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CHAIRPERSON DEATON: If I could have your attention, we will get started with the spring meeting of the Board on International Food and Agricultural Development.

And let me thank everyone from the public that are here with us today and take a moment to ask each of the BIFAD board members to introduce themselves, if they would.

Bill, can we begin with you?

DR. DELAUDER: Yes. Good morning. My name is Bill DeLauder and I'm -- my name is Bill DeLauder and I am President Emeritus of Delaware State University.

MS. BERTINI: I'm Catherine Bertini from Syracuse University.

MR. McVEY: Marty McVey from McVey and Company Investments, Houston, Texas.

DR. MURANO: Elsa Murano, Texas
A&M University and food safety, is my area of expertise.

DR. EJETA: Gebisa Ejeta, Purdue University.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: I'm Brady Deaton from the University of Missouri and chair of BIFAD. We also have with us today as someone we want to add a congratulatory note to, and that is Bob Easter, former chair of BIFAD and new president of the University of Illinois system.

Bob, congratulations.

We have a fast-moving agenda for parts of the day. It will give us ample time, however, to have interaction with you as well. And we will keep a running summary of where we are up on the board here, I think.

Does someone shift this separately? I have it -- I mashed my button here, but -- oh, there we are.

Well, you know, the paper copies of the agenda are available, and I think
everyone who needs those has them at this point. And let me take a moment.

        Susan, thank you, and Malcolm,
        Susan Owens and Malcolm Butler, who worked with us from USAID and APLU, respectively.
And the staff have been so wonderful in getting everything logistically done.

        Paula, thank you, especially, for your great work here.

        We have this morning highlights. Let me just review quickly. We will be covering old business, new business. We will have Feed the Future updates, BIFAD board member outreach reports, and then sessions on Higher Education Solutions Network. That is the development RFA that is out there.

        And then we will have two periods of opportunity for public comment this morning, and then in the afternoon. So, again, we want to encourage that interaction with you.

        A couple of items of old business,
just to bring everyone up to date on the work that BIFAD has been doing. Really, this goes back over more than even the past year.

But we had a human and institutional capacity building working group established in 2011. Gebisa Ejeta has chaired that group. And we are now reviewing a BIFAD future capacity, the future capacity development framework.

And we will be considering other BIFAD working group follow-ups as we look to the future. Gebisa, anything else you want to add on that?

DR. EJETA: No, I think that is fine.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Any other members of the board on any of these points? Interrupt me if I am moving too fast on them. I simply want to provide the public at large and our own sense together here of where we were on covering some of the issues we have been dealing with.
We also had, as you will recall --
and this goes back a couple of years to
BIFAD's work on Haiti, and a report was
submitted. Elsa Murano led that effort with
a trip to Haiti and focused on the tertiary
agricultural education in their report to
USAID.

And we now considering, I know,
additional follow-up activity in the food for
future, Feed the Future context. And Elsa,
let me turn to you for any comments you would
like to make.

DR. MURANO: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. The activity that we undertook on
Haiti, just a very, very brief background, was
on the heels of the earthquake in January of
2010.

And we put together a report that
we provided the administrator on how we think
the agency should physically marshall its
considerable human and other resources to
address some tremendous needs there in that
country.

We then received a briefing from the agency with regards to the kinds of activities that they were going to be undertaking.

There was some delay in getting those started for a variety of reasons not in the control of the agency, mainly political in the country of Haiti itself in getting their elections out of the way and new leadership in place and so forth.

So we are very eager, the Haiti task force within BIFAD is very eager to then do a follow-up trip, frankly, to Haiti to -- with agency representation to take us around and show us the kinds of activities that they are undertaking where they are in terms of progress.

Because we see Haiti as an example, a good model, if you will, a country that is in tremendous need. And if we can get things done there well in and efficient and
effective manner with good planning that is very well executed, then you can replicate that in many other parts of the world.

So we are excited about that and planning to see if we can, at least one or two of us from BIFAD and the task force might be able to go out there to Haiti and have the agency host us and show us the progress that they have been making first-hand.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Elsa, thank you very much. Any comments from anyone else on the board?

Thank you for your continued leadership on this effort as well. We are tracking now, thank you. So you have been following this.

Another item of old business has been our Minority Serving Institution working group that Bill DeLauder has led this group and has submitted to the administrator a report on the MSI engagement with USAID with recommendations for specific follow-up and
with steps to implement in a variety of areas. And consideration of workshops with stakeholders for communication engagements of a breadth of community institutions in the United States and various aspects of USAID work.

Bill, anything beyond that you would like to add?

DR. DELAUDE: Only, as you indicated, that we did -- the administrator did receive the report. He did respond to the report.

It was good to see that he recognized the value that minority serving institutions can bring to the work within USAID. So that was important and I understand that there is a group working within USAID to move forward on some of the recommendations.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Thank you.

Another item of old business that we are currently working on is the BIFAD award for scientific excellence and the USAID
Collaborative Research Support Program.

This arose from discussion with the CRSP directors a year ago at the World Food Prize meeting in Des Moines, Iowa. And consideration has been given to an annual award for a CRSP researcher and a graduate student.

And we have been discussing that criteria and we have, I believe, a resolution that Bill DeLauder has been chairing that committee effort.

And, Bill, thank you and let me turn to you.

DR. DeLAUDER: Okay, thank you, Brady. You have in your document, I think behind Tab 5, the document that has been presented for the program for the CRSP award.

And there is a resolution and time line. But let me just say at the outset that BIFAD is delighted that we have reinstituted this CRSP award. We understand the value of the CRSP and we want to be able to recognize
the outstanding work that individuals working within the CRSP have -- the work that they have done.

So if the award I think was last offered back in '99 or somewhere in that vicinity, so we are going to reinstitute it, hopefully with the approval of the board today and to move forward with this award.

We also have added a student award to this. It is not just an individual researcher. But we also want to honor a student either at the graduate level or at the undergraduate level.

The document -- and let me just say that my committee included -- Jo Luck and Bob Easter worked with me on this, plus we got some help from Mark Varner in his support. So I want to thank them for that assistance.

I did circulate the document to the board members to give them an opportunity to offer any suggestions before we formally bring it to the board for action, and so the...
document that you have now reflects all the
inputs that I have received.

And so, to determine if it is
appropriate, what I would like to do is to put
the resolution on the table. And then if
anyone has any unreadiness they can do it
after the resolution is on the table.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Bill, do you
want to -- should we read the resolution for
everyone at this point?

DR. DeLAUDER: Yes, I'm going to
read it.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay.

DR. DeLAUDER: So, Mr. Chairman, I
am going to move that we approve the following
resolution. It is a resolution to create the
Board for International Food and Agricultural
Development Awards for Scientific Excellence
in the United States Agency for International
Development Collaborative Research Support
Program.

And the parameter says: Whereas
the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) has the responsibility in its charter to assess the impact of programs carried out under Title 12 in solving agricultural problems and natural resources issues in developing nations.

And whereas one mechanism to assess this impact is provide an opportunity to review in greater detail the contributions made by researchers and students who work in a USAID collaborative research support program, resolution.

Therefore be it resolved that the BIFAD should create an award for scientific excellence in a USAID CRSP, that the award be given to former or active members of a CRSP in a researcher or graduate student category, and that the award be given annually.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay, so that is a formal motion in front of the board.
DR. DELAUDER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Do I hear a second to the motion?

DR. EJETA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Second. And let's open up for discussion. Since this was suggested and evaluated there have been award programs in the past many years ago, we discovered.

And it is consistent with -- it is interpreted as being consistent with the role of BIFAD in recognizing the scientific excellence and the interface between USAID and the higher education community as well.

MR. MCVEY: Question. How many awards? You said two, annually?

DR. DELAUDER: Yes, there would be one award for a researcher and one award for a student.

MR. MCVEY: And can you discuss some of the mechanisms on how the award is -- the designee is selected?
DR. DELAUDER: Well, it is included in the document that you have. But there will be an awards committee outside of the BIFAD that will be chosen by the chair of BIFAD with input from the members of BIFAD.

That committee then will evaluate the applications that are received, both for the researcher award as well as the student award. And then they will submit their recommendations based on the evaluation to the BIFAD Chair, to be reviewed by the BIFAD.

BIFAD itself will then made the recommendation for the awardee and officially it will be the Chair who actually will make the -- based on the input coming from BIFAD.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Bill, thank you. Other comments?

(No response).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay, are we ready for all those in favor of approving this resolution say aye.

(Chorus of ayes).
CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Any opposed?

(No response).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: The ayes have it.

Bill, thank you. Any -- yes?

DR. DELAUERDE: Yeah, the other thing I would like for the board to do is to approve the time line. And you have the last page behind Tab 5 gives a suggested time line, beginning with the day's action for approval of the resolution.

Our target is to be able to make a presentation of the award at our October -- at our October meeting that we usually have out at the World Food Prize.

So the time line indicates that we will begin next week to actually announce the award and to solicit nominations. And the time line does indicate when the committee will be put in place.

There is about a two-month period in order for individuals to get your
nominations in and then the recommendations come into -- to the BIFAD, final selection being made by the first of September.

And then the presentation has to be made in mid October. So one of the things that we will need to decide -- and we can do this a little later -- is what will be the nature of the -- of the award.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Right.

DR. DELAUDER: So, Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the time line.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay, the time line, there would be nominations through the 15th of June. And then, as you indicated, the recipients announced by the first of September.

DR. DELAUDER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: So that puts us on a pretty fast track and --

DR. DELAUDER: Well, we wanted to do it --

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: But that's
what --

DR. DELAUDER: We wanted to do it
this year, so --

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Right.

DR. DELAUDER: -- that's what. I
think we can do it.

MR. McVEY: I have a question.

Since this is such an aggressive time line,
how do you propose getting that out to folks
to know about it --

DR. DELAUDER: Yeah, well--

MR. McVEY: -- to make
application?

DR. DELAUDER: Well, next week,
since the board has already approved it and if
you approve the time line, we use aplu, who
has linkages with all of the folks out there,
particularly the anything deans, the
international people, and so forth.
And they will assist us in making
that communication. I assume also that it
will be posted on the website of USAID. So we
have a communication link with the folks out there in order to get this out.

We also will get it out to all the CRSP directors, as well.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: I was going to say, the CRSP directors --

DR. DELAUDER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: -- who of course are in town this week.

DR. DELAUDER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: And we'll touch on that in just a moment.

DR. DELAUDER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: But that provides a really great network --

DR. DELAUDER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: -- for getting the word out immediately.

DR. DELAUDER: Absolutely. So we have a multidimensional way that we can get the -- that we will get the word out.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay, the
motion is -- we have a separate motion, I believe, on the time line.

DR. DELAUDER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Any other?

Do we have a motion to approve the time line?

DR. MURANO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Motion has been seconded. Any further discussion of the time line itself?

(No response).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: All in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Any opposed?

No?

(No response).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay, again, Bill, thank you for your leadership on this. And I know to many in the research community it will be a welcome, welcome move to make.

And we are aware that it is going to require some logistical work on all of our
parts to expedite this on staffing, staff support.

But it is something that within a university context we are very -- we do these a lot, in a lot of different ways. So it will probably move a little faster, maybe, than -- than some have anticipated.

Okay, thank you very much. And that is an important item on the agenda for action and one that we are pleased to see move on.

The next item of new business -- yes, it is attracting there, I believe. Earlier, I was looking at the portable down here. It was working fine, but we didn't have it on this screen. So now I think we have got it all in sync. So thanks very much for the work there.

We wanted to move to another item of new business. It is a very important item and I will be introducing some people here associated with it. And that is the study of
the CRSP system, the Collaborative Research Support Program, that is very familiar to BIFAD USAID.

And communications with Raj Shah last year at the APLU meeting, he suggested that BIFAD take the ownership of a formative review of the CRSP program.

