



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

TITLE XII REPORT TO CONGRESS FY 2009 & FY 2010

August 2011

This report is submitted to Congress pursuant to Section 300 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.



Board for International Food and Agricultural Development
U.S. Agency for International Development, Ronald Reagan Building Room 6.7-153, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, D.C. 20523-2110

FOREWORD

I am pleased to present the *U.S. Agency for International Development Title XII Report for FY 2009 and FY 2010*. The report underscores a renewed urgency to address root causes of food insecurity in the world's poorest countries and documents USAID's valuable collaboration with American public agricultural universities and their public and private partners. While we have made significant progress in expanding Title XII agricultural research, education and extension programming, important work remains.

Following a period of global food price volatility, trade disruptions, and political unrest between 2007 and 2008, the United States committed to an increased focus on food security. Feed the Future, President Obama's food security initiative, is driving this commitment, making focused investments to support sustainable, country-led agricultural development. Spearheaded by USAID, Feed the Future leverages the strengths of agencies across the U.S. government to help countries to transform their own agricultural sectors and regional trading systems.

Our engagement with agricultural institutions is a critical part of this effort. Between 2008 and 2010, we increased funding to the field by 67 percent for Title XII agricultural research, education and extension capacity building programs. Of our 54 ongoing Title XII projects, 20 represent new activities launched in FY 2009 and FY 2010. In recognition of this work, the Chicago Council on Global Affairs recently awarded solid marks to the U.S. for leadership in support of Title XII programs. The Council also recognized the advisory role of the presidentially-appointed USAID Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD).

We continue to build on our progress. In June, we announced the Borlaug 21st Century Leadership Program that - together with our new Feed the Future research strategy - will help develop institutional capacity in our partner countries and empower the next generation of agricultural leaders. To further strengthen U.S. leadership, I have asked BIFAD members to take on an expanded role as advisors for Feed the Future. In addition to working with Title XII agricultural universities, BIFAD will help guide Feed the Future in its engagement with youth, private sector actors and international agricultural research institutions.

We value the expertise and contributions of our Title XII partners, and we look forward to deepening this collaboration as we work to alleviate suffering, reduce poverty and create sustainable, long-term solutions to food insecurity.



Rajiv Shah
Administrator

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As the world again faces food price instability and uncertainty of supply, programming that targets agricultural productivity and market linkages is a United States priority. The current Title XII Report, which covers both FY 2009 and FY 2010, provides an excellent opportunity to revisit Title XII program definitions and concepts related to U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) projects and activities. A clear understanding of Title XII legislation can support USAID's use of Title XII as a strategic instrument for agricultural development assistance.

This biennial *Title XII Report to Congress - FY 2009 & FY 2010* summarizes USAID's mutual investments and priorities with U.S. state and local universities and colleges under Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. It reflects USAID's re-commitment to agricultural funding to address the food insecurity facing developing countries and the importance the Agency attaches to partnerships with its Title XII partners to address challenges in agriculture education, research and extension.

There were 54 active Title XII projects and/or activities during the two-year period, divided across the five program components including Human and Institutional Capacity Development (9), Collaborative Research Support Program (25), Engaging International Agriculture Science (4), Program Support to Research (16), and Special Programs (0), funded at \$47.3 million in FY 2009 and \$72.2 million in FY 2010, a clear increase in Title XII funding. Over 80 separate university and college activities engaged in these 54 programs in conjunction with nearly 150 public and private partners. Sixty developing countries participated in these programs, including all 20 of the countries identified in the FY2010 Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ) as Feed the Future (FtF) countries¹. The Title XII projects were linked to approximately 80 international agricultural science networks.

Eligible Title XII universities and colleges include all types of U.S. universities and colleges. The Executive Secretariat of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD), responsible for monitoring Title XII program design and implementation, employs the Carnegie 2010 Basic Classification to characterize participating Title XII universities and colleges.² Of the 54 active projects, agreements for all were directly awarded to universities classified as Research Universities, with the exception of one award to a Masters (Large) university, also a Minority Serving Institution (MSI). Table 2 lists all active projects, in order of their dates of completion. Table 2 also lists the prime awardee, which can be a single Title XII university, consortia of partners, or a Title XII partner institution on its own (e.g., Tegemeo Institute at Egerton University in Kenya).

During the two-year period covered in this report, the responsibility for support of BIFAD within USAID was transferred to a BIFAD Executive Secretariat established in the Office of Development Partners. This shift signaled a new relationship between USAID and U.S. universities and colleges, one of mutual appreciation for the important role played by higher education in addressing global and regional food insecurity facing agriculturally developing countries. BIFAD's Executive Secretariat is coordinating with all USAID bureaus to better reflect their input in BIFAD's plans for assistance and advice. Over FY 2009 and FY 2010,

numerous BIFAD public meetings were held as well as more focused workshops with deans of schools of agriculture. Two topical workshops were also sponsored by BIFAD: one on rebuilding Haitian agricultural education programs after the earthquake of 2010 and another on expanding the engagement of Minority Serving Institutions in USAID programs.

Over the next five years, USAID anticipates shifts in the shape and character of Title XII programs in line with the changing program priorities outlined in the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review and operational reforms guided by USAID FORWARD, including:

- Increasing involvement of Title XII institutions in agricultural programming in developing countries;
- Increasing the range of institutions both domestically and overseas involved in Title XII programming consistent with USAID Forward reforms;
- Expanding the engagement of Minority Serving Institutions in USAID programs;
- Aligning Title XII programs more closely with USAID initiatives, particularly Feed the Future, in terms of programmatic and geographic focus;
- Improving the tracking of sub-awards to Title XII institutions; and
- Conducting rigorous performance monitoring and impact assessments, in line with USAID's new evaluation policy, to inform programming decisions and assess the contributions of Title XII programs to overall impact of agriculture investments

The President recently appointed four new members of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development. The new board includes one current university chancellor, two president emeriti and three World Food Prize winners. This new board will continue the revitalization of Title XII activities over the next five years, will advise USAID on food security issues, and will monitor engagement with Title XII institutions.

ACRONYMS

AA	Associate Award
ABSP	Agricultural Biotechnology Support Project
ADS	Automated Directive System
ALSCC	Adapting Livestock Systems to Climate Change (CRSP)
AMA	Assets and Market Access (CRSP)
AquaFish	Aquaculture and Fisheries (CRSP)
AWATT	Afghanistan Water, Agriculture and Technology Transfer Program
BASIS	Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems
BIFAD	Board for International Food and Agricultural Development
CRSP	Collaborative Research Support Program
DGP	Dry Grain Pulses (CRSP)
EIAS	Engaging International Agricultural Science
FACA	Federal Advisory Committee Act
FtF	Feed the Future
FY	Fiscal Year
GHFSI	Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative
HECTARE	Higher Education Collaboration for Technology, Agriculture, Research and Extension
HICD	Human and Institutional Capacity Development
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
Hort	Horticulture (CRSP)
LCC	Livestock-Climate Change (CRSP)
IPM	Integrated Pest Management (CRSP)
INTSORMIL	International Sorghum and Millet (CRSP)
ME	Management Entity
MEAS	Modernizing Extension Advisory Services
MSI	Minority Serving Institution
NARS	National Agricultural Research Systems
ODP	Office of Development Partners
PPR	Performance Plan Report
PS2R	Program Support to Research
QDDR	Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review
SANREM	Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (CRSP)
SMOG	Sorghum Millet and Other Grains (CRSP)
SP	Special Programs
SPSD	Standardized Program Structure and Definitions
STI	Science, Technology, and Innovation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.....	i
Executive Summary	ii
Acronyms	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	v
Section I: Introduction.	1
Section II: Title XII Projects and Achievements in FY 2009 & FY 2010.....	1
Projects by Program Component	2
Highlights of Achievements Supporting Key Development Issues.....	7
Highlights of Achievements in Each Program Component.....	11
Section III: Looking Forward: Title XII–The Next Five Years.....	17
Outlook in Response to USAID Policy and Strategy Initiatives	18
Outlook in Response to USAID Budget and Operational Reforms.....	20
Section IV: Summary of BIFAD Activities in FY 2009 & FY 2010	20
Section V: BIFAD Response on the FY 2009 & FY 2010 Title XII Report to Congress.....	24
Glossary	27
Endnotes.....	28

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Overview of Active Title XII Projects and Participants in FY 2009 & FY 2010

Table 2: List of Active Title XII Projects in FY 2009 & FY 2010

Table 3: U.S. Universities Participating in Collaborative Research Support Programs in FY 2009 & FY 2010

Table 4: CRSP Activities in Feed the Future Focus Countries in FY 2009 & FY 2010

Table 5: Summary of BIFAD Meetings and Workshops in FY 2009 & FY 2010

I. Introduction

The Title XII report is an annual accounting of USAID's programming through universities in the agricultural³ sector. This year, the report carries special significance since agriculture is once again at the forefront of the development agenda. Concurrently, USAID has revitalized its relationship with the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD). In early FY2009, USAID renewed the BIFAD charter and transferred support for the Board to the Office of Development Partners (ODP), which resides within the Office of the Administrator. The move signaled a new relationship between USAID and U.S. Title XII universities and colleges that emphasizes the importance of international higher education collaboration to address growing global and regional food insecurity facing agriculturally developing countries.

This report is a mandated by Congress, pursuant to Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.⁴ This year's report covers a two-year period and seeks to respond to new requirements for greater transparency and more robust reporting. It builds on the FY 2008 Report to Congress to establish a baseline for Title XII programming and combines two annual reports of activities and achievements into this *Title XII Report to Congress - FY 2009 & FY 2010*. It includes a summary of BIFAD activities and the Board's views on Title XII programming.

This report has five sections. First is a section reporting on the activities and achievements under Title XII in FY 2009 & FY 2010, which offers a definition and overview of program type and scope. This discussion clarifies current use of Title XII as a strategic instrument of U.S. foreign assistance, including highlights of the direction, location, pace, and pattern of programming. The discussion of the program achievements links to USAID performance objectives and program types.

The next section presents a five-year outlook from FY 2011 through FY2015. It identifies opportunities for Title XII programs to respond to new U.S. Government (USG) development policy and strategy, especially in USAID's expanded programming in agricultural development and FtF.

