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ADMINISTRATOR SHAH: Thank you.

SWEARING-IN OF NEW MEMBERS

(Applause.)

ADMINISTRATOR SHAH: Well, I am just going to be very, very brief, but I wanted to share a few thoughts which I had the chance to share with the group yesterday evening.

Where did Bill go?

Oh, there you are. Oh, please.

Come up.

So, all right. First I want to thank the new Members of our Board who have joined today, and I think everyone here knows Brady Deaton, the Chancellor of the University of Missouri and someone who has had a long and illustrious career in agricultural development, a former Peace Corps volunteer -- is that right?

And we are -- USAID are packed
with former Peace Corps Volunteers, so we are really, really appreciative of that, and we thank you for your service on this Board.

Jo Luck needs no introduction, a World Food Prize Winner, the President of Heifer International, and someone who has been a personal source of inspiration for me in a number of different roles.

And, Jo, we are grateful that you have taken this on, and we'll benefit from your wit and wisdom on a number of issues, both in terms of how to implement this program, but also in terms of how to better connect our work to the American People, and to find opportunities for Americans to express their values through partnering with us in this effort.

Gebisa Ejeta, also a recent World Food Prize Winner, and a distinguished professor of agriculture at Purdue. Gebisa's research has been groundbreaking and has helped numerous agricultural organizations in...
Africa and around the world do a better job of serving those in need.

I've learned, Gebisa, from you, the importance of listening to the people we are ultimately trying to serve, and this portfolio of work, usually women, mostly small farmers and small holders and, in Sub-Saharan Africa, really understanding the need and aspirations that they have, and then pursuing science in a rigorous way that supports that aspiration.

So, thank you, Gebisa, for taking this on.

And Marty McVey, the president of -- is it McVey --

MEMBER McVEY: And Associates.

ADMINISTRATOR SHAH: -- and Associates, right.

And we very much appreciate your participation. One of the things we are trying to do is to open up this sector and to make it more -- to make it easier and more
effective for the private sector to work with
and partner with the types of organizations
that do the work on the ground in Africa and
around the world, and we are deeply grateful
that you'll bring that expertise and a
financial management background as well and
help us do some creative things with a much
broader set of communities and perspective.
So, thank you.

I also want to welcome back Bill
DeLauder and Elsa Murano. We very much
appreciate your continuing on. And I know you
have serious business to do, so I will be very
brief, and then I will -- then I will
disappear.

But I wanted to say just a few
things so folks here understood just how
important this Board has been and is going to
be. This group will be -- will play an
absolutely critical role in helping us guide
and manage our portfolios going forward.

And, just in the past, as I have -
- I mentioned yesterday evening, I have received letters from BIFAD through Bob Easter and his championship and leadership of this effort.

In every instance, when I've gotten feedback from this group, we have taken it very seriously. And we do that because, as I mentioned yesterday, when you all come to a consensus, observation and recommendation that we need to do something differently, I think it is our obligation to take that very seriously. To start from the presumption of a desire to address the challenge you've identified, and to recognize that, by doing that, and by thinking of and being accountable to this group we can craft better programs, bring on board a broader variety of partners, build capacity in a more fundamental way in all of the work that we do around the world and ultimately deliver better results.

And so I'll just conclude with a brief summary of what the President has told
me to get done with our efforts in food
security.

President Obama launched the Feed
the Future initiative at the L'Aquila Summit
in 2009, and it was at a moment when the G-20
world leaders came together to address the
global financial crisis, and in a context of
recognizing that food and fuel price spikes
that were, in part, the manifestation of that
crisis had moved for the first time in decades
100 million people around the world back into
a condition of extreme poverty and hunger.

And this was a remarkable
observation that, after decades of steady
progress we were seeing this real reversal in
the basic human condition.

And the President believed that
that is not the way globalization should play
out, and we embrace globalization, but we are
responsible stewards of how these issues
affect the most vulnerable amongst us all
around the world.
And so he, together with all of the other world leaders assembled there, made a commitment to invest $22 billion and to take a new approach to addressing global hunger and food security.

And the resource investment was critical. The United States committed to three and a half billion dollars of that. We will meet that commitment.

But was really more important than the actual dollars is a commitment to do things differently. And there were some very basic commitments we made. We would follow and support country-owned plans, which does not mean just country government-owned plans, but genuinely plans that were developed in participation with the private sector, civil society, women, farmer's groups, et cetera, that we would fundamentally take a private sector approach, recognizing that every country or region that has sustainably solved their food security challenges has done so in...
partnership with the private sector.

We would mobilize capital, promote investment, think of agriculture as the basis of pro-poor growth and be very focused on tying that into a future of regional and global economic trade for the countries that we work in.

We made an absolute commitment to focus on and measure outcomes for women because we know that a dollar invested in women or women's incomes has much more impact on improving the health and welfare of children and communities and families in poverty reduction than the alternatives.

And, we made a commitment to take a comprehensive approach. And, through that comprehensive approach we highlighted the importance of universities and research and science and technology.

But we also said, we can't just create scientific breakthroughs that sit on shelves in African research facilities and
don't get out to the people who need them most.

And so, I would as you, as a board, to feel a broad sense of responsibility for the commitments the President has made to both address this issue successfully, inspire others to generate real results and work with us to make this as successful as it can be, and I would ask that you play a unique role, both in helping to oversee the university partnerships and the research and the science and the education and capacity-building that have been the traditional functions of the BIFAD Board, but that you also go back to those principles and you help us make sure we're living up to the President's very direct expectations that we, in fact, do things differently, and that we live up to those very high, but very important standards that he and the Secretary, Secretary Clinton, have laid out.

So, with that, I would just say
thank you, and I appreciate the chance to be here. I think I'll have the chance to come back and hear from you after you've had the chance to deliberate, and if there are any comments or questions we could take that now, otherwise I'll get out of your hair.

Good. Okay.

(Appause.)

CHAIR DEATON: Administrator Shah, thank you so much. I don't want to hold you up, but as you're departing I just want to say thank you for the tremendous charge and the embracing posture that you and the Administration have taken, and the Board of BIFAD is very excited and energized with the words that you have used and offered here today, and with the challenge that's out there before us.

So, I thank you on behalf of the entire BIFAD Board. Thanks so much.

(Appause.)

CHAIR DEATON: Well, as the new
and incoming Chair of BIFAD, I call this meeting to order. And, as the first order of business, I'll ask that we move approval of the agenda that's before us.

MEMBER LUCK: I move.

MEMBER DeLAUDER: I second.

CHAIR DEATON: Second. Moved and seconded, and by consensus, all in favor, say "Aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR DEATON: Thank you.

As the first order of business, let me first say welcome to all members of the public here with us. You will have a chance at 11:45, we will have a public comment period, and any of you who want to make comments about the deliberations -- you see here, today, we have mics here, and we welcome you to these open, transparent proceedings of what, as you heard from Administrator Shah, is a very noble calling, we feel, and you're looking at a Board, one of whom is not here.
Catherine Bertini was unable to be with us today, but a Board that is fully committed to the charge that has been laid before us, and we're excited about our own dialogue, deliberations and ideas that we can bring together that can drive this challenge forward and respond in the way that we feel the values and the mission of our land grant universities and our educational system across this nation has poised us to do at this particular time in history.

And so, we are energized. We are ready to move forward and we look forward to working with the Administration and with any input from those of you from the public who come to these meetings.

Let me -- as a first order of business, the Board has had before them a motion, and I will read that motion and ask for move and approval of this motion.

And this is in recognition of a work that our former Chair, Robert Easter, who
is Chancellor at the University of Illinois. Because of his tremendous service, the Board has made this motion.

The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development appoints former BIFAD Chair, Robert Easter, as BIFAD Senior Advisor through the 2011 period.

In this capacity he is welcome to attend BIFAD Executive Sessions and to participate in BIFAD working groups.

We believe that BIFAD will benefit from Dr. Easter's recent term as a BIFAD Chair and his in-depth knowledge of global agricultural development.

That is the motion. May I hear -- that is the motion that has been before us. Do I hear a move for that approval?

MEMBER LUCK: So moved.

MEMBER DeLAUDER: Second.

CHAIR DEATON: Okay. Moved and seconded.

All in favor, say "Aye."
(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR DEATON: Thank you very much.

And, Bob, if I may ask you to join us here for just a moment, I have a token and recognition, and I will hold this up so I can read it properly.

"In recognition of your exceptional national leadership for advancing the cause of higher education and development, as Chairman of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development and in your life's work, June 24th, 2011, on behalf of the BIFAD Board and Secretarial Susan Owens, thank you for your work in all of this and your continued work with our BIFAD Board," Bob Easter, we are very happy to present you with this award.

(Applause.)

CHAIR DEATON: I have assured the Board that our collegiality, as fellow Chancellors in the Midwest, and as competitors
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on the athletic field will in no way get in
the way of our constructive dialogue for the
good of BIFAD and our national agricultural
development policy.

So, Bob, again, thank you very
much.

Bill.

MEMBER DeLAUDER: Mr. Chairman, I
just wanted to highlight -- can you hear me
okay?

Okay. I just wanted to highlight
again. I had the pleasure of working with Bob
Easter, and I can't say enough about the
outstanding leadership that he provided to
BIFAD to sort of reinvigorate us and move us
in a direction that will allow us to serve our
universities and to serve this country in a
much better way.

So, we just wanted to thank you,
Bob, for that outstanding leadership.

(Applause.)

MEMBER MURANO: Mr. Chairman, if I
may, as well.

CHAIR DEATON: Yes.

MEMBER MURANO: As the other "old-timer" on BIFAD, having had the pleasure to work with Dr. Easter, we're going to miss you, but it's so great that you are going to be with us one more year in the capacity of advisor of Dr. Easter.

You've led this Board through a transitional time, I would say, and have elevated it in the minds of everyone in terms of the potential that this Board has to help the agency fulfill its mission.

So, I thank you personally for what you've done to mentor me through BIFAD and certainly, in the future, for this next year.

CHAIR DEATON: Thank you both very much.

Any further comments from any Members of the Board?

Bob, again, let me say thank you,
and we look forward to continue working with
you and gaining from the wisdom that you bring
to these deliberations.

This morning we have two important
panels for discussion that we are presenting.
And just so everyone will be clear, I am going
to introduce the Chair of the Panels, and they
will, then, introduce those panelists that
will be with them.

And we are going to -- the Board
will move back to the audience in the front
row here, and give the group an opportunity to
present from here.

You're aware that Administrator
Shah talked about the Feed the Future
initiative of this Administration, its
important components. There has been an
ongoing working group that has dealt with
responses and strategies made up of the
Government, private, NGO, and university
people, scientists, since then working on
this.
And some of the deliberations, for a two-day conference that just ended yesterday, we'll be hearing key summaries for that.

And the first session is on Feed the Future, the Research Agenda and Forum Report. And, chairing that panel is Montague or Tag Demment, as he's well-known by everyone here, Associate Vice-President at APLU, and also professor at the University of California, at Davis.

Tag, let me welcome you and your panel to the podium here.

MR. DEMMENT: Thank you. Good morning, everybody.

Well, we just concluded the Forum yesterday, and my -- our job is to reflect on what went on in this process, and we will give you some thoughts.

The goals of the process overall -- and I have to recognize that many of you have -- are quite familiar with this, have
been through this, but some have not, so I think it's important that we cover the ground again a bit.

We are -- as a research community we have been invited by USAID and USDA, the Feed the Future organization, generally, APLU was invited to organize a process by which the research community could have input into the operationalization of the research component of Feed the Future.

We were invited, and we took this with great seriousness, and we welcomed the invitation. It has been a very strong interactive relationship and I've worked with, as I said yesterday, with US -- I started working with USAID in 1968 as a Peace Corps volunteer in Ethiopia.

And, in all the time I've interacted with USAID I think this interaction over the last -- since January, has been one of the most, one, intensive, interactive, dynamic in many ways, but it really has
fostered a very strong and a starting point for interactions between the university community, in particular, but -- and the research community and the agency.

So, I do thank USAID for its leadership and USDA for its leadership in engaging us.

We wanted a broad consultation and I have to say right off the bat, one of the difficulties and the challenges is that, to bring the country-driven concept to a priority-setting process when we don't have the active participation, at least physically in the forum of many of the in-country people who would have, certainly, a position.

So, how did we address this? We developed the ideas for the overall process at Purdue. I know a number of you were at Purdue and what we did was, we laid out the context for the research strategy.

We discussed how we would get to an end product and we decided to have an e-
consultation, and that e-consultation was our attempt to try to reach out to the rest of the world to get their input into this process because we could not — we didn't have the resources, frankly, to bring all those people together in one spot.

And then we had a forum which was held here in Washington, D.C. We had a working group that had wide representation from the research community and representation from the agencies involved.

Out of that, we developed the white paper which is available online. It discusses the results of the Purdue meeting and gave us a way forward.

We ran a three-week e-consultation where we had over 1,100 people registered. We had over 2,000 people who visited the site. We had representation from over a hundred countries on that — in that e-consultation.

So, we did reach out significantly.

Some key themes — and this is a
selection -- sustainable intensification, which is one of the themes Saharah-Moon will talk a bit about that in a bit.

That was very -- everybody focused on that and felt that was a very important theme, and we also identified supporting research on key problems rather than crafting too specific an agenda.

This is a point of some tension, and I'll talk about the tensions here. We want specific solutions, but we won't -- we don't want to define those too early in the process. And then capacity-building which I also mentioned was a major area identified in the e-consultation for support.

There's a whole -- we defined, in the end, a series of about ten challenges and, for BIFAD, I've given you a copy of the agenda in that folder from the conference, is a hard copy of the summary. It's about a 40-page summary, and in it, you can look at the details of the challenges that were...
identified.

The Forum took place here. It had over 400 people registered. I'd say we probably had somewhere in the neighborhood of 300 people who actually participated on each day, and people stayed with it.

We had break-out sessions which allowed people -- we had a fair amount of break-out, about four hours of break-out, and we allowed people to further refine the challenges to get more specificity.

Those will be summarized by the working group, and for a document to be provided to USAID -- to Feed the Future.

Let me just make a few individual comments, or personal comments. Spatial scale. One of the things that was clearly attention, was the idea, on one hand, that we want things that are universally -- universal solutions, but we also want to deal with small holders.

So, when you deal with small
holders, you are dealing with a scale of heterogeneity that is a challenge to find broad solutions.

One of the things that I think about in the difference between the medical model and the agricultural model is, in the medical model you can have these broad and sweeping solutions because you are dealing with one species.

Human beings, I know, are heterogeneous, certainly in personality, but we -- medical -- a vaccine that works for some will work probably for all. So, you can have these broad solutions that save a million children.

In agriculture it's a little bit more difficult to do that because if you're focused on the small holder you have a scale of heterogeneity that's quite small. It requires great local adaptation.

If we look at Africa, Africa is an environment of great heterogeneity in terms of
environment, and sweeping solutions are more
difficult in that kind of approach, so there
is that tension.

How do we deal with the small
holder in a heterogeneous environment, yet get
-- choose those things that are -- that have
an impact on a large number of people? And
that was a tension in the discussion.

The time scale. Short -- what I
call the short-term development trap. We talk
about the poverty malnutrition trap. People
are poor because they are malnourished. They
are malnourished because they are poor and
they get stuck.

Are we stuck in the short-term?
We focus a lot of resources on the short-term
and, by focusing resources -- by focusing on
the short-term we, in a sense, have a tendency
to ensure that we have long-term problems
forever.

We need to figure out a way to
balance our commitment between short- and
long-term, and that's another tension that was very evident in the break-out groups.

And then the public versus the private sector. It is very difficult, it has been very difficult to figure out how to integrate along that, in our projects, engaging the private sector at a point where they can feel they have ownership or they're involved in the project, but where the predictability of gain for them is evident.

It's a challenge, and I think that that's one, another one of the tensions that appeared.

Then I would say the other challenge that I mentioned is how do we -- how do we as a centrally-focused group, and mainly the people in the room in the Forum were from the U.S.

How do we engage, how do we link that with like the CAADP process? The CAADP process, I think we can all say is a really major step forward in the development arena.
The fact that African countries have really started to make an effort at the country level to define what their problems are, and how do we, as we sit at the table in Washington, D.C., how do we engage in that, and respect that process, and I think that's an interesting one, and it is -- it also flows along the tension of, for many -- for USAID, the relationship between centrally-funded programs and mission funding programs: how do we coordinate it and make that work better?

One of the strongest themes that came out of the consultation, all of that whole process, was capacity-building, and I think I could say that, of all the things that we've had in our consultations, particularly with the Africans, as well, in our university experience, capacity-building is the number one thing that appears to be the difference between short-term and a sustainable effort.

And Dr. Ejeta gave us a very compelling argument for capacity-building at
the forum, and I think that one that everyone
takes very, very seriously.

The strength of the Feed the
Future concept, to me, is this wonderful link
between agricultural production, human
nutrition, and I would take it one step
farther, the development of human capital.

Human capital, in the end, in-
country, is the thing that's going to change
-- it's going to make development. Many of
our programs are helpful, but if we don't have
the people in-country, the human capital, and
that human capital starts with the nutrition
in the first thousand days.

And if we -- that is the real
strength, I think, of the Feed the Future
concept.

The question of follow-on has been
addressed to some degree. We will be
compiling the results of the break-out
sessions. We will produce a working document.

We will -- there's a working group that I
showed you which will craft this and then we will produce a final report to USAID.

At the Forum, the agency indicated that they would take this very seriously, and that they would respond to this, and we hope that that's the case. We look forward to that interaction.

So, those are my opening remarks. I'd like to introduce the first panelist, or the -- is Saharah-Moon Chapotin, who is the Acting Division Chief of the Bureau of Food Security at USAID.

She is also intimately involved in the overall strategy that has been produced by USAID and will explain to us a little bit about what that strategy is and how it fits with this process.

Saharah. Thank you.