This has been suggested a number of times, has been even proposed in legislation, I believe, at one point that we simply need to take a comprehensive look in addition to the individual evaluations that occur with each of the CRSP.

Here we wanted to find whether there's new ways of gaining efficiency, of ensuring alignment with the Feed the Future initiatives, and in a sense capturing the best of science and ensuring it is being applied in the field.

And as we talk later this morning about some of us who have been involved in the inception workshops and CRSP reviews, I think
we can give you some really interesting examples of how that linkage is occurring.

CRSPs have been doing this for some time in a variety of ways and as the emphasis has been made to us, there is no single CRSP model. There a lot of different approaches being taken by the Collaborative Research Support Programs.

So let's find a way of looking at those and seeing we can gain administrative power and synergy and leverage to use vague terms that actually do mean a lot in the end, even though they sound like rhetoric at times.

So we took that quite seriously. BIFAD embraced it immediately as a board and we set about identifying a team of evaluators who could effectively undertake this task in a very short order because Administrator Shah had hoped that we could complete this review by the next fiscal year, July 1 of 2012.

And this began really back in January and February, so it has been on a fast
track. And that was a challenge itself. But we put together a study team that is here with us today.

And I want to introduce these individuals and give them great thanks from BIFAD for sure. And Robert Jones, executive vice president at the University of Minnesota is leading the team.

Robert, thank you very much for your work on this effort.

With him is David Sammons from the University of Florida, Barbara Stoecker from Oklahoma State University, Derek Byerlee, who is a consultant and has been with the CGIAR system as well for many years.

Derek, thank you.

Carol Kramer-LeBlanc is an independent consultant and Karen Brown, also at the University of Minnesota in international program work.

And each of these individuals brings a tremendous expertise. They are very
well respected in the roles they play and it is a team that has moved very rapidly to pull together, get themselves organized to look into the different dimensions of the CRSP initiative and develop a time line that will enable them in early May to meet at the University of Minnesota.

They have been here this week interviewing all. They met with the CRSP directors and had a number of individual interviews with a variety of stake holders involved with CRSP program development and implementations, and including private sector, international agencies, various governmental agencies and university personnel.

Robert, anything you would like to add to that, please feel free to do so. I just wanted to sort of give an overview.

But if you feel I have covered that adequately, then let me again thank you because we will then -- the report will be completed by the review team and submitted to
BIFAD by early June.

    Did I get that right? Yes, early June in time for BIFAD to be able to make a review and submit it to the administrator.

    Dr. Shah has asked for a personal sit-down on this topic, so we will be organizing that later in June as well to ensure that he is well-informed on all aspects of this study.

    And of course the CRSP directors were in town earlier this week, as I indicated, and we spent time with them. Many of us did yesterday and had a great deal of interaction.

    And we want maximum input from all parties.

    And we are excited about the study because it is the kind of initiative that we feel BIFAD can move ahead with, in concert with USAID's interest in making appropriate modifications as needed to ensure the maximum impact of today's science on field world, alignment with USAID missions in countries
around the world, and particularly with the Feed the Future. It clearly has some implications also for the initiative and development that we will be talking about with the educational work of USAID later on this morning. So, Robert, again, and the team, thanks very much.

The new business is board recommendations on focus areas for BIFAD engagement. And we have had in a retreat in Little Rock earlier this year, as well as at earlier meetings we have had this past year, extensive discussion among the board about new initiatives that we perhaps should be working with, and with USAID on.

And what -- and looking -- trying to look to the future at focus areas that are critically important, and I know one. We have talked about several.

One that we discussed at some length yesterday in our executive board
meeting yesterday afternoon was the issue of agriculture, nutrition and health concerns.

And let me just open this up to the board for discussion because it is at this point at a very general level but one we want to take a few minutes to address, and perhaps other ideas that you might want to bring forward.

So with that, Elsa?

DR. MURANO: I'll start. Dr. Ejeta I know has a lot of great thoughts about this topic. But it really comes from just a sense that obviously agriculture is at the root -- pardon the pun -- of what we are wanting to do in development in these countries, these areas of the world that need it so much and all that agriculture means.

But the connection between agriculture and health has always been important and is even more important now. And there has been a recognition of this by the agency and by other entities in terms of
injecting human nutrition into the mix.

And we absolutely agree with that and welcome that and are supportive of it.

But health goes even beyond that in terms of what the effects of agriculture and good qualify food and nutrition can have on so many other aspects of health.

So we are wanting to explore how we can better connect the influence of agriculture, food production, food processing, frankly, post-harvest, which is something that we sometimes ignore a little bit, and on how that impacts health in a myriad of ways.

And so we haven't quite identified all the nuts and bolts of what we want to do. We are thinking about it still, whether BIFAD wants to engage in posting any of kind of a meeting or just engaging with various groups that are thinking about these things as well and kind of gathering what is the consensus of where we are in the state of the science in this area.
So we are not sure exactly what manifestation our activities will take. But this is still in the thought process, but very important to us as we recognize that.

You know, to a lot of people, when they think of agriculture they don't necessarily think health; and they need to.

Dr. Ejeta?

DR. EJETA: Yes, just a little bit. I think several organizations have been thinking about this and some have put up major conferences.

Within the CG system, International Food and Policy Research conducted a policy-oriented dimension of this issue in India about a year ago and held a major conference there.

And very recently, among others, a totally different dimension in a way that the health units were not involved in much of this discussion in a more significant way.

Just recently about a month ago I
participated in a conference at the Welcome
Trust in England in connection with NIH and
CDC, put together a small group of people.

About 30 people called together to
look specifically about how one would address
those research, integrated research in what
brings about environmental change,
agriculture, food and nutrition and health to
addressing specific and watershed problems and
livelihood issues in developing countries.

And so we thought maybe this may
be an area where the agency could provide
leadership in development and the whole of
USAID concept, particularly with under the
current administrator this may be something
that we may get a greater advocacy done right
because of his background and his experience
in both agriculture and health.

And so we thought maybe we would
think about it. As Dr. Murano said, we
haven't had time to be very specific about the
kind of dimension that we would take up on
As you can see, it is a very broad area. But perhaps if we could find a niche in which USAID could provide that leadership, it may be an important agenda.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Other comments? Catherine?

MS. BERTINI: Thank you. Yes, and I understand USAID is looking into some of these issues. So perhaps we can have some dialogue with them about it.

And to add to the list, the U.N. had a conference in September, I think, on these broad topics. And Skaggo Council (phonetic) did a review on non-communicable diseases and the connections of agriculture to health.

And I think we see it in our own Farm Bill Crops Act with that now about to be reviewed and the issues of whether or not our agriculture policy domestically has any relation whatsoever to our health policy, and
whether it should.

And then finally, I think in the field there are a lot of connections that USAID and others in the field are already making in order to connect agriculture and health, especially with the generous funding that goes to PEPFAR and other health-related programs from a U.S. perspective and from others through NGOs.

And already I think there's a lot of people making connections in this area. So we might want to learn from some of the things that are already being done, I mean, actually in the field.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Anyone else? Bill?

DR. DELAUDE: I would just indicate one of the things I, you know, continue to think is extremely important, is HICD. And I know that we have a group that has been working on that.

But I am hoping as we go forward...
that we can make a lot more progress in trying to address some of the issues that are important in terms of institutional and human capacity developments.

Because in most of these developing countries, to me that is one of the key to their own further development and particularly in becoming more self-sufficient that they build their own capacity to be able to do the things that they need to do to better the people of that country.

So HICD is something that I think -- I hope that we keep on, on the table and that we can make some progress in trying to address that.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Those of us in universities that have medical schools as well as colleges of agriculture or food and natural resources and in life science work generally, the interdisciplinary nature of what we are doing and the need to move out of the -- any academic silos that have been
created is there.

And certainly I think it is fair to say that has occurred in the medical profession as well as anywhere, and higher education. And we have been really placing a great deal of emphasis on working together on the research side.

And we need to do a lot more on the educational and outreach components of what we do. So I can see how higher education could make a tremendous important -- could make a tremendous contribution to USAID thinking and implementation.

And it fits, as Catherine said a moment ago, so much of what we are doing with our own domestic programs, the farm bill and the need to encompass a breadth of thinking about what impact all these programs are really having on the quality of life that we are trying to work with in our society and internationally.

And we find that -- I hear from
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people from time to time. They are surprised
that other countries who may have -- be
challenged with lower incomes than the United
States nevertheless are very committed to a
healthy lifestyle and are making very
important choices to integrate what we are
doing on the production and nutrition side
with a whole health approach.

So there's many dimensions of
this. And in fact, USAID 20 or 30 years ago,
40 years ago, were addressing -- has been
addressing some of these issues.

And there's segments of the
academic community that have been working with
them on both the production and the nutrition
side that brings in the medical components and
health effects in new ways.

And of course clearly epidemiology
has made tremendous contributions in these
areas, and a number of other health-related
research areas.

And we simply need to point to
ways in which we can integrate, pull together, and make relevant the programming, as I see it. So to me, there is almost a "sky is the limit" on the potential contribution that could be made in this area.

But at this time, just to double-check with my colleagues here, we have nothing specific in place at this point but it is an item that we want to look at, take action on, and perhaps should be considering a more refined, strategic approach that we might take as a group to address this issue.

Other comments or observations?

DR. MURANO: Just to support Dr. DeLauder, capacity building cannot be, you know, set aside, if you will. We have got so much work to do there.

And so many people who work in this area will tell you that that is what makes the biggest difference in these developing countries on the long term.

We tend to do a lot of shorter
term kinds of projects and interventions, but it is on that long term that we are going to really make a big difference. And it is the capacity building that is going to get us there, as difficult and kind of challenging as it can be at times.

But if we don't focus on that, we are never going to make the big, fundamental impacts that we need to make in some of these countries. So I completely agree with him that we have got to not -- we have to keep our eye on this.

And we have to try to come -- develop better ways to leverage our resources, not just in terms of AID's resources but USDA, who is doing a lot of capacity building in some other places.

Some other areas that I think we can all work together better to use all these resources to improve the capacity of a lot of these countries, not only people capacities, but obviously institutional.
CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Is there any thinking about specific action that we should take as a board at this time? Or are we comfortable with -- well, we all -- we have been thinking about this, especially we will be exploring it and discussing it further for sure.

And perhaps that is the next step unless you have some real specific ideas about?

DR. EJETA: Which one? The new initiative on agriculture, food and nutrition and health, or HICD?

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Well, I was thinking specifically of the new initiative on health, but would be open to any integration to other areas if you felt that was related to -- specifically to human institutional capacity building.

DR. EJETA: Well, as the chair of the subcommittee looking at HICD, I opted not to report anything because we didn't have
anything definitive to share and publish.

But I think I appreciate the
support of the board members in accentuating
the importance of HICD both for the principles
of development and USAID's mission in that
area.

I think the narrative about the
importance of HICD has got broad acceptance
and appreciation within the agency and outside
the agency and I think we are in the middle of
having a dialogue with folks in the agency in
terms of finding how to go about it.

And I think there would be a
presentation from the Bureau of Food Security
today and we will have discussions. And I
have no doubt we will come into terms on how
best to get on in getting it done.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay, thank
you. Any other comments on this issue or
other issues? We focused on the health and
agricultural interface here. Are there other
ideas that you want to bring up in terms of
major focus areas that we should be emphasizing?

I know the issue of water has been a big issue that we have talked about from time to time and it is those kinds of all-encompassing topics that have captured a lot of our attention from time to time, and water being one of those because of the critical nature of water in the world today.

And are we doing all the right things to ensure that it is being addressed scientifically, the critical nature of it with regard to programming in terms of various countries of the world and different ecosystems.