Following is a section that provides a summary of BIFAD activities, including its sponsored events, the work of its sub-committee(s), and issues linked to its specific duties outlined in Title XII legislation and Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) charter.

The final section documents the Board's separate views on the strategy, policy, and implementation efforts taking place during the reporting period and into the next five years.

II. Title XII Projects and Achievements in FY 2009 & FY 2010

Title XII, "Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger," was introduced in 1975⁵ and significantly amended in 2000.⁶ From 1975 and until the 2007-2008 global food crisis, global food supplies were relatively abundant; the significant investments that the USG had made in agricultural development in earlier years were a major contributing factor. As a result, funding levels for famine prevention were modest. In this same period, agricultural programming focused increasingly on reducing poverty through food aid and agricultural development, and specifically on addressing the root causes of food insecurity. Today, the world once more faces food price instability and uncertainty of supply, raising the importance of agricultural programming that targets productivity and market linkages.

PROJECTS BY PROGRAM COMPONENT

Section 297 of Title XII authorizes five different program components. Although these various program types are not always mutually exclusive in their implementation, they typically achieve distinct outcomes, as described below.

- Component 1: Human and Institutional Capacity Development (HICD)

“... to build and strengthen the institutional capacity and human resource skills of agriculturally developing countries...”

Typical programs in this category focus on the sustainable expansion of a specific public and/or private sector capacity in education, research, and/or extension/outreach in agriculture and the related sciences at a regional, national, or subnational level. While there are similarities between HICD activities and those in other Title XII program categories, the HICD project must have built sustainable institutional capacity as an outcome of the project.

- Component 2: Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSP)

“... to provide long-term program support for United States university global agricultural and related environmental collaborative research and learning opportunities...”

Perhaps the best known of the Title XII programs, the Global CRSPs certainly help to achieve the goals of Component 1 (above), but they do so uniquely by building collaborative relationships between U.S. and developing or transition country institutions over the long-term. These two characteristics of collaboration and longer-term programming for achieving global agricultural research and development goals set them apart from the programs in Component 1.

- Component 3: Engaging International Agriculture Science (EIAS)

“... to involve United States universities more fully in the international network of agricultural science...”

The outcome emphasized under this program component is strengthened participation of Title XII universities and colleges in international networks. Activities under this component may support strengthening grants for U.S. universities with the purpose of furthering their ability to contribute scientific and technical leadership in international circles.

- Component 4: Program Support to Research (PS2R)

“... to provide program support for international agricultural research centers, to provide support for research projects identified for specific problem-solving needs, and to develop and strengthen national research systems in the developing countries.”

This research support program component involves the transfer of a specific research capacity to fill a void in the recipient organization; Title XII programs under this component offer external support to bridge or fill those gaps. The support is usually time-bound; it may involve training on specific scientific protocols or techniques; and the result is the resolution of a specific research constraint facing International Agricultural Research Centers (IARCs) or National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS).

- Component 5: Special Programs (SP)

Title XII Special Programs are agricultural projects or activities within projects designed and implemented like any of the other four components except that they are specifically funded for a non-agricultural program purpose.⁷ In FY 2009 and FY 2010, several Title XII projects received significant levels of supplementary incremental funding to address non-agricultural purposes.

In summary, a USAID Title XII project or activity can be any activity that addresses the development outcomes legislatively defined by the program components and implemented through an eligible U.S. Title XII university or college or through a formal association with a public or private partner of an eligible Title XII university or college.⁸ This is the central point of Title XII programming.⁹ Thus, Title XII programming represents a partnership between USAID and eligible U.S. public state and local universities and colleges.

A summary overview of Title XII projects and participants active during FY 2009 and FY 2010 is shown in Table 1 and in Table 2 a list of all active Title XII prime awards in FY 2009 and FY 2010 is provided.

Table 1: Overview of Active Title XII Projects and Participants in FY 2009 & FY 2010

Number of Projects and Activities	Number of Participating Title XII Universities and Colleges	Number of Public and Private Partners	Number of Participating Countries or Global/Regional Networks
	<i>Human and Institutional Capacity Development (HICD)</i>		
9	13	12	5
	<i>Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP)</i>		
25	51	20	63
	<i>Engaging International Agriculture Science (EIAS)</i>		
4	4	7	5
	<i>Program Support to Research (PS2R)</i>		
16	15	90	70
	<i>Special Programs</i>		
0	0	0	0
Total 54	Total 83	Total 149	Total 143

Source: Compiled by ODP/BIFAD and based on FY2008, FY2009, and FY2010 total obligations data from USAID Phoenix Viewer Reports and Title XII project websites and periodic reports.

There were 54 active Title XII projects and/or activities during the two year period, divided across the five program components. The 25 CRSP programs listed include not only the 12 Global CRSP awards but also 13 additional associate awards. Six of the 16 PS2R projects and activities were also associate awards.

Title XII program funding during the biennial period increased significantly. In the baseline year of FY 2008, total agricultural and non-agricultural funding of the Title XII program was \$43.2 million. In FY 2009, as President Obama’s *Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative (GHFSI)* was being designed as a “whole of government” program in response to the 2007/2008 food crisis, Title XII program funding increased nearly 10% to \$47.3 million. In FY 2010, the first year of increased agricultural program funding under the GHFSI, the Title XII program increased over 67% to \$72.2 million.¹⁰

Table 2: List of Active Title XII Projects in FY 2009 & FY 2010

Project Title (Acronym)	Life of Award	Geographic Focus	Lead Title XII Partner
<i>Human and Institutional Capacity Development (HICD)</i>			
1. Fisheries Investment for Sustainable Harvest (FISH)	5/16/2005-11/16/2008	Uganda	Auburn
2. Private Community Forestry for Natural Resource Management (PCF/NRM)	11/7/2006-12/31/2009	Afghanistan	Cornell University
3. Advancing Afghan Agriculture Alliance (A4)	3/14/2007-12/31/2010	Afghanistan	Purdue
4. Afghanistan Water, Agriculture and Technology Transfer (AWATT)	3/3/2008-3/2/2011	Afghanistan	New Mexico State University
5. Pastoral Engagement, Adaptation, and Capacity Enhancement (PEACE)	7/1/2006-4/30/2011	Afghanistan	University of California
6. Sustaining Partnerships in Rural Enterprise and Agribusiness Development (SPREAD)	9/29/2006-9/28/2011	Rwanda	Texas Agricultural Experiment Station
7. Value Chain Training for Agricultural Technical School (VCT/ATS)	4/1/2008-3/30/2012	Egypt	Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities
8. Education and Research (ERA)	1/2010-1/2015	Senegal	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
9. Modernizing Extension and Advisory Services (MEAS)	9/15/2010-9/14/2015	Global	University of Illinois
<i>Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP)</i>			
1. Global Livestock (GL)	9/30/1998-9/30/2008	Global	University of California
2. GL-Associate Award (AA)	8/10/2007-8/9/2008	Mali	University of California
3. Assets & Market Access (AMA)	9/30/2006-9/29/2011	Global	University of Wisconsin
4. AMA- AA (Food Security)	9/30/2008-9/29/2013	Africa	University of Wisconsin
5. AMA-AA (MCC)	5/30/2007-9/29/2011	Nicaragua	University of Wisconsin
6. Aquaculture & Fisheries (AquaFish)	9/30/2006-9/29/2011	Global	Oregon State University
7. AquaFish-AA	9/30/2010-12/31/2010	Mali	Oregon State University
8. AquaFish-AA	10/1/2010-9/30/2013	Africa	Oregon State University
9. Sorghum, Millet, and Other Small Grains (SMOG)	9/30/2006-9/29/2011	Global	University of Nebraska
10. SMOG-AA	4/8/2010-3/7/2013	Mali	University of Nebraska
11. SMOG-AA	10/1/2010-9/30/2013	LAC	University of Nebraska
12. Peanut II	7/31/1207-7/30/2012	Global	University of Georgia
13. Dry Grain Pulse (DGP)	9/19/2007-9/28/2012	LAC	Michigan State University
14. DGP-AA	10/1/2010-9/30/2013	Global	Michigan State University
15. Integrated Pest Management (IPM)	9/30/2004-9/30/2014	Global	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
16. IPM-AA (Food Security)	9/30/2008-9/29/2011	Africa	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
17. IPM-AA	1/1/2010-12/31/2012	Mali	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
18. IPM-AA	10/1/2010-9/30/2013	Indonesia	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
19. Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (SANREM)	9/30/2004-9/30/2014	Global	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
20. SANREM-AA	10/1/2008-6/30/2009	S. Sudan	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
21. Horticulture (HORT)	10/1/2009-9/30/2014	Global	University of California
22. Adapting Livestock Systems to Climate Change (ALSCC)	4/20/2010-4/19/2015	Global	Colorado State University
23. ALSCC-AA	8/1/2010-7/31/2013	Mali	Colorado State University
24. Nutrition – Africa	10/4/2010-10/3/2015	Africa	Tufts University
25. Nutrition – Asia	10/4/2010-10/3/2015	Asia	Tufts University
<i>Engaging International Agriculture Science (EIAS)</i>			
1. Sustainable Development Cooperation	4/8/2004-9/30/2011	Global	Association of Public & Land-grant Universities (APLU)
2. CRSP Long Term Training Assessment (CRSP-LTTA)	9/26/2008-12/25/2010	Global	IQC Task Order
3. CRSP Program Support (CRSP-PS-FAS)	9/30/2008-9/30/2010	Global	USDA/FAS
4. CRSP Program Support (CRSP-PS-ARS)	9/23/2005-9/30/2010	Global	USDA/ARS