MS. CHAPOTIN: Thank you. And I'll say it's a great honor to be here. Thank you very much for coming to hear a bit more about the research strategy. I certainly hope...
there's at least one person in the audience who has not seen a presentation in the last few weeks on the strategy. I feel like it's been getting a lot of coverage, but that's because it's excellent.

So the Feed the Future Food Security Research Strategy was developed jointly by USAID and USDA, and it -- I will go ahead and describe the overall strategy. I will illustrate it with some examples from USAID's research portfolio, keeping in mind, of course, there will be an entire presentation on research from USDA following.

So, the Global Food Security -- I should say the Global Hunger and Food Security Research Strategy. So, again, this comes out of the global challenge that we are facing.

Obviously, the research strategy is just one part of the overall Feed the Future Initiative, which was designed to address these issues.

There are almost a billion people
suffering from chronic hunger. Food demand is going to increase drastically over the next decades, due partly to population growth, but also to increase food demand through income growth.

Feed the Future goals: inclusive agriculture sector growth and reducing child undernutrition. And it's a comprehensive strategy. It addresses the entire value chain and the enabling environment. Research is one part of that, but it also goes to extension, information policy analyses, and it seeks really to leverage strategic partnerships. That's a very large theme of Feed the Future.

It also has some cross-cutting themes across the entire initiative which also pertain to the research strategy, and these are resilience to climate change. That's obviously a big issue that agriculture will be facing in the coming years.

Sustaining the natural resource base is going to be essential to our
objectives under Feed the Future and maintaining a really strong focus on gender awareness and inclusivity.

And I include this picture because, of all the field visits I've done in South Asia, I think this was the only time that I saw a farmer bring -- I don't know if it's his daughter or his granddaughter, but making sure that women are completely included in the initiative from the beginning and especially from their youth.

So, global agricultural research is one element of the Feed the Future strategy. It's obviously a very important element, as agricultural research is known to be one of the investments that have the highest rates of return in agricultural development.

It's been calculated that, in Africa, agricultural research can result in a 34 percent social rate of return, even higher globally.
So, our specific objective, USAID, USDA, and the others who contributed to the research strategy was to define problem-focused topics that meet the Feed the Future objectives with the idea of building a global research portfolio.

At the same time, national and regional investments both from our missions in the field and from partners complement this, so it's a global research strategy, recognizing that research goes all the way down to the sublocal level.

In building this portfolio, it was necessary to identify researchable constraints. We have just established a set of criteria to prioritize these researchable constraints.

We wanted the research pipeline to have both short-, medium- and long-term impact, as Tag alluded to, and we saw the need to recognize -- to manage risk, both -- you want some of those high-return, but possibly
risky investments, and you also need some that
are very solid bets where you will have -- but
possibly lower return.

Of course, research, agricultural
research cuts across a number of disciplines
from the biophysical, social behavioral,
economic policy, and I think the research
strategy seeks to include all of these
disciplines as potential researchable areas
under the strategy.

Briefly, these were the research --
- the investment criteria that were used in
developing the research strategy, from
relevance to poverty, the likelihood to
success, what are the cost/benefit
considerations, what's the economic
sustainability of the interventions that will
be made, how can we maintain natural resources
sustainability, the institutional
sustainability; again sustainability is a
strong theme here and, again, keeping in mind
the time frame for your impact, and the
potential risks that you could have in implementing the strategy.

So we used a nutrition and a poverty lens in order to focus in and identify what were going to be the top priorities under the strategy.

Poverty is an important one. We mapped out -- we took maps of poverty, overlaid them with maps of child stunting, with areas where hunger is extremely high, with major farming systems across the world.

And, pulling these all together, we came out with several regions within the world, major production systems where the analysis shows we could focus our efforts and have major impact.

These are the Sudano-Sahalian Transect in Africa, the Ethiopian Highlands, the East and Southern Africa Maize Mixed Systems, and the Indogangetic Plains.

There was recognition that, even in focusing on these specific agroecologies
there would be large spill-overs to other regions in the world.

We also came out in tagging and alluded to sustainable intensification. This emerged as the top theme within the entire research strategy that we could use to anchor all of our investments on research.

These three themes emerged from the research strategy process, advancing the productivity frontier, transforming agricultural systems through sustainable intensification and improving nutrition and food safety.

And the way I see it, number one and number three are really the component technologies that feed into number two. You need the technologies to advance productivity, you need the research and the understanding of what contributes to household nutrition and, pulling all that together, we can transform systems in a way that is sustainable, but that does significantly intensify their production
so that we're not increasing the land area under use for agriculture.

Advancing the productivity frontier on a number of fronts, primarily overcoming major constraints to productivity, increasing yields and incomes as a result. This includes breeding and genetics for major crops, livestock and fish.

It includes addressing diseases of livestock and small ruminants, improving food quality. And then, also, some considerations around, once you've developed various technologies whether they are agronomic or genetic, how do those get adopted by small-holder farmers, and there are research questions around the technology adoption that need to be addressed as well.

And then finally, what are the range of policies that can influence technology adoption and your ability to increase productivity, and policies here but, of course, it cuts across the entire...
One example of the kind of work that can be done and that USAID has some significant investments in is around developing climate-resistant cereals.

Currently in target environments in South Asia and Africa, our research partners are addressing issues like drought, salinity, nitrogen use efficiency, high temperatures are emerging as a major constraint that have not been fully considered yet.

And this is in order to address some of the challenges that farmers face now and will continue to face in the field, whether there's sufficient water, the coming impacts of climate change, the population pressure on land use and resource uses, and through enhancing the productivity of crops such as these, there is the potential for enormous impact on both food security, income generation and also the environmental impacts.
that agriculture is having.

And this is an area where we see
is ripe for public/private partnerships and,
in fact, we are working with several companies
in the private sector on developing new crop
varieties.

Transforming key production
systems, as I said, emerged as sort of an
overarching framework for our approach on
research in these areas. It integrates the
global technology with the site-specific
constraints, the site-specific opportunities.

It links the agronomy, the plant
breeding with the social science with the
market research with the value chain work
that's happening in conjunction with the
research.

And this is where we link our
global research efforts to the local and
regional and national partners.

Again, these are the four systems
that emerged under the research strategy and,
again, the range of partners that we are working with, the NARs, the U.S. universities, the CGIR, the private sector, the policymakers, the NGOs.

The Indogangetic Plains is an area where USAID and its partners have considerable experience already taking this approach of sustainable intensification to transforming production systems.

This is the bread basket of South Asia, home to a seventh of the world population. It's dominated by rice/wheat systems, but also rice/rice, rice/cotton, and the key constraints that will be faced, I think, by farmers all over the world, are being felt already here.

Water is becoming more scarce. Climate is more unpredictable. Soil is being eroded, and energy and labor constraints are coming into play as well.

And you say it’s been working in this area with the Gates Foundation on the
Cereal Systems Initiative for South Asia which we see as a model. This kind of activity could be taken to some of the systems in Africa and the experiences that we've learned in South Asia around introducing resource-conserving technologies, they may be different technologies in Africa, but this experience about working with small holders, working with the national partners in these four countries can, we believe could be transferred to some situations in Africa.

And the outcomes of this work have been trying to achieve higher cropping intensity, introducing abiotic stress-tolerant varieties, at the same time, working on diversifying the systems, bringing in different cropping systems, different cropping patterns, more nutritious crops, bringing in the legumes, making sure the livestock are fully-integrated in Bangladesh, working with small fish systems, rice/fish, prawn introduction, so really looking at the entire
agricultural system as -- as a sort of a comprehensive approach where you do need these component technologies, but you cannot introduce any of them on their own.

At the same time, this dove-tails with the policy work, both at the local, national and regional levels.

And then, I think what's very innovative about this project is its attempt to, on the ground, come up with what are the right public/private partnerships that you need in order to get technologies adopted.

Obviously, this cannot only happen through the public extension services. Wide-scale adoption of really transformative technologies, we believe, will rely on local private-sector collaborations.

This is an example of some of the long-term research that's happening under the project, looking at today's cereal systems and the future cereal systems and doing the long-term experiments to see what are the benefits
in terms of productivity, in terms of environment, in terms of incomes for farmers, for example.

So again, there are these three systems in Africa, each of them supports a very large number of people, many of which are living in poverty, are living with hunger or malnutrition, and yet there is, we believe, very high potential for this sort of transformation that is now taking place in South Asia, and many of these efforts are underway in Africa.

I don't want to imply that we're coming in and doing something new, but really see if we can strengthen those efforts and bring a comprehensive approach to transforming systems where there is high potential for use of conservation agriculture, integration of leguminous trees, for example, diversifying systems with food crops that are more nutritious.

The Sudano -- I won't go through...
all of these because I think I'm probably going to run out of time, but -- and then, finally, the Ethiopian Highlands.

So, the third theme under the research strategy is enhanced nutrition and food safety, and this includes both the nutrition research basically understanding what are the best food-based approaches to improving nutrition and what are some of the social considerations around improving household dietary decisions, for example, and making food both more available and accessible to households, particularly to the women and children.

So, this includes making available grain legumes, very excellent source of protein, more animal-source foods. There is some work on biofortification that can be very important here, and also some food safety issues such as reducing or eliminating mycotoxin contamination, reducing postharvest losses. We heard a lot about that at the
Research Forum.

Again, just another example of some ongoing research on developing an insect-resistant cowpea. Cowpea is a huge staple crop in African, particularly in West Africa, and yet yields are decimated by an insect, the Maruca podborer.

So, in this case we're using biotechnology as a tool, taking a technology that's been proven in other crops and inserting a gene into cowpea which makes it resistant to the insects.

And this is a project where I think it's -- it's a very long-term project. This is one of those examples of one of the longer-term, but potentially very high-reward projects. And, in fact, in Africa, there are confined field trials underway in Nigeria, recently approved in Burkina Faso, soon to start, and there's a field-trial application pending in Ghana.

And this has a number of partners.
Again, I think this illustrates working with the national partners in these three countries. Research institutions from around the world, in this case in Australia, working with the African Agricultural Technology Foundation on the ground in Africa, universities here in the United States, other donors, Rockefeller and the private sector, Monsanto.

So these are basically our global research partners that we do work with under all of our research efforts, and that we are looking forward to increasing our collaborations with, and that we have been receiving very valuable feedback from on designing the research strategy.

So, going forward, we're going to be taking this lens of each of these production systems, and this is the point where we take the research strategy and try to implement it, what are the areas where we can have entry points within these systems, where
can we have the largest impact, what are the
technologies out there, the management
practices that need to be developed in order
to have an impact in these systems.

And then, trying to work very
closely with our partners on the ground with
our missions to meet us from the other end,
how can their investments leverage what we're
doing at the global level, ensure that the
technologies that are being developed, the
management practices are really adapted and
working on the ground at the local level in
all of the Feed the Future countries and
around the world.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. DEMMENT: Brady, I assume that
you will take questions at the end?

CHAIR DEATON: Yes.

MR. DEMMENT: Okay. Our next
speaker is Anita Regmi. Anita is the Senior
Advisor in the Office of the Secretary of the
USDA and has been very much our contact in developing the Forum with USDA, and we appreciated her efforts very much.

MS. REGMI: Thank you, Tag. Thank you for giving me this honor and pleasure to address you today.

It's been a -- I think when I first addressed this group it was on the Feed the Future Research Strategy, and that strategy has come a long way as both Tag and Sahara-Moon have already talked about it.

Since the two of them covered Feed the Future Research Strategy, what I thought I would do is talk to you briefly about how the research, education and economics mission area of USDA would work to help implement this strategy, as well as to closely, in general, support -- talk about, a little bit about a partnership with the USAID on the border of the -- in the commemorative research initiative as well.

What we -- did I miss one? Okay.
Within the REE mission area, we've made global food security be one of the priorities, along with bioenergy, nutrition, food safety and climate change.

Now, any of these other areas could technically also support global food security, but in putting aside global food security as a separate piece by itself, what we have done is we are only going to include under this category those programs that directly have an international link. That's why we've sort of separated one by itself.

And the reason for this, during the last several days I know all of you have heard it, so I don't think I need to explain the dire challenge that's facing us with the potential for increase in gap between global food supply and demand, as well as the additional challenges with limited resources and increased variability due to climate change.

Given all these, we've made global
food security be a priority within REE, and
the activities that we will be implementing
are going to be those that directly benefit
U.S. agriculture, given USDA's interest in
U.S. agriculture, but at the same time they
will also help further global food security.

In developing this priority, this
strategy we have put together a white paper
that I would be glad to share with any of you
who would like to take a look at it.

And in developing that white paper
we help to inform ourselves, looking at a lot
of the literature that has some out in the
last several years following the 2008 food
prices, including the National Academy of
Sciences report, the Chicago Council report,
World Bank, federal and others, and the key
take-aways from that that we used in
developing the strategy was that food
insecurity, food scarcity and food price
volatility will continue to escalate without
significant improvements in agricultural
productivity, and that a comprehensive approach is required to address this, which, of course, is the same as Feed the Future's guiding principle, as well, and that scientific breakthroughs must be adapted into economically, environmentally and socially-sustainable practices, and investments to improve agriculture productivity must be long-term and complemented by efforts to improve human capacity in agricultural research extension and education, which, again, was one of the key things that came out of the Forum.

And, finally, research, education, extension and development need to -- have to focus on women which, again, is something that Feed the Future focuses on.

Why are we, within the REE mission, focusing on this? Because we believe that we have something that we can bring to bear on the strategy and address global food security.

We have many ongoing dual research
and analysis and extension programs that we think can be leveraged. We have many ongoing international partnerships with other countries.

We are also engaged in a lot of programs under reimbursable agreements with the USAID, State Department and others, and we have tremendous institutional knowledge that we feel we can help strengthen ministry level capacity in other countries.

We have historical relationships with the university system in the United States that we expect to be a partner with us in this effort, and also we have many ongoing industry partners.

There were three topic -- goal areas that we identified under the strategy. The first is to research development of education extension to sustainably increase productivity, quality and nutritional value of food products.

The second one, to research
development, education and extension to minimize human and environmental health risks from an agricultural production.

And then the third one is data development analysis dissemination to improve understanding of agricultural markets and policies.

Again, these are three areas the REE mission really has inherent comparative advantage in, and we think they are programs within the mission area that can be leveraged to help promote global food security.

Okay. And this is just a snapshot of the Feed the Future research strategy and the three themes, and within these three themes we will look both at the global level and, where appropriate, way with other partners that our resources can be leveraged to look at country-level research extension, information capacity-building and a policy analysis program.

So, within the next several weeks
and months we will be working both internally
as well with partnership -- partners in USAID
to see what can be done.

And to implement the strategy, the
mechanism that we will be use will be the
normal collaborative research initiative,
within which we are looking at four specific
areas to collaborate on: wheat rust, green
legumes, livestock disease and post-harvest
and food safety issues.

Additionally, we are also engaged
in helping improve agriculture statistics
capacity in the developing countries, in
general, and specifically, among a few of the
Feed the Future countries.

And, again, where appropriate, we
will work with the -- internally with the US
-- within other missions in the USDA such as
FAS, as well as USAID and State Department and
others to help improve in-country capacity on
extension SPS, youth development, post-harvest
and policy analysis.
How will we respond to what came out of the Forum? The Forum was really important, and the input that we got from it will be taken very seriously, not just in implementing the programs under the Feed the Future, but in general for all the different REE priority areas.

What is relevant to this will also be relevant to our programs in nutrition and food safety, so we will take them very seriously.

Coordination will be key, both externally with USAID and with our partners in the university system, but as well, internally, as I've already alluded to, the Office of Chief Scientist helps in that.

I think some of you heard from Jill Auburn how we have the senior advisors in each of the areas of nutrition, food safety, global climate change as well as bioenergy, and we will be working together to make sure that we put together a comprehensive effort in
Within the USDA, again, I have mentioned FAS. FAS will be a key partner that will help us and implement some of the programs in the countries.

We are also internally realigning our existing programs to see how, within the mandates and the authorities that we have, we can help further Feed the Future's goals.

And an example of that is the AFRI program has been open for international partnerships that are, I think, the individuals have outlined for these programs can take advantage of, and accountability and measuring success will be an important element to this.

In the advancing the productivity frontier, we will look at what we are currently doing, and some of the -- what I have here are examples where we think there could be room for leveraging and that one of them is the genetic resources information.
network.

ARS, in collaboration with its partners, is looking to make that be a global effort. We will also seek, where appropriate, collaborations on our ongoing programs, working on biotic and abiotic stress tolerant and resistant.

And we are also going to explore what we have in extension education which will -- to educate proper stewardship and enhancement of soil, water and other natural resources.

And again, on the post-harvest. And within the post-harvest we are already working with the USAID on aflatoxin, using the ARS as a resource on both genetic programs going on in genetic resistance, as well as in biocontrol.

And then on the transforming key production systems, we have a wealth of information. One of the things we've done is not just REE mission area has put together an
action plan, but USDA as a whole has put together coordinated action plan as well. And in that action plan we are focusing on five focus countries and regions, including East Africa and Central America, that cover Feed the Future in focus areas to look at how the ongoing USDA programs, for example, FAS, APHIS and others, could be knit together to put together a program that would help transform production systems within the certain area.

For example, in Ghana, we are also looking at the maize system, maize value chain. Similarly, the USDA's Office of Technology Transfer, we believe, has a model for transferring technology that is demand- and market-driven and will be sustainable, so we could look at that and see how can a model such as this be also used to leverage programs for Feed the Future.

And again, the National Agriculture Library is leading a cross-U.S.
Government initiative to organize and provide access to transparent, internationally compatible quality control lifecycle data on sustainable food, agriculture and forestry supply chains.

Something like this probably would also provide information and knowledge that can be used for Feed the Future.

And sort of a repetition in this is to emphasize that we have a wealth of information and across all of USDA, not just the REE mission area, and we will look to leverage them.

Similarly, on the cross-cutting challenges, we've already talked about this, we will walk across missions and priority areas to make sure that the cross-cutting challenge areas of climate change, gender -- and what was the other third one -- all of them are going to be addressed.