So, other issues? If not, let me -- we will move on then to -- I think the other item you see on the board up there is simply calling your attention as members of the public that we, as BIFAD, are open to your ideas.

Any recommendations of topics that
you feel ought to be, that BIFAD should be thinking about considering as appropriate with its charge of giving advice to the administrative USAID under Title XII.

We are open to ideas and you can submit them to the secretary. Susan Owens will take those at any time. And I think most people in the room are aware of Susan and that office and Malcolm Butler and APLU.

A lot of university people particularly work that way. So if there are ideas simmering out there that you think, my God, BIFAD is just missing this whole thing, well, let us know.

We are open to those. This is a group that has really pulled together and worked very hard over the last year to not only communicate clearly with Administrator Shah, but to work with staff and to work with each other to ensure that we are trying to gain the most effective interface possible between higher education, scientific learning
and what is happening in the field as USAID undertakes its mission.

And so, we are open to ideas. We don't want them to simmer. And I know I had at least one suggestion came up earlier before the meeting today. And we want to absorb those and sort through them and then take the action that we feel is necessary.

We are going to move in just a moment to the Feed the Future update. And if Paul Weisenfeld and Julie Howard are here at this time so -- ah, we are. So no need to -- I was going to have another great story I was going to fill in with if we had time.

But if you are here we will go ahead. No, no, I'll do it later. We've got plenty of time. I do want to allow time, ample time for the program that we have and the agenda, discussion with BIFAD board and then open comments from you as well.

So with that, we will turn to the next item on the agenda, which is the Feed the
Future update. We have two individuals who will be -- okay. And I can always tell my story, too.

So I will -- no, I was going to in the spirit of what we are about at BIFAD I was simply going to relate to this group the wonderful visit I had with Paul Findley, who is one of the authors of Title XII, sponsored it in the House along with Senator Hubert Humphrey in the Senate.

And he lives in Jacksonville, Illinois, so with my good friend from Lincoln University in Missouri, Iqbal Choudhary, we jumped in the car and decided it was worth a day to this icon who has contributed so much to international policy in the United States.

So many of you are familiar with him and his career, books that he has written. He is still very active, 90 years old, going strong, writing his memoirs, and still a very acute observer of everything USAID is doing as well as our foreign policy generally.
So we had a very exciting session. And he sends his regards. And we invited him in fact to be here to say a few words to BIFAD and the public.

He could not make it this time, but we have more or less an open invitation. So whenever his time schedule permits we will have time for him on -- with the board. So I think it is well worth our time.

So, Paul, that was my story. But it was such a wonderful personal experience I just had to share that because it was really worthwhile.

Catherine?

MS. BERTINI: If we are waiting for Julie, I want to match your story with a visit to George McGovern recently, who will be 90 in July and whose big mission is: What more can I do to ensure that every child in the world has a meal in school? And he is still working it.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Wonderful.
Anyone else? Well, these kinds of reflections are great. I had just recently seen George McGovern on a film, in fact, on his farm and so it brought back -- did bring back a lot of memories.

Okay, we will go ahead then with the next part of the program. And let me just take a moment to introduce Paul Weisenfeld, and he and Julie Howard will address the issue of the update -- an update on Feed the Future.

Paul is assistant to the administrator of USAID and director of the Bureau for Food Security, which is the agency that leads President Obama's Feed the Future initiative.

And in this capacity he is responsible for overseeing the agency's technical and regional expertise, focusing -- focused on improving food security and reducing persistent rural poverty.

Paul has served for 20 years at USAID and four overseas posts and in
Washington, D.C. and was recently promoted to career minister, the agency's highest rank.

And let me say what I said to our CRSP directors and others yesterday. I had just read an article of Paul's in the Foreign Service Journal that I thought was just very profound and addressed this topic and I have been using it as resource material in all the talks I have been giving around the country.

So I commend it to you for your review as well. Paul, thank you for being with us and we are looking forward to your update.

MR. WEISENFELD: Thanks very much, Brady, and thanks to the BIFAD board. Really would like to welcome them and thank them for inviting us here today.

And the mic works fine, and welcome all of our friends and partners who are here, including the CRSP review team and including the directors and staff of CRSP programs as well.
I should also say I want to thank the BIFAD board for their advocacy efforts for their recent travel to countries, and the advice that they are giving us.

We are really excited about the revitalization of BIFAD and the renewed energy and the interest and detailed advice that they are giving us to help us really think, as Brady said, how to use the best of science and the best of human institutional capacity building to improve what we are doing and achieve our goals.

I want to give just a general update of Feed the Future and the Julie is going to talk more specifically about human and institutional capacity development.

I think people know in general two words on Feed the Future and if there is anyone in the room who doesn't know that much about it, it is the President's global hunger and food security initiative.

It was really launched in 2009 at
the G8 Summit in L'Aquila, Italy. And the
issue that it was dealing with was: We know
that the United States has a longstanding
commitment to provide food aid when we see
crises like in the last year the crisis in the
Horn of Africa.

And there is a commitment that is
a deeply American commitment. The American
people want us to do it and the U.S.
Government has this longstanding commitment to
feed the hungry so that they don't starve.

But there was a real recognition
in that summit in 2009 following the food
price hikes of 2007, 2008. There was an
enormous missing piece that we were not
helping countries grow their agricultural
economies so that we could prevent those kinds
of crises.

And that, as well at the time
there was research out of the World Bank, out
of the FAO, that really showed that you can --
the best way to lift people out of hunger and
have an impact on poverty reduction was through agricultural development and stimulating agriculture.

Not only because significant portions -- I think it is 43 percent, but don't quote me on that -- of the rural poor, of the poor in the developing world are engaged in the agricultural economy.

So there was this increased focus on agricultural development and in a way that improves nutritional outcomes as Elsa and others and Catherine were talking about.

A real focus on not just lifting people out of poverty, but making sure that we are reducing hunger. So that is the background of Feed the Future.

The pledge was $3.5 billion. So to talk for a couple of minutes about money. The President pledged $3.5 billion over three years.

Through our last -- because we do our funding on a quarterly basis, we don't
have the latest figures, through December 2011 the U.S. had committed $2.68 billion, fully on track to reach the President's pledge.

We expect to meet that pledge completely with our 2012 allocation. We haven't gotten our 2012 budget yet. So in a sense, one could say that the President's pledge is over.

But if you look at the 2013 budget request that was submitted, the President's budget request is $1.2 billion. Our 2012 budget is $968 million.

So what we are seeing is an increase. And this, for us, shows that the Administration's commitment to deal with these issues and improve security and nutrition lasts well beyond the L'Aquila Pledge.

And we expect to continue to request significant levels. And in a constrained budget environment to see an increase of about 3 percent from 12 to 13 we think is a remarkable achievement and shows
the Administration's commitment to this area.

To talk about what has happened, what we have done with our resources, over the last year there was a lot of effort focused on strategic planning. One of the principal approaches that we have followed is enshrined in the Rome Principles.

The Rome Principles were the principles that were issued in the 2009 G8 summit, and the first principle was about country-owned plans.

So we took that very seriously and spent resources, financial resources and significant time of our staff in helping to develop country-owned plans.

In Africa, the people know CAADP, the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program, which really led the way in developing these country investment plans, country-owned plans, and how countries were going to use their resources to stimulate agricultural production and lay out a strategy
that donors could buy into.

So we spent significant time doing that. And then we built our own strategies based on those country-owned plans. So that was an effort that took the better part of a year.

And we finished strategy in 24 countries and regional programs, three regional programs: East Africa, West Africa -- actually, East Africa, West Africa, Central America, and Asia; so, four regional programs.

The second big accomplishment that happened over the first year was the U.S. is one of the founding partners -- or inaugural donors, I should say -- of the Global Agricultural and Food Security Program, which is an enormous effort to stand up at a global level.

A fund that can continue to provide resources to developing countries, it is managed by the World Bank. Our commitment or the funds we have allocated so far is $481
million -- no, sorry, I'm reading the wrong figure.

We have allocated, I think it is 475 out of the total. The GAFSP, as it is called the Global Agricultural and Fruit Security Program has allocated $481 million to 12 countries so far, eight of which are countries that we have helped.

And the real benefit of that is, there are donors who don't have the bilateral presence that we have and they don't have the ability to go into countries and implement programs.

And they are looking for tools and resources that they can use. They are committed to these areas but they want to have an avenue where they can easily provide funding.

So this global fund has allowed us, the U.S. Government, to show leadership on the global stage and attract resources from a wide range of donors. So we are really
thrilled about that.

Another kind of over-arching theme that we are proud of over the last year is our efforts to stimulate partnerships with new partners.

We recognize that the challenges are significant, and as much as the U.S. Government's resources are significant, we can't solve all of this ourselves. So we are looking for partnerships with NGOs, with universities, U.S. universities, local universities and the private sector.

I think what we have seen over the past years is, it is not just donor resources that do the job, but we have to find a way to crowd in private sector resources in a significant way to bring sustainability and to bring markets for small holder farmers.

So we have spent -- we have spent -- we have put up an office dedicated to creating public-private partnerships in the agricultural sector, and have put together
what we think of as some signature partnerships.

The most recent one is with the World Cocoa Foundation and the Sustainable Trade Initiative to improve cocoa production, quality, quantity in West African countries.

And it is a partnership that includes Cargill, Hershey Company, Kraft Foods, Nestle, Lindt and Mars, among others. So that kind of partnership for us is exciting.

To get the backing and marketing expertise that private sector companies focus on improving small holder farmer quality we think is a great -- a great achievement and something we want to continue to replicate.

Another kind of over-arching result that we are proud of is our focus on monitoring and evaluation. Donors have played around with monitoring and evaluation for a number of years and some of it has resulted in a lot of bean counting.
And bean counting for accounting purposes is always necessary. We can't get away from counting how many people we train, but we have tried to be very rigorous about setting up the monitoring and evaluation system that cascades indicators up, starting with how many people were trained and concluding with what was the impact of the intervention.

So all of our activities cascade up to two high-level indicators: reducing poverty and reducing malnutrition. And that is -- it sounds simple, but it actually is something that is very new and innovative for USAID, to focus all of the efforts in one sector just on two indicators solely.

So when we make decisions on program funding, when we make decisions on assessing the quality of programs, we are just looking at the impact on those two indicators. And we think that is a nice innovation.

As part of this, as we were
establishing our monitoring results framework and consulted with NGOs, what we heard over and over was the importance of women. And if you do, anyone who looks at the literature also hears about the importance of women worldwide.

In developing countries, women make up about 43 percent of the agricultural labor force. In some African countries it exceeds 50 percent. And donors have had rhetoric about the importance of empowering women for a long time.

So our team tried to think about what does that really mean in agriculture and how do we know that we are doing it? Instead of just talking about it, instead of just trying programs that we think are going to empower women, how do we measure it?

So as part of our monitoring framework we created a tool that we found out after we started to get into it has never existed before in the development community,
created a women's empowerment and agricultural
index that I had the pleasure of launching
with Administrator Shah at the Committee on
the Status of Women at the U.N. last month.

It really has taken the donor
community by storm because no one has done
this kind of thing before. It separates out
into five areas what do we think women's
empowerment means?

Looking at how they spend their
time, who has control over resources, who has
decisions over planting crops? What the
parity is -- and this is the really unique
part because no one has done this before --
looking at parity of empowerment between women
and men in the same household.

And it comes up to a quantifiable
index where we can say are women empowered or
not and are they moving towards greater
empowerment as a result of our intervention?

Again, I think I am saying this
for the fourth time, no one has done this
before so we are excited about the data that this is going to generate. And it is a public good.

So we are trying to talk about it as much as we can to see if other donors or institutions will take this index and apply it more broadly than our researchers will allow us to, so that over the coming years we will start to generate a real wealth of information on what does women's empowerment really mean in the agriculture sector.