Project Title (Acronym)	Life of Award	Geographic Focus	Lead Title XII Partner
<i>Program Support to Research(PS2R)</i>			
1. Partnership for Food Industry Development/Natural Products (PFID/NP)	9/30/2004-9/29/2009	Global	Rutgers University
2. Partnership for Food Industry Development/Meat, Seafood & Poultry (PFID/MSP)	9/30/2004-9/29/2009	Global	Louisiana State University
3. Partnership for Food Industry Development/Fruits & Vegetables (PFID/FV)	1/15/2001-1/14/2010	Global	Michigan State University
4. Tegemeo Agricultural Policy Research and Analysis (TAPRA)	10/2006-9/2010	Kenya	Tegemeo Institute at Egerton University
5. Ethiopia Sheep and Goat Productivity Improvement Program (ESGPIP)	9/22/2005-9/21/2010	Ethiopia	Prairie View State
6. Partnership for Innovation and Knowledge in Agriculture (PIKA): Indian Horticulture Development Alliance Program (IDHA)	10/1/2008-9/30/2010	India	Michigan State University
7. Partnership for Innovation and Knowledge in Agriculture (PIKA): Increasing Productivity and Value Chain Links for High Value Agricultural Products	9/25/2008-3/31/2011	India	University of Wisconsin
8. Agricultural Biotechnology Support Project II (ABSP II)	9/30/2002-9/29/2012	Global	Cornell University
9. Agricultural Biotechnology Support Project II-AA (ABSP II -AA)	8/18/2004-8/18/2012	Uganda	Cornell University
10. Food Security III (FS III)	9/30/2002-9/29/2012	Global	Michigan State University
11. FS III-AA	9/24/2007-3/31/2011	Africa	Michigan State University
12. FS III-AA	10/1/2004-9/30/2008	Mozambique	Michigan State University
13. FS III-AA	9/13/2006-9/30/2010	Mali	Michigan State University
14. FS III-AA	6/2/2010-9/30/2010	Mali	Michigan State University
15. FS III-AA	10/9/2009-9/30/2010	Zambia	Michigan State University
16. Pastoralist Livelihoods Initiative (PLI)	9/30/2005-3/31/2013	Ethiopia	Tufts University

Source: Based on FY2008, FY2009 and FY2010 Obligations Data from USAID Phoenix Viewer Reports compiled by ODP/BIFAD

Table 3 highlights active universities in the Global CRSPs. Of the 71 different colleges and universities participating in the CRSP networks, 51 are Title XII universities (seven of which are Historically Black Colleges and Universities, HBCUs) and 20 are U.S. non-Title XII university partners. The CRSP category possesses the largest set of institutional networks among the different program components. This is not surprising, since the CRSPs are designed to foster long term collaboration. Faculty and staff involvement from U.S. universities and colleges in global and regional public agricultural research networks clearly yields long-term benefits. Other Title XII projects also involve extensive partnering and testify to the important and broader role that Title XII plays in integrating the U.S. public agricultural Science, Technology, and Innovation (STI) sector with agricultural sectors in developing countries.

Table 3: U.S. Universities Participating in Collaborative Research Support Programs in FY 2009 & FY 2010

University	ALSCC	AMA	AquaFish	DGP	GL	HORT	IPM	Nutrition	Peanut II	SANREM	SMOG
1. Alabama A&M			X								
2. Auburn			X						X		
3. Clemson							X				
4. Colorado State	ME			X		X					
5. Cornell		X		X	X	X			X	X	
6. Delaware State			X								
7. Emory U	X										
8. Florida A&M					X		X			X	
9. Fort Valley State							X				
10. George Mason		X									
11. Georgia Tech		X									
12. Georgia State		X									
13. Harvard		X						X			
14. Idaho State					X						
15. Indiana U					X					X	
16. Iowa State				X	X					X	
17. Johns Hopkins		X						X			
18. Kansas State				X	X		X			X	X
19. Louisiana State			X								
20. Michigan State	X	X		ME			X				
21. Montana State			X								
22. New Mexico State									X		
23. North Carolina A&T										X	
24. North Carolina State			X			X	X		X		
25. Ohio State			X			X	X				X
26. Oregon State			ME				X				
27. Penn State				X	X		X			X	
28. Princeton	X										
29. Purdue		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X
30. Rutgers						X					
31. South Dakota State	X				X						
32. Syracuse	X	X			X						
33. Texas A&M	X			X	X				X		X
34. Texas Tech			X								
35. Tufts								ME			
36. Tuskegee								X			
37. U Alabama-Birmingham									X		
38. U Arizona			X				X				
39. U Arkansas-Pine Bluff			X								
40. U California-		X			X					X	

University	ALSCC	AMA	AquaFish	DGP	GL	HORT	IPM	Nutrition	Peanut II	SANREM	SMOG
Berkeley											
41. U California-Davis	X	X			ME	ME	X			X	
42. U California- Los Angeles					X						
43. U California-Riverside		X		X							
44. U California-San Diego		X									
45. U Colorado										X	
46. U Connecticut									X	X	
47. U Connecticut-Avery Point			X								
48. U Denver							X			X	
49. U Florida	X					X	X		X		
50. U Georgia	X		X				X		ME		X
51. U Hawaii-Hilo			X								
52. U Hawaii-Manoa						X				X	
53. U Illinois-Urbana-Champaign				X							
54. U Kentucky					X						
55. U Michigan		X	X								
56. U Minnesota		X									
57. U Missouri										X	
58. U Nebraska											ME
59. U Puerto Rico				X							
60. U Rhode Island			X								
61. U San Francisco		X									
62. U Tennessee										X	
63. U Vermont	X				X						
64. U Wisconsin-Madison	X	ME				X					
65. U Wyoming					X					X	
66. Utah State					X						
67. Virginia State							X				
68. Virginia Tech			X				ME		X	ME	
69. Washington State				X			X				
70. West Texas A&M											X
71. Yale		X			X						
TOTAL	12	18	18	11	19	10	18	5	11	17	7

Source: Compiled from FY 2009 and FY 2010 Title XII project websites and periodic reports.

HIGHLIGHTS OF ACHIEVEMENTS SUPPORTING KEY DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

Achievements in Title XII programming are discussed in the context of three broad development strategies employed by the U.S: Global Agricultural Development, Global Hunger and Food Insecurity, and Transitioning to Stability.

Global Agricultural Development

The programs' main achievements implemented under each program component areas are highlighted below. As noted earlier, the four program component categories are not always mutually exclusive in operation, but they do seek to achieve distinguishable outcomes.

Strengthening higher education capacity in agriculture and related sciences in developing countries has long been recognized as a key challenge for both those countries and the world. In FY 2009 and FY 2010, there was significant funding for agro-industrial skills training in Egypt, an award to a new major project supporting comprehensive agricultural higher education in Senegal, and a new project to provide advisory services globally on agriculture extension. Also during this period, USAID completed the report, *Agriculture Long-Term Training-Assessment and Design Recommendations*. It emphasizes the imperatives to: 1) focus on the institutions performance improvement rather than training out of context; and 2) link U.S. degree training to the specific institutional performance gaps.

Several Title XII sub-awards to strengthen African agricultural universities began under a competitive grants program funded by USAID and managed by Higher Education for Development (HED). These activities are consistent with Title XII but are funded under Section 105 Education and Human Resources Development of the Foreign Assistance Act. As more HED sub-awards to agricultural higher education institutions are likely, USAID will make additional efforts to track sub-awards and provide complete reporting about them.

There has been significant progress in CRSP activities. FY 2009 saw the end of the very successful Global Livestock CRSP¹¹ and competition for a new program focusing on adapting livestock systems to climate change that started in FY 2010. Also in the FY 2009 and FY 2010 biennial period, ongoing CRSP projects expanded their global and regional research collaboration efforts and networks with a wider array of public and private Title XII partners.

Associate awards funded by country programs increased substantially, as evidenced by the USAID Mali Mission, showing that CRSP programming is in demand for its expertise in addressing agricultural commodity sub-sectors outside of the basic grains (maize, wheat, and rice). Finally, two regional Nutrition CRSP programs were awarded in FY 2010, breaking from the historical structure of a single Global CRSP with associate awards.

U.S. Title XII universities and colleges recognize the importance of international collaboration for their students, faculty and staff, and they historically looked to USAID to facilitate their involvement in developing countries and regional fora. However, as agricultural programming fell, so too did USAID support for Title XII university engagement in international agriculture science networks. To rebuild U.S. university leadership in these networks, USAID has relied on its partnership with the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU). In a 2008 member survey, APLU observed that large research institutions, while recognizing the critical importance of collaboration with USAID on international development work, have attracted new revenue streams. Smaller institutions though, such as the Minority Serving Institutions, have not done so, thus must rely upon USAID's strengthening support to rebuild their capacity.

The biennial period of this report saw the completion of the three successful projects in the category of Program Support to Research: the Partnership for Food Industry Development projects, implemented with Rutgers University, Louisiana State University, and Michigan State University. These global projects not only provided research services to developing countries but

also established these universities as key sources of expertise. Two other projects in India (Partnership for Innovation and Knowledge in Agriculture) also concluded successfully.

Tegemeo Institute at Egerton University in Njoro, Kenya is the first case in which a Title XII public partner became the prime awardee of a Title XII award. Michigan State University is the sub-awardee under this grant. This illustrates how well the Title XII partnership is working to build institutional capability overseas. It is fully consistent with USAID Forward reforms¹² for greater local level programming and serves as a model for the future.

Another unique example is the Prairie View State University project in Ethiopia, which is not only the prime but also both a teaching university and a MSI.¹³ Under this component, research support in agricultural biotechnology and agricultural economic policy has significantly expanded, evidenced by support to six associate awards.

Global Hunger and Food Insecurity

While Title XII programming in Global Agricultural Development captures the broad effort for agricultural development, the U.S. has also launched the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative (GHFSI) or - Feed the Future (FtF). Under the GHFSI, specific countries are targeted and relevant missions and regional programming units have food security budget controls appropriate to each country's conditions. Working with the GHFSI, Title XII programming aims to sustainably reduce chronic hunger, raise the incomes of the rural poor, and reduce the number of children suffering from under-nutrition.

The current CRSP research and networking activities are relevant to the FtF and align with its country foci and core investment areas, as well as the seven key areas of the GHFSI. Most CRSP activities aim to increase agricultural productivity, enhance access to markets, ensure nutritional security, and add value to agricultural commodities and natural resource products. All eight identified outputs of FtF are reflected in the goals of at least half of the CRSP programs.¹⁴

There is a strong geographic correspondence between CRSP international engagements and the USAID FtF focus countries (Table 4). This alignment makes a compelling case for an expanded CRSP role in realizing the objectives defined in the FtF strategy. Special foci and outcomes of the CRSPs are the generation of knowledge and technologies relevant to the agricultural needs in developing countries, while also building the institutional capacity and human resources in those countries to support agricultural growth and improved nutrition into the future.