And this is something we cannot do by ourselves, so we will look forward to all
of our partners, university, private sector, other government agencies as well.

And then, in conclusion, I guess we all share a common goal. The last several days you have been here in Washington, D.C., is because you feel global food security is a big priority and USDA is very committed to it.

The REE mission area, we have tremendous support from Dr. Watecki in this and we will look to work together with all of you in partners in the U.S. Government as well as university and elsewhere to take this forward.

(Applause.)

MR. DEMMENT: Thank you, Anita.

And we've asked Professor Irv Widders, who is the Director of the Dry Grain Pulse CRSP. These names, the CRSP --

MR. WIDDERS: Pulses.

MR. DEMMENT: Pulses. Okay. Do you have a pulse, Irv. That's the question.

He's a professor of horticulture at Michigan
State University.

Irv has been a director of the CRSP for many years and has always been a person who has made major contributions to the development assistance area, particularly through his program. Irv?

MR. WIDDERS: My hands tend to flare, and the worst nightmare would be to knock over that glass of water while I'm talking.

It is truly an honor and a privilege to speak and share some of my thoughts with you this morning. When Susan approached me, I felt a bit overwhelmed with the task.

It is daunting to present a university response to both the Feed the Future document as well as to the consultation process. For those of you who know university professors and the university community, we're quite diverse and it's difficult many times for us to a consensus.
What I want to share this morning with you are some of my thoughts, some of my interactions, with my own administration and colleagues at Michigan State University, as well as the larger CRSP community, and my experience in participating in all three events associated with the consultation, beginning with the meeting at Purdue.

What I would hope to have this morning is a conversation with you, BIFAD. I'm going to throw out some ideas. I'm not expecting concurrence, but perhaps it will catalyze some thought.

Which button do I need to press? The white one? Where do I aim it? I'm sorry. I was pressing -- okay. This one here, or this one? Okay. Thank you very much.

I want to affirm that most of us within the university community believe that the FTF, or Feed the Future, global security, and I put that in quotes, because many times we do not cite that when we're talking about...
the strategy.

Research strategy is an excellent document. It provides some compelling themes and arguments for research areas. It has an innovative implementation plan. We agree largely that we need to do things differently.

I concur with the administrator's comments that there is too much research that's only in printed form, or technologies that are sitting on the shelves, that haven't been deployed and adopted, and there's structures for accountability.

I would also, though, qualify my statement. And many of us view the strategy, though, not to be as much a strategy, but as a framework for future decisionmaking. It provides guides. It defines themes. It defines agriproduction systems which to focus our efforts.

But it's a very ambitious document, and it's unlikely that we're going to achieve everything in there, and it
certainly requires much additional debate and
definition, but it serves as a very, very
useful framework, I believe, as we move
forward and make investment decisions in
research.

As I mentioned, it has some very
compelling themes. You, all who participated
in the Forum, are very aware of these. I
think the universities are well-positioned to
play an active role in contributing and
supporting this initiative of our government.

I don't to preach to the choir,
because you recognize the capacities, the
expertise, the international connectedness,
engagement of our universities that we bring
to the table and offer our government to
achieve these ends.

There is one aspect that I would
like to note, though, and I think it's vitally
important. Much of the capacity, the
technical capacity, that is resident at our
universities needs to be exploited in
providing technical leadership to these future research initiatives.

The farther we remove that from where the research is being done and the program and decisionmaking, I think the greater risk that we may be sidelined.

I think it's important to recognize that we're going to need a sustainable -- sustained commitment to some of these research efforts.

We agree that there is a need for short-term, medium-term and long-term impacts. However, in many cases we're dealing with what we call wicked problems. These are complex problems that have been very recalcitrant for which we haven't found solutions.

Over the last day I sat in and led the discussion on edaphic or soil constraints, a soil fertility problem. That has been around for decades, and still we're dealing with degraded soils.

And where is the breakthrough
coming? I don't know, but we are going to need sustained solutions. It's going to require investments. It's going to require some risk at times.

Sometimes the greatest potential for impact comes from those areas, research areas, where there is high risk. We don't know if that's going to give us the home run, so to speak. And certainly, we need interdisciplinary approaches in everything we do.

There is general excitement among the university community about the whole of government approach. I think it only makes sense. Within the scientific community there is collaboration with ARS scientists. There is significant participation in the CRSPs. Many universities, scientists, faculty have to play the competitive grants route, receive funding from NIFA, NSF, NIH.

To the extent that there can be coordination of these efforts it's only going
to contribute to more robust and more
effectual, I think, long-term successes in
these research initiatives. It certainly
avoids the potential for duplication.

I'd like to make a few comments,
though, about the consultation here. I think
it was wonderful and I want to congratulate
and thank both USAID and USDA for their
leadership in approaching APLU and APLU's
effort in making this happen.

There's a lot of exciting things
that have occurred as a result, from my
opinion, of this consultation. It brought to
the attention of countless people around the
world this research strategy.

I can assure you that if it was
only posted on USAID or the Office of Food --
the Bureau of Food Security's website, it
wouldn't have received the visibility that it
had if there wouldn't have been this series of
consultations.

And the e-consultation also opened
that up. It started out with a smaller group at Purdue, and then expanded.

As David Atwood said yesterday, it was exciting to see the number of institutions, organizations, programs, federal agencies represented at the Forum over the last two days.

I've been, over the course of my ten years, at many meetings to discuss international agricultural research, and there wasn't a group any larger than we see today.

So it is very, very commendable. There is an enthusiasm and excitement about how these various institutions and programs globally can work together to achieve common goals, and it was exciting to hear some of the comments of administrators from these various organizations.

I believe that a result of this consultation is that universities are very well-positioned to contribute in a variety of ways to the Feed the Future objectives and,
hopefully, that becomes clear as we go along.


I'd like to make a comment, though, about it. I think it is important, though, to understand the purpose of a consultation, and some of the constraints of a consultation.

It provided, I think, a wonderful sounding board to provide feedback on the Feed the Future Global Food Security Research Strategy, and I think it did do that. It achieved that well.

It identified and confirmed the importance of certain research challenges and themes. That was much of the purpose of the break-out groups that we had to look at these development, agricultural development challenges, and I think the outputs of it strengthen that effort.

However, we talk a lot about evidence-based programming and decisionmaking.
and bringing the appropriate people together.

I still have some concerns about our expectations of the process. I think it moved us forward, but I don't think it's the end. The Forum cannot be the end. We didn't have the evidence before us.

I led a group on, once again, I just said soil fertility, addressing that. I only had one soils scientist in my group. That's not to be an indictment against multidisciplinary groups looking at research themes, but I would question if we had the appropriate evidence, the sufficient evidence, the sufficient demographic of participants to really make this a -- to achieve the goals of priority-setting and giving guidance to these federal agencies on where they should be making their investments in the future.

I guess the bottom line is that, as I looked around the audience, and it was a wonderful audience, and there was a lot of wonderful things occurred there. Most of the
participants looked more like myself than the people that are in the trenches doing the work.

I guess my admonition to BIFAD is that -- and I'm speaking as an administrator, a program director. I need to be a bit more humble at times and recognize that the breakthrough ideas, what's going to be the transformational research area -- I don't know what that is.

And we need to have greater consultations with different communities of scientists that really are at the cutting edge, that know truly the potential of some of the -- maybe the molecular approaches, or even adaptive research that they're working on.

So my admonition is: This process should not stop here. I think there's much more that needs to be done.

As I ended up this process there are a number of questions that still remain in my mind, issues, and I think some of these
were, in part, responded to or addressed by
the comments of my previous two speakers from
the Bureau of Food Security and USDA, but I
just pose these questions because I think it's
important for BIFAD to consider them.

What is the process for further
defining and prioritizing focused focal
research areas in the four strategic
agricultural production systems?

There was much conversation during
the Forum about the haste and the pressures
that are upon federal agencies to implement
something. I hope that in this haste there
isn't -- that there is sufficient consultation
with the appropriate communities of scientists
to really make the appropriate investments.

And I question, where do the
outputs of the Forum go from here? I'm still
not sure about that, and how can university
scientists contribute to this ongoing
dialogue.

Who will provide the -- the second
question is: Who will provide the leadership for the interagency coordination of priority research initiatives?

I'm delighted that there is this whole of government coordination, but who is providing the leadership? It's not only here in Washington, but at the mission level. How will FTF research initiatives be integrated and be supported by USAID country and regional missions and their strategies?

There is a set of focus countries. There's the 20 and then there's the subset of six. I know that in the subset of six there's efforts to integrate research in there, which I think is wonderful. Certainly research and the potential for output to research should inform those strategies.

I have concern about how that's happening, who is providing input to that, if there's diverse input in those areas. We talked a lot about country-led strategies. I think this is wonderful, but I question to
what extent many of our national programs are fully-engaged, to what extent many of our national agricultural universities with whom we collaborate are actually engaged.

I have a few personal experiences that I don't want to outline, but I know cases where there has not been that kind of consultation. I hope the CRSPs can inform these dialogues, and I would like to see some conversation about that.

A fifth question: How can long-term research initiatives effectively achieve the out--intended developmental outcomes in focus countries?

If these countries change over time or if the agricultural production systems change, I believe, and I fully support, a sustained long-term focus on certain regions and countries, I think this is wonderful.

But, being a realist and having been involved as a director of a CRSP program, I know that things change from one
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administration to another. We have to have sustained commitments if we are going to realize the impacts of those investments.

And who will -- the final question is: Who will provide the leadership to and what will be the mechanism for ongoing performance assessments, determining what does and doesn't work and why?

I think this is one of the comments that David Atwood said yesterday. "We need to take advantage of the lessons learned." We are going to be making certain investments that don't result, that aren't successful.

All of those of you who have been scientists over the course of your career know that, for every five initiatives that -- or projects that you undertake, maybe only one is truly successful and makes a transformative difference.

So, we have to embrace risk, but at the same time we need to be evaluating and
assessing. We need to have baseline data. We need to see if we're moving the target.

I work in pulses, and I am the first to acknowledge that we have not made gains in pulse productivity over the years, in spite of the investments and incorporating disease-resistance and now the BT gene and many of these things.

But, why haven't we had that impact? We need to understand that if we're to make decisions about going forward. And what does that process look like? I would hope that universities could play a role in that, because we are the people in the ground doing the work in many cases.

Thoughts regarding future steps. I would strongly encourage consideration by the agencies that are leading and coordinating this effort, as well as APLU, to think about follow-up forums involving international communities of scientists and private sector to provide guidance on the game-changing
and/or transformational research approaches to address the wicked problems.

    We are doing something like this.

Just to share a little experience, not to make a sale point, but in the Pulse CRSP we are going to be convening a workshop in a little over a month that brings together -- that's co-sponsored by three of the international ag research centers that are involved in pulse research.

    We are bringing -- plus ARS scientists, NIFA scientists. We -- various foundations. But we're bringing together a selected group of bright young scientists that have some interest or track record in research in pulses, a multidisciplinary group.

    I want to be candid. Only about a third of these are CRSP scientists. Our effort is not to give any hopes or bring in or support or -- or ensure a future for the CRSP, but really ask what needs to be done to move the bar up.
And we're bringing in young people because they are the future. They are the group that is going to need to take ownership of this new research agenda. Us old fogies are going to be retired before any of this is realized.

The second point is that I would encourage USAID to renew its commitment to proven and effective models for university engagement. I know that with any new program there's desire to implement new strategies, new programs, and they are very worthy. But, on the other hand, don't throw out what is tried and proven.

I've been a university professor for 30 years. I've been involved in international agricultural development for over 40 years. I only say this because I know I'm speaking from a biased perspective, but I think the CRSPs are the best thing in town, and I hope that USAID and others don't overlook the potential they have there.
I had a recent conversation with one of my deans, and he acknowledged -- he said, "Irv, you know, I'm coming to appreciate, after many, many years, the importance of the CRSPs. The CRSPs programs are one of the few programs that support scholarship."

Scholarship is what universities are about. Universities are academic institutions, research-intensive academic institutions. We don't have capacity and we can't do everything, but certain things we do extremely well. And one is the generation of new ideas, generation of new technology scholarship.

And it comes in different forms. It comes through our research programs. It comes through our teaching, our building up of a new generation of professionals and the integration of those two.

We need to work with others, though, to be effective. The CRSPs, through
its collaborative efforts of partnering with national programs, seeking to empower those programs, seeking to support and give them the research tools, the training, to make them successful to address their own national needs is a tried and proven model, and I think the data show it's a worthy research -- I mean, provides a worthy return on investment.

Many have talked over the last couple of days about the institutional capacity-building. I think this is clearly an area that the CRSPs do exceedingly well. This is going to be a strong part of our legacy, and it's the integration of research, technology transfer, outreach, extension activities that we as land grants do exceeding well that builds a new generation of scientists in our focus countries that are going to provide leadership to their new agriculture.

Thank you very much for your time.

(Applause.)
CHAIR DEATON: Tag, and Panel, let me thank you very much. And, Tag, I want to give you an opportunity. The three panelists, anything further you wanted to say as sort of a summary comment here.

And then we will look to our Board. As I indicated earlier, we'll have board discussion around each of the panels and then public discussion at the 11:45 period that we indicated earlier.

MR. DEMMENT: I would like to say that I think, if I was in a position of leadership in the agencies, that I would think that, unfortunately, and fortunately, that the issue -- when I look at the trajectory of food prices over the last five, six years, I don't think anything is going to change. In fact, I think it's going to get worse.

And I think we're going to have these consistent spikes in prices globally. And so I think that the attention that this issue will receive is going to increase.
I think -- and this is personally my integration of all of what I've read --
that climate change is going to start to become a bigger and bigger issue as well.

So, I would -- I don't think of this effort as being one that needs to be harnessed in our minds as a small program. It's going to become, I think, a major program, and I think it's going to force a whole-of-Government approach.

Recently, I read an article in Science that was authored by about 40 scientists, but headed by a guy by the name of Robert Blankenship at Washington University in Missouri about photosynthesis.

And it basically provides -- this is DOE work, Department of Energy work. And they were talking about what they could do to increase the efficiency of photosynthesis for biomass production.

Well, I picked up the phone and called Dr. Blankenship and had some very good
conversations and email exchanges.

And he basically said to me that
there's a pretty good chance they could
increase the efficiency of photosynthesis from
one percent of sunlight to two percent of
sunlight, i.e., double it over some years,
with an investment.

And I said, "Well, you know, what
about food plants?" And he said, "Absolutely
applicable to food plants."

Well, I mean, just think of the
implications of increasing the efficiency --
of doubling the efficiency of photosynthesis.
Now, I don't know how -- I mean, I'm putting
this out there with -- I think this was a
telephone conversation and a few emails.

But, it does show you -- and I was
never aware of how much DOE is doing in
photosynthesis. So, this concept of how we --
that the problem is going to become greater,
I think. The attention is going to become
greater. The resources are going to become
greater, I think.

And I think the question of how we organize this whole of government effort is going to be a very important one. So, that's one comment.

Another thing about technologies on the shelf. There is the implication, often, that technologies on the shelf are a -- occur because there's a constraint on extension of technologies.

I would say there are probably two factors. One of those is certainly the extension of technologies. The other is the fact that we create a whole lot of technologies that are not adapted for environments in which we'd like them to be adapted.

Why? Because we don't understand the needs at the level before we start to develop the technology.

So, it seems to me that there's an important thing, that we shouldn't just
develop technologies because we think that they're important. We should develop technologies because people need those technologies, and we have the evidence for it.

Alex and I have exchanged ideas about this evidence-based decisionmaking. Irv brought it up. Of course, in our Forum, we did not have all the evidence in front of us. In fact, we had a very good slide from Ken Cassman which showed that, even when you have what you think is good evidence it may not be good evidence at all.

The weather stations -- if you take the actual data from weather stations and yields relevant to those weather stations you get very good correlations between the models that predict plant productivity.

If you use the weather data that's projected between weather stations, because of -- on the basis of weather models, you don't get very good prediction. And a large number of our predictions come from those kinds of
So, it strikes me that, yes, at all levels we have to make some -- we have to make wise choices. Sometimes we don't have all the evidence.

I certainly agree with Irv that we need to have continual refinement of our thoughts on this, but on the other hand, we need to take action. And I think we all -- and I think the agencies all do the best they can at assembling that evidence.

But I don't think because we make decisions on strategies now that we should not continue to refine our data, to collect our data, to continue to look at our data, and continue to refine and modify our discussions.

Irv also raised the point about CAADP. The CAADP process is, like all these processes, is a way to get information from the country about its needs.

We had a meeting in Kampala of the ministers of the CAADP countries that APLU
participated in. Peter McPherson was a prime speaker.

Brady Deaton gave the keynote at that, where the -- we recognized, working with the CAADP countries, that universities had not had much input into the CAADP agenda, that there was a resolution in that forum that strongly urged that the CAADP process incorporate higher education and research into the agenda more directly and that, hopefully, will occur, and we need to continue to put pressure.

But the CAADP process is a wonderful process. It needs to be refined, but it is something that is, I think, a landmark in terms of development and the Africans should be congratulated for taking that first step.

So, that would be my --

CHAIR DEATON: All right. Thank you. Wonderful summary of a fabulous panel, and we want to give the Board an opportunity
to ask questions, specific issues that they
want to bring up.

It's been a very rich process, and
I congratulate all of you on getting us to
this point.

May I turn to the Board, BIFAD
Board Members who want to ask more specific
questions about this.

Bill.

MEMBER DeLAUDER: I did have an
opportunity to participate in the Forum, and
it was a wonderfully organized process, and I
know that we're going to come out with a very
rich, rich document.

My question is -- is it on? I
don't -- I'm not getting the feedback from the
mic, and so that's why I asked the question.

My question is -- and Tag had
suggested something. I know that your next
step is to compile and edit the document and
make it available to various audiences,
including USAID and use, but my question is:
What would you like to see, beyond that, to happen as a result of this wonderful effort? And I'll ask that of you as well as of Irv.