And then hopefully people can apply it to other sectors as well. Just as a quick reference, we have continued to invest in the Borlaug 21st Century Leadership Program, which we think is an important effort on human and institutional capacity development.

But Julie is going to go into that area in detail, so I won't talk about that. And I think that is going to be an important focus of ours -- Julie Howard, I should say --
in the coming year.

A couple of quick examples at the country level, because all of this doesn't mean anything unless you are having results and impact at the country level to change people's lives.

And we are starting to see that, and even though kind of a conversation we have with Congress all the time is, the President made a pledge in 2009 and Congress first started to appropriate money for this in 2010, which we got at the end of 2010.

And people think: Okay, where are the results? I think everyone knows that you have to spend time figuring out how to invest the resources to make sure that it makes sense.

That requires analyses, conversations with our partners governments to make sure that we are in sync with them. But now we are at the point where we are starting to generate real results. We are excited.
Ghana is one of our critical focus countries in Africa and Ghana provides examples of a couple of successes that are things that we are highlighting in our approach.

We know that if you want to have sustainable increases in agricultural production and reducing poverty, you have to connect people to markets. So our mission in Ghana has done a great job looking at market connections between farmers' groups and buyers of produce.

Premium Foods in Ghana is a private Ghanaian company that is the largest purchaser of grains in the country. And they have signed up to a partnership with us where they are buying grains from farmers' groups right now after the year in the numbers of thousands of farmers.

And we are trying to expand that to tens of thousands of farmers with them and replicate that with other buyers of grain. So
we are already seeing increases in income
there because of these stable contracts that
farmers' groups are having to get their grain
out.

I visited Ghana and the head of
Premium Foods told me that their processing
plants have unused capacity and he wasn't
sure, he thought they could triple, quadruple
easily, and not even approach their capacity.

And they are searching to buy
grain from outside of Ghana, and of course our
focus is: How do we ensure that Ghanaian
farmers can supply this market that is already
there, and in that way improve their incomes
and reduce their hunger?

Ghana also provides a really good
example of what we are doing on impact
evaluation. I talked about the indicators
that we are doing in the women's empowerment
index, but as part of our monitoring framework
we are setting up a whole series of longer
term impact evaluations to generate more in-
depth knowledge and learning about what is going on here.

So we talk about the importance of integrating nutrition and agriculture a lot. And one of the innovations of Feed the Future is -- I forget if it was Catherine or Elsa -- talked about integrating health and agricultural programming.

So Feed the Future, by design, is intended to integrate ag and nutrition programming. And if you look the strategies we have put up on the Web, you can see how we have thought about that and we have tried to make an effort to do that.

It is also innovative. But we want to study what does that really mean and what is the real impact. So one of the impact evaluations we are going to do will be in Ghana, where we will set up basically a laboratory experiment looking at what are the nutritional impacts in communities where our only intervention is agriculture programs.
And then look at the nutritional impacts of communities where our only intervention is nutrition, not agriculture. And the third case would be where we are integrating ag and nutrition, and figure out what the differences are and what are better ways to do this integration.

We are doing that study in a couple of countries around the world and hope within about a two-year period to have some real better understanding of what this means.

Ethiopia is another priority country of ours. And you will notice again if you look through the range of strategies that are on the Web, there is a lot of discussion about the importance of land tenure.

And everyone knows that it is taken as a given that if people have tenure security their incentive to invest more in their property goes up. That is a significant challenge in a lot of the developing world, and particularly in Africa.
challenges about land tenure security.

Ethiopia was a country that was
for many years very resistant to giving out
land titles. But our mission there has been
working on a program for a number of years to
change the attitude of the Egyptian (sic)
authorities about giving greater land tenure
security.

They developed these land
certifications. They are not ownership but it
is a piece of paper given by the government
that demarcates the land very specifically to
small holder farmers and farmer immediately
feel greater security in the land.

They feel that this is mine. And
we have seen investments go up and we have
seen productivity in these areas triple in
just the last year. So we are really excited
about that.

It has already been rolled out to
thousands of farmers and we are trying to
courage the Government of Ethiopia to expand
this on a broad scale.

I was just in Ethiopia last month and I have read about this program and talked about it and have been really impressed, but nothing prepared me for seeing it on the ground.

And if you talk particularly women farmers, I talked to several women farmers who said they had parcels of land that they couldn't farm and they knew that if they leased them out that they could make more money.

But they were unproductive and they wouldn't lease them out because they were worried that if they leased them out someone would claim that they were theirs; and they had nothing to prove that this was their land.

There was all this unproductive land out there, and as a result of these certification programs, significantly more land has been brought into production in this area. And the women, in particular, are the
ones who feel greater security and have seen increases in their income.

We just think that is a fabulous program. Two more examples. Tanzania is another real focus country of ours. Tanzania is a great example of the public-private partnerships we are trying to push.

The Tanzanian Government, and in particular President Kikwete, and it demonstrates how leadership at the highest level can really move things forward.

President Kikwete has been a tremendous partner in establishing the southern agricultural growth corridor of Tanzania, the southern part of the country, identifying that as an area with -- and I know several of our members from the BIFAD board travelled to Tanzania and saw this.

I was talking to Dr. Ejeta about this last night, establishing that area as an area where they really do want to crowd in private sector investment to overcome
generations of lack of investment and longstanding poverty and hunger.

They are targeting $2.1 billion in investment over the coming years, private investment. And we have already worked out a relationship with a private rice producer called Kilombero Farms in Tanzania that has a 25,000-hectare farm and they are producing rice for the domestic market.

It is a company that is an international company. It has American and, I believe, British ownership. But they are interested in taking product and working with the surrounding farmers.

They have got 5,000 farmers in that immediate area and we have made connections between this large commercial farm, the small holder farmers, again with the results that we are seeing increases in the incomes of those farmers.

So that is the kind of thing again like in Ghana that we are really interested in
expanding. And Tanzania has also been a leader in the Grow Africa platform, which is something that we are going to talk about hopefully a lot more in the coming year.

Grow Africa is a partnership of the African Union and the World Economic Forum. It was started last year at the World Economic Forum in Davos.

And it is a partnership specifically intended to stimulate private investment in agriculture. Seven African countries were self selecting countries, where Africa calls them first wave countries.

Tanzania has really been in the leadership in that effort. And what we are seeing with several Grow Africa meetings that have happened in the last year is it is starting to create a real buzz around Africa and a little bit of competition among countries.

But how do you position yourself in a way to attract investment from your own
domestic private sector and from international companies? And again, it is focused on small holder farmers and how to impact to benefit small holder farmers.

So we are excited about that. I will mention it again in a second when I talk about the G8. The last country example, this is Bangladesh.

Bangladesh, everyone knows, is a country that has significant food security problems, has ongoing imports of U.S. food aid and it is a real priority to help Bangladesh overcome those kinds of challenges.

And the example there I think is one about -- is one about technology. The deep urea replacement technology is something that the Government of Bangladesh and our partners working there have taken to heart.

And there is often a challenge in the uptake of any new technology, whether it is new cell phones or whether it is technology for farmers.
So the thing we are proud of in Bangladesh is, we have seen in just the last year in our program the hectares using this technology of deep urea replacement go from 94,000 to about 300,000.

And we are hoping this expansion and working hard to get this expansion at those levels to continue over the coming years. But again, the increases in productivity and incomes are what we are really excited about.

And we are happy that we have got this monitoring system that can measure those results, cascade the results from the number of people who are trained in this technology to the number of farmers who have actually applied it and carry that through to what that has meant in increases in income.

The Horn of Africa, I'll say two words about the crisis in the last year. A big focus of ours, of our a lot of our staff obviously was on the crisis in the Horn of
Africa.

We in Feed the Future do not work on the food aid part of it, so our folks in OFDA, the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance and the Office of Food for Peace were heavily engaged in providing food and other humanitarian assistance to save lives there.

But what we have done with them is create what we have called the joint planning cell over the last year to think about how can we do a better job planning and integrating our short-term and long-term resources.

Again, something that has been talked about for a number of years by USAID, but we never really have gotten a good handle on it. And there are a lot of reasons.

Part of the reason is the folks who were delivering food assistance and saving lives are fully engaged in that effort and it is difficult to pull them away to engage in long-term planning.
But we have through this setting up a joint planning cell in Washington and one in the field, we have hammered out a strategy that connects better the immediate relief effort.

And the work that the immediate -- that humanitarian assistance does to start to build resilience to our longer-term planning efforts and making sure that the ties between the programs continued.

This culminated in a conference last week in Nairobi that Administrator Shah shared. It was co-sponsored by us and the World Bank and Inter-American Governmental Authority on Development, one of the sub-regional organizations in East Africa with high level participation from the Governments of Kenya and Ethiopia and Uganda.

And I won't remember all the governments, but the benefit of that conference for us was our push to get other donors and the World Bank as well on board.
with this concept of integrating the short-
and the long-term development.

Because we realized that if we
don't do that, we are just going to continue -
- we are not going to make progress in these
repeated crises. And a lot of the specific
focus of this conference was on the
pastureless populations in the Horn of Africa
because those are the most vulnerable
populations that we have seen.

For the activities to just
highlight that work, we are planning to
execute in collaboration with other donors and
those governments there, focus a lot on
enhancing the efficiency of the livestock
value chain.

You see breakdowns when the
droughts come and the cattle start to wither
and die. And then the pastureless populations
have no means of support and their resiliency
fares away.

So we know that if you work on
improved water management, you work on
enhancing market linkages so they can get
better value for their cattle, so they can do
offtakes at an earlier stage when droughts
come and work on issues of diversifying
livelihoods.

I won't mention all of them, but
you can make real progress on this. And there
are definitely isolated cases of progress.

Even in Ethiopia, which is known
as, or which is often seen as synonymous with
famine, the drought last year -- in the
drought last year eight million fewer people
were in need of food assistance than in the
drought in 2003.

And that is true, despite the fact
that Ethiopia's population is significantly
larger. It is 80 million people now. I can't
remember the 2003 figure. And it is true,
despite the fact that the drought last year
was the worst drought in 60 years.

What explains that difference is,
under the Ethiopian Government's leadership it has created a safety net program. They understand much better how to do this work on market linkages and the livestock value chain.

So we are trying to build on the lessons learned that they have acquired that we have seen progress on and really expand it and bring it to scale.

The last thing I will mention before wrapping up is the G8. I think people know that the U.S. Government holds the presidency of the G8 this year and there is historically an Africa session in the G8.

And we anticipate an Africa session this year in the G8. And we are really hopeful, given President Obama's personal engagement on issues of food security at prior G8 summits, we are really hopeful that food security and nutrition will have a principal place in the Africa session of the G8 this year.

And we are doing a lot of work to
try and make sure that that happens. The White House will sometime over the coming weeks announce the agenda and announce invitations.

But for us, it is a phenomenal opportunity to again on the global stage highlight and continue the effort that was begun in 2009 and really make sure that the world -- that complacency doesn't set it and the world continues to hammer away at improving food security and nutrition.

Because I do think what I have seen as I travel around is, we have the tools and technology and at the highest level we have the political will to address these issues. And we just have to keep at it and make sure that we don't fall back into complacency.

So to wrap up some of the principles, I think the examples I have highlighted or what I have tried to do is highlight examples that show a new business
direction for us on food security.

The first part of that business direction is being very deliberate about supporting host country-led strategies. And that is our over-arching theme.

The second principle we are trying to follow is with integrated programming, principally between agriculture and nutrition, but also cross-cutting issues: natural resource management, water, climate change, gender as critical themes and make sure that we are taking a holistic approach in looking at all of those elements that are key to achieving results on food security.

The next principle that we are really trying to follow is forming partnerships to reach significant scale. Our efforts if we help 50,000 farmers in country X is nothing in comparison to the combined of host governments and donors helping 500,000 farmers.