Table 4: CRSP Activity in Feed the Future Focus Countries in FY 2009 & FY 2010

CRSP	Aquafish	AMA	HORT	IPM	SMOG	ALSCC	Nutrition	Peanut II	DGP	SANREM
AFRICA										
Ethiopia		✓		✓	✓	✓				
Ghana	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		✓
Kenya	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Liberia		✓								
Malawi		✓	✓							
Mali	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓
Mozambique		✓			✓				✓	
Rwanda			✓						✓	
S. Africa	✓								✓	
Senegal	✓			✓	✓			✓	✓	
Tanzania	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Uganda	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓
Zambia			✓		✓				✓	
ASIA										
Bangladesh	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				
Cambodia	✓	✓	✓	✓						✓
India				✓						
Nepal	✓		✓	✓		✓				✓
Tajikistan				✓		✓				
LAC										
Guatemala		✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	
Haiti			✓		✓			✓	✓	✓
Honduras			✓	✓	✓				✓	
Nicaragua	✓	✓	✓		✓				✓	

Source: CRSP Council 2011 “Collaborative Research Programs for the Feed the Future Plan” (unpublished), page 2.

Transitioning to Stability

Agricultural development in fragile and conflict-affected countries is and will be an important aspect of Title XII strategic programming, particularly for improving the human and institutional capacity development required in the transition to stability. A country’s public sector institutions at the national and provincial levels, including universities and colleges, lead the way in strengthening public agricultural services. They provide technologies and train personnel to sustain private sector investments. During the reporting period, significant progress was made in these areas in Afghanistan and discussions were started between a consortium of nine Title XII universities and the USAID Middle East Bureau regarding Title XII programming in Iraq.

In Afghanistan, Title XII projects helped to strengthen higher education, improve natural resource management, build watershed and irrigation infrastructure, and manage pastoral systems. The U.S. also introduced a new agricultural strategy for Afghanistan to strengthen the Afghanistan Ministry of Agriculture, especially its local level extension and outreach services, which play an important role in stabilizing agricultural production, creating rural employment, and fostering agro-industrial investments. With support from USAID, the U.S. Department for Agriculture (USDA) took the lead in implementing this new strategy, working closely with state universities and Army National Guard. As a first step, BIFAD convened a meeting to incorporate best practices and lessons learned from these activities.

In Iraq, like Afghanistan, agriculture will play an important part in the country's recovery, and will need agricultural universities and training institutions to lead the way. At the request of the Department of Defense, a contingent of seven Title XII universities travelled to Iraq to determine what human resource requirements are needed to support the recovery. BIFAD coordinated a meeting with USAID Senior Management in the Middle East Bureau to discuss their proposal to establish a Title XII University Consortia to provide long-term academic training for the 400 entry and mid-level university personnel needed to rebuild public agricultural support services.

HIGHLIGHTS OF ACHIEVEMENTS IN EACH PROGRAM COMPONENT

Human and Institutional Capacity Development (HICD)

Auburn University completed its successful commercial aquaculture development project in Uganda that transferred the technology for model fish farms. The project modified Uganda fish farming from a semi-commercial and highly inefficient sector to a sustainable aquaculture industry from the ground up using proven, feed-based technologies, and best management practices. The Auburn model is now being replicated in Ghana with the support from American Soybean Association International Marketing.

In Afghanistan, the Pastoral Engagement, Adaptation and Capacity Enhancement (PEACE)¹⁵ project successfully reduced the social and economic risks in livestock production by providing timely information on forage conditions and market prices. It also received non-agricultural funding to facilitate conflict resolution processes among pastoral communities in Afghanistan. The Private Community Forestry/Natural Resource Management (PCF/NRM) project developed farmers' business skills so that they could establish private agro-forestry businesses. It also strengthened local community institutions to better manage watersheds. The Advancing Afghan Agriculture Alliance (A-4) project started agriculture and livestock programs at four Afghanistan universities and partnered with the Ministry of Agriculture and local NGOs. Lastly, the Afghanistan Water, Agriculture and Technology Transfer (AWATT) project linked universities and ministries in efforts to extend information and appropriate technology at the community and farm-level for water resource management and land tenure.

In Rwanda, the Sustaining Partnerships in Rural Enterprise and Agribusiness Development (SPREAD) project built on earlier successes of a value-chain model to build strong alliances between the private and public sectors among a range of U.S., European, and, Rwandan enterprises, institutions, Universities, and NGOs as well as Rwandan farmer associations. The

project focused on three crops - coffee, cassava, and chiles - and helped farmers to meet current certification and traceability standards.

In Egypt, the Value Chain Training for Agricultural Technical School (VCT/ATS) project created a new training program that is accelerating agricultural development in Upper Egypt. Commercial export farms are in dire need of skilled labor, and Agricultural Training School students must have rigorous and in-depth training to find employment after graduation. The project bridges the gap between ATSs and the world of work. Since April 2008, the VCT project has organized internships for 1,027 Egyptian students on 25 commercial farms and packing stations, and 325 (32 percent) of students received employment offers.

Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP)¹⁶

AQUAFISH CRSP

The Aquaculture & Fisheries CRSP (AquaFish) is committed to implementing the FtF goals to sustainably reduce global hunger and poverty. In implementing its strategies to improve the livelihoods of smallholder farmers and fishers, AquaFish CRSP is aligned with the FtF key objectives to accelerate inclusive agriculture sector growth and improve nutritional status. AquaFish CRSP's cross-cutting projects involve stakeholders at all levels and emphasize gender equality, environmentally sustainable development, and sound natural resource management. Combining the resources of 16 U.S. and 29 host country partner institutions, AquaFish CRSP is currently engaged in ten FtF focus countries. Within the aquaculture and capture-fishery sectors of agriculture-led development, the AquaFish CRSP has invested its efforts across a broad range of FtF target areas: *Improving Agricultural Productivity*: focusing on local solutions to develop sustainable fish feeds, aquaculture, cage culture and native shellfish hatchery technologies, best management practices for fish farmers and processors, and management plans for threatened native fisheries; mentoring producer cooperatives; and training the rural poor through extension and outreach. *Expanded markets and trade*, particularly for women, is achieved by training stakeholders in value chain development for aquatic products; applying value chain analysis to assess market opportunities for farmed fish; and expanding market opportunities through food quality and safety standards for processed products. AquaFish helps build sustainable aquaculture and capture fisheries sectors by developing management plans for fisheries and watersheds, domesticating local species for aquaculture development, and training smallholders to enter aquaculture or to improve practices results in *increased economic resilience and less vulnerable rural communities*.

BASIS CRSP (AMA)

The BASIS Assets and Market Access Collaborative Research Support Program (BASIS) currently has activities in 12 FtF priority countries. Building on prior and ongoing basic research that documents the impact of risk on generating and sustaining poverty, BASIS strongly aligns with the FtF Increasing Economic Resilience in Vulnerable Rural Communities priority. Current BASIS research, pilot projects, and impact evaluation activities include analyses of *Productive safety nets*, *Local and regional food procurement*, and *Extension of financial services*. Particularly important are projects where BASIS has designed and worked with market actors to implement index-based agricultural insurance for small scale producers, giving households access for the first time to *sound and affordable risk management services*. BASIS also is exploring the effective design of fertilizer subsidies, which affect smallholder *access to*

affordable inputs and improved technologies. Further contributing to the goal of Accelerating Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth, BASIS has projects that examine the impact of financial and business training designed to help smallholder farmers *improve access to business development and financial services.*

HORTICULTURE CRSP (HORT)

The Horticulture CRSP emphasizes the horticulture value chain, i.e. the production, marketing and consumption/utilization of fruits, vegetables, spices and medicinal plants, and ornamentals, to improve the incomes, nutrition, health, and economic well-being of the rural poor, especially women. Hort CRSP project goals are to 1) increase production of nutritious foods and provide households with a diverse micronutrient-rich diet; 2) improve safety and reduce postharvest losses of nutritious but perishable foods; 3) improve incomes by linking farmer groups with domestic and export market opportunities; and 4) empower women by providing increased access to income through production and marketing of horticultural crops. Hort CRSP achieves these goals through innovative technology, increased access to information, human and institution capacity building, and gender equity. Hort CRSP projects are aligned with and directly relevant to the FtF Initiative priorities of Agriculture Productivity, Community Development, Gender, Nutrition, Public-Private Partnerships, Poverty Reduction, Research, and Trade/Markets. The Horticulture CRSP currently has thirty projects in twenty countries of Sub-Saharan Africa, South and Southeast Asia, and Latin America.

INTSORMIL CRSP (SMOG)

The Sorghum, Millet and Other Grains CRSP (INTSORMIL) will contribute to the goals and objectives of the FtF Initiative, which are to sustainably reduce chronic hunger, raise the incomes of the rural poor, and reduce the number of children suffering from under-nutrition. INTSORMIL had collaborative research Memorandum of Agreement with fourteen FtF countries as of September 2010. INTSORMIL program investments are in the areas of: 1) *Raising Agricultural Productivity*-Focusing on adoption of higher yielding technologies, technology generation, water management, and land rights and land use; 2) *Linking Farmers to Markets*-Focusing on reducing transfer and transaction costs, supporting mobilization of rural finance, and other value-adding innovations; 3) *Reducing Risk and Vulnerability*-Focusing on price management and weather risk, reducing production and storage pests and diseases, strengthening food-related social protection in rural and urban areas, and improving nutrition of vulnerable groups; and 4) *Improving Non-Farm Rural Livelihoods*-Focusing on improvement of the investment climate and promoting non-farm rural entrepreneurship.

INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT (IPM) CRSP

The IPM CRSP mission produces research to develop pest management solutions for smallholder farmers around the world and to promote transfer of these technologies. Combining the resources of eighteen U.S. and forty-six host country partner institutions, the IPM CRSP contributes directly to the FtF performance indicators. The IPM CRSP contributes to multiple FtF target areas, including improving agricultural productivity by developing technologies that increase yields, reducing losses due to pests, and, thereby, improving household incomes. The majority of this work is focused on vegetables. IPM CRSP works on expanding markets and trade by addressing sanitary and phytosanitary issues and increasing the comparative advantage of producers who reduce pest management costs and increase surpluses. IPM CRSP reduces *risk and vulnerability* by improving availability of food and by improving incomes among poor

smallholders who grow food for sale. By focusing on production of high value fruits and vegetables often grown in the counter season to grain crops, the IPM CRSP promotes household economic resilience through income diversification while also supporting improved nutrition. Technical assistance, institution building, and capacity development are achieved by supporting farmer training for technology transfer as well as short-and long-term training of host country partners.

THE LIVESTOCK-CLIMATE CHANGE (LCC) CRSP

Expanded in 2010 to include the climate change component, LLC CRSP is contributing to the goals and objectives of FtF to reduce hunger and under-nutrition and raise the incomes of the rural poor. The LCC CRSP catalyzes and coordinates research to improve the livelihoods of livestock producers affected by climate change by reducing vulnerability and increasing adaptive capacity. The LCC CRSP has over 15 collaborative research projects in FtF countries (Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali, Senegal, Tanzania, Tajikistan), and it anticipates expanding into Nepal and Bangladesh in 2011. The LCC CRSP supports the FtF goals through expanding markets and trade (builds pro-poor value chains, expand income opportunities for livestock producers to alleviate poverty, and enhances resilience to climate change impacts), improving agricultural productivity (advances management practices that optimize use and allocation of limited resources and improves animal health and productivity), and reducing risk and vulnerability (does research to improve the livelihoods of livestock producers, enhances income diversification, and reduces risks in the face of climate change). In addition, the LCC CRSP provides support in technical assistance, institution building, and capacity development, in particular, through partnerships with host country graduate students and faculty.

NUTRITION CRSP

The Nutrition CRSP aims to identify and replicate the most effective approaches to improving child nutrition at scale in priority developing countries. This effort is motivated by continued widespread maternal and child malnutrition, even in countries benefitting from agricultural growth and poverty reduction. Despite conjecture about how various interventions in agriculture and public health might improve child nutrition, limited empirical evidence exists to determine how to bring and sustain the greatest improvements on the largest scale. The Nutrition CRSP focuses on countries across Africa and Asia to explore not just what should be done, but how evidence-based interventions can be most effectively moved from community-level pilots to national programs and policies. This activity has a strong element of capacity-building for problem analysis, operations research, and implementation of best practice. In line with FtF guidelines, the Nutrition CRSP activities represent an investment in country-led research that supports outcome-based programming and partnerships. It considers what sets of “essential actions” are needed not only in food production and marketing, but also in water management, disease control, private sector development, environmental management, and health service delivery. Success in identifying strategic combinations of interventions requires location-specific research, whose focus and methods are tailored to the needs of implementation agencies and household participants at the community level. The CRSP continues to interact closely with USAID and other partners, building agreement around key lessons and feeding insights into mission-supported FtF interventions, host government policy debates, and regional and international evidence building.

PEANUT CRSP (PEANUT II)

The Peanut II CRSP contributes to the FtF initiative through projects affecting agricultural growth, market access, and nutrition. It provides small farmers with technologies, market expansion tools for commonly neglected commodities, and provides consumers with highly nutritious foods. The peanut is distinct from most other crops considered for FtF, because it is both protein and energy dense, with high value-adding potential, and is grown and processed in Africa- mostly by women. Additionally, the peanut is a legume with superior nitrogen fixing abilities providing system level benefits equivalent to 60-100 kg N/ha when grown properly. Peanut II CRSP focuses on improvements across the whole value chain: a) increasing agricultural productivity through farming systems and genetic improvement research; b) through processing and food safety technologies in order to provide the consumer and vulnerable groups (malnourished children, people living with AIDS) better nutrition and safer foods. Non-farm rural livelihoods are also addressed through the development of industries to add value to peanuts, improve and develop local markets and market access, and improve nutrition and food quality. The Peanut II CRSP addresses mycotoxins relevant to many staple foods to increase food safety developing countries, and to thereby improve public health- particularly reducing malnutrition and infectious disease rates (including HIV, tuberculosis and malaria). Almost all Africans are exposed to these natural food-borne toxins due to their food systems limitations.

DRY GRAIN PULSES CRSP (DGP)

The Pulse CRSP is strategically positioned to support FtF increased agriculture sector growth and improved nutritional status of infants and children in food insecure countries goals. Pulses (e.g., dry beans, cowpea, pigeon pea, lima bean) are nutrient-dense affordable staple foods that contribute to household food and nutritional security, and are high value cash crops in many FtF countries. Strategic Pulse CRSP research investments aligned with FtF priorities include: 1) improving agriculture productivity- deployment of biological controls for insect pests in cowpea, bean, and cowpea varieties with resistance to diseases and pests plus adaptation to drought and low soil fertility, and improvement of biological nitrogen fixation in bean cropping systems through the use of *Rhizobium* inoculants and integrated crop management strategies; 2) increasing access to nutritious foods-enhancement of the nutritional value of bean through processing, generation of new knowledge on the nutritional and health promoting attributes of cowpea, and the development of bean/cowpea and cereal-based foods for nutritional enhancement and the strengthening of immune systems in HIV+ children and; 3) expanding markets and trade-strengthened pulse value chains and studies of bean market structure and function for formulating improved policies in Southern African countries, and the development of markets for “Fair Trade” beans from Central America. The Pulse CRSP also supports the dissemination of quality-declared seed of improved cowpea and bean varieties developed through the CRSP to resource-poor farmers in West Africa, Latin America, and Haiti. Projected enhancements in crop productivity are expected to improve household food and nutritional security.

SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (SANREM) CRSP

The SANREM CRSP is developing sustainable conservation agriculture production systems to increase smallholder agricultural productivity and food security thereby supporting the FtF goal to sustainably reduce global hunger and poverty. SANREM’s multidisciplinary research program involves stakeholders at all levels and emphasizes gender and marginal group equity,

environmentally sustainable development, and improved livelihoods through increased agricultural productivity through the restoration of degraded agricultural soils. The SANREM CRSP currently works with eight U.S. universities and 34 host country universities, research institutes and NGOs. SANREM research seeks to improve agricultural productivity through the introduction of conservation agriculture production systems that increase yields, soil fertility, water holding capacity, and response to inputs. This effort also increases economic resilience in vulnerable rural communities by stabilizing higher levels of production despite climate change and drought stress. Applied SANREM research increases soil carbon sequestration to combat global warming, and provides other ecosystem services such as soil conservation, groundwater recharge, and flood mitigation. Technical Assistance, Institution-Building, and Capacity Development: SANREM projects support local farmer groups, private sector input and advisory services, NGOs, research and extension institutions, and universities through participatory research, short-term training in production and marketing practices, and human and institutional capacity building through long-term disciplinary training.

Engaging International Agriculture Science(EIAS)

Consistent with the perceived need for U.S. universities and colleges to expand international collaboration opportunities for students, faculty and staff noted above in the 2008 APLU survey of members, BIFAD established an MSI working group. With the support of APLU, BIFAD hosted a workshop in September 2010 to examine the relative strengths of the MSI community in addressing the needs of the underserved with FtF. The workshop also focused on the USAID Forward procurement reforms that could enhance opportunities for MSI engagement in international agricultural science networks through the strengthening of local level universities and colleges to meet the needs of their minority and underserved populations.

Program Support to Research (PS2R)

In Ethiopia, Prairie View University in Texas is implementing components of the Ethiopia Sheep and Goat Productivity Improvement Program (ESGPIP), crossing Dorper Sheep and Boer Goats with native sheep and goats of Ethiopia to increase meat yields, led by a MSI. Also, the Pastoralist Livelihoods Initiative (PLI) II project started in FY2009 to support livelihoods of current and former pastoralists. It has improved rangeland management practices and water points, supported income generation groups, and animal health service delivery.

In Kenya, the Tegemeo Agricultural Policy Research and Analysis (TAPRA) project completed analytical studies guiding the inter-ministerial Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit in coordinating the Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture and the 2009-2020 Agricultural Sector Development Strategy.

In India, Partnerships for Innovation and Knowledge in Agriculture (PIKA) program links two U.S. universities with partners in India to introduce technological innovations and share the latest scientific knowledge to raise agricultural productivity and value chain efficiency. One alliance including Mahindra & Mahindra, the Rajiv Gandhi Charitable Trust, and Tasty Bites exceeded its FY 2010 targets, enabling nearly 70,000 farmers to apply new technologies or management practices. The results included: improving dairy farming skills and milk yields of women's groups; expanding the range of agricultural services through one company's network of rural business hubs, including soil testing, management advisory services; and market linkages between farmer clusters and commercial bulk buyers. In FY 2010, another alliance among Tamil

Nadu State Agricultural University, Yes Bank, and others reached its target of 77,000 smallholder farmers with new technologies and management practices.

The Agricultural Biotechnology Support Project II (ABSP II) harnesses biotechnology to increase the productivity and sustainability of staple crops in Africa and Asia. In October 2009, India's Genetic Engineering Approval Committee approved USAID/India-funded *Bt* Brinjal, an improved eggplant variety. Final government approval for product release is pending. If cleared, *Bt* eggplant would be the first genetically modified food crop to be commercialized in India. Through ABSP II, other country partners are preparing to distribute pest-resistant eggplant varieties to resource-constrained farmers on a non-profit basis through existing university extension systems. ABSP II has also made significant progress in the development of pest resistant potato and banana.

In October 2009, the Food Security III project released a significant report detailing lessons from its twenty-five years of food security research, capacity building, and outreach in Africa. This report has been central to more informed country and regional food security programming by not only USAID but also other donors and stakeholders in responding to the global food crisis. The project also helped to build local research and policy capacity on trade and fertilizer policies. In East and Southern African, the project successfully promoted policy dialogue on barriers to trade and the effects of input subsidies, which will improve regional integration. In particular, the project provided vital assistance to the Common Market for East and Southern Africa in the preparation of the regional Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program Compact by identifying investment priorities and required policy reforms.