MR. DEMMENT: Okay. Well, what I would like -- I would not -- I would like the process to be, have some continuity and continuation.

In what form that is, I think we need to discuss with the agencies to make sure that -- that they're comfortable with -- with how we proceed, but we certainly do not want it to end with us passing them the document, and we would hope that BIFAD, as our partner in this, would also be part of that, furthering that discussion.

MR. WIDDERS: That is somewhat of a challenging question to respond to because I think there could be different forums and venues in which to have the dialogue.

As I mentioned, I think it's vitally important that there be follow-up,
continued discussion to better define.

There is no way that resources are
going to be adequate to address everything
that came up in this -- in the Forum, and
there's some wonderful ideas, but there are
some poorly-informed ideas, as well, that
emerge, from my opinion. And so, there needs
to be continued conversation.

I would also comment -- and, Tag,
you may differ from this -- that the e-
consultation, in part, was flawed, if I can
use that comment, in that there was not
participation by certain communities.

I would ask how many molecular
geneticists or biologist participated. Maybe
one or two. But does that provide a
consensus?

So, I would ask, even, the
question: Are there certain challenges that
we've overlooked? Are there areas in the
strategy that need additional emphasis?

I think this really needs to be an
ongoing conversation. I think it needs to involve people from the various agencies, as well as the scientific community. I think it can occur through a variety of venues.

And to the extent that evidence can inform those conversations, all the better. And we certainly need -- let me just make this -- we certainly need greater participation of our host country scientists because they are the ones who understand those systems better than anyone.

Not to be critical. I mean, this was a US-centric forum, plus we need greater participation from our CGIR scientific community.

CHAIR DEATON: Any comments or questions from other Members of the Board?

MEMBER EJETA: Before I ask my question, I think the question that was asked, it looked to me the most appropriate response would be from the two federal agencies.

What are your expectations of what
would come out of this?

MS. CHAPOTIN: We are very much looking forward to the outputs -- I mean, I think the Forum was excellent, and there were some -- some really great ideas, really rich discussion coming out of it.

Your point is well-taken. There needs to be also an evidence-based process at the same time, and so I think the types of discussions that are referenced, for example, that's going to be happening on Pulses, needs to happen going forward.

If there are some areas that emerged under the strategy, as an area in which we should focus, then that community needs to come together also and have some input and try to identify further research questions, and help us prioritize under -- under particular questions.

So, I think that's one area going forward in which we could have a lot of additional interaction.
Obviously, we're looking forward to seeing the report that APLU will do on the Forum, and I expect that we will be taking that very seriously and probably coming back to the community and -- with a response on how we see the inputs of the Forum outputs being integrated into our process.

MS. REGMI: I also agree with a lot of what you said, the points that you make, and the Forum was excellent.

And, moving forward, as Tag pointed out, some decisions have to be made fairly soon, and we proceed with them, probably.

But, at the same time, there are many questions and, as Tag, again, pointed out, the climate change issue is one that's going to get only bigger as we move forward.

And, at least, within the USDA, as I already mentioned, we are focusing -- working as a whole-of-government, on climate change, on nutrition, and many other issues.
And again, the necessity to make
decisions based on evidence is really
important and the need for data. And on that,
as well, we are involved both as a whole-of-
government, as well as with the international
community and agricultural and rural
statistics as well as working together in the
climate change and data.

And there is a big need to really
knit together what's going on in those
programs because they do relate to global
security. And we expect to remain talking
with both our government partners,
international partners, as well as, hopefully,
the university partners and I think we will
look to remain engaged.

How exactly that's going to move
forward probably will work out in the next
several weeks and months.

CHAIR DEATON: Let me say, the
subject of our next panel will be to address,
in many ways, the government -- what
government expectations are at interagency coordination, so forth.

So, we're going to be continuing this dialogue with a new group here in a few minutes. But any other -- and we'll surely want to provide opportunity further for any of the Board Members to ask questions.

Bill, you had another comment?

Bill DeLauder.

MEMBER DeLAUDER: Yes. I had a lot of questions, but I'll just ask one more.

We've seen a lot of data that shows the relationship between reducing poverty, increasing income and whether the country has the capability to engage in innovation and invention and to drive that, and we've seen unequivocal data that shows the importance of that.

My issue with what we do, particularly in developing countries, and particularly in the African countries, is how do we build in self-sufficiency and
independence.

We're not going to solve this problem long-term unless, in the African countries themselves, they are able to use research to address the issues that affect them, farmers and products on the ground.

I have not heard very much -- and I'm addressing this mostly to USDA and USAID -- of what's going to be done in terms of helping to improve and enhance, in the African countries, their capabilities in using research to address the issues of increasing and sustaining agriculture productivity.

MS. CHAPOTIN: Thanks for asking that question. I have a little note right here saying, "Talk about human institutional capacity-building," but then the note stayed here and I went over here. So, thanks for bringing that up.

You're absolutely right. And I think the package of capacity-building activities that the administrator announced
the other day, I think, is a start towards that.

It's obviously going to take a lot more than that, but that is basically -- I think we completely recognize that both the capacity of the institutions in Africa, as well as the researchers, the scientists, all the way down through extension and the farmers needs to be built up in order for this to be a sustained -- to have sustainable outcomes.

One area, I think, as far as in the research investments that USAID makes, we see them both as investments in research to develop new technologies, new management practices, new policies, but each research investment is also a capacity-building program.

And each research program works very closely with institutions in the countries where we work, and with the scientists. And just as an example, in Uganda, AID has had very long-term and active
investments both from the mission level and from Washington, in the area of biotechnology, and at the same time they've been working with the National Research Organization in Uganda to build their capacity to do biotech work.

And actually, it's been a long-term investment. It's been slow, but now there is really significant capacity in the country to take ownership of using technology such as biotechnology and putting them into crops and, in fact, Uganda has a number of field trials.

So, that's just one example, but I think we will strive, going forward, to build that into each and every of our research programs as an integrated part of it and then, additionally, to really focus on where can we best -- how can we best increase the capacity of the country to take forward this research and development program, so it's not just from the outside.
MS. REGMI: Within the USDA, again, what we can do is fairly limited, but within the capabilities and authorities that we have, we will look forward and try our best to move forward -- help the countries develop their own research capabilities.

NIFA has a program on education, international education, that I think some of you may be aware of, but within the budget resources that are allocated to that, we will hope to engage in that.

And, additionally, also, FAS has training and exchange programs wherever it is possible to use that to train individuals in developing countries. On the -- within the -- focused on the priority areas for Feed the Future, we will be working very closely with the FAS to do that.

And finally, I have seen Marshall here, and I meant to mention that USDA had signed an MOU with AGRA, but I think Marshall has left by now. I forgot to mention that
earlier.

And so we also need to work together with AGRA to see how we can leverage our strengths and have somebody else, you know, take the part that we are not allowed to directly participate in, and look forward to strengthening capacity in the developing countries that way, as well.

MR. WIDDERS: May I make a comment to that?

As a director of a CRSP, one of my recommendations is that we give some thought to how we build human resources and through training -- and I'm thinking largely of degree training.

My greatest concern is that we, as universities -- and this is one of our challenges -- our admission requirements into graduate programs is very high, the GRE, the TOEFL and everything.

And we put some high barriers, and so we admit we have these training
opportunities. We admit into our programs those students who are admissible and -- but what is not integral to this process is working with the NARs and the universities to have a conversation about where they want to build capacity, because there has to be a place where these people go back to so that we're truly building and investing in capacity-development in the appropriate areas.

It would be nice for a molecular geneticist working on cowpea to have a bright graduate student that contributes to our program, but is that what that national program needs?

And I don't think many of our capacity-building programs -- we think, well, yes, we need to build capacity in biotechnology. That's a no-brainer. But are we investing and working with institutions to develop personnel develop plans to develop -- to think about what is the long-term research capacity that they want to build upon, and
that needs to occur, I believe.

CHAIR DEATON: Tag.

MR. DEMMENT: Yes. This is a very important and very -- I would say it's a big task. We've been working on a partnership program through APLU between African and US universities, and we've funded -- under that program we've funded eleven partnerships.

I think, in the process, we spent two years working with the Africans through various channels to get feedback on how -- you know, what they needed, what they -- and we got a lot of advice.

And there's a couple of things that I think are fairly important. One, African universities, particularly in agriculture, are under great stress and strain. They don't have resources. They -- institutions that used to be good in the Sixties and Seventies are not there today.

They are overwhelmed with students. I think at the University of Ghana,
which is one of the better African
universities, the enrollment over the last ten
years is five times higher than it was, and
there's just no place to put the students.

So, I think one of the things that
we need to consider is: Are we going to --
how are we going to change the agricultural
education system? How are we going to help
that change through time?

And I think Irv's point is quite
correct, but the Africans have -- if I talk to
African academics, most of the best ones know
what needs to be done. They know they need
institutional transformation.

One of the greatest problems we
have is that there are a lot of donors
involved in higher education in Africa and,
frankly, they are very -- they are not very
well-coordinated.

They are doing different kinds of
things. And what we need to do is, we need to
think about, as BIFAD, and as people
interested in this area is: How do we create
a mechanism that brings donors together in a
coordinated fashion?

So, what the Danes do and what the
US does and what the Brits do is coordinated
into an educational transformation strategy
for a particular region or a particular
country.

And then the resources can be
focused much more, and be much more effective.
But frankly, at the moment, the resources are
small from most all groups and they are not
coordinated, so they are spread quite thin,
and I don't think they are being as effective
as possible.

So that's a point that I think we
as folks in the international development
arena should be thinking about.

CHAIR DEATON: Tag, let me thank
you. Saharah, Anita and Irv, fabulous panel,
and I would ask that we give them a big round
of applause for a great effort.
(Applause.)

CHAIR DEATON: Well, all journeys begin with a small step, at least, so we've had a fairly significant step here today. And we're going to be continuing the dialogue.

At this time we are going to take about a 10-minute break and be back to start the 10:30 panel. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record 10:19 a.m. and resumed at 10:31 a.m.)

CHAIR DEATON: Welcome, everyone. If everyone could please get seated we will get started. And let me thank the panel for being here to address the overview and interagency coordination, the Feed the Future initiative and the work that you heard presented in Panel I on the Research Agenda and Forum Report. And Julie Howard was the moderator of this panel and I will turn the panel over to her. This is looking at whole government efforts. And Julie Howard is the
coordinator for the Feed the Future. Julie?

MS. HOWARD: Thank you very much, Brady, and actually you've given me a promotion, an undeserved promotion. I'm deputy coordinator for development of Feed the Future.

CHAIR DEATON: You've done so much.

(Laughter)

MS. HOWARD: Well, first of all I'd like to start off by congratulating the members of BIFAD. This is an exciting new moment for us to have the new board on board, may I say. So let me just say a couple of things about myself and then I want to say a few words about Feed the Future before I quickly turn over to my panel members. This is my third month, the beginning of my third month in the U.S. government. I'm an agricultural economist by training, I've done most of my work in African agricultural development in the academic world but then the
last 10 years I've led, before coming here I
led a research and advocacy organization
working with many of you in the university
community and the NGO world and private
sectors to advocate for increased and better
U.S. investment in agricultural as a catalyst
for broad-based economic growth. So it's
delightful, you know, for me and a challenge
to be now on the other side of the table,
again still working with you to implement this
Feed the Future initiative.

So a few words about Feed the
Future and I think you probably know this
story, maybe you know it by heart by now. So
Feed the Future initiative really comes on the
heels of the need for a different kind of
response to the global food price crisis that
we all witnessed in 2007-2008 and saw very
starkly the connection between food security
and national security and global security. So
Feed the Future is President Obama's
commitment to recognizing the importance of
food aid but also recognizing that we really
need to turn our attention to a longer,
sustained impact on agricultural production
and nutrition security as the sort of long-
term answer. So President Obama pledged at
L'Aquila in 2009 to double U.S. assistance in
this area and leveraged a commitment of $18.5
billion for our $3.5 billion commitment which
we think is quite impressive and we are on
target to meeting that. And I just wanted to
say that these are not only resources, that
Feed the Future is not only about an increase
in financial resources, it's also
fundamentally about a different way of doing
things. It's a harbinger, a stalking horse I
think for how we would like to see foreign
assistance reform progress.

So, and I just wanted in my
remaining couple of minutes before I turn it
over to the panel members just sort of give
you five different ways in which the Feed the
Future initiative is different. First of all,
Feed the Future is committed to investing in country-owned plans, and these principles really track the principles that came out of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and previously the Accra Agenda and really have been solidified in the Rome Principles for Sustainable Food Security, also 2009. So investing in country-owned plans is at the center and I think this really gets at the heart of what is sustainable development. Sustainable development is not what donors think is right to do, a sustainable development is what countries think their priorities are. So this is really the first and to my mind one of the most important principles.

So that investing in country-owned plans, and that's important in another way and leads to the second principle which is strengthening strategic coordination at different levels. So we have the country-owned plans that provide sort of this platform
of, you know, a few different areas that
countries commit to, that countries'
governments invest in themselves, that private
sector and CSO partners at country levels have
agreed are important, and then the U.S. and
other donor partners also come in and say
we'll take a piece of that plan. I think
that's a revolution in how we think about
foreign assistance. Because, you know, before
sort of going in and having a set of very
fragmented investments, a little bit of
everything scattered across the landscape, I
think our realization is we're not
accomplishing enough that way. We really need
to focus and concentrate our resources. So we
do that by these country-owned plans, focusing
on a few priorities, and then using those
priorities to co-ordinate across donors,
across our U.S. government agencies and with
our private sector and NGO partners.

A third way that Feed the Future
is different is that we're looking at a
comprehensive approach. So we're not just
talking about increasing agricultural
production, we're also talking about
nutrition, talking a lot about nutrition and
Cindy's going to address that later. We're
also talking about infrastructure, we're
talking about post-harvest losses and we're
talking about value chains. So from soup to
nuts what does it take to strengthen a maize
system in a country, what does it take to
improve research, what does it take to get the
seed system going, what does it take to
enhance the nutritional properties, so a much
more comprehensive approach.

Fourthly, the Feed the Future
seeks to leverage the benefits of multilateral
institutions and Dan will be talking more
about that. I mean, GAFSP, the global ag food
security program is sort of our signature
effort in that regard, but recognizing that
aside from agreeing at the country level that
we all should work more closely together, this
is the kind of fund that allows us to pool our resources to address these country plans.

And finally but very importantly this Feed the Future is different because we're committing to deliver on sustained and accountable commitments, and those are very clear for us. Over the next five years we're committed to lifting $18 million mostly smallholder farmers out of hunger and poverty. We're committed to reaching 7 million undernourished children with our nutrition interventions. We're committing to generate $2.8 billion in agricultural GDP through our research and development activities. And we're committing to leveraging $70 million in private investment for agricultural in these target areas.

So lastly I want to say, so these five principles, these top-line targets that guide us and we are focusing our efforts. You know, we're saying we can't do everything....
everywhere so we're focusing in 20 countries, 12 in Africa and others in Asia and Latin America.

So I now want to turn to my colleagues to give a bit more detail about the interagency role. I want to say that over the past few days we've been really privileged I think to witness the interagency in action as we've been talking about the research form, you know, what are our research priorities. Importantly, that's been a very, very solid effort between USAID and USDA in drafting this research document that everyone here, many here were commenting on. And going forward you know, essentially we're asking for comments and the involvement of our very important U.S. university community and also private sector and NGO community in really helping us digest the results from this forum and drill down into more specific priorities.

So I seem to have lost my agenda. Who is coming next. Okay, great. So now let me turn
to Paul Weisenfeld who is Assistant to the Administrator in the Bureau for Food Security.

Paul?

MR. WEISENFELD: Thank you very much, Julie. Good morning, everyone, and let me as Julie did congratulate the new members of the BIFAD board. We're extremely excited to have such a high-powered board here to advise us on issues not just for Feed the Future but across the agricultural portfolio and development portfolio generally. I am the head of the Bureau for Food Security and as Julie did I'll say two sentences about my -- I'm a career Foreign Service officer. I've been in the agency for -- this is my twentieth year in various assignments, most of my time overseas serving as a Foreign Service officer in different countries. But my last job before taking over about 10 weeks ago as head of the Bureau for Food Security was leading our coordination efforts for the Haiti relief from shortly after the earthquake until about
So I will talk a little bit about what the role of the bureau is. As Julie said, I have a chart up there that shows the basic outlines of the structure. Julie said it's an interagency initiative so our partnerships with USDA and the State Department and the Department of Treasury among others as well as other research organizations, National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation are critically important but USAID has been given the lead role in coordinating the initiative, not in doing everything, but in coordinating this whole of government effort.

So the Administrator Rajiv Shah in November set -- made a decision to stand up a new bureau as a means to institutionalize our efforts to implement the initiative, and to create a structure focused around the ideas of Feed the Future so that AID is positioned to implement in an effective way and to
coordinate this initiative. One of the things you'll see, I'll start over on the right side, kind of the -- we have the Senior Deputy Administrator, sorry on the left, Greg Gottlieb and the other Deputy Assistant Administrator Tjada McKenna, but under Tjada you see the Country Strategies and Implementation Office. And one of the reasons for the structural change here is to really focus ourselves structurally on implementation in the field. As Julie said, it's critically important to us that we have programs that follow country-led efforts, and as part of implementing that it's important for us to allocate our human resources in a way to support implementation in the field. So we've set aside a separate office that's focused on field implementation, or stood up a separate office that's focused on field implementation, helping missions overseas do rigorous analysis, setting up rigorous monitoring and evaluation systems and all of the project
design and implementing necessary to get activities going in the field, to show concrete results in the near term and to make the results sustainable over the long term. So that's really the heart of the bureau is a focus on field support, kind of in the -- prior to the Bureau for Food Security the field support side of what we did was merged with other offices. It was part of the Agricultural Research Office for awhile. Over the years in AID it's been part of different offices, but the intention of the Administrator is to really focus our efforts on field support as the heart of it.