So that is where we want to be.
We want to apply these principles in a way that reaches scale through partnerships. The next principle we are applying is just rigorous monitoring and evaluation.

Having a set of indicators that cascade up to really precisely measure impact, focusing on empowerment of women, and then thinking about how you attach impact evaluations to those that generate real learning about what we are doing.

Technology, the deep urea replacement is one example. But what we are doing is trying to find technology and Rob has talked in past meetings about our research strategy and the component of that, sustainable intensification.

What are the packages of technology that really can be applied and brought to scale to have impact? Capacity development is just two more of these principles.

Capacity development is the second
to the last, and again, Julie is going to
cover that in detail. But the last one I
would say is the overall research strategy
that -- applying research and the best of
science.

And so, it is not just applying
technologies like deep urea replacement that
exist, but focusing on research to develop new
technologies.

And really thinking about the best
of science and the best that the U.S.
scientific community has to offer, bringing
that to bear, focusing the attention of the
U.S. scientific community on these challenges
so that we can have a significant impact.

And in two years from now we can
talk about results at a much more significant
scale. I hope that is useful. I don't know
if we are taking questions or if --

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Paul, yes,
and I wanted to thank you very much. That was
a really excellent, comprehensive overview and
I appreciate the details.

And I did want to take a moment here with -- yes, for the BIFAD board members to give us a chance to interact with you because we have a time schedule and --

Catherine.

MS. BERTINI: Thanks very much, Paul, for the good presentation. I have a question about leadership and what it is about the chief AID representatives in the country, whatever the right language is, in the country offices when you decide that you are going to scale up in Ethiopia?

MR. WEISENFELD: You mean like aid, the aid?

MS. BERTINI: Yeah, the USAID country director.

MR. WEISENFELD: Okay.

MS. BERTINI: When you decide you are going to scale up in any -- any number of countries, what kind of process do you undertake within, in Washington in order to
decide whether or not you have the staff
capacity to actually carry that out in the
field?

And I ask that in part from my
experience at WFP, because sometimes when all
of a sudden the situation changed in one way
or another we had to quickly assess whether or
not whoever was in charge had the capacity to
keep doing that, to stay there and to do now
what was required of him or her.

Do you have some sort of a process
to do that, or does the aid director just come
stay there until his/her term is up and they
move on? Thank you.

MR. WEISENFELD: Yeah, so that is
a really good question. Part of it goes back
to, if I can give a slightly -- before I
address the specific part.

Our process to select the
countries I think gives a little bit of
context to this. And that was an innovation,
although it was several years ago so I didn't
talk about that.

    Historically, the agency has gone through an allocation process by country based solely on need. It is not quite as simple as whoever is the poorest gets the most money, but need was the most significant factor.

    For Feed the Future, levels of poverty and hunger were absolutely taken into account. But we also looked at potential to grow because what we really wanted to do and what the President specifically charged us with doing was to set up a system where we could demonstrate success.

    And the concern was that people, not just the American public but people in general, have this view that famines are inevitable, droughts are man-made, there is nothing we can do. People will continue to die from them.

    And part of the whole purpose of the program was to show that is just not true. So it's critical for us -- it was critical for
us to pick countries where we can demonstrate real signature success at the country level. So we looked at potential as well. We looked at countries' commitment, whether they engaged in CAADP plan. That resulted in a selection of 20 focus countries that didn't overlap with where we had significant staff resources and expertise.

And we dramatically increased the budgets in agriculture in some -- some of the countries we were working in this area. But they were countries where we weren't, and they were countries where their budgets were dramatically increased and they had not agricultural expertise.

So we travelled. We had teams from Washington travel to these countries, do assessments of staffing needs, and we significantly increased staff in a lot of countries.

We have made some staffing changes; in other countries we haven't. I
can't promise that it has been as thorough in all 20 countries as in others, but there are some countries that we're particularly focused on.

If you look at the budget you can see Ghana, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Kenya that come to the top of the list in overall budget. So we have had much more attention on those countries. And we have dramatically increased staff and changed the mix of staff in them.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Yes, Marty?

MR. McVEY: Paul, thank you. I agree with Catherine. Great presentation. We appreciate that.

Can you tell us a little bit what the plans are for disaster response in these developing countries, particularly with the agricultural projects that are going on?

How does the agency have the outlook to prevent or curtail the loss for natural disaster so you don't have to restart the program over?
MR. WEISENFELD: So, disaster response, I should -- I'll talk about it but I should say it is not under my responsibility. We have a bureau for DCHA, Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, which contains both the office of Food for Peace and the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance.

So they are principally responsible. But we have tried to build in disaster response to our programs. And again, Ethiopia is a country that has really shown the way.

Our colleagues in Ethiopia -- I can't remember whether it is 5, 7 years ago -- developed a technique in their program, a risk modifier. So countries that are continually at risk for disasters, they have a modified where they can change the programs rapidly to respond to catastrophe.

And as you know, government programming, granting, contracting doesn't
necessarily, because of bureaucratic rules,
facilitate easy shifting on a dime to do
something differently.

So we are building into programs
this risk modifier, drawing on the experience
in Ethiopia. I was in Ethiopia a few weeks
ago and the other kinds of things that were
done I talked a little bit about connecting
the short term to the long term.

Some of our short-term programs
have looked at, as part of the disaster
response -- I can give you an example maybe,
instead of just talking about the overall
principle, kind of worrying about issues of
soil erosion that when you have a climate, a
problem you see all over Ethiopia and Kenya,
you have a drought and then it is followed by
very heavy rain.

And you see lots of soil runoff
that results in floods and killing people, and
that tends to happen over and over again. And
it really can damage the work through Feed the
Future and building crops.

So there is a lot of experience in stabilization of soil. So we are building those kinds of things in, kind of thinking about implementing our programs by looking at the entire watershed.

So when I referred to integrating natural resource management activities, it is really about looking at watersheds at the natural resource management level and stabilizing systems so that you don't have those kinds of disasters.

Some disasters, obviously earthquakes, you can't do anything about. But the kinds of disasters that we are seeing tend to be around droughts and floods and there is a lot of natural resource management work that can mitigate those risks.

MR. McVEY: Thank you. I am very happy to hear that the agency is taking that up. It is a good investment on this project.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Anyone else
want to ask a question? I had one observation
or question I wanted to ask you and it is
based on your comments regarding the gender
roles and the security women feel regarding
land tenure and title, which I have noticed in
the literature has been a common concern.

And Marty McVey and I attended the
meeting of the ITM CRSP in Memphis. And there
was significant discussion given to the gender
issues there.

And the one that caught me a bit
by surprise was the discussion about how much
variation and gender role there is from
community to community, even within a common
ethnic geographic area, which will tend to
then challenge some of the easy
generalizations we often make about the gender
roles.

And I thought that was very
profound in terms of the kind of work that you
all are doing throughout the world. I just
wondered what -- any sense you have on that or
One perspective you can suggest --

MR. WEISENFELD: Yeah.

MR. McVEY: -- to us for fully understanding that issue better.

MR. WEISENFELD: Yeah, I mean, I have been -- again, get back to that in a second but start in a slightly other place.

One of the things that has really influenced me in the last year in terms of development literature is reading the books that are coming out of the J-PAL group from MIT, the Poverty Action Lab at MIT.

And they have done -- one of the books is called, "More Than Good Intentions."

And a lot of what comes across here is the need to do these randomized control trials to really figure out what works.

But what they reveal is also that what works in one village is not necessarily what works in another village. And I think you are right, the donors often figure out a solution that they think applies regionally --
that globally or continental or regional or
even -- and what their research shows is, it
doesn't even necessarily apply at a national
level.

You have to really disaggregate.

So what we are hoping is our impact
evaluations are going to give us more learning
on that. But it is complex. The women's
empowerment index we piloted in -- I forget if
three or four countries: Bangladesh, Uganda -
- I forget if it's Guatemala or Honduras.

And we have preliminary results
from the pilot They are not specifically
relevant so, you know, I would hesitate to
extrapolate from that.

But one of the things that at the
preliminary results that was surprising is,
people have tended to think that women's
empowerment is associated with increases in
income and increases in education. And from
the pilot, that wasn't true.

There was no -- there were women
who were empowered who had lower incomes. And women who had higher education and incomes were not empowered. And again, because it is not statistically relevant, are those aberrations.

Are they differences at the sub-national level or is it some broader learning? We don't know. But it is interesting that no one has done that kind of research to figure that out.

Income and education have just been used as proxies, so I don't have a full answer other than I think this requires a lot more research.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Yes, great. Any other questions or comments on Paul's presentation?

DR. EJETA: Is there time for that?

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Pardon?

DR. EJETA: Is there time to ask the questions?
CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Yes, we'll take a moment and then we'll -- yes.

DR. EJETA: Paul, how can the agency enhance complementarity between programs in would and the mission? Is there anything BIFAD can do to help?

When these kinds of things happen and take place, the synergy that arises is extraordinary. I just happened to be in Ethiopia about the same time that an APLU-led program, a conference was going on.

A small grant initiative that started in Washington had some enhancement out of a USAID mission in support and education and program in a specific area established that resources in the national program there, established a water institute and put in together now a Ph.D. human and master -- human and institutional capacity development program for about over 40 young men and women just in a very short period of time with relatively small contribution from the participants.
But very often what you put out is not always taken up by the mission because it got a sense of priority set there beside it to work on, and so on.

MR. WEISENFELD: Yes.

DR. EJETA: Is there any way once a major initiative like Feed the Future and so on takes up to gradually move the mission to begin to take up these major initiatives coming out of Washington?

MR. WEISENFELD: I think you are highlighting, Dr. Ejeta, a real challenge for donors, not just for us.

USAID is more decentralized than other donors, so if you think about our presence is more significantly overseas. The agency staff overall, most of us are serving overseas more than any other donor.

And our budget also follows that. So the $968 million we have for fiscal year '12, the vast majority of that is allocated directly to our overseas missions to program.
And we retain -- I won't remember the precise figure; my guess is somewhere around $200 million overall for programming in Washington. And it is always a challenge for donors that have a worldwide presence to make those linkages between what Washington does and the field does.

There are a couple of concepts that we try to follow. We want impact on the ground in Uganda, for instance, so that is why we allocate money to the Uganda mission, to figure out how to program it.

And we provide oversight and advice and guidance and direction. But the kind of Rob's program is our largest Wachnata (phonetic) only but our largest Washington budget.

And the reason we do those in Washington rather than the field, there are a couple because there are programs that cut across different countries, because there are kind of global public good issues.
So the mission in Uganda is not going to spend their budget on something that benefits the global public good. But you are right. The challenge then is when Rob's program comes up with a great innovation, how do you get Uganda to apply it and to understand it?

So it's those kinds of conversations that have to happen. The change that we have made from the past is structurally to try to deal with this, is that we have a country support office that we haven't had in Washington for the agricultural sector before.

And we have had the research office, we have had the ag office, but we have an office that is solely dedicated from Washington to supporting countries and making sure that we have regular dialogue with them.

And we are hoping that that is going to make these connections better. But - so that is the innovation that we are trying
to do the Washington field connection a little better.

DR. EJETA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Paul, thank you again, very, very much.

MR. WEISENFELD: Thank you.

(Applause).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay, we will move to our second part of the agenda here for looking at the Bureau of Food Security CAADP building framework.

And Dr. Julie Howard will make a presentation to us. She is the chief scientist in the USAID Bureau of Food Security, which leads the implementation of Feed the Future, the U.S. Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative.

She also serves as senior advisor to the USAID administrator on agricultural research, extension and education.

And in this role she oversees the implementation of the Feed the Future research
strategy and leads related new programs to advance innovation in global food security efforts, working with both global and national partners.

Julie, good to have you.