Also included in this category are the three Partnership for Food Industry (PFID) projects on fruits and vegetables (Michigan State University), natural products (Rutgers University), and meat, seafood, and poultry (Louisiana State University). The Fruit and Vegetable project, which closed in FY 2010, supported the development of products and services that created market linkages for the small-and medium-scale fruit and vegetable producer and strengthened institutional capacity and access to systematic information on agri-food market development. The Natural Products project partnered with NGOs and African universities (Stellenbosch University, South Africa; Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana, University of Dakar, Senegal) and the private sector to bring natural products to the market in Ghana, Malawi, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, and Zambia. The large majority of its 16,000 beneficiaries were African women. From 2004-2008, the program led to U.S.\$ 17 million worth of trade in new crops, the sustainable collection of indigenous African botanicals, and the development of new plant products. Louisiana State University implemented the project, which operated primarily in Southern Africa with partners including the World Food Logistics Organization and national universities in the region.

III. Looking Forward: Title XII–The Next Five Years

U.S. leadership in international development has been revitalized over the past two years. The President launched a first-ever Global Development Policy recognizing development as vital to U.S. national security interests, as well as a strategic, economic, and moral imperative for the United States. Simultaneously, the Department of State and USAID completed a Quadrennial

Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR) that assessed how these agencies can become more efficient, accountable, and effective in a world where rising powers, growing instability, and technological transformation create both new threats and new opportunities. The Global Development Policy and QDDR resulted in USAID program initiatives and operational reforms that will significantly impact Title XII programming through the next five years.

OUTLOOK IN RESPONSE TO USAID POLICY AND STRATEGY INITIATIVES

The outlook for USAID Title XII programming will be shaped by the U.S. development program initiatives and continuing program priorities.

Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative (GHFSI)

The GHFSI will be an important driver of Title XII programming over the next five years. Global competition between food and energy will continue to spur agricultural prices and greater volatility. Food aid will be a less viable option to address hunger as U.S. and global carryover stock levels dwindle and prices rise. As developing countries seek to become more self-reliant, USAID's Title XII programming will play a major role.

Higher education capacity development in the agriculture sciences will continue to be a priority investment in developing countries. USAID is collaborating with these countries to develop country implementation plans. BIFAD will coordinate the plans' reviews, identifying which countries and institutions would be candidates for Title XII investments. It will also provide a roster of Title XII universities and colleges and their public and private partners that could be available. The review results will be shared by the BIFAD Executive Secretariat with the countries and USAID missions.

Global CRSPs and Associate Awards will continue to play a critical role in support of FtF goals over the next five years. CRSPs will help to build the key collaborative public agricultural research networks between Title XII institutions and the National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) in the FtF focus countries. BIFAD will coordinate an evaluation of the current CRSP portfolio to ensure that the most important CRSP networks are included in the global/regional CRSP portfolio and that funding allocations are both effective and efficient. The evaluation will also include a robust inventory and examination of the Title XII public and private partners and the role they play to link the CRSP networks to the small farmer sector and underserved.

Title XII programs are an integral part of the FtF research strategy. Given limited resources, it will be important to ensure that research funded through Title XII institutions is closely aligned with the initiative. USAID and USDA have been executing a consultative process with BIFAD and APLU to define a strategic approach to agriculture research focused around sustainably reducing hunger and poverty. The consultative process has validated three themes: advancing the productivity frontier; transforming production systems; and enhancing nutrition and food safety. An important aspect of the research agenda will be focusing USAID interventions to transform production systems within geographic regions where malnutrition and poverty are concentrated. USAID will work with Title XII institutions and other key partners, to design research investments to develop and deliver high-impact innovations to smallholder farmers, particularly women, in these regions. The FtF research strategy is available at www.feedthefuture.gov/research.

Public agricultural research and development in large emerging economies such as India, Brazil, and South Africa are important to FtF focus countries, as well as to other agricultural developing countries because of their bilateral cooperation and direct foreign investment programs. Under FtF, increased Title XII university engagement in international agricultural science networks in these three countries will be examined to identify opportunities for tri-lateral cooperation on major agricultural challenges.

Global Health Initiative (GHI)

Integrating the Global Health Initiative goals with agricultural programming will be achieved through nutrition programming, especially nutrition extension, and possibly under agricultural extension, where field officers carry multiple and intersecting educational messages about farming, food, and health. The regional Title XII Nutrition CRSP will promote a new paradigm linking innovative agriculture and health strategies resulting in improved nutrition. Academic training of local universities and training institutions will improve host government technical capacities to deal with nutrition, food security and health problems. The program will also support high-quality, locally-owned research that will help enhance farmers' incomes, productivity and market participation, and also enhance the formulation and implementation of national policies and programs designed to improve nutritional outcomes. Other CRSPs programs (Hort, SMOG, Peanut II, and DGP) also feature nutritional outcomes. Indicators will be developed by the BIFAD Executive Secretariat with the support of the CRSP programs to reflect nutritional outcomes in Title XII programming. Title XII programming that contributes to agricultural value chain development can support nutritionally enhanced products and food safety issues.

Global Climate Change

Climate change is a rapidly developing global crisis that has already contributed to floods, droughts, and devastating storms- all of which increase poverty, foster instability, and hold back agricultural development and economic growth. USAID is finalizing a climate change and development strategy that addresses the climate challenge by committing new resources to mitigation and adaptation and the integration of climate change considerations into programming in climate-sensitive sectors, such as agriculture and water management. Support to mitigation approaches will likely include Title XII institutions and partners to create policy frameworks for market-based approaches to emission reduction and energy sector reform, sustainable management of forests and agricultural lands, and better carbon accounting systems.

Inclusive Private Sector Development

Successful agricultural development will include expanded education and training for women, small farmers, and underserved youth. Title XII programming investing in commercial agricultural and agro-industrial efforts will include performance measures indicators measuring the inclusion of and benefits to these populations. BIFAD, through its monitoring responsibilities, will increase attention on expanding the number of women participating in international agricultural science networks and reducing gender-based barriers to their involvement. Finally, for stable growth and development, more attention must be paid to underserved youth. Title XII programming will review opportunities for youth in associate level colleges and private, for-profit educational institutions.

Fragile and Conflict-Affected States

Three FtF Phase I countries have fragile economic and governance institutions: Haiti, Nepal, and Liberia. Other states are conflict-affected such as Afghanistan. In all cases, special Title XII investments can provide needed foundational programming to build (or rebuild) a strong public agriculture sector. The BIFAD Task Force on Haiti Reconstruction raised this issue in its report on Haiti. BIFAD, in coordination with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Service will review and report to the Bureau of Food Security on the adequacy of the public agricultural institutions in the three FtF countries and also will seek to upgrade the systems in conflict-affected countries.

OUTLOOK IN RESPONSE TO USAID OPERATIONAL REFORMS

The USAID reforms under USAID Forward also influence the USAID Title XII programming outlook. USAID FORWARD is a series of reforms that Administrator Rajiv Shah announced in fall 2010 as critical to achieving President Obama's vision of the United States as the global leader in international development. The initiative is an early outcome of the QDDR led by Secretary of State Clinton. USAID FORWARD will help modernize and strengthen USAID to meet the most pressing development challenges and work more efficiently towards its ultimate goal: creating a world without hunger or poverty in which the Agency and its programs are not needed.

The comprehensive package of reforms that comprise USAID FORWARD covers seven key areas: implementation and procurement reform, talent management, policy capacity, monitoring and evaluations, budget management, science and technology (S&T) and innovation. Under USAID FORWARD, USAID will change its business processes, contracting with and providing grants to more and varied local partners. Acquisition and assistance processes will be streamlined, with an increasing use of small businesses. Implementation agreements will include metrics for capacity building and use host country systems where appropriate.

In the first phase of FtF, investments focused on institutional capacity building in research, education, extension, and training to help countries implement their plans. It is USAID policy that missions use Title XII institutions, whenever possible, in capacity-building efforts.¹⁷ BIFAD will work with the Bureau for Food Security to review relevant policies and practices and update guidance as appropriate to assure effective and efficient implementation of this critical investment.

IV. Summary of BIFAD Activities in FY 2009 & FY 2010

From 2008-2010, BIFAD members included Robert Easter (Chair, University of Illinois), Catherine Bertini (Syracuse University), William DeLauder (Delaware State University), Elsa Murano (Texas A&M University), H.H. Barlow, III (Burkman Feeds and Dairyman), Tim Rabon (Mesa Verde Enterprises), and Keith W. Eckel (Eckel Farms, Inc.).

BIFAD's Charter describes specific duties, which frame the following discussion of the biennial period.

Participating in the formulation of basic policy, procedures, and criteria for proposed project review, selection, and monitoring

The U.S. government review and design process associated with the GHFSI and FtF initiatives included stakeholder consultations with BIFAD and Title XII universities and colleges. In late FY 2008, the first Conference of Deans entitled Higher Education report: A Critical Partner in Global Agricultural Development that BIFAD shared with USAID, State, and the USDA. In FY 2009, senior managers of USAID briefed the second Conference of Deans, discussing programmatic options report in Summary Report: Conference of Deans II. In late FY 2010, BIFAD hosted a workshop for Title XII MSI representatives where senior managers of USAID provided briefings on the status on FtF and USAID FORWARD. The results of the workshop can be reviewed in the workshop report entitled Expanding the Role of Minority Serving Institutions in the Work of USAID. All reports are available on the FACA Website at www.fido.gov/facadatabase

USAID initiated a whole-of-government revitalization of the role that science and technology (S&T) plays in foreign assistance. It launched this revitalization at a July 2010 conference, reported in *Transforming Development through Science, Technology and Innovation*. The BIFAD Chair participated in the conference and stressed the fundamental challenge of public sector capacity development to support increased S&T in developing countries. The new USAID S&T initiative, coupled with USAID FORWARD reforms, resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding between USAID and BIFAD to support a series of structured consultations to support USAID S&T programming, rebuilding policy capacity, and talent management through joint activities with Title XII institutions.