Next to that office you'll see the Markets, Partnerships and Innovation Office. In a similar vein AID has been working on public-private partnerships, understanding markets for a number of years, but it's always been a task that's an additional task for AID officers. People have to set up programs as well as think about markets. And the idea
here is that we understand as part of the
initiative that it's -- the easy part is
giving people hybrid seeds and better
fertilizer and getting them to grow produce,
and the hard part is making it sustainable.
And that means finding market outlets. So
even though we've been doing markets, we want
to -- the intention here is to stand up a
separate office that's focused like a laser
beam on how we think about issues of markets
and partnerships. So we've done that under
the leadership of Margaret Enis in our office.

Those who attended the Research
Forum the last few days are very familiar with
the Agricultural Research Office that Rob
Bertram heads. That is another key part of
the initiative is reversing a decades-long
trend of reduced investment in agricultural
research, and we know that research for the
long term is a critical part of seeing
agricultural production and productivity turn
around. So that is another one of our -- the
core parts of our efforts.

The Strategic Planning and Communications Offices are parts of a standard AID program, but here kind of the difference is Strategic Planning is an office that does our budgeting and supports budgeting across the initiative working with other agencies, but it's also the office that houses our monitoring and evaluation expertise within the bureau. There is kind of an interagency-wide effort to support monitoring and evaluation led by a woman named Kristin Penn who's absolutely fabulous, but we have capacity within the bureau ourselves to support missions in setting up monitoring and evaluation, and also to think initiative-wide across the various countries about what the learning agenda is. As we move forward in the initiative what are we really learning about the differences between what we're doing in Ghana versus what we're doing in Guatemala versus Tanzania. So we've made sure that
we've stood up the capacity in that office.

Communications and Outreach, the last of these offices, is again a big part of making sure that we're building support and disseminating what we're learning from the initiative and making sure that people understand what's going on with Feed the Future and we have the capacity to spread the message out so that we can generate support for what really is a core area of development investment. If we think about what the agency does as a whole as an economic development agency kind of the core of it in addressing poverty really cuts to rural poverty. In the countries where we work in poverty is mostly rural poverty, and getting at rural poverty and learning -- generating the learnings that we're doing, it's necessary to make sure that we have the capacity to disseminate that out.

So the final thing I'll remember, underscoring what Julie said, is all of this, all of these offices and capacities are...
intended to implement this focused approach.

And I know our Administrator probably
mentioned this morning that a big part of the
initiative is understanding that if we -- our
investments are dispersed too broadly that
we're not going to see the kinds of results we
want and that his expectation for the
initiative and the President's expectation for
the initiative is that we can demonstrate in
some countries that we really can address
issues of food insecurity, that we can
eradicate food insecurity in some countries.
So we are focused on 20 focus countries and
within those focus countries our field support
efforts really help our missions make choices
about within the investment envelope that we
have where are we going to invest those
resources in a concentrated way that we think
will generate significant impact. So for
instance, in Ghana we've made decisions about
focusing our energies in the northern part of
the country in a select set of value chains,
because we believe that those value chains will drive increases in agricultural productivity and reduce levels of poverty and under-nutrition in that area. So the -- all of this is geared towards analytical capacities to help ourselves make those decisions and focus our resources in a way that will generate significant impact. So thank you very much.

MS. HOWARD: Great. Okay, thank you, Paul for that great explanation of how U.S. is organized -- or USAID is organizing the new Bureau for Food Security. So one of the fundamental things underlying Feed the Future is the sense that this is an initiative that this is an initiative that is led by USAID but it's much broader than USAID. The sense that we can do much more in the countries and regions where we work if we're actually drawing on the strengths of all of the U.S. government agencies.

So I think the next panelists are Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433
going to explain, Cindy Huang is first up.
Cindy is the senior adviser at the Office of
Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative at
the State Department. So Cindy has been
involved I think from the very beginning. I
think she is the founding member of the Feed
the Future --

MS. HUANG: Close to the
beginning.

MS. HOWARD: -- club. Right, so I
think she's the perfect person to explain how
State has been involved since day one in this
initiative and how State's role is evolving as
we go from the strategic planning phase for
the first couple of years to actually what
does this look like as we implement on the
ground. Cindy?

MS. HUANG: Thanks, Julie. It's
been a really exciting time I think for food
security generally, and I also want to add my
congratulations to the members of the BIFAD
board. It's wonderful to have your input and
expertise as we continue to develop Feed the Future. So -- oh, okay. I was worried about straining my neck a little bit. So you know, after President Obama announced our $3.5 billion commitment we've been going full steam ahead and Secretary Clinton along with Secretary General of the United Nations Ban-Ki Moon held a big meeting at the UN General Assembly in 2009 and since then the Secretary created a special office within the Office of the Secretary called the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative Office that really shows how much we're trying to elevate and think about how diplomacy can support development.

So some of you may have heard about the large review that Secretary Clinton led to make sure that we are first elevating development as a critical foreign policy and national security objective as Julie mentioned, and second, looking at the tools that the State Department has in order to
support these goals. Currently, our office is led by the Deputy Coordinator for Diplomacy, Jonathan Shrier. Unfortunately he's on his way to Rome for the annual FAO meetings and so he was unable to make it today. There are a lot of different ways that the State Department is supporting Feed the Future, but I also want to emphasize a point that Paul and Julie both made which is that a lot of this is context-specific. There is no cookie-cutter, you know, example of what we should be doing. Rather, we're really encouraging our embassies, our econ and political officers to think about how they can bring their resources and of course the offices here in D.C. as well, how they can bring their resources to bear on our overall goals.

In terms of multilateral and bilateral engagement we're working with the interagency team to coordinate our policy positions, and a great example is recently at the G20 there was a working paper, sorry, a
declaration about how different countries will
be working together to increase transparency.
I'm sure you're all very familiar with it.
But that's an example where bringing together
the different resources we can really
influence the outcomes at multilateral fora.

We also have supported the GAFSP, the Global Agriculture and Food Security
Program. I'll let Dan give the details of
that. At the State Department we're in the
unenviable position of helping to raise funds.
I think all of you are aware that it's a very
difficult fiscal environment, but again that's
where by keeping it at the top of our agenda
we hope to raise more funds.

Donor coordination I would say is
probably one of the largest areas of our
support. So through the tracking of the $22
billion we are working with different donor
countries to make sure that they report their
contributions transparently. As Julie
mentioned we are on track and we're trying to
be very transparent and also sharing our results framework. So that will be as the U.S. will be the chair of the L'Aquila group this year that's tracking the $22 billion. We want to make it a priority to look at how we're tracking results and under the leadership of Kristin Penn we've developed a very rigorous results framework. So how are other donors planning to bring their resources to align with the country investment plans and also to begin closing the gap. And I think that one of the great successes of the various high-level events that we've had in different countries is that it's pushed the countries to articulate better their priorities within the plans, and that's something that's very important as we then also choose to align our resources for greater impact. And part of donor coordination at the country level, I would add, is that really looking at how the chief of mission, our ambassador, and the deputy chief of mission can contribute to
getting greater transparency and a focus on results.

I already discussed a little bit about how in trade and agriculture policy the State Department is contributing to negotiations. And then also an important issue that's coming up is around land tenure and property rights. And so our ambassador to Rome for the UN agencies there, Ambassador Cousin, has been very active in working on getting consensus around the voluntary guidelines and we hope that will be affirmed at the CFS this fall.

Here's some areas, the State Department has a lot of experience in several of these including biotechnology as used appropriately in different contexts and also regional integration. I mentioned land tenure already. Private sector investment which is linked to of course American businesses when it's applicable. And one story that I really like is in Rwanda which is one of the first
countries to have a meeting around its country-led plan, the team there found out that Caterpillar was going to have are regional office opened up and they were just making people aware of it, and through that they were able to facilitate some purchases for the implementation of Rwanda's plan. So that's an example where, you know, we're out there competing with others but where it's applicable and where we can facilitate those relationships there can be productive synergies.

On the right-hand side there are some areas which go beyond agriculture such as corruption and overall policy-enabling environments, and that's something of course that the State Department works on regularly. And of our efforts is to tailor that to the Feed the Future policy priorities. Some example from Tanzania, Kenya and Ghana around how we're working on that. In Tanzania there's currently -- there are currently
export bans that are discouraging trade and
so, again, we're working with our ambassador
to help advocate against those. In Kenya
we're working on regional integration. In
particular, there's also a regional program of
course in the East African area to facilitate
greater trade. And in Ghana we're focusing on
land tenure. And one example of bringing
efforts together is there's another initiative
going on called Partnerships for Growth and
that's part of implementing the aid
effectiveness principles, and Ghana and
Tanzania are also countries for Partnerships
for Growth. And so through that exercise of
working with the government to identify
overall economic priorities, land tenure has
come up in that analysis too. So that gives
us more leverage and cooperation with the
government to address these critical issues.

The State Department is also
involved in strategic and economic dialogues,
so -- with various countries. And then we
have particular partnerships with India, Brazil and South Africa where we're combining our diplomatic leverage with specific programs. So for example with Brazil we're working in Mozambique to help them develop school feeding programs and to improve nutrition.

So one of the -- last year at the UN General Assembly the Secretary decided to do an event on the thousand-day window of opportunity which is really -- there's a lot of great science recently including in the Lancet that shows that if a child has good nutrition up to two years of age that it has lifelong impacts for intellectual and physical development. So I'm just -- this is I think a great example of how the Secretary was able to bring together actors in order to really spur change. And then recently she was in Tanzania where there were, you know, through engaging with the government we were able to come away with a lot of progress including the
government announcing its own national budget line for nutrition. So again there's an example of where high-level advocacy can make a difference that embodies our commitment to country ownership and also domestic financing for development goals.

We are also engaged in outreach. I've mentioned many of these already so I'll just speed it up. And -- oh and I, but I don't think any of us have mentioned CAADP yet so that's a, you know, as part of working on country-led investment plans in Africa we're working with the African Union's Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program. And that's I think been a very successful collaboration and in fact CAADP was mentioned in the original L'Aquila statement. And so that's, again, a way that we can keep returning to the principles.

So that was just a quick overview, a not-so-quick overview of how we're trying to figure out. And it's really, I mean I would
just close by saying it's really been a
process and I think that's where we've really
become friends and partners in this process to
figure out in which context, which fora, which
countries, you know, how should this
collaboration really play out. So I also want
to thank my interagency colleagues for
enduring in this and I look forward to your
questions.

MS. HOWARD: Thanks, Cindy, very
much for that overview. Cindy, your
presentation also reminded me that I need to
say that not all of our interagency partners
are with us today. So other key members of
this group are the Millennium Challenge
Corporation, Peace Corps, the U.S. Trade
Representative's Office, OPIC and others who
regularly participate with us in our biweekly
meetings, but also as important in the country
interagency meetings that we put together. So
in Ghana for example MCC, a very, very
important partner there as Peace Corps. So
just to give you that picture. I think it's -
- it would make a very large and long panel to
have everybody with us today.

But it's not just country
implementation activities. For example, MCC
is also -- has been instrumental in helping us
developing our results framework, our
monitoring and evaluation system. So we've
actually taken a long-term loan of one of
their key people, Kristin Penn, to lead our
monitoring and evaluation efforts. MCC has
also been a key partner on knowledge
development. So land tenure for example is an
area in which we're all working together using
MCC's experience with land tenure compacts.
They're working in several countries today
with USAID, together with State. So just to
give you that picture.

And so now I'd like to introduce
Dan Peters who's the director of the Office of
African Nations at the Treasury Department and
just to say personally how delighted I am that
Treasury is engaging in the area of food security and, I mean, this is really the first time in my career that Treasury has been engaged with us in this way as a very regular and important partner in this effort.

MR. PETERS: Thank you, Julie. I'll move over to the podium as well. So good morning. Again, I'm Dan Peters. I'm the director of the Africa Office at the Treasury Department. I'll just explain briefly I've also been -- I was a charter member of the interagency food security group. I frequently get questions and looks when people say Treasury and food security. Our involvement has been linking in very much with the overall strategy in terms of multilateral support for food security. Treasury within the U.S. government is the liaison agency for the international financial institutions, the multilateral development banks and so early on in the development of Feed the Future there was a decision made that looking at...
multilateral mechanisms that could leverage in additional resources against country strategies would be one of the ways that the U.S. government would pursue its food security strategy. So the United States with a number of other donors worked together to establish the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program, or GAFSP as we call it, and I'll note up front our largest mistake was the acronym. (Laughter)

MR. PETERS: So if we were going to do something different that would certainly be one of the things at the top of the list. So GAFSP, what is GAFSP? Again, it's a multilateral, a multi-donor trust fund that was called for by G20 leaders at their summit in Pittsburgh in 2009. The donors to GAFSP include the United States, South Korea, the Gates Foundation, Australia, Spain and Canada. The purpose of GAFSP again was to help bring in resources that were aligned with country-owned strategies in low-income countries. And
the mechanism that we have used is the trust fund and then individual projects are implemented with the assistance of the multilateral development banks, and these include the World Bank, the African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

And some of the reasons again that we worked to set GAFSP was one of these was to help pool resources against the shared goals that we had within the Feed the Future initiative. We worked certainly strongly at the country level with other partners and donors, but GAFSP also allows us to pool resources at a global level and bring in donors that we might not, you know, deal with always at the country level. So for instance, I think one notable thing is that South Korea is a participant. South Korea, you know, doesn't generally engage much at the country
level. This allows them though to participate in our global efforts on food security. It also allows us to directly draw in for instance the Gates Foundation which you know is another kind of non-traditional player, certainly one that has increasing weight on the development stage. And we're in continuing conversations with other donors that you might not necessarily consider both within the Gulf, within the emerging markets generally. And so this provides us certainly with one mechanism there.

Another advantage that we saw in the GAFSP model was that it also provides countries with clear incentives to move forward with the department of their country's strategies. GAFSP works on an open call model so that we put out, you know, we periodically put out calls for countries to make proposals to GAFSP. And one of the top-line requirements for countries to put that in is that they need to have in place a robust
country food security strategy. So it was, you know, another way to incentivize countries to move forward with comprehensive strategies.

And then, you know, one other comparative advantage I'll note is that it does also help us within the overall accounting for donor commitments. Julie mentioned the overall amount that was leveraged from our $3.5 billion at L'Aquila. GAFSP is one way that we can very concretely account for monies that donors are putting in to the food security effort.

This is a very complicated slide but let me try to explain again in a little bit more detail how GAFSP works. Again, it's on an open call model. Any country, any low-income country that is eligible for concessional financing from the World Bank can apply. So that's a broad set of about 60 different countries. Countries submit proposals to GAFSP. Again, they have to have in place a country strategy and the proposal
is a portion of that strategy. So again, this forces countries to prioritize what they would like to be financed. And then we have a technical advisory committee that's made up of 12 experts from development and the agriculture sector who review these proposals against a set of criteria that were established by the steering committee. And these criteria include we look at need and this is looking at the MDG1 indicators basically and seeing what the levels of poverty and hunger are in a country. We look at country readiness, so again, the technical advisory committee reviews a country's overall food security strategy. We look at the country's policy environment. So Cindy noted for instance during her presentation for instance the export bans that Tanzania has in place, so that would be something that would impact a country's opportunities. And then finally we look at the proposal itself. And then the technical advisory committee ranks
the proposals that we receive, presents a list
to the steering committee who then makes final
decisions on the allocations of funds.

So GAFSP was established in April
of 2010. In our first year we've allocated
nearly half a billion dollars to 12 countries.
Just a couple of weeks ago, June 7th and 8th,
the steering committee made its third round of
award grants of $160 million total to
Cambodia, Liberia, Nepal and Tajikistan.

Previous awards from the previous two rounds
went to Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Haiti, Mongolia,
Niger, Rwanda, Sierra Leone and Togo. So one
thing I would note here too is that we have
very strong overlap with our Feed the Future
focus countries as well. Of our 12 original
grants eight of them are Feed the Future focus
countries. So we have very strong overlap in
that way.

Also in the first year something
else that I would note is just as Feed the
Future, just as we in the bilateral operations
have worked very strongly to put in place a monitoring and evaluation framework, that's something that we've also worked to do within GAFSP as well. You know, with so many different agencies that are assisting in implementation we forced them all to sit down and come up with a common set of results indicators so that when these projects are implemented we'll be able to compare results across countries and aggregate those results. And we've also pushed very hard to have many of these projects undergo in-depth impact evaluations so that we'll be able to tell kind of at the household level what impact the GAFSP investments have.

We've also tried to place a very high level of transparency in GAFSP's operations. So GAFSP has its own website, GAFSPfund.org, and all of the information on GAFSP is posted on that website including country proposals, the minutes of the steering committee meetings and the governance
And finally I would note that civil society has been a strong participant in GAFSP from the beginning. On the steering committee itself we have three civil society representatives. We have one from kind of the northern CSO community, so we have ActionAid that sits on the board. But we also have ROPPA which is a West African umbrella organization for farmer's groups that sits on the board. And then from Cambodia, Farmer and Nature Net which is a farmer's organization in Cambodia.

So in terms of again of complementarity with our bilateral activities under Feed the Future, again I'll just, you know, one of the advantages to GAFSP is the leveraging of our limited development resources. The United States contributed $67 million upon the establishment of GAFSP. With that and some of the strong diplomatic outreach that Treasury, the State Department and AID have done in that first year we've
managed to leverage $450 million in pledges from other countries, the other donors, of which they've already put in $403 million. So we've strongly leveraged our initial contribution. I would point out that in the current fiscal situation you know we are facing some challenges going forward. We have a total pledge to GAFSP of $475. We just got $100 million in FY '11 so we're still working forward on our pledge and that certainly complicates raising financing from others.

Again, you know, we bring additional resources to our Feed the Future focus countries. I noted the strong overlap between the initial grants and our FTF focus countries. And then another thing I would note is that we do also have strong overlap in the results indicators in monitoring and evaluation framework. So Kristin Penn who heads up the monitoring and evaluation framework for all of our bilateral activities has also worked very closely with GAFSP in
terms of developing the common results indicators for GAFSP itself.