DR. HOWARD:  Thanks very much.  I don't know if the BIFAD members want to change or whether you can see the PowerPoint from where you are.  Can you see it?

Okay, great.  Okay, thanks.  Well, good morning everybody.  It is great to be here and I want to say a special thanks to Paul for setting up so nicely the topic of my discussion.

Because I think it is evident from Paul's talk that we are feeling a growing sense of excitement that the investments, the planning that we have all made in Feed the Future with our country partners is now beginning to bear fruit, that we are beginning to see things now starting to roll out.

So what I want to talk with you
about this morning is exactly how do we ensure
the sustainability of these emerging
successes, of these emerging impacts that we
are beginning to see?

And how better to ensure the
sustainability of Feed the Future's success
than to think about capacity development,
capacity development of individuals and
capacity development of institutions?

So what could be more important
than that? So I just wanted to spend a few
minutes thinking about that together with you
today. I feel like this theme has been a bit
of a late-comer to global food security
discussions and to our Feed the Future
discussions.

I think part of it is that it is
just impossible to give the same attention to
everything and do it well. I look at how our
country partners, particularly our country
partners in Africa, how they have addressed
capacity building.
And I also think that they have been very much late-comers to this game. So many of the country investment plans in through the CAADP progress were developed 2008, 2009, and really hardly any consideration at that point of capacity development.

It wasn't until a conference of ministers of agriculture and ministers of education took place in 2010 that you began to see people say, well, we have these very ambitious and very important goals for agricultural development nutrition.

But we don't have really a sense of what capacity is going to be required to carry out these programs. And what is our current capacity in terms of individuals and institutions into the future?

So to introduce this topic, I want to say this is a topic of importance to the administrator and one that he has asked BIFAD to take on. And so we are happy to partner
with BIFAD as thought leaders.

And the intention of the discussion today is really to share with you some of our initial thinking about how we might begin to better organize our investments in human and institutional capacity development and how to make sure that they are aligned with Feed the Future investments and with other partners, other global food security investments.

So this is very much in the spirit of sharing ideas with you, intended to continue our discussion with BIFAD, but also to begin to engage other stakeholders in this discussion.

Okay, so just to tell you, we will talk a little bit about the history of USAID investments, what we know about impact in this area, the changing environment, the sort of changing also challenges that we are sensing in this area, and then these initial ideas that we have come up with for an investment
framework particularly for USAID investments.

And then I wanted to throw out to you some key questions for discussion, not just for today but really over the next couple of months and we will use that couple of month period to arrive at a final framework, investment framework.

Okay, well, I think to start off this discussion we really should start out by just clarifying what are the reasons why we want to invest in agricultural sector human and institutional capacity development.

And, I mean, these are not -- this is not rocket science. These will be familiar to all of you. Capacity development certainly is needed for improved performance across the agricultural sector, across this wide range of functions that we see in agriculture research through the agribusiness and at all levels of institutions, from small companies through to ministries and universities.

We are seeing, you know, as we are
seeing development, agricultural development
begin to pick up, we are seeing that new
capacities are needed.

Developing countries are needing
new kinds of professionals and new kinds of
vehicles to work with their farmers and
entrepreneurs.

And I just wanted to say one of
the great things that I think is happening
over the past, really over the past three or
four years, in my conversations with the
private sector I can remember well before I
came into government I would talk to private
sector companies and say, you know, why aren't
you investing in African agriculture?

And they would nod politely.

Interesting idea. Very risky, Latin America,
Asia. But now they don't say that anymore.
We are seeing really a remarkable pickup in
private sector investment.

So what people say now, you know,
when we are talking to investors is: Yes.
Great opportunities, and we are planning to invest. But, you know, we have no one to hire there.

You know, we need everybody from researchers and scientists to warehouse professionals to accountants and we simply can't find them in the countries. And that is a big problem for us.

So I think, I mean, it is a good problem but it is a problem to think about as we tackle capacity development. So lastly, you know, what is the major reason that we invest in this area?

Well, capacity building creates the conditions where we work ourselves out of a job, where aid is no longer necessary in the countries.

Okay, I'm not going to go through all of these. I sense that the history of U.S. investment in HICD is probably familiar to many of you. In the 1950s, particularly in Latin America, North Africa, USAID established
early programs to build ministries, to build
extension services, banking services, land
tenure agencies, really massive amount of
investment.

And this continued through the
1960s and '70s and then really, you know,
focusing as well on long-term training, on
building agricultural universities, on
building the national agricultural research
systems.

And, you know, these investments
will be familiar to you. I mean, we think of
the investments that were made in Brazil and
in India, you know. And the impact of those
investments is very much visible to all of us
today.

And I think it is quite rewarding,
you know, for all of us to think about, well,
these are the countries that 30 and 40 years
ago were the main beneficiaries of our
assistance in this area.

And now we are seeing these
countries begin to step up to the plate and become very active in providing assistance on their own, and in many ways, you know, very, very unique effectiveness.

So, I mean, we ourselves are promoting strategic partnerships with Brazil, with Africa, and we are seeing increasing exchanges with Embrapa, the research institution and African research institutions.

And we are hoping the same thing now we'll begin to take off with, with India. So then we saw a decline in these investments overall in HICD, investments for agriculture in the 1990s and through the 2000s as the emphasis really shifted to primary education.

And we saw this deterioration of agricultural capacity in our partner countries, but also here in USAID. And now in the last few years we are beginning to see a renewal of interest, a renewal of the acknowledgement of the importance of this capacity buildings for sustaining the key
investments we are making today.

Just a word on what we know about impact. We talked a little bit about Brazil and India but, I mean, really the numbers are quite staggering. We developed capacity in 63 agricultural universities in 40 countries in this span of time from the '50s to the late '90s.

And, you know, literally, you know, have trained thousands and thousands of people, and you know, we know of these impacts through anecdotes.

You know, I would say now at the beginning of another effort I think of building back our investments in this area we need to be much more diligent about tracking the recipients of our assistance because we know that the recipients of our investments back in the '50s and '60s became vice ministers of agriculture, became university chancellors.

And it is just hard for us to call
up that information to continually make the

case anew that these investments matter but we

may not see the impacts over the next three toour years. It may take 10 to 20 years for

the full potential to unravel -- unravel, to

reveal itself, say.

You know, I had this problem

before. Okay, let me describe to you what is

on this. What should be on this slide is a --

yeah, is a graphic that shows sort of really

steep increase in USAID investments in human

and institution capacity building through the

'60s, '70s and '80s, and then a very, very

sharp decline.

So I will try and get a copy of

this out to you. I don't know why this goes
blank on us every time. But anyway, it is a

very stark reminder that we really went to

very low levels of investment in this area

starting in the late '90s and 2000.

Okay, so I think happily we are

now in the beginning of changing environment
for investments. Some of the contributing
factors to this: we have launched an agency-
wide policy on HICD in 2008.

Also, very significantly, the
administrator's commitment and high priority
to USAID Forward, you know, which is
essentially our stake in the ground basically
saying we as an agency wish to move towards
more local procurement of services.

And what that implies is, you
know, very much strengthening of local
investments, and, you know, by deduction
strengthening of the individuals who will
support those institutions.

So that is a very, very important,
I think, foundation for us to build the
argument for increased investment in this
area. Last year the administrator charged
BIFAD with recommending to him what we could
do, how we could be more effective and
efficient in this area.

And then we have also had very
recent but not new, and certainly very welcome
to all of us, a mandate to focus much more on
women’s equality and empowerment in all of our
programs.

So I mentioned before, you know,
as we have had this reawakening to HICD, also
our partners are also beginning to reflect on
the need to put more attention to capacity
building.

So we have this 2010 ministerial
where CAADP leaders mandated individual
countries to go back and look at your programs
and begin sort of very purposefully drawing
out what are the individual training needs,
what are the institution strengthening needs.

And we have had a very interesting
emergence of a project that's hosted at the
World Bank, but it's actually a donor platform
to support tertiary education in Africa.

And this is very innovative. It
is putting -- the leadership of this is really
-- World Bank is a holding entity but really
led by two very, very good African organizations, RUFORUM and ANAFE, who had been leading support for curriculum development, support for strengthening agriculture universities, especially in East and Southern Africa.

So this is meant to be a mechanism where donors can come together and sort of sort out a coordinating umbrella for their investments to strengthen key institutions, higher education institutions including technical colleges as well as universities, and coordinate their investments rather than doing it in a scattered manner.

Okay, quickly then I just want to sort of introduce as we are sort of on this edge of what would new, what would more coordinated, what would more effective investment look like, sort of reflect on some of the things that we have been considering.

And one is just sort of thinking that capacity development is not -- is really
at multiple levels. It is individual, it is
organization, it is also capacity building for
the enabling environment.

And like we have these multiple
layers, we also have multiple challenges to
address. And these again will be very
familiar to you.

So professional capacities, as the
private sector is pointing out to us,
demographic challenges, and this, I mean, you
see. You are so aware of this when you visit
Africa, I mean, this huge demographic bulge
that we have.

And partly I think, you know,
happily because of the attention to primary
and secondary education over the last decade
or so now you have, you know, a cadre of young
people who really want more education, you
know, but are confronted with, well, you know,
what next?

There really aren't the quality
technical schools to accept them. There
really aren't the quality university programs. And it is such a huge, huge cadre. It really forces us to think innovatively.

It may not be possible or desirable to think of this in terms of, well, how are we going to build all of the college classrooms or technical college classrooms that are going to fit this great number of folks.

But really, we will need to be creative in terms of distance education, in terms of making materials available electronically, and other kinds of education.

So critical infrastructure and technology, we were just talking about ICT. You know, we're seeing a great expansion of the use of ICT here in the U.S. and developed countries. It is still sort of in its infancy in most of the countries where we are working.

And so, you know, just the availability of broadband, the availability of functioning computers is a severe constraint
for us. Okay, and then other challenges now, coordination with partners. And these are big problems.

We are not going to be able to address them ourselves in the U.S. Government, and alignment of these interventions with plans, with Feed the Future, with country investment plans.

Okay, so as we think about how in USAID and Feed the Future, you know, we can make our investments. And it is not that we are not investing in this. We are actually doing quite a lot, and I will run through some of that.

It's just, you know, we are asking ourselves at this point in time, you know, how can we coordinate more effectively to get some of these central admission linkages that Gebisa was talking about?

How can we coordinate better to reinforce country priorities and how can we coordinate so that donors are not sort of
duplicating effort, that we are taking advantage of our comparative advantage?

So these are the things that we are talking about. You know, we want to being by saying, you know, what are the principles that we want to operate on as we develop our framework?

We want to respond to country-led and demand-driven plans and we want to align with other donors. We want to look at best practices, analysis. We want to operate from what we know is working.

We want to integrate these different levels: human, organizational and dimensions. And then I bolded coordination and accountability because I think that these are particularly challenges and that we ask for your help in thinking through.

Okay, so this I think, you know, the field of agriculture innovation, I am looking at Derek Byerlee, who has been one of the innovators of this along with Gary Alex
sitting in the back.

You know, we have really come a long way over the last couple of decades, you know, in thinking about, you know, what sparks and what sustains agricultural innovation.

And I think of this as kind of a, you know, a framing graphic for us to think about.

So actually I would say we have producers in the middle here. I guess at this point I would put producers and entrepreneurs rather than just producers but, you know, as having -- being affected by and also influencing the research system, the education system, the ag extension and advisory services.

And then over to the left, you know, you see the links, you know, with other actors in the value chain from land tenure agencies, credit agencies, all the way through the exporters and agriprocessors.

So as we think, so now when I begin to shift into, you know, how are we
thinking about framing our USAID investments in support of Feed the Future, and sort of, you know, distilling from this ag innovation system graphic.

You know, this is a -- this is what we are coming out with. We are putting at the center our target of innovation for producers and I am going to add in entrepreneurs.