Developing and keeping a current roster of universities

Shifts in USAID agricultural programs motivated a call in late FY 2008 for establishing an updated and more useful roster of Title XII eligible institutions. The BIFAD Executive Secretariat in the Office of Development Partners initiated the process of rebuilding this roster. Working with APLU, it identified a list of approximately 200 eligible institutions that meet the Title XII legislative criteria for eligibility, using the Carnegie Basic Classification to characterize the eligible institutions as research universities, teaching universities, or associate degree colleges. Each category has its own strengths and challenges in addressing international agricultural development challenges under Title XII. The BIFAD secretariat is now developing an inventory instrument to determine which of the eligible institutions has both the desire and the capacity to engage in international development. A key aspect of this work is to clarify each institution's particular teaching, research, and extension/outreach advantage. When completed, the roster will be made available on the internet and will include a geospatial characterization of its U.S. domestic and international agricultural program coverage.

Recommending which developing nations could benefit from programs carried out under Title XII, and identifying those nations that have an interest in establishing or developing agricultural institutions

BIFAD initiated several different types of meetings and workshops to discuss the agricultural program needs in specific countries, which universities and their partners could effectively contribute. This included the following:

- On August 19, 2009, BIFAD and the APLU co-hosted a meeting to discuss university engagement in Afghanistan and organized a field visit with several university representatives to develop recommendations for new programming.
- On April 29, 2010, BIFAD held a workshop on rebuilding Haitian agricultural education systems

Assessing the impact of programs carried out under Title XII in solving agricultural problems and natural resource issues in developing nations

Under this category of responsibility, the BIFAD completed five major activities both in the U.S. and overseas:

- Board members (Easter, Barlow, and Rabon) traveled to Kenya, meeting with USAID Kenya Mission officials and visiting key program sites, including two Global Livestock CRSP activities. The assessment examined the potential for enhanced Title XII partnerships with local dairy cooperatives and expanded livestock activities. The trip was reported at the BIFAD Public Meeting (February 2009).

- A second Conference of Deans (COD) of Schools of Agriculture was held in July 2009 building on the success of the first meeting in April 2008. The COD II purpose was to: (1) identify opportunities to build strategic partnerships between colleges and universities and USAID in support of the new USG food security strategy; and (2) provide input into the design and development of new types of university-based programs to build human and institutional agricultural and science capacity in developing countries. More than half of the 68 attendees represented the university community and others included USAID, USDA and State Department staff. BIFAD took recommendations to share with USAID on strengthening the relationship between USAID and the U.S. university community.

- In response to the January 2010 earthquake in Haiti, BIFAD created a Task Force on U.S. University Engagement in the Reconstruction of Haitian Agriculture. Led by BIFAD member Elsa Murano, the group of USAID, USDA, and U.S. academics and practitioners met in Orlando, Florida in April 2010 to identify actionable, science-based approaches. The resulting report covered the research and extension characteristics needed to address Haiti's agricultural programming. Two task force members also traveled to Haiti to visit the country's agricultural system and met with USAID staff regarding agricultural programming.

- At the BIFAD meeting in March 2010, Board member William DeLauder moderated a panel of representatives from U.S. MSIs on their contributions to the international agricultural sector. BIFAD established a working group of MSI representatives to collaborate with USAID and other government agencies to explore enhanced engagement. The BIFAD hosted an MSI Workshop in September 2010, "Expanding the Work of Minority Serving Institutions in the Work of USAID." The workshop welcomed representatives from over 30 U.S. tribal, historically-black and Hispanic serving institutions. USAID representatives recognized the willingness of MSIs to further development efforts under USAID's Forward Reform initiative.

- Developing information exchanges and consulting with NGOs, consumer groups, agribusinesses, agricultural cooperatives and commodity groups, State departments of

agriculture, research and extension agencies, and academic institutions. The BIFAD held both executive and public meetings between FY 2008 and FY2010 (see Table 5). Agendas and many of the meeting documents, including presentations, are available on the USAID or the APLU websites.¹⁸

Investigating and resolving issues concerning the implementation of Title XII as requested by universities

- On October 17, 2008, BIFAD sent a formal letter to the USAID Acquisition and Assistance Ombudsman to request clarification on the final rule regarding prime contractor changes to established key subcontractors. The rule is that a prime contractor must notify USAID in advance for approval of changes, with no recourse to the affected subcontractor. The USAID formal response to the letter was presented at the July 29, 2009 BIFAD Public Meeting in a presentation entitled *Universities as Subcontractors—Update on Revision and Implementation*.
- CRSP representatives raised the issue of USAID technical capacity to participate substantively in approval of annual work plans under the “substantive involvement” clause of the CRSP agreements. While acknowledging that USAID’s agricultural technical capacity had diminished, BIFAD clarified that the clause holds, with concerns resolved on an individual basis.
- This category also includes the discussions held during the COD II (see Table 5).

Table 5: Summary of BIFAD Public Meetings and Workshops

Date	Location	Presentation Highlights
October 13-14, 2008	Des Moines, IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Meeting • Report on the Conference of Deans and White Paper (June 2008) • Global Food Price Crisis • Expanding U.S. university-USAID partnership • Agricultural Development and the Private Sector • The University Brain Trust
February 23-24, 2009	Washington, DC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Meeting • Report on BIFAD site visits in East Africa • New CRSPs in water, nutrition, horticulture, and livestock/climate change interactions • Planning for the Conference of Deans II (COD II) • Report on long-term training • Planning to implement the University Brain Trust
June 29-30, 2009	Arlington, VA	COD II meeting (see report <i>Building a Global Food Security Strategy: The Role of Higher Education in U.S. International Development</i>)
July 29, 2009	Washington, DC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Meeting • Report on COD II • USAID food security programming in Latin America • Several sessions on USAID partnerships with universities and other partners, including the private sector, in development • Update on Congressional efforts on agricultural and food security • Report on rice intensification production systems
August 19,	Washington,	BIFAD co-sponsored a workshop with USAID/Asia and Near East Bureau on

2009	DC	Land-grant and university engagement in Afghanistan
October 13, 2009	Des Moines, IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Meeting • Tribute to Norman Borlaug • Report on COD II • University role in civil-military collaboration • Update on the Africa-U.S. Higher Education Initiative • Critical Role of Minority Serving Institutions in Today's Complex Agricultural Development Environment
March 3, 2010	Washington, DC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Meeting • Dr. Gebisa Ejeta, the 2009 World Food Prize Laureate, on the Revitalization of Agricultural Sciences to Achieve Global Food Security • U.S. university engagement in Afghanistan • Updates on the Title XII report • Establishing a BIFAD Task Force on Haiti • Evaluation of USAID's Long Term Training programs
April 2010	Orlando, FL	BIFAD-Haiti Task Force Meeting
July 7, 2010	Washington, DC	Review of assessment of agricultural training in Iraq
Sept 29-30, 2010	Arlington, VA	BIFAD-MSI Workshop on Expanding the Work of Minority Serving Institutions in the Work of USAID (see report of same title)

Advising the Administrator on any and all issues as requested

At the request of the USAID Asia and Near East Bureau and the USDA Foreign Agricultural Service, BIFAD and APLU co-sponsored a day-long workshop on university engagement in Afghanistan. This meeting led to a field program assessment, which results BIFAD reported to the Acting Administrator of USAID, and other involved agencies. BIFAD/APLU advised that to sustain the near-term momentum of the USG strategy in Afghanistan, investment in Afghan human capacity is critical. Collaborative relationships between U.S. universities and others in the region must be strengthened to support Afghan higher education training, research and extension in addition to the support of the Ministry of Agriculture.

V. BIFAD Response on the FY 2009 & FY 2010 Title XII Report

The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development welcomes this biennial report and appreciates the tremendous time and effort put into it. The Board believes that the FY 2009 and FY 2010 Title XII Biennial Report provides useful information to Congress and the public on the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative – Feed the Future – and the important role Title XII and higher education have played in the Initiative.

While the Title XII legislation calls for an annual report to Congress, the Board agrees that in this case, taking a two-year horizon will provide the Congress a more complete picture of the new direction and reforms taking place in USAID and their impact on Title XII. In fact, the last two years have been a significant departure from the past.

In President Obama's dramatic address to the G-20 early in 2009, he called for a doubling of U.S. financial support for agricultural development in developing countries, to more than \$1

billion. The President pledged that the budget request for agriculture and food security would be part of a multi-year effort to renew U.S. leadership in providing food security and to galvanize an international partnership to cut global hunger. He also explained that a major focus of this bold new policy would be expanding development and use of modern technology, *working in collaboration with U.S. land-grant universities* (emphasis added) and strengthened host country research institutions.

The context of the Administration's efforts was the global food crisis of 2008, the spike in commodity and food prices and unrest in several countries critical to the U.S. The Administration chose to lead with a new global food security vision and proceed to make good on its promise to drive the policy and provide the resources. Title XII was passed in 1975 in a similar period of global food uncertainty and declining agricultural production. USAID, the World Bank and other major donors invested heavily in agriculture in the late-1970s throughout the 1980s, and agricultural productivity increased. Unfortunately, donors began redirecting investments to other sectors beginning in the 1990s, contributing to the food shortages which occurred in 2008.

In Title XII, Congress recognized the critical role of land grant and other colleges and universities in building human and institutional capacity, developing new knowledge and technologies, and transferring that knowledge to the user. Colleges and universities proved to be key USAID partners throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Long-term higher education degree training in U.S. universities has been one of USAID's most valuable investments to build institutional and human capacity in developing countries. Past generations of scientific, technical, and managerial counterparts trained in the U.S. have significantly enhanced their nation's development, while future leaders have built long-standing personal and professional relationships that are important to the U.S.

The Board is encouraged that the Administration has made agriculture one of three principal areas for its development policy, along with health and climate change. In fact, agriculture is an integral part of improving health, and of climate change mitigation. As the Biennial report points out, the Administration's Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review and its Global Development Policy, which the President articulated at the United Nations, lay the foundation for an agriculture-centric development strategy, and explain agriculture's importance to health and climate.