So our next steps. First of all, there's also a private sector window within GAFSP that is set up in order to help provide financing to small- and medium-size enterprises in the agricultural sector in low-income countries and also to help provide financing to smallholder farmers themselves. The private sector window has not moved quite as quickly as the public sector window largely because the United States is still working on putting in some money. But the Canadians have contributed $50 million and we are likely to go out with a first call for proposals on the private sector window over the next several weeks.

On the public sector side we're working on setting up a third call for proposals hopefully sometime later in 2011 dependent on raising financing. So those are kind of the next steps within GAFSP, and then
working on implementing the existing grants.

So with that I think that was my last slide, yes. So I'll be happy also to take questions from the audience once we finish the panel.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Dan.

Well, last but certainly not least we have Lona Stoll who is the USDA coordinator for Feed the Future in USDA's Office of the Secretary. And Lona is also -- while USDA is a charter member of the Feed the Future club, Lona's predecessor Ann Tutwiler is now the second-in-command at FAO which is great. But I also, over the last few days we've really witnessed through the Research Forum I mean how we are really trying to knit together in an integrated way USAID, USDA priorities and programs in consultation with our external stakeholders. So I think Lona you're going to sort of step back and reflect a little bit on the Research Forum but more broadly on USDA's
role in Feed the Future. Right?

MS. STOLL: Well, thanks for that introduction, Julie, and let me go to the first slide here. To Julie's point about just the level of integration and really commitment to this effort I put up here a quote from Secretary Vilsack. But I think one of the notable things about Feed the Future is the way you see the key principles in our government, Secretary Clinton, Administrator Shah, Secretary Vilsack, Treasury leadership, really communicating the same message and the same level of importance that this effort constitutes for our country, but then also for the global community. And so forward-deploying Ann to FAO is part of our plan for how we make sure everyone's on the same talking points. But it really is something that USDA leadership has embraced and as Julie was saying, looked at not only how can we really be a good partner in this overall effort, but how can we make sure that our core
programs and the things that have existed at USDA for years really are aligned and brought into this same context.

And so when you originally had discussions around the Feed the Future initiative Secretary Vilsack and Administrator Shah had some long conversations about what does it mean to have our two agencies really partner together well and what is it that USDA does bring that's unique and that can contribute to what we're trying to accomplish. And so I put in a box up here at the top the kind of three general things that they talked about. I'm going to dig into those for a second, that you get a sense of what we mean when we say we're partnered, that it's not just this conceptual, high-level thing but we've actually thought really specifically about what that partnership means.

So the first on research which Julie was talking about and we really have seen play out this week at the Research Forum.
USDA has significant in-house research expertise through our Agricultural Research Service which has, you know, 72 different labs and research institutions around the country that are doing kind of core agricultural research with the primary purpose of benefitting the U.S. agricultural producers and farmers. But as we know it's a global agricultural environment so our farmers face many of the same challenges that we see in these countries, the same challenges of salinity and drought and flooding, you know, happened here in the United States as well. So on the research front part of what we've been really doing is really seeking to align our core research programs with in the cases where they serve that dual purpose of U.S. farmers and international farmers to support Feed the Future as well as U.S. agricultural growth.

So on the research category you also have our extramural programs that are
handled out of our National Institutes of Food
and Agriculture, and I think you've had an
opportunity to talk to Nita and Hiram was at
the forum this week about some of the ways
that those programs are being crafted to
really ensure that international cooperative
research is something that is emphasized.
When we've gone out with our requests for
proposals through our competitive grant
programs it's built in a reference to Feed the
Future and to the website so that the
different researchers can think about where
these much more significant U.S. government
investments are going into these particular
countries and see where those focus areas are
and think about that in the context of their
proposals through these competitive grant
programs.

The second category in country
capacity-building sounds really vague but
we've actually narrowed it more than that.
There's a lot that USDA does on trade
capacity-building, regulatory system capacity-building, natural resource management support through our Forest Service and so the areas we're looking at are those core kind of ministry to ministry, government -- inherently government functions which can include research institution capacity-building as well. And where there are cases that some of that USDA in-house capacity and those relationships that can be built between partner institutions can really form a contributing part to the Feed the Future strategy.

The third is data analysis, market information. Statistics also falls in there. The inherently governmental function of really understanding what's going on in our own country in terms of agriculture but also around the world. And some of the ways we work to make sure there is global approaches to statistics so that we are talking about the same data when we're trying to figure out what
are the long-term trends and what are the
different factors that we're grappling with in
these countries.

So those three areas really
defined how the Secretary and the
Administrator talked about this partnership
and talked about how USDA could play a role in
this that was appropriate to sort of our core
value-added in the U.S. government. And so
when we were then looking at, okay, well so
what does that mean for what we're actually
going to do one part of what we did is really
look at our existing resources and programs.
So absent the funding that has come through
USAID and through the specific Feed the Future
program USDA has a lot of existing
longstanding programs that have supported
global food security efforts and what we want
to do is make sure those are aligned. And so
in the global arena that means our research
programs which I already talked about, it
means what we're doing in terms of data and
economic analysis from places like our
Economic Research Service but also the work
that's done out of our Office of Chief
Economist and within our Foreign Agricultural
Service and Office of Global Analysis. So
making sure that those existing reports and
analysis we were doing both can be fed into
the Feed the Future broader interagency team
and also are aligning and doing research in
these Feed the Future focus areas.

The third is on trade facilitation
that the work that we're doing on the broad
kind of U.S. global, the worldwide trade
system is supporting the Feed the Future
initiative. And on the country level we don't
have the same footprint that you see that
State Department and USAID has overseas, but
throughout Foreign Agricultural Service and
then our Animal and Plant Health Inspection
Service we do have Foreign Service officers
overseas. So when we were thinking about,
okay, where can we bring our, again, our
appropriated programs and our activities and resources to bear we looked at where do we have USDA personnel overseas already, where do we have existing USDA programs that can complement what's going on with Feed the Future. So we narrowed from those 20 countries to really focus our efforts on the subset you see here, Ghana, Bangladesh, Guatemala, Haiti, Kenya, East Africa which includes Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, and then Central America as being core areas where we were going to focus on making sure that the USDA programs and activities really were aligned. We are of course aligning in the other 20 countries too but in terms of where I spend my time and where, you know, we're trying to make sure that people are talking and coordinating we've really focused on these particular places.

So that same focus you heard talked about from the U.S. government level to get us to kind of 20 countries, within USDA,
first out of the block for us to really make
sure our programs are aligned and supportive
was this group. So with that I think I'm
going to stop and leave room for questions.
Okay, great.

(Applause)

MS. HOWARD: Our final speaker, we
have our BIFAD member Dr. Elsa Murano, the
president emerita from Texas A&M.

MEMBER MURANO: Thank you very
much. I'm going to be speaking to you this
morning I think not as a member of BIFAD but
as a representative of the university
community. I am an academic professor at
Texas A&M University, nutrition and food
science, and so I feel I can speak on behalf
of my colleagues in academia regarding what
we've heard this morning. I'm not going to
take a tremendously long time to speak to you
because I think it's much more important to
engage in dialogue than just listen to a bunch
of us talking, but there's a couple of things
that I wanted to cover this morning in response to what's been said and really in response to this whole concept of having the whole of government or interagency collaborations for this initiative called Feed the Future.

First, I wanted to say that certainly I think all of us recognize that there are costs and there are benefits to having better interagency coordination or to working together when you have several groups of people with perhaps separate missions in a way. First, in the way of the cost, it is a difficult thing to pull off to work together because agencies I think tend to get upset when somebody else creeps up on their mission. When I worked at USDA we were forever talking about mission creep and making sure that, you know, nobody got on our turf and we didn't get on anybody else's turf and so that's a reality that exists in the federal government and frankly in just about every public...
organization. So that's something that is seen kind of as a cost when you consider working together.

Secondly, I think it makes allocation of credit for a job well done more difficult to do it fairly. You know, we human beings like to be given credit for what our efforts are and so when that credit gets spread around or doesn't get spread fairly we tend to have a problem with that, and that also kind of keeps us from working together.

And then thirdly I think when we work together it kind of decentralizes the control in a way because everyone has a piece of the action, everybody works on some aspect of a problem and so it's a lot more difficult to control the outcome than if it's just one entity doing it, or at least that is the theory. So there are those realities that I think we face and certainly in the federal government these agencies face so I commend them for this attempt at doing the work of
coordinating each other's activities because there are benefits also.

There's those costs, but there are benefits and I think these professional people that have spoken to you this morning recognize that there are benefits provided that it is done right. First and foremost of course working together diminishes the opportunity for duplication of efforts and that's important. Secondly, you have a synergistic effect that happens when you work together where the whole becomes more than the sum of the parts. And when you coordinate efforts, when you coordinate funding, when you coordinate expertise you have that synergistic effect that takes place. And then thirdly, certainly when you work together the expectation is that results will be more meaningful, more substantive than if it's just individuals working separately. So I know certainly as a member of the university community, you know, where I think we invented
silos to be honest with you.

(Laughter)

MEMBER MURANO: See, they're all saying amen back there. I know from firsthand experience that for people to work together there has to be a driver. It's that simple. The driver can be just simply the desire to work together but most of the time that's not enough of a drive. The driver needs to be more compelling in nature. It needs to be one that minimizes those costs that I just mentioned and maximizes the benefits as well. I certainly can say very safely and it was seen and demonstrated this week during the Research Forum that was organized by APLU and certainly by the comments from my colleague this morning that universities are very eager to participate in Feed the Future. The e-consultation certainly was a testament of this with so many comments being offered on behalf of many members of the academic community. And that is because we in the land grant
university community, at universities we have
the expertise in the agricultural sciences.
All the way from agronomy to nutrition to food
safety to economics to climate change issues,
we have that expertise. We also have
experience in working in a lot of these Feed
the Future focus countries and we have the
experience also of working with the agencies
that are involved in Feed the Future. And I
think also we have the structure that helps us
to get the Feed the Future priorities
accomplished because we're educators, we're
researchers, but we also love to translate
that information to the end user through
extension, and we're very, very good at it.

So there is certainly a lot of
commonality here between the land grant
university system and what the agencies are
trying to accomplish with Feed the Future.
And I do believe that there is a tremendous
interest by these agencies to work together.
They have demonstrated it this week. The fact
that they're sitting here at this table
certainly shows that as well, and we stand
ready, the land grant university community, to
work with all of these agencies in this
endeavor.

So what I wanted to do secondly
then this morning is to offer on behalf of the
academic community three thoughts that
probably you have had anyway, but it probably
would be helpful to mention. And these are by
no means the only thoughts that should be
offered by the academic community with regards
to how the government can work better
together, but these are just a beginning. So
first of all, we would suggest that the
agencies as they structure themselves to work
better together, that they take into
consideration how to avail themselves of the
advice from independent entities and BIFAD is
a great such entity. And here I'm advocating
for the very board that I serve on so it's a
little self-serving here, but I think it's for
a good purpose. And what I mean by that is that BIFAD can act not just as an advisory board to USAID in this case, but it can also act as an accountability partner. BIFAD can be an entity that can serve the agency in ensuring that for example Feed the Future projects not only keep to the objectives of the initiative but also that they include the participation of all other agencies. You know, that's one way that BIFAD can certainly serve its role well in ensuring that people are working together by being kind of a little bit of the watchdog, and I don't mean that in a negative or overbearing way, but in a friendly way to keep everybody accountable.

Secondly, the agencies can and should avail themselves of the input that land grant universities can offer through APLU in terms of how to diminish the bureaucratic barriers that sometimes make it difficult for institutions, for universities to seek funds from various agencies for the same project.
So for example having common deadlines, if you have RFPs that you issue would be very helpful as well as submitting joint RFPs by several agencies together so that we can maximize the impact of those resources.

And third, ultimately it's been my experience that people follow their leaders. So if the leaders of the government agencies make a commitment to work together, make a commitment to not care about turf, to not care about who gets the credit, to not care that they don't have total control of the issue, then collaboration will happen. In my experience when leaders act selflessly they end up getting the credit anyway. When I was at USDA as Under Secretary for Food Safety heading the Food Safety Inspection Service at USDA one of our colleague agencies was the Food and Drug Administration, a completely separate entity of the federal government. And if you want to talk competition, you know, I will daresay that you know we probably had
the market cornered there between FSIS and FDA, positioning ourselves to see who could say that they were the undisputed leader in public health. And so friendly competition as it was but it was competition. Well, it turned out that just because of regulations and the way the system works the Food and Drug Administration doesn't have, even to this day doesn't have enough food inspectors to do the job that it needs to do to ensure the safety of the food supply. In comparison, USDA has exactly the number of inspectors they need to inspect meat and poultry products. So we collaborated with FDA offering the services of our inspectors to help kind of fulfill their mission to inspect the foods that they were -- were under their jurisdiction. So because it was a worthy cause, protecting the public's health, we came together, even as competitors we came together. So I urge the leadership of the agencies to make their commitment to collaborate as one government a reality. And
we at the land grant university community
salute you, frankly, for the commitment that
I have certainly already observed to perhaps
the worthiest of causes which is eradicating
world hunger and poverty on our planet.

I'd like to in short conclude that
I believe that we have a unique opportunity to
get this right, ladies and gentlemen, to fully
address world hunger and make a difference in
people's lives. It is a golden opportunity
really that only comes once in a lifetime I
would say. If you're old enough I suppose
maybe twice. Dr. Deaton, I don't know.

(Laughter)

MEMBER MURANO: I'm not saying
you're that old, but I've heard your remarks
earlier about your efforts early on in your
life with the Peace Corps. But we need to
seize the moment and we need to make sure that
we marshal all our considerable resources and
talents in a coordinated fashion to get the
most bang for the taxpayer's buck who is
ultimately who is footing the bill for all of this.

The academic community has partnered with the federal government for decades on a variety of issues including global food security and I know I speak for my colleagues when I say that we stand ready to continue that partnership. And actually we pledge to also do our level best to coordinate and partner with each other because we are guilty of that as well. As we prepare proposals and as we address the researchable questions not only in a multidisciplinary way but also multi-institutional manner which is hard for us to do too.

I will close by saying that Dr. Norman Borlaug whose name was uttered many times this past week, rightfully so for the leader that he was. He ended his career as a professor at Texas A&M University so he was one of us in the academic community. And one of the things that he used to say, in fact
there's a quote in a book that's attributed to him that says that, "Man seems to insist on ignoring the lessons available from history."

Well, let's not insist on ignoring those lessons, let's learn from those lessons, learn from our failure to work together in the past and let us commit to working together right here and now. So thank you very much.

(Applause)

MS. HOWARD: Thank you very, very much, Dr. Murano, you know for the suggestions. But I mean, also I think the very important commitment of the university community. I mean, we all know that we cannot do this alone in the U.S. government so you all with our partners in the private sector and NGO community are just critical to whether we're going to be able to get this right or not. Do we have a few minutes for questions, I hope so? Yes. And I also just wanted to say that you said we needed a driver for this. We have four very important drivers for this
starting with President Obama, Secretary Clinton, Secretary Vilsack and Administrator Shah. This is at the top of their agenda so I think if we can't get it right with this level of commitment it's not going to happen.

CHAIR DEATON: Julie, thank you, and panel members, thank you. That was a wonderful presentation. Let's turn to the board for any questions or comments that you would like to make. Bill DeLauder.

MEMBER DELAUNDER: Talking about coordination, could you say a bit more about the relationship between this effort and the Millennium Challenge? Because some of the countries have received Millennium Challenge grants and maybe also went through GAFSP for additional funds. Say something about how that effort is coordinated.

MS. HOWARD: Okay, well let me start and then turn to Dan and Cindy for additional comments. Well you know MCC is set up in a different system, so country-driven,
country-solicited proposals and with a number
of ongoing proposals and compact
implementation. So I do want to say that MCC
has been a very active participant in the
interagency process, and I mean especially as
new compacts are being considered this is a
prime opportunity for us to sort of think
together about what are sort of the key areas
where MCC involvement might be most important.
In fact, we had a very good meeting with
Ghana's vice president about the, you know,
possible areas for their follow-up compact.
But also in the compacts that are already
under way, for example, in Mali the Alatona
Irrigation Project. This interagency process
has resulted in an agreement between MCC and
USAID for USAID to take on some of the
activities that as the compact is about to be
completed really still remain some work to do,
you know, especially farmer association, land
tenure arrangements. So I'm feeling very
optimistic about that. So let me turn to Dan
and Cindy for additional comments.

MR. PETERS: Thanks. I guess, you know, between GAFSP and MCC I don't see extremely direct linkages at this point. I guess one thing that I would say is that I think, you know, the design of GAFSP certainly drew from some of MCC's principles in that, you know, it's a competitive process and you're looking at kind of outside indicators for country eligibility. So I think MCC in that way certainly informed some of the design principles that GAFSP has.

MS. HUANG: Two examples of cooperation are I think earlier it was mentioned that with the comprehensive results framework we're trying to align the indicators that we use so there is good overlap, partly because of joint creation of the results framework. I think that's an important area. And then the second is, and Julie also mentioned how our investments can overlap. And I think part of the benefit of
communication is that you're able to align them. So for example in Tanzania the agricultural investments will focus on the southern corridor and that is in fact where MCC has built a lot of roads and will continue to. So that's another example where, you know, where we're really harmonizing our efforts.

CHAIR DEATON: Thank you.

Question? Yes, Marty.

MEMBER McVEY: I heard some discussion from each of the agencies represented about donor programs. How are they working together among the agencies so you have a good donor base that are looking at it as a holistic approach to government as well? And how can we increase that participation, donor participation?

MS. HOWARD: So, donors beyond the U.S. government?

MEMBER McVEY: That's correct.

MS. HOWARD: Okay.
MEMBER MCVEY: From private organizations, NGOs, that type.

MS. HOWARD: Great, okay. Let me start and then Cindy. Or maybe Cindy, why don't you start?

MS. HUANG: No, go ahead.