And then the circles that we have really represent the five strategic areas of central Feed the Future, USAID capacity development investment. So we have got policy and data. We have got research, got extension and advisory services, got education and we have got agribusiness and value chain.

And so these five areas are corresponded, the elements of the agricultural innovation system that we saw in the previous graphic. Okay, so I think this is a central slide for us and something that we want your feedback on and something also that responds
to Gebisa's earlier question.

So our proposed approach is to think in terms of making platform investments. So we already are investing broadly and to respond to and support a range of capacity development needs and missions and to emphasize and suggest to missions the importance of capacity development.

So what we are trying to do now really is focus on several dedicated central investments, central investment platforms that serve as a service to missions but also provide them with a way to coordinate with other donors, to coordinate investments across the U.S. Government, to coordinate with country plans to provide a source of technical assistance, but also, you know, a feedback loop essentially.

Best practices, you know, what results are you having and what -- you know, can similar approaches be implemented in other countries? What can we all learn together
from this?

So we have got in the middle USAID Washington, Bureau of Food Security and others, the idea of the platform so missions access capacity development services from central programs. And I will talk about those in a minute.

You've got missions on the left identifying their needs based on their multi-year strategies, which are in turn based on the country development strategies. And then you have got implementation and management mostly in the court of the missions, but again supported by USAID Washington and mission field staff.

So we have a kind of mega-platform, you know, that we already have in place. And that is the Borlaug 21st Century Leadership Program, which sort of is going to be the umbrella platform for almost everything that we do in capacity development in all of their troubles that we are looking at.
So this is a program that we announced last year and are representing a $13.5 million investment, the central commission contributions. It's -- okay, and then so think of that as the overall, the mega-platform.

And then I want to go through, you know, for these individual umbrellas sort of the types of programs that we are currently engaged with and that we wish to bring together more purposefully through this platform approach.

So capacity development in research, we have got -- I won't go through all of these but you can see, you know, a number of programs, the AWARD program focusing on developing capacity of African women.

We have got long-term degrees, training for developing country students as well as long-term degree training for U.S. students. And, you know, I am particularly pleased about that because I think this has
been really an area that we have neglected pretty substantially over the last few years.

And having been a beneficiary myself of USAID support, you know, for young folks -- not so young anymore, but at one time I was young. So I think it is important, you know, because we need to draw from those folks for USAID in the future, for other institutions.

Okay, so just to go through, the Purdue US Borlaug Fellows Program is just one of these. A graduate research fellowship grant program, so this is meant again to expand the pool U.S. through security professionals who have the scientific base necessary to be effective.

The Borlaug Fellowship program, okay. And so I want to spend a few minutes on announcing. One of the programs that we are very, very excited about, so I believe that this RFA is being released today.

I am looking around for
confirmation from APLU.

MR. BERTRAM: We hope so.

DR. HOWARD: Okay. Is it safe for me to continue talking about it?

MR. BERTRAM: Yes.

DR. HOWARD: Okay, great. Okay.

Well, so, I mean we are very pleased that we think the RFA is going to be issued today by APLU for a brand new, long-term training program which is called -- this is very innovative -- the Borlaug Higher Education for Agricultural Research and Development, BHEARD.

And we are really excited about this partnership between APLU and CIMMYT, you know, which many of you know was Dr. Borlaug's home institution.

And this is a program that is going to offer long-term graduate fellowships and institutional capacity development for developing country researcher and Feed the Future focus countries.

And many of these researchers will
complete their degrees at U.S. land grant universities. So APLU is playing a lead role in this. They are going to lead the selection of the university or a consortium of universities is going to manage this effort.

And there will be many opportunities for U.S. universities to host developing country students who are studying for their degrees. And, you know, again I think this is so important.

When I think back on my own training, possibly the most important part of my training was being able to interact in my program with developing country students.

There is no better way to learn about what life and development is really like. So we are going to pilot the program in Zambia in Mozambique, in Ghana, Bangladesh and also in Mali.

But the program is ultimately going to be open to any Feed the Future country interested in long-term training. So
I want to thank APLU. And thanks to you, especially, Malcolm, for your role in making this a reality.

MR. BUTLER: If I could just offer one clarification, APLU will sit on the panel, including AID and university representatives.

DR. HOWARD: Great. Okay.

DR. DELAUDER: And how much money do you think is associated with this?

DR. HOWARD: How much money?

MR. BERTRAM: This year it is the essential budget which includes probably about three and a half million dollars.

DR. HOWARD: Okay. All right, well, so let me sort of run quickly through. So these are examples of the programs that we are doing under these different areas and that we are planning to have platforms again to support that critical central mission coordinating learning function.

So we have this in post-secondary education and we have the modernizing
agriculture education training systems that will serve as that platform.

And we have our investments with the donor platform, the Team Africa program I was telling you about.

Okay, again capacity development in extension. The platform here is MEAS, Modernizing Extension and Advisory Services. We have other programs, for example, in collaboration with the Gates Foundation and other partners.

Infarmer, to increase use of ICT in extension. Entrepreneurship, you know, a number of different programs. Africa Lead, the leadership training capacity building.

And also I think sometimes a forgotten, but very important part of capacity building is a lot of the work that we are doing to support farm association development.

So this is, you know, in my mind one of the most unsung success stories of U.S. development assistance, the extent to which we
have really been able to help build strong
farmer associations and cooperatives and
farmer-owned businesses.

Okay, capacity development in
policy and data, you know, that multiple
element. The enabling environment, very,
very, important. Another place where U.S.
investments have been quite, quite important
in terms of providing analysis, training,
developing country researchers and analysts to
be able to inform their policy-makers.

What are the options? You know,
what should we do? Should we use fertilizer
subsidies or not? What is the outlook for
production over the next season?

Okay, well, let me pause here.
This is the next-to-last slide, and really
sort of drill in a little bit with you. I am
hoping that we can discuss a little bit here.

I am hoping that you will engage
us by e-mail or phone later. These are some
of the critical questions that we think as we
are moving forward with this platform approach.

What are the things that we need to think about? First of about, is the agriculture innovation system framework that we have laid out, is this an effective way, you know, for us to align and integrate our range of investments?

And you can see they are quite far-ranging. Is that effective, you know? Is this the right way? And then secondly, what are the best ways, you know, that we can serve the field, you know, linking central USAID and mission investments?

So I think, you know, really as the platform is conceived right now it is kind of spot on. But, you know, I also think, you know, we have a challenge in going beyond thinking about just USAID investments.

How do we make this framework really whole of government, and able to draw on HICD resources across U.S. Government
You know, I have a dream, you know, of us, you know, U.S. missions sitting down in countries and saying, gosh, you know, we've got this -- we've got a plan that has been developed, a capacity development plan that flows from the country investment plan.

And we have got these targets to hit over the next five years in terms of, you know, supported business schools, support to technical colleges, support to ministries.

And, you know, USAID can take this piece. USDA through its programs might be able to take on this piece. Health and Human Services and FDA might be able to take on this piece. And for this other range of investments, this is how we are coordinating with donors.

And, you know, I dream that that might be a conversation that we'll see over the next two or three years, you know, being able to engage not only U.S. missions but
other donors, foundations, and sort of a much
more comprehensive framework for investment
and a way of tracking how well are we doing,
you know, at meeting those targets.

How well are we doing at
coordinating our investments? Because having
been out in the field, you know, we know
sometimes that our investments, although they
are important, you know, may not be -- be used
well enough against, you know, a well-defined
target.

So we may have a number of study
trips. But maybe with a, you know, a more
focused goals we could say this year we are
really, really focusing hard on cooperative
development.

So we would like, you know, help
from states and USDA when they have
opportunities for short-term visits to really
help us focus in on that objective; and
similarly.

Okay, so how can we make our
framework whole of government? And then the next, how will these objectives, how will what we are doing in our platforms correspond to CAADP, to country objectives and to investment plans?

And how will we -- we set benchmarks for achievement, you know, for USAID and also more broadly at country level.

Another question: How can the private sector contribute?

How does the private sector both benefit and contribute to HICD? And then I just think this larger question of how donors, countries and private sector work together, you know, to figure out what the needs are, you know, over a period of time to coordinate, track investments and the impacts of this diverse set of HICD programs.

How do we program against common objectives and hold ourselves accountable for those benchmarks for achievement? Okay, so quickly, I mean, the BIFAD working group has
already begun work and we are hoping to
accelerate our joint efforts in this area and
carry out an informal consultation, stake
holder consultation over the next few weeks.

And then we are hoping to finalize
our HICD framework by July of this year. So
key folks working on this with us: Clara
Cohen and Gary Alex. Are both of them here
today, Clara and Alex? Okay.

And with that, I thank you.

(Applause).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Julie, thank
you. Let's turn to members of the board for
any questions or comments at this time.

DR. DELAUDER: Will you send a
copy of the PowerPoint?

DR. HOWARD: Yes. Will I send --
it was a softball. Will I send a copy of the
PowerPoint? The answer was yes.

DR. MURANO: I have a couple of
questions. Why is -- I guess in the whole
portfolio of HICD, and I don't mean for the
whole history of the agency but these last programs over the last, you know, three years or whatever, what would you say is the total amount of the portfolio from USAID? Not other donors, not USDA.

But what would you say is the agency's investment in HICD specifically, HICD programs like those that you mentioned< the Borlaug leadership and all that?

DR. HOWARD: Yeah, I'm turning to Rob, the king of numbers.

DR. MURANO: Ball park, you know. Thirty million? Ten? A hundred?

DR. HOWARD: Clara? Gary? Total investment this past year?

DR. MURANO: Yeah, yeah. About the I guess --

DR. HOWARD: The level of --

DR. MURANO: -- the last couple --

DR. HOWARD: -- total investment --

DR. MURANO: -- of years.
DR. HOWARD: -- which we know is growing and we have been adding programs, you know. I still have the figure of 13.5 for Borlaug over five years.

But that doesn't represent our -- you know, the problem is that we're -- it is difficult for us to sort of corral all the mission investments in this area.

DR. MURANO: Right.

DR. HOWARD: But Gary?

MR. GARY: To get it exactly is the difficulty of corralling the mission investments and choosing out of them how much is direct delivery of services and how much is capacity building. We plan to do that, but that is going to take a while.

DR. MURANO: Sure. And I didn't mean that, because obviously that is difficult because the CRSP system, for example, they do lots of capacity development.

So I know that is going to be a difficult thing. But just target it for
capacity development such as the Borlaug 21st Century, the Borlaug -- well, I guess Borlaug Fellows is USDA.

But this new one from -- that APLU will be managing. I guess I'm trying to get a sense of -- you know, from the total portfolio. As you said very well, Julie, we all believe very strongly that HICD is key. But I'm just sensing that maybe our total portfolio is not matching the need. And I may be completely wrong because maybe the bulk of it, as you said, maybe 80 percent of it is being done through these other means that we can't really tease out that easily.

DR. HOWARD: Yes. No, I would agree with you there, I mean, that we need to build the investments. I mean, we are definitely recovering from the debts, you know, of the early 2000s.

But I think, you know, Gary and Clara, perhaps we can work together over the next few days to get a clearer idea of a ball
park, you know, mission and central investments in this across the board.

                      DR. MURANO: Yes. Only in agriculture.

                      MR. BERTRAM: Thank you. I just wanted to add a comment, maybe a clarifying comment that I think what we were talking about here this morning is this platform that Julie is talking about, which are sort of very generically-focused pieces of the innovation chain.

                      A huge amount of our human and institution capacity building is mainstreamed into our programs. And the CRSPs are the best example.

                      DR. HOWARD: Right.

                      MR. BERTRAM: I mean, that's their -- right at the core of their business. So it is a little misleading sometimes if we just -- when we are counting up it would be good if we could somehow capture both of those kinds of investments because we do it all over.
I mean, if you are going to have a sustainable program you are going to build in that human capacity building.

