burma for first two growing seasons
- Pete Lutken and Oliver Trechter spent several months in Burma during first two years
- Set up Experimental Demonstation Fields at Kutkia and Namtu.

Other project activities included:

The introduction of additional crops

- Buckwheat
  - Wheat
  - Vegetables
  - Edible Soybeans
  - Regular and Hy-Lysine Corn Hybrids from CIMMYT
  - Regular and Hi-Lysine Corn Hybrids from Texas A&M University
- 
- Trained project personnel at CIMMYT and AVRDC
  - Want to produce hybrid seed corn
  - Want to train people in Aquaculture

Project procedures entailed the following:

- We provide hybrid seed corn, fertilizer and weed control chemicals for 1 acre.
- Earlier we did this for 2 years but found that 1 year was sufficient
- We set up cooperatives that help farmers buy inputs and sell outputs.
- Our project then imports the seed, fertilizer and chemicals for them, often makes loan to farmer.
- We add ~ 20 new locations each year to project and keep old locations as cooperatives.

Instruction is also a part of the project.

- Seminars and Instruction in village homes and via field tours.
- Live in extension agents in villages have always been part of the project.

Poppy production results include the following:

- We ask cooperators to sign agreement that they won't grow poppies.
- For the most part farmers have quit growing poppies. They don't like growing poppies for many reasons.
- The people suffering most from poppy production are the farmers themselves. Every family has, or has had addicts and many died very young.
- Gross Income from corn production sold to China is at least US\$1,000,000 in 2005.

Why does an Old Soldier Project need new activities?

- How do we make the project more sustainable? What happens if the US State Department funding should be disrupted?
- Hybrid seed, fertilizer and chemicals are expensive.

- Presently bartering is still a major way to exchange items within project areas. Cash is scarce.
- Can we increase Cash Flow in Area? If so how? Trade with China is a big step forward.
- Hybrid Seed Corn production and Increased Vegetable Production may help the project be more sustainable
  - By reducing expense for hybrid seed corn
  - By selling hybrid seed corn to others outside project in Burma
  - By increasing the quality and quantity of vegetable production and hopefully exporting production to Lashio and Mandalay.

Some recent and new project activities to improve sustainability

- Sent two project employees for 8 months of training in Corn and Wheat Production at CIMMYT in 2003.
- Began effort to try and produce Hybrid Seed Corn in Burma in 2003 and 2004.
- Made Contact with Dr. Fan Xingming from Kunming Academy of Science to help us produce hybrid seed corn in Burma at DFW airport in October 2004.
- Contacted AVRDC and enrolled 2 project people in Vegetable Production Short Course, Bangkok, Thailand October 31, 2005 to March 31, 2006
- Pete Lutken and I visited AVRDC in Tainan, Taiwan and Dr. Fan at Kunming and Luxi, China from August 22 to September 3, 2005 to launch these two activities

Peter McPherson adjourned the meeting.