MS. HOWARD: Okay. You know, I think one of the really interesting things that's happened as we think about what country-driven strategies really mean is this has provided an opportunity to frame at the country and regional levels, you know, what are sort of key strategy areas. And for the U.S. to define, okay, within those country strategies what do we most want to focus on. So we have for example in Ghana, you know, a focus on several value chains. So maize and rice, for example. So I think once you define those areas then it becomes easier, I mean, for us certainly in the interagency to say well, USDA's comparative advantage in that value chain might be to provide this. You
know, USAID's might be to provide this. Does this fit with the MCC compact? But it also provides a window for the private sector to come in, right, and say okay, for -- there may be an agroprocessing opportunity here.

And we have a portal, do you remember the private sector portal address for inquiries from private sector? As we are releasing the details of our multi-year strategies at the country level for NGO partners and for private sector partners, we're developing portals for potential partners and existing partners to email us directly to get information, to get connected with our folks in missions as well as here in Washington to explore opportunities for collaboration. For the NGO community, I mean certainly -- I come from the NGO community and the NGO community was instrumental in creating a support base for this initiative. We have really urged and facilitated NGO involvement in the country-level consultation. So NGOs
both local and international have had a voice
in what are the priority areas at the country
level but also where the priority areas that
the U.S. is pursuing.

We recently committed at the
Cameroon meetings of the African Union, the
Comprehensive Agricultural Strategy review, to
facilitating 10 different civil society round
tables in our Feed the Future focus countries
to explore really how civil society can be
much more involved as we move into
implementation and accountability phase for
these country implementation strategies. So
Cindy? And Paul if you want to?

MS. HUANG: Yes, I agree with
everything that Julie said and it sounds like
you've been here much longer than three
months. I don't know how you've -- and
really, I think the main mechanism in order to
align investments has been the development of
the country investment plan so that, I think
one of the main issues has been whether you're
talking about new resources which we're very excited about, or aligning resources, what are you aligning against. And so I think that's been, for all of the different actors the country-led investment plan has been very critical. And then the second piece that the State Department is trying to ramp up its work on is if you want to attract more private sector but also foundation money that enabling environment is so critical because you can, you know, create all kinds of partnerships, but if you want the sustainability that Paul talked about you really need progress. And that is another strong link with MCC that I should have mentioned earlier which is they have their 13 areas that they're measuring. And also efforts like the World Bank's Doing Business report and also Ag Clear which is a similar effort in agriculture. You know, how do we bring together advocacy around that so that we can unlock private sector investment.

MR. WEISENFELD: Thanks. Just to
add a small bit to that I think the planning process, the joint planning process as both Julie and Cindy are saying is one of the key ways in which we make sure that we're aligned with other donors to make sure we're not tripping over each other and that the activities are mutually reinforcing. If you think about -- so that's the investment side of it. So in a place like Ghana which is one of our key countries we are working together with the World Bank which is one of the principal donors there to jointly design the government's commercial agricultural program. And that kind of joint planning process is helping us see where we can fit in, where the World Bank can fit in to add. In the southern agricultural growth corridor of Tanzania it's a similar process where we're working with the government, with other donors on a program to think through how to stimulate private sector investment and how to target our investment.

So the investment side is one
important point, but another point is thinking
about policy reforms getting a little bit to
what Cindy was saying. In a lot of these
countries, again, it's easy to give people
improved seeds and fertilizer and grow, but we
also have to think about what are the policy
constraints that prevent farmers from really
benefitting from those tools, from using those
tools to dramatically increase their incomes.
And we also are thinking through together with
other donors about policy reforms that we need
to jointly talk to the government about and
have a joint dialogue. Because if we just go
as the United States with guidance on input
subsidies it's not as powerful as if it's done
in a joint process together with the other
donors.

MS. HOWARD: So and just to add, I
mean I have a real example of that. I just
came back from Zambia, the AGOA Forum, a
couple of weeks ago. And after the AGOA Forum
the embassy and the mission set up a meeting
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with the donors and also key government officials where we did talk about key agricultural policies in Zambia. Zambia has just gone through its second bumper harvest of maize because their subsidy programs, they've been subsidizing fertilizer on the front end but also buying back maize above market prices. So exploring options for dealing with that and sort of rethinking the subsidy program in the future is now I think really on the multi-donor agenda. So I think that's -- it's really important. There's a lot we can do.

CHAIR DEATON: Gebisa, did you have a question?

MEMBER EJETA: I would like to thank the panelists for the information and the clarification that is provided. My colleague, Dr. Murano, for the thoughtful response that has been given. Just to accentuate on the point that has been made relative to the possibilities of core mission
and the caution that Dr. Murano indicated. I'm really not as worried as well as Julie had indicated, the fact that this is indeed a presidential initiative and the line of command is set and the vision is set from the top, and then the line of command that exists there and the fact that the Secretary of State is supportive and had said this all along. I was very surprised when I got an invitation from the Treasury Secretary to sit at a round table discussion and I have, you know, as Julie indicated I too was surprised how the Treasury would be involved in this. And as indicated and clarified this morning to everybody and the vision set there is wonderful in terms of -- and the buy-in that that provides and the incentivization that it provides to the country programs. And something that has not been said but it's implied both with the State Department and with the Treasury Department, and the kinds of things that we had not addressed in the future
of research strategy discussions is that policy advocacy, that those two agencies could provide for this initiative and that -- at that level, the same way that top level of this country's command is involved in Feed the Future to the extent that that would buy us, that kind of advocacy in the country program that is the great opportunity that this initiative provides.

But the thing that -- but on the other hand really the challenge is to us and those of us who are going to be participating in much of this initiative both at the national level, at the U.S. level. I think if anyone in that field is not excited for this, you know, with this initiative I don't know what else we would want to have with an initiative such as this, the resources and the politics notwithstanding. But the line of command that is supportive of this program. So to the extent that we could be very creative in putting in place a results-based
framework for the implementation of this project, that is the task that we're charged with. And how we could get that done, recognizing in my view, recognizing the difference between a program that is implemented in an agency like NSF where science is generating knowledge in the global public good, or -- and then using the example and the history and the legacy of a USDA where we have knowledge, innovation and centrally focused research working with a network of U.S. universities and extension service and the private sector to delivering that technology to those who put it to use.

Now, when you're talking about a USAID-led historically international development assistance research that may be done partly at the central level, what we need to remember then is the task there is different because we're dealing with the lack of capacity at the delivery stage and how do we create a results-based initiative that
would work with a capacity that is not as
developed. And then make sure that the
results that we generate is going to make that
livelihood change that is implicit to the Feed
the Future initiative. That is the task that
we are charged in and that's a charge that I
would ask Paul at your level that you would
continue to create a mechanism that that
definition is achieved so that at the end
you've got a relatively functional machinery
in place that vision set by the President is
eventually implemented.

CHAIR DEATON: Dr. Gebisa, thank
you so much. Jo?

MEMBER LUCK: Thanks. Well,
that's not my job with BIFAD is to take care
of the microphones, that's a good thing. I
would like to thank both panels. It's just
been really, really impressive, very exciting
and as we spend more time and learn more and
research more and have more discussions we'll
-- I'll have more questions for sure, and I'm
sure the others will as well. But let me just
express a couple of concerns. They're not
about you or anyone in particular, any
organization, but they're just thoughts that
I have coming into this, my first meeting and
second day with the group about that group.
You know, business, agribusiness, I don't want
to just give a small -- but the private sector
investments and all the things we've talked
about and those who are doing the research
have the science, have the information as well
as U.S. government does to give the inputs to
these countries whatever level the farmers are
so that they can have more productive, more
nutritious food, more -- you know, all the
things we're talking about. It seems to me,
and I don't know that the academia created
silos, I don't want to ever say that, you did,
that was kind of interesting, but the NGO
community which I cannot speak for all but I
was chair of the board of directors of
InterAction representing at least 200 of them
based here that work around the world and we
didn't all have the same opinion. But I felt
there was a real fence around that silo, I
mean, not a defensive one, but they almost
didn't want to talk to -- just some of them,
didn't want to talk to the agribusiness
because sometimes they things they were doing
was impacting in a negative way the
smallholder farmer which 70 percent of course
are women and particularly in the Africa area.
So I am very interested in -- with BIFAD and
any of the agencies to get more conversation
and dialogue, and not just dialogue. You
know, I've worked 50 years and I've heard so
much dialogue and I think we're getting to the
point now where we're going to go past that,
and even if we take one or two steps. But
getting them to come together is so important
because they have resources and technology
that's greatly needed, but because people --
and I've seen it on the ground. I mean, I've
talked to farmers and I've seen examples where
something's been polluted or the trade issue
hurt them, you know. But if we could come
together there's a way to make those fit. And
we have to if we're going to feed 9 billion
people in 2050.

And you know, over here is the
organic farmer and the, you know, I love to go
to my little farmer's market and I like the
schools to have more local food, healthy, all
those things. On the other hand, I'm right
now working with an advisory committee with
DuPont and of course my staff said oh, you
know, you're not going to go to that. And I
said of course, I need to learn what that side
is. And so we may have to give a little from
each but in order to achieve success we're
going to have to all work together. And so
I'd like to help with that, I'd like to
understand how we can make that happen because
Feed the Future, somehow we think the poverty
level, people and taking care of them which we
should. So is agribusiness going another way
to invest and thinking this is just for those
that will not be their future customers.

Well, I take exception with that. And very
quickly, Mr. Chair, not to -- but one example
is when I was in China some time ago. I think
Sasser was the ambassador then. And the
agriculture attache or someone came in and
said aren't you that woman that's giving
cattle away in China? I said well I guess so,
if you think I'm Heifer International, you
know. And he said don't you know we're over
here trying to build a market for buying, you
know, livestock or cattle. And I said well
then I'm one of your best friends. And he
said what. And I said yes. We're empowering
people to go beyond being subsistence farmers
and they're moving up into entrepreneurship,
and they will be your future customers so you
can say thank you. And so let's work
together. And I mean that was not to be
flippant, it's just that we've got to quit
making it so complex. So I hope that you'll
take that in consideration and as well as BIFAD board, Mr. Chair, that we might talk about how we can make some of that happen.

And the other thing, excuse me, that really bothers me is that we're trying to show results so quickly. I understand that you can't be elected or reelected if you don't hurry up and show something. I just think that's terrible we do that to our elected officials because if we want real progress they plant seeds that we may not see for a decade. And I understand the importance of focusing, I certainly do. We've had to do that with our work. But if we're also not planting seeds for the long term we're just showing results and looking really good for awhile and let's be sure when we're -- in 2050 I won't have to help feed everybody. I won't be here. That's interesting. But I want to be sure the rest that are can do it. So thank you very much.

CHAIR DEATON: Jo, thank you very
much and let me say you've raised a whole
range of questions that I know the members of
this panel given their responsiveness are
going to carry home, talk about and we will
all be engaged in important dialogue on these.

Given our time frame here at this point I would like to thank the panel very
much for all that you've done. Julie, thank you very much for moderating and binging
forward just a very exciting program. Paul, Cindy, Dan, Lona and our colleague Elsa who
reminds us to let's get it right this time and Jo, you raised some challenges in your
concluding moments there that are -- we are going to have to address directly and each of
you will be addressing to get it right. So Julie, thanks again, panel thank you. And let's give them a big round of applause.

(Applause)

CHAIR DEATON: Okay. We're moving to a point here we want to take some time for
public comments. And I would ask -- we will
reassemble our board up front and anyone who
has questions there's mics here. And I would
ask if you have comments to please limit them
so that we can take here in the next, oh, 10
minutes or so an opportunity to get any ideas
in front of the board that you want to bring
forward.

May I ask BIFAD board members if
you would please take your seat at the head
table? We will continue with our public
comment period. Folks, it may be that there
are no public questions or comments but we are
committed to allowing this period. I know we
have a couple, so I'm going to ask BIFAD board
members to please resume your seats at the
head table and we will take time for some
questions and discussion before our final
speaker of this program. Yes, this is a
period for you to ask questions of the board
members. So yes, if we have a question.

Please, if you would just introduce yourself
and proceed.
MR. MILLER: Yes, I am Ray Miller, University of Maryland. I think we've all learned a great deal over these last four days about many, many things, new information, a lot of suggestions. I'd like to make two observations. We've heard a lot about looking for those discoveries that are going to change how we do and so on, but we've also heard a lot that we're going onto yield plateaus. Irv said this morning that in the top pulses we haven't made any gains. I have not heard any discussion to speak of of maintenance research. It takes a huge effort just to stay where we are and I think we need to make sure we factor that into all of these discussions that we aren't really focusing as much as we probably need to on maintaining where we are so that we can make that next leap. That leads me into my second observation.

We've heard an awful lot capacity development and we've been talking almost exclusively about capacity developing in these
countries, 20 countries or whatever we're talking about. We've talked very little about the capacity we have in this country. And if you look at most of the universities that are involved in agriculture there has been a huge flattening of our capabilities. Everything is being driven to grantmanship and there has not been very much money in the areas related to what we're talking about these last few days. And so we need to be worrying about our capacity if we're going to be able to do all these things we're talking about. Very, very important. Thank you.

CHAIR DEATON: Mr. Miller, thank you very much. And that sure resonates with all of us in the university community let me say, but if anyone would like to make a comment on the board. Response? Yes.

Gebisa?

MEMBER EJETA: These are great comments, great questions, both of them. I think the vision that we would like to or I
would like to see happen is a vision of how do you deliver technology that's already there and the kind of adaptive research that needs to be done. And so the so-called short-term kind of expectation. And at the same time while you do that use that to build a capacity through that adaptive research. And at the same time in areas where you have some significant research advances that have been made, the kind of maintenance research you're talking about, that that focus is provided at that level while the global public good hardcore research or centrally coordinated research could be done as well. And so using each one of them at the same time in building that capacity.

I have spoken in numerous occasions about the erosion of skilled programs and disciplines in this country that we have lost. Just to give you an example you would be hard-pressed to find a place where you would send people to train to study crop
physiology or plant pathology. These are the kind of disciplines that were so important, so integral to bringing about the agricultural revolution that have taken place in this country. And so in my comments the other day I was deliberately including capacity-building at the national level as well. The kind of people, the Borlaugs of the '60s, we need to be thinking about those kinds of individuals being trained not only in the skill sets that they have here for national development but at the same time people whose focus and interest in international engagement as well. So I -- your comments are very well taken in my opinion.

CHAIR DEATON: Thank you. Yes?

MR. MATZ: My name is Marshall Matz. I'm an attorney that specializes in agriculture. I have, like a lot of your constituents, been excited by the events of this week from State to the convention center to here. And I think my comment is probably
a little broader than just this morning but I
wanted to put it on the record.

The thing that excited me the most
about Feed the Future were the comments
articulated that the goal was to actually link
production agriculture, improve production
agriculture, quantity and quality, and then
link it directly to people that need the food.
Child nutrition in the first thousand days, et
cetera. Within the world of child nutrition
which I have spent some 30 to 40 years dealing
with here in the States and around the world
there's really two subsets of experts, the
nutritionists that can tell you what
micronutrients and macronutrients should be in
that food, the people at Tufts who did the
wonderful document for USAID which they -- the
report that was released last month. But
there are also a group of experts that really
focus on how do you deliver that food, how do
you get those calories into the kids' mouths
and stomachs. And I don't feel we have -- we,
larger "we" have reached out adequately to that group of people. I didn't see them here. That's -- talk about silos, Elsa. I mean, you know, that's another silo. It's very, very separate. But there are experts on that at World Food Programme, at the World Bank, at CAADP and NEPA, at the Global Child Nutrition Foundation here in Washington. There are people that have spent their time doing that, that know how to do it, that work with the institutional structures that can help deliver that food. And I just think that's a huge category of people, if you're actually going to end hunger and end -- focusing on the first thousand days in children and in schools you've got to bring that group in. And they're a very different group than the people that study the actual nutritional benefit of the food.

CHAIR DEATON: Excellent. Great observation, thank you very much. Other comments or questions?
MR. MCGIRR: My name is Mike McGirr. I'm with the Department of Agriculture, NIFA, National Institute of Food and Agriculture. Back in the 1980s and into the '90s we used to talk a lot about development education. How do we educate Americans here in this country about the importance of what we do overseas and why it's important even in tough economic times like we have now, important to invest in foreign assistance and programs like Feed the Future. And for those of you who have served in Peace Corps this was one of the primary goals of returning volunteers. I think we've lost sight of some of that, and I think Feed the Future offers us a real opportunity to once again engage the American public in describing how food security is important for all of us, and even describing what food security is. I think if you go to most people on the street and mention the term they won't know what you're referring to. It's just like climate
change. That was brought up a couple of times today. We've got an American public where it's increasingly thinking that climate change is not a reality and that humans don't play a role in it.

So I think as we focus our attention, rightly so, on all these countries overseas that have severe food insecurity we need to keep at least one eye here on the U.S. in how we develop effective communication messages to engage and build a constituency for what we do in efforts like Feed the Future. And I think the media offers an opportunity to do that, but also our university community. And not just in the classrooms. We have thousands of extension agents in communities around the country who can help carry this message to local communities.

CHAIR DEATON: Yes, wonderful.

Excellent comment, thank you. Yes, Bill.
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excellent comments and I agree with those.
But I would also add to that we need to do
more to educate the American public about
what's happening in countries for them to
improve what they do in terms of food and
productivity. We don't hear enough about
what's happening especially in the African
countries, and I think what it does is gives
the American people the wrong idea, that
perhaps we're putting money into countries and
it's not going to good use because good things
are not happening. So we really need a better
way of not only informing them of the good
that our investment does, but to talk more
about what countries are doing themselves to
help themselves.

CHAIR DEATON: Thank you. Yes,
Irv.