It is somewhat disappointing, then, to note in the report that while the renewed focus on agriculture has increased Title XII agricultural program funding substantially in absolute terms, it has actually *declined* as a percentage of total agricultural program funding. We hope that as Feed the Future becomes more deeply embedded in the Agency, and the new Food Security Bureau takes shape in driving policy, Title XII will again be seen as critical to accomplishing Agency priorities, with concomitant funding. We also hope that the Board's role in shaping the research component of Feed the Future will highlight the importance of Title XII funding to the research effort which is essential to the goals of Feed the Future.

The Biennial report discusses Administrator Shah's reform efforts, USAID Forward, which the Board views very positively. Title XII universities are obvious partners in helping the

Administrator implement his reforms. The procurement reforms will afford the Agency enhanced opportunities to leverage the intellectual resources of Title XII universities to rebuild USAID's technical capacity in agricultural science, technology and innovation, which serves as the foundation of sound development policy. We believe the Administrator should ensure that USAID Forward managers follow the model of Science Advisor Alex Dehgan, who has reached out to universities. The Board has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with his office to develop a framework for joint activities, in addition to the structured consultations pertaining to talent management, rebuilding policy capacity, and science and technology.

As made clear in the Biennial report, the Board has been active over the past several years. The Board's work in rebuilding Haiti's agricultural capacity, raising the profile of Minority Serving Institutions in USAID, bringing together Deans of Agriculture for two important conferences, developing new ways for USAID to leverage university assets in conflict states, improving USAID management of CRSPs, and proposing changes to protect university interests as subcontractors to prime contractors, all demonstrate the value of partnerships with Title XII institutions.

For the most part, these initiatives were generated by the Board itself, rather than being a product of dialogue with USAID leadership. We also note that much of the Feed the Future policy framework was developed with little consultation with BIFAD and the universities, key Agency stakeholders in global food security. BIFAD recently communicated to the agency the need for Feed the Future to focus greater attention on building human and institutional capacity, and on developing benchmarks for long-term goals. The Board also made the case for long term higher education degree training to be integrated into the Agency's Education Strategy.

Similarly, BIFAD asked the Administrator that Mission-originated Title XII Feed the Future RFAs conform to existing Agency policy that these competitions be reserved for Title XII institutions in lead roles rather than being open to for-profit contractors and NGOs. The relevant ADS states:

"Title XII activities must be carried out, insofar as possible and appropriate, by Title XII institutions, with any additional non-Title XII resources as may be needed, under sub-agreements. Missions must identify Title XII activities at an early stage in the development of a planned results framework."

We believe Feed the Future would benefit greatly by adherence to the ADS. This would also be consistent with the vision of Title XII, which authorized the President to provide assistance "to involve United States universities more fully in the international network of agricultural science" and to "utilize and strengthen the capabilities of US universities."

We recognize that for a good deal of the period covered by the report, USAID was without a confirmed Administrator. We have every reason to believe that Administrator Shah intends to use the Board more directly in pursuing his goals for the Agency. We welcome that challenge. However to do this, Dr. Shah will need to consider additional resources for the Board. The current budget is only sufficient to conduct BIFAD meetings; if the Board is to continue to sponsor workshops supporting USAID objectives, undertake in-depth studies of key issues, and carry out site visits, additional resources are needed.

The Board's success in the accomplishments noted above and in the Biennial report would not have occurred had the Board not been repositioned into the Office of Development Partners. The move has afforded the Board opportunities for engaging multiple bureaus and given it access to staff dedicated to maximizing the leverage of external partnerships.

Finally, we note that over the period of this report the relationship between USAID and the CRSPs continued to be less than desirable. The report does not mention that BIFAD spent considerable time with CRSP issues, because USAID did not meet previous agreements or attend to legitimate CRSP concerns. The Agency did not approve the CRSP guidelines to which it agreed in good faith negotiations with the CRSPs. This left unresolved issues regarding CRSP portfolio reviews, a water CRSP, and changes in the new Nutrition CRSP to ensure a strong research focus and adherence to the CRSP model. We do believe that the Bureau for Food Security recognizes the value of the CRSPs and will define a meaningful role for them as the Feed the Future research portfolio is developed and implemented.

This concludes BIFAD's separate views on the Biennial Title XII Report. In sum, both the Board and Title XII are much more relevant to the Agency today than they seemed five years ago. We are optimistic that Administrator Shah will build strong and lasting partnerships with Title XII institutions, and that as a result Feed the Future will yield increased global agricultural productivity, expanded rural incomes, reduced poverty, expanded economic growth and prosperity for those who have been without it for much too long.

GLOSSARY

Activity: An activity is the term applied to one Implementing Mechanism for one Program Element (among possibly many that this Implementing Mechanism could be working in. See the definition of "Project" below).

Agriculture: includes the science and practice of activities related to food, feed, and fiber production, processing, marketing, distribution, utilization, and trade, and also includes family and consumer sciences, nutrition, food science and engineering, agricultural economics and other social sciences, forestry, wildlife, fisheries, aquaculture, floriculture, veterinary medicine, and other environmental and natural resources sciences.

Program Areas: Program Area is a mutually exclusive and exhaustive category. This is a very broad level cut at the different segments of foreign assistance: for example, Health, Environment, or Counternarcotics. Program Areas can be funded by more than one appropriation account.

Program Elements: A Program Element is a category within a Program Area. Program Elements are mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories and reflect the different elements that make up a Program Area. An example would be HIV/AIDS within Health, Business Enabling Environment within Private Sector Competitiveness, or Alternative Development and Alternative Livelihoods within Counter Narcotics.

Program Sub-Elements: A Program Sub-Element is a category within a Program Element. Program Sub-Elements are mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories and reflect the different sub-elements that make up a Program Element. Examples include Preventing Mother-to-Child Transmission within HIV/AIDS, Property Rights within Business Enabling Environment, or Farmer/Community Group Support within Alternative Development and Alternative Livelihoods.

Project: A project is a structured undertaking of limited duration and broad scope. Through its component activities, a project mobilizes inputs such as commodities, technical assistance, training, or resource transfers in order to produce specific outputs that will contribute to achieving development results either within one or across several Program Elements or Program Areas. It is developed through the same administrative, analytical, and approval processes as a stand-alone activity. See the definition of “Activity” above.

ENDNOTES

¹ FtF focus countries experience chronic hunger and poverty in rural areas and are particularly vulnerable to food price shocks. At the same time, they currently demonstrate potential for rapid and sustainable agriculture-led growth, good governance, and opportunities for regional coordination through trade and other mechanisms. See <http://www.feedthefuture.gov/investment.html> for more information.

² See <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/basic.php>.

³ Title XII defines agriculture as “including the science and practice of activity related to food, feed, and fiber production, processing, marketing, distribution, utilization, and trade, and also includes family and consumer sciences, nutrition, food science and engineering, agricultural economics and other social sciences, forestry, wildlife, fisheries, aquaculture, floriculture, veterinary medicine, and other environmental and natural resources sciences.”

⁴ Section 300 of Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended reads as follows: “*The President shall transmit to the Congress, not later than September 1 of each year, a report detailing the activities carried out pursuant to this title during the preceding fiscal year and containing a projection of programs and activities to be conducted during the subsequent five fiscal years. Each report shall contain a summary of the activities of the Board established pursuant to section 298 of this title and may include the separate views of the Board with respect to any aspect of the programs conducted or proposed to be conducted under this title.*”

⁵ *International Development and Food Assistance Act*, Public Law 94-161, signed December 20, 1975.

⁶ *Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Improvement Act*, Public Law 106-373, signed October 27, 2000.

⁷ A “non-agricultural program purpose” refers to activities that are defined under the State Department’s Standardized Program Structure and Definitions (SDSP) under program areas other than 4.5 (agriculture). The SDSP is a categorization of State-USAID managed assistance; including a set of commonly agreed definitions on different program areas (see www.state.gov/organization/141836.pdf).

⁸ Section 296(d) of Title XII states: “*As used in this title, the term 'universities' means those colleges or universities in each State, territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, benefits under the Act of July 2, 1862 (known as the First Morrill Act) or the Act of August 30, 1890 (known as the Second Morrill Act), which are commonly known as 'land-grant' universities; institutions now designated or which may hereafter be designated as sea-grant colleges under the Act of October 15, 1966 (known as*

the National Sea Grant College and Program Act), which are commonly known as sea-grant colleges; Native American land-grant colleges as authorized under the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note); and other United States colleges and universities which -- (1) have demonstrable capacity in teaching, research, and extension (including outreach) activities in the agricultural sciences; and (2) can contribute effectively to the attainment of the objectives of this title.”

⁹ There are situations where USAID agricultural programming involves casual academic faculty and staff or associated professional and academic organizations, but in the absence of formal university or college participation these would not be considered Title XII activities. For example, when a contractor carrying out an agricultural value chain program hires a faculty member from a land-grant university to conduct a baseline study for the project it cannot be categorized as a Title XII activity.

¹⁰ Total Title XII funding estimates are based on FY 2008, FY 2009 and FY 2010 Obligations Data from USAID Phoenix Viewer Reports compiled by ODP/BIFAD.

¹¹ Johnson, Susan, David Wolking, and Montague Demment (eds.) “*Global Livestock CRPS Final Report 2010*” Davis, CA: University of California, Global Livestock CRSP.

¹² USAID FORWARD is a comprehensive package of reforms in seven key areas including implementation and procurement reforms. See <http://www.usaid.gov/press/factsheets/2010/fs101118.html> for additional information.

¹³ Following the Carnegie Categorization of Colleges and Universities.

¹⁴ Excerpted from CRSP Council, 2011, “*Collaborative Research Support Programs for the U.S. Feed the Future Plan.*” (unpublished draft).

¹⁵ The PEACE project was initiated under the Global Livestock CRSP program and was continued with other funding.

¹⁶ This is excerpted from CRSP FY 2009 & FY 2010 annual reports and project documents.

¹⁷ ADS 216.3.9 states that “Title XII activities must be carried out, insofar as possible and appropriate, by Title XII institutions, with any additional non-Title XII resources as may be needed, under sub-agreements. Missions must identify Title XII activities at an early stage in the development of a planned results framework.”

¹⁸ http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/agriculture/bifad/index.html or <https://www.aplu.org>.