DR. HOWARD: So -- but I would say even as we are thinking about these platforms, I would expect that the platforms would also reach out and see, well, how do we coordinate the capacity building that is being done in the CRSP.

That's really -- that's really essential. And it -- I mean, that just sort of epitomizes the problem that we face, you know. A lot of effort is going on, a lot of important things.

But we don't necessarily know if we are on track to, you know, our goal of having whatever -- 20 plant breeders, you know, active and functioning or a functioning department or policy analysis capacity.

You know, we know that something is going on out there, but no one is sort of keeping track of, okay, you know, this program
is taking care of this set of policy analysts.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay. We are, Julie, very -- if any burning questions, otherwise we are close on time here and -- I'm sorry, I'm getting -- okay.

Any other comments? We'll have a chance to visit -- revisit some of this later on in the discussion and particularly as we talk about the inception workshop I think that is going to provide an opportunity for interaction on issues that we have observed in the research plan.

We are going to take a short break right now. And it's right now by my clock 10:42. Let's try to be back as quickly as possible, maybe by 10:50 or so. Eight minutes okay for a break? Thank you.

That's not enough? Or maybe five minutes more than that.

(Whereupon, the foregoing proceeding went off the record at 10:42 a.m. and went back on the record at 11:02 a.m.)
CHAIRPERSON DEATON: So for the next hour you are going to hear reports from myself on the visit I had with the inception workshop in Tanzania, Elsa Murano, who participated in a similar workshop in Ethiopia, and Marty McVey, who participated in IPM/CRSP meetings in India, Nepal and Bangladesh.

And these members of the board -- Jo Luck, who could not be here, and I have not explained this actually. Another member of our board who is absent today, Jo Luck, had a medical situation that arose as a result of too much dust from a wind blower or a leaf blower.

That created some real damage and it had to be remedied. And so, unfortunately, she was not here. And she had participated in a CRSP, peanut CRSP meeting in Malta and would have been making a presentation.

And then Rob Bertram will be responding and talking about the research
strategy and a summary fashion response to
what you are hearing from the three of us.
And let me say that we undertook
this effort to participate in the inception
workshops and with the CRSP meetings in
response to Administrator Shah's admonition
for us to be fully engaged with the programs
of USAID in the field.

And so, we took that seriously and
set about organizing ourselves to be full
participants and really just want to, for the
next few minutes, share some of that
experience with you.

Because I think each of us had a
great deal of excitement about our role and
what we were doing with the workshops. And we
will give you a sense of those. And each of
the individuals that I have just mentioned
will be making a brief presentation.

I have actually already said most
of what you are seeing up here. I didn't
coordinate this fully. As I said, we were
trying to respond.

The purpose of these inception workshops as some of the work with CRSP as well that is taking place is an attempt to ensure that the research strategy of USAID in the Feed the Future area is aligned with country missions, is identifying partners and bringing the parties that are involved in the entire research and implementation process together to engage in strategic planning for implementing the entire strategy from the research right down to the field applications and adoption of new processes.

And Rob will respond and clarify that if I have missed any part of that. And I think what was very exciting to us as we looked at the -- and each of the visits was set up so that those of us participating would visit the USAID mission as well, participate in the discussion with the actors in the working, meeting either then with the country ambassador or the mission director and have
additional site visits out in the field with partner projects or Feed the Future implement of partners.

And I participated in one of those in Tanzania and I will say this again in a moment, but one of the really exciting things was to see the strategy developing with all the players and then to see it carried into USAID planning sessions in a very specific and concrete way.

USAID has a solid history in Tanzania and these are some examples of project work that has taken place in the country.

And I was able to visit Sokoine University after sitting in the workshops and actually seeing the fruition of what was actually several years of involvement with USAID with Sokoine University.

For example, Robert Cunnane, the mission director here, presented a million-dollar check to Sokoine.
I will call attention to the university linkages here a bit because that was something I did out in the field as we completed the inception workshop.

We had a kickoff session. Julie Howard, whom you heard earlier, was also here to kick off and provide the overall purpose and scope of what we were going to be engaging in in the workshop.

And we also had the minister of agriculture of Tanzania who met with us. We had a very invigorating and stimulating workshop. And this provided background for what went on in the workshop and continued dialogue with the mission and with leaders of the country.

The workshops were very operational. And, Larry, I believe you were there in Tanzania with us as well. So I'm presuming you tasked with the CRSP.

And we had participants from a variety of in-country organizations. The
CRSPs that were active in the country, the NGO, CDOs, the various private sector institutions involved, as well as educational institutions.

And I think one thing that we all did a checklist at some point was: Did we have the right group of people here? Did we miss anyone important? And that may come out as we engage in discussions here.

I think one observation we made in Tanzania was that perhaps my memory is that we could have perhaps had more representation from some of the universities and educational institutions, including Sokoine, in the workshop.

We had then follow-up discussions with them in the field about that. Each component of the entire implementation process took place in small groups where various groups could address specific issues, then bring it back together and report back to the large group with an attempt made to develop
very clear strategies for implementation. 

And the push towards actual implementation with each partner involved being -- identifying the responsibility they would undertake and how that would add up to successful Feed the Future objectives in the country every dimension of it was focused on.

The partnership -- I have mentioned several of the institutions involved with Tanzanian institutions, Sokoine being the SUA and the National Agricultural Research System and the various components of field stations that are involved in the various parts of the USAID programming in the country were brought into this.

And I made a specific visit to Morogoro with the Ohio State-led consortium that involves Michigan State and a variety of other institutions in the United States.

And currently, there is a Gaps analysis being conducted where research things are being done on the key priority research
issues within Tanzania.

At Sokoine it was particularly interesting to see the very rapid advancement that had been made on identifying postgraduate training opportunities for 20 doctoral students and 100 master's-level students.

And these students are -- were selected with the idea of filling some of the research gaps that were being undertaken. And we visited a number of field sites where research from the laboratories of the country as well as where previous participants who had been educated in the United States.

I'm thinking of a specific example at Penn State University where there is research being undertaken on viruses affecting tomatoes and various kinds of mulching processes that were being used to prevent fungus development and disease development was being monitored by the instructor who had just completed her doctorate at Penn State.

And she was in touch with the
research labs at Penn State at the same time that she was engaged in the field trials. And also they worked with farmers' associations throughout the country. They have a select group of farmers that they test out these strategies with and then use a broader farmer organization and farmers' association to implement and carry out the dissemination of the research results. I think it is interesting to recognize in each of the countries as this kind of work is going on that you are actually involved in creating specific institutional arrangements that may emerge into a new kind of cooperative form for the purchasing of inputs or the sale of outputs and tapping a very important entrepreneurial element in the country. And we saw evidence of this with a number of the commodities being produced: rice, vegetable crops, field crops, within Tanzania. And in every one of those there
had been both private sector entities who were involved in the workshop in Dar es Salaam as they carried those out.

The workshops were met with tremendous enthusiasms by the participants. It was clear that it was something they were excited about participating in.

And it was also clear that they were ready to look at concrete strategies for the implementation of the research results. So from my standpoint, it was a very, very successful effort.

And we were able to talk about certainly what BIFAD is all about in our role and what we were learning as we participated in the workshop with them and the messages that then we could take back here.

And there were a number of major initiatives that were identified within the country that really I think impacted my thinking a great deal. And let me just share a couple of observations with you on those.
And one was the very simple observation that if you are going to successfully implement this entire framework of research and implementation you have got to have all parties involved in the process in order to be successful.

And that was obvious from the -- almost a micro look that you have to take in various regions of the country to develop the strategies and then to pull them together in a way that they themselves could see how the pieces added up to the bigger whole in the research process.

So I am saying nothing more than those affected and involved need to be there for the planning process for it to be successful.

And I think the workshop demonstrated that and put it within the context of not only USAID's mission but the agricultural system of the country itself being very, very critical.
And aligning those strategies with the various private sector, public sector, multinational entities involved, including the variety of organizations within South and Eastern Africa who are involved in this process; so that participation is vital.

The workshop played a very critical role in calling attention to the breadth of involvement.

Another very important observation that was made during the workshop by a variety of individuals was how critical it is for those donor agencies to maintain long-term involvement with participants.

And there was a lot of examples given about the success that can be garnered in a country when you have a U.S. university that maintains ties with someone who has been a CRSP participant, for example, goes back to the country.

The need for start-up funds and the need for continued professional mentoring
and involvement, and that point was made again
and again when I visited the university.

And I visited, had a special

session with those faculty members at the
university who had been trained in U.S.

institutions. And hearing them talk about

that need was very touching, really, because

you saw the professional development

occurring.

And here was a country which had

had tremendous gaps in the amount of funding

available for postgraduate training. And

therefore, you had a generation -- you had a

generational gap.

You had an elder group ready to

retire with no young group right below them.

And then you have new initiatives under way.

So you have -- you do not have a continuity at

a time when in fact you need that continuity

at all levels to be able to develop the kind

of human capital that is needed within the

country.
So I think that notion is something that I feel USAID needs to address and its human and institutional capacity building is ensuring longer-term continuity and support for those individuals that we are working with.

So I know that is not going to be news to many of you, but it was something that left me very excited about that potential for adding to what we are doing.

So we saw some wonderful examples of human resource development. We saw a lot of needs identified in some very obvious ways, seed development and distribution, some very technical areas.

And we saw good examples of the way in which cutting edge research is implemented at the field level. And in my field visits, I got good examples of that.

We also saw the need for continued consultation with the educational institutions within that country, within Tanzania, or any
other country that we are working with so that we gain that partnership at all levels and have educational institutions that are aligned also in providing continuing support with the private sector entities as well as with the USAID mission longer term.

So with that, let me move on to our next presenter and we will look forward to continuing discussions. We have Dr. Elsa Murano, who will be talking about her visit to Ethiopia for the inception workshop.

DR. MURANO: Well, my trip to Ethiopia was similar in many ways to Dr. Deaton's, but also somewhat different. And I will illustrate in what ways.

I wanted to first say that we had really great accommodations at ILRI and Addis. And it was really a great way to see the kinds of facilities that one can have when one engages in these kinds of projects and in collaboration with a CG center like ILRI.

Ethiopia, as a lot of you know who
I have been there, is a wonderful country, and
two wonderful people. Very friendly, very polite
people, but people who are very determined to
try to do better for themselves.

And as I like to think about it,
and as all of us know here, it is a country
that is surrounded by trouble. Maybe that's
a good way to look at it.

And so it has a lot of challenges
not of their own making a lot of times. And
I commend these people for just being so
resilient over so many years after so many
struggles.

You have got to love a country
that has a ceremony for drinking coffee, don't
you think? I think.

Agricultural production there, of
course, is quite varied but the main crops are
the Feed the Future: maize, sorghum, wheat,
barley.

And as you may know if you have
been to Ethiopia, teff is a grain that is used
by Ethiopians constantly because it is the main ingredient, if you will, for this fermented bread injera that they use in their typical meals. And so, a very important commodity for them.

And also production, of course, as well, cattle, sheep and goats, and so forth.

And, of course, as I said before, coffee. I think on this map picture I am showing you coffee production areas in green throughout the country, so fairly diverse agriculture.

The workshop that was held there was in a very, very similar way as the Tanzania inception workshop that Dr. Deaton attended. It was populated by a diverse group of people, by scientists, by educators, by policy-makers.

And you can see there a list of the various organizations that were represented. From the Ethiopian Government, obviously the minister of agriculture, but also the Ethiopian Institute for Agricultural
Research, a very important player there.

CG center representatives were there, not of everyone, but of the ones that were germane to the discussion. The U.S. academic community I was very pleased to see, some of the core center directors present.

And then they had NGOs