MR. WIDDER: I wasn't planning to
make a comment but I feel compelled to. Over
the last several months we've been focusing a
lot on a research agenda, an agricultural
research agenda to achieve a worthy end. I've heard this morning some reassuring comments that the administration is very committed to spending and investing that $3.5 billion into achieving Feed the Future goals. My fear -- and I know that we live in very difficult economic times and there has to be belt-tightening, there has to be some hard decisions made about where we make these investments. But I still am concerned about what priority agricultural research has within this administration. As we look to the foreign appropriations bill for next year there is no language, not even report language, regarding the CRSPs. Current levels of funding for the CRSPs are around $30 million. Current levels of funding for the CGIAR maybe $30 to $50, I don't know the exact number. You could -- by our government. You add that up, it's not a lot of money. We're talking about pittance and this is out of the $3.5 billion investment. I visit missions and
I applaud the focused effort of our government. I think it's a must and this is wonderful. But I go to countries that are receiving $50 billion and what's our global investment through the agricultural university? It's only a very, very small fraction. I would just appeal to BIFAD that as you think about where we go that you're thinking about the cost. There needs to be greater investment and I think this is an opportunity to change direction. I know there's a Borlaug, there's other things, but if you total it up it isn't all that much money.

CHAIR DEATON: Thank you very much. Any other comments from the public? I don't want to cut off anything. Handy?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Well, I want to say that I'm a supporter of BIFAD and have been associated with it in the earlier years as a consultant to the board. And my concern over the past years is that we have gone into
a period of being adrift, away from the things
that were important when many of us initially
committed to working with USAID 20-30 years
ago back when the handshake on that symbol
meant something when we say from the American
people. I think we need to seize this
opportunity to recommit to the old values we
had and at the same time realize that two
years is not long enough. Old wine in new
bottles is not good enough. And so while we
all are excited there is a longer term that we
need to be concerned about. But I believe
that this board, I hope that this board can
lead that charge.

One last comment about the media.
I just wanted to put in a plug for a school in
the Midwest that happens to have the world's
oldest school of journalism working with some
of our Missouri advantage initiatives. One of
them is on media and the future, and we have
been hosting a series of forums bringing in
experts from around the country to discuss the
food issue, Feed the Future, food and fuel. And I think that going through a mechanism like that we can engage constructive media engagement and help them to deliver the message. Thank you.

CHAIR DEATON: Handy, thank you.

Unless there's a burning question from the public, given our schedule we have another speaker who is here that I know you're also waiting to listen to. We will move ahead. We wanted to provide ample time for public comments and you've made some very wonderful ones that this board as I believe you're aware is very sensitive to and certainly stands ready to continue in its advisory role with AID to address just every single issue that is out here including the expansive commitment to communicate with the public here and abroad because of the nature of the financial situation that we're working in today in the world. So I want to thank members of the public that are here very much and every
comment will be taken very seriously. We will continue to deliberate on those later on even today.

With that let's turn to our final speaker of this morning is Littleton Tazewell, coordinator for Procurement Reform at the Office of the General Counsel of USAID. And Littleton, thank you very much for being flexible with your schedule and I know you have done that on our behalf. We appreciate you being here now. Thank you.

MR. TAZEWELL: Well, thank you.

It's a pleasure to be here. And you've actually given me a bit of a boost. I work for the coordinator of Implementation and Procurement Reform, Lisa Gomer, who is our general counsel at USAID. I've been working on this particular effort for the last year with Lisa Gomer and it is led by the general counsel's office. But it, let me see if I can get this thing to work. There we go. Good, thank you. It's really an interagency effort
in a big way. And I think it's important for me to be speaking to you today to contextualize what it is we're trying to do in the context of Implementation and Procurement Reform and how that could be impacting the entities that you represent.

As you are I think aware, Implementation and Procurement Reform is part of the overall USAID Forward reform agenda of which it is just one element, one of seven different elements. The importance of this particular piece I don't think can be overstated, but I do want to mention the other portions of USAID Forward, including the talent management which is focusing on our own personnel strengthening, rebuilding our policy capacities, standing up our policy shop which we had lost several years ago, strengthening monitoring and evaluation which is a key element to what our reform effort is all about and is very much linked to Implementation and Procurement Reform. Rebuilding our budget
management capacity, innovation, and science and technology. Now again, all of these various components of the USAID Forward initiative or reform effort are linked in. What I am directly responsible with is in the context of how we operate, how we actually spend the money. And of course that is of great interest to just about everybody.

The overarching goal associated with this effort is to work ourselves out of a job. How can we work to ensure that our assistance includes the strengthening of local institutions, local actors, so they can take over these responsibilities in the long term. Not discounting the incredible power and importance of what the international community and the institutions that come out of the United States bring to the table, but ultimately, end of the day the developmental things that we support are those things that need to be taken over by the host countries themselves.
There are six different components to Implementation and Procurement Reform. The first is focused specifically on the partner country financial management systems. Where we can work through those financial management systems we'd like to expand in doing so, and there's a whole effort under that which I'll go into in a little bit more detail in a couple of moments. Objective 2 focuses specifically on working with local civil society and the private sector, and that again is broken into two pieces between the government and civil society, private sector, but there's a great deal of linkage in how it is we work through our local partners and how those efforts need to be linked together.

The third objective focuses on the partner base that we utilize. And as I think most people are aware, USAID over the course of the last 15 to 20 years has moved away from working through host country financial management systems and more towards working
through large institutional contractors and large international NGOs. The underlying objective behind this third component is to expand that partnership base to look to those organizations that have capacity in the United States, small businesses, minority-owned businesses, institutions serving other aspects of our community, particularly such as some of the agricultural universities, the smaller, that have capacity that they might more readily be able to be partners with USAID.

Objective 4 looks at our systems and how we can improve our efficiency and effectiveness in how we do our business. Objective 5 looks at how and when we can work through other donors, other multilateral actors as well as public international organizations. These are entities that are often in the field, have expertise and may be the logical entities for us to be working through. Objective 6 looks at our own internal capacity, and this is an area where
particularly in the acquisition assistance,
our contracting officers, our technical
personnel, there's been an under-investment
over the course of the last number of years
because of the lack of resources available for
our operational expenses.

In the context of Objective 1,
working through the public financial
management systems of our host governments,
the major focus has been on returning to the
table. We used to implement close to 50
percent of our foreign assistance through host
government financial management systems and
that percentage has drifted down over the
years to where it's roughly about 8 percent
now. To do so though we want to make sure
that we're doing so in a financially
responsible fashion. So the primary focus has
been on developing a risk management
assessment framework. And that process has
been ongoing over the course of the last year
and focused primarily on initially four pilot
countries, Rwanda, Peru, Liberia and Nepal. This process basically looks at the financial management systems of countries that we believe are strong enough to manage our resources in a manner that is accountable sufficient to satisfy our concerns domestically. We've expanded that pilot to include now six countries. The process does involve several phases. The top-level phase that is highlighted up there, Stage 1, is done by USAID itself and goes in, utilizes the existing financial management assessments of other partners and donors to do a top-level review. Based upon that review a determination is made to bring in or not bring in an audit firm to take a much more deep dive into how those systems actually function. Again, it's looking at utilizing the public financial management systems of the host government to implement some of the programming that we're looking to do. Expectations in the context of this Objective
1 is to expand our work through host
government systems over the course of the next
five years up to 20 percent of our financial
resources. There are several different
training courses being developed associated
with this on how we actually do that
implementation. This is something that
unfortunately over the course of the last 15
or 20 years we've lost that ability as we've
grown to rely much more on international
contractors and large NGOs.

The Objective 2 is again looking
at how we can expand our work directly with
local organizations and how we can ensure that
when we work through intermediaries that we're
looking to organizational capacity-
strengthening as well as technical capacity-
strengthening in our interventions. We as an
agency have focused on capacity-strengthening,
capacity development, capacity-building for
many, many years and we have some great
examples of success there. We also have a lot
of examples of where we have provided technical assistance in the capacity development arena that really is focused on inputs as opposed to results. A significant part of this effort is to take a look at our capacity development interventions and hold our intermediaries accountable when we are working through intermediaries, but also to look to where we can work more directly with local organizations. Part of that of course is we are a difficult funder to work with. Our expectations are very, very high. Part of what we're doing in that context is looking at our rules and how they impact local organizations, non-U.S. NGOs, and where it makes sense to align our expectations with general accounting practices that are applicable in a global context. Again, take a look at our systems to ensure that we're actually an entity that local organizations can work with.

To that effort we have established Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
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initially five local capacity development teams around the globe in Peru, Egypt, South Africa, Kenya and the Philippines, and recently added two more, Senegal and Ghana. These teams are interdisciplinary which I think is something that is critically important in looking at local capacity development, and bring together backstops of financial management, contracting, program as well as technical. We're bringing together and relying heavily on our experienced FSN, our Foreign Service National staff and our new officers that we're bringing into the agency. This is an exciting area and I think has a real opportunity to change how we actually operate, and also how we operate through our intermediaries.

Some of the things we've done to foster a better ability to work with local organizations is expanded the use of fixed obligation grants. And fixed obligation grants are grants that are provided, paid on
results attained or outcomes, milestones, as opposed to reimbursing for cost incurred. So a different approach. We've had this type of a grant format in the past but it has been restricted to only entities that are -- that we had experience with in the past. What we've expanded our guidance to allow for fixed obligation grants to serve as a vehicle with new organizations, new organizations that have not worked in the past with USAID. It is limited in the amount, it's up to $500,000 per year for up to three years and the expectation in the guidance is it would be an entry-level grant mechanism for use while you work with the organization developing their internal capacity.

The other major thing that I think has been very well received by our partner community is work on our source origin nationality rules. These are rules that basically implement by America requirements that we have in a statutory framework. Our
actual rules in the statutory framework, our rules are actually more restrictive than the statutory framework allows. The statutory framework for AID allows for procurement from the cooperating country and from developing countries on equal parity with the U.S. government, but our source origin nationality rules have a preference for U.S. procurement. What we have done is started a process by enacting or exercising some waiver of authority to allow for local procurement up to $5 million per instrument which again relieves some of the burden on the part of our local implementers from having to go through either purchasing U.S.-sourced goods or having to go through a waiver process to do so. We've also increased the amount of money that mission directors can award on their own authority with local organizations and increased the amount that mission directors can settle claims against local organizations, again enabling the mission where there's a much
better grounding as to what the capabilities and the extenuating circumstances may be around the implementation by a local organization to be able to make the decisions appropriate to the circumstances.

In the context of Objective 3, the focus up to this point in time is in increasing the competitive opportunities on the part of small organizations. We've recently released our small business goals. The Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization has been very active and has just held its fourth annual Small Business Conference, again, linking together small businesses with other partners that we traditionally work with but also our senior leadership to expand opportunities and information about what is available for working with USAID.

Another major thing, major reform initiative has been requirements for non-competitive extensions or follow-on awards
above the $5 million level. That has recently been put into place and basically requires senior, top-level approval for any extensions of awards in excess of $5 million.

In addition to, and this is interesting because the Objective 3 and 4 are very much linked and part of Objective 4 but linked back to Objective 3 is increasing the amount of the Contract Review Board threshold. The Contract Review Board is a mechanism by which the agency maintains quality control and ensures that large contracts are being executed consistent with our policies. But it has the prospective of slowing down awards and that threshold has been increased from $10 million to $25 million. This is linked to -- I'll just jump to the next -- the Board of Acquisition Assistance Reform at the very bottom, the BAAR, which is an entity that was set up a year ago to basically review all large planned acquisitions or large planned procurement actions to look to see where they
could be broken up and reduced in size to
expand the opportunity for other smaller
organizations to be able to partner with us.

Associated with it is review of
our -- use of IQCs, the indefinite quantity
contracts and the leader with associate awards
which are large, fairly long-term awards that
are typically only accessible by fairly large
contractors and international NGOs, and
basically reviewing our policy with regards to
utilizing those types of mechanisms to again
discourage our reliance on those type of
mechanisms for implementation of our
assistance programs and expanding the
opportunity of small businesses and other non-
traditional partners.

In the context of the leader with
associate award guidance we have tightened up
the ability to use it, basically noting or
providing that you cannot exceed the award
amount without high-level review and approval,
that it cannot go beyond five years without
high-level review and approval, and that any
field or mission-level buy-in has to be
anticipated actually when the award is
planned.

In addition, and I think this has
been very well received in the health sector
on the part of our partners is a
pharmaceutical waiver that was recently
exercised in a revision of ADS guidance. This
basically was to streamline our approval of
the purchase of pharmaceuticals. Again, this
is part of the process of how we can reduce
some of the burden on the part of our staff as
well as our partner staff in going through
bureaucratic processes that have no value-
added at the end of the day. How can we --
what this effort is largely about is how we
can reduce the overall bureaucracy that we
have over time instilled upon ourselves.

A major area as I mentioned before
is how we can strengthen our collaboration
with other bilateral donors as well as
multilateral international organizations. Traditionally we have not worked through other bilateral donors directly and our work through public international organizations has been limited to the large ones. We have been reluctant to use basket funding mechanisms for a variety of reasons largely around the fact that much of our funding has so many different types of regulatory and policy-related restrictions. What we have done to address that again is looking at how we can exercise waivers that exist in current regulations, particularly with respect to source origin nationality requirements, but also develop some templates that we have been successful in working with other bilateral donors and expand the use of them. So basically from Washington taking the initiative to work through some of these issues so that the field can actually have the ability to work through other bilateral donors or other multilateral organizations without having to go through the
negotiation process for each time. And again, it's looking to which entity in the field is in the best position, has the strongest capabilities to implement the type of programming that we have. Looking at the other side we do often take money from other bilateral donors in particular and implement where we have that capacity.

A major effort has been the revision of our guidance on our grants to public international organizations, expanding the definition of what is a public international organization to include those entities that don't have U.S. government membership. The prior definition was restrictive to only those entities that U.S. - had membership and by expanding that expands the types of other partners that we can work with in the field. It also breaks the types of awards into three different categories which will allow us to basically provide general contribution and program contribution-
type arrangements and achieve the multi-donor pool funding results that we have not been able to do by stripping away many of our regulatory and statutory requirements and only including those things that are absolutely critical from a political standpoint as a policy matter in those types of agreements.

Again, a major part of the Implementation and Procurement Reform is on our own internal capabilities, and part of our focus is on expanding the warrant level of various types of contracting agreement officers as well as looking to utilizing Foreign Service Nationals and third-country nationals for certain roles in procurement actions above what they currently have.

I mentioned the source origin nationality. Another one that just was released earlier this week is a waiver for vehicles, right-hand drive vehicles and motorcycles and three-wheel vehicles. A bureaucratic requirement associated with
having to process a waiver for purchase of these types of vehicles has been around for a long time. There's no need for it and it was a fairly easy way to relieve everyone of some bureaucratic burden and that has just recently been passed.

There's an overall effort in rewriting the source origin nationality rules. That process has already gone through the initial notice of intent to change the rules and in short order you'll be seeing a -- for public comment a revised regulation. So I think that will be welcomed by our partner community as well as our local partners.

Next steps. We're in the process of developing guidance on the use of partner country systems. As I mentioned we're going to be breaking up some large IQCs into smaller ones, or at least that's the expectation. There's an expectation to be simplifying the RFP and RFA processes. I think a big, an important piece is requiring that private
contractors use local, non-profit and private
businesses, and U.S. small and disadvantaged
businesses and then be held accountable for
having done so in their commitments. And as
I mentioned, the pilot program to give FSNs
and TCNs warrant authority.

So with that I will open up to
some questions. Typically there's a lot of
interest in what it is we're doing in
Implementation and Procurement Reform because
it does impact how we spend our money.

CHAIR DEATON: Littleton, thank
you very much and that's a fascinating
presentation and I think enlightening to many
of us as we look at ways in which given the
kind of financial constraints we're facing as
we look into the future the potential for
regulatory reform for capacity-building both
within the U.S. and abroad is a fundamental
aspect. Gaining the efficiencies it frees up
some of the dollars so to speak that we know
are so constrained out there in the economy.
So I particularly felt that was an important message that I took from what you're doing. Let's open it up to any questions from members of the board. Comments?

MEMBER EJETA: I had a question that's kind of peripheral but very useful to me and also has relevance to BIFAD. I sit on the board of the CGIAR and -- the Consultancy Group for International Agricultural Research where USAID is a major funding there. And so the reform that has taken place there, they have windows for funding, Window 1, 2 and 3. Window 3 fits into what you refer to as a blanket basket funding. And in the past USAID provided if I recall about $2 million to all of the centers to an activity that is very, very important to the U.S. university community. It is a targeted fund to build a relationship between the CGIAR and the U.S. university communities. Small competitive grant funding between a scientist at a center and a scientist at a U.S. university. And so
there was a pool of funds that was available and now with the new structure on the fund structure that has been developed I was told that there was some recalcitrance on the part of USAID, allowing that $2 million or whatever that amount is to be put on that Window 3 which is a blanket basket. What may be a way to get around that because this is a small amount of resources but an extremely valuable instrument for engaging the U.S. university community in international research?

MR. TAZEWELL: Certainly it sounds like a very valuable tool. And I don't know, I can't give you an answer to this but perhaps we could follow up afterwards. My sense is that it isn't a procurement reform-related matter, it's more of a programmatic decision with regards to the use of funds because -- I would be interested to know what the mechanism has been in the past for AID to provide the support for that particular mechanism. But I think that level of detail, perhaps we could
share some more information offline.

MEMBER EJETA: Thank you.

MR. TAZEWELL: Certainly.

CHAIR DEATON: Any questions from other members of the board? Littleton, thank you very much.

MR. TAZEWELL: Great. My pleasure.

CHAIR DEATON: And we look forward to continued dialogue with you and your colleagues as we address these very complex issues that have been brought before us.

Thanks so much.

MR. TAZEWELL: Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIR DEATON: Well, this concludes the public session of our board meeting and I want to take just a moment to express thanks on behalf of the board to two key staff members that help us so much. Susan Owens, if you would raise your hand in the back, who's the secretary at AID and Malcolm
Butler at APLU, thank you so much to both of
you for what you do. They deserve a round of
applause.

(Applause)

CHAIR DEATON: Thank you all for
being here and we will adjourn the meeting at
this time. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
went off the record at 12:42 p.m.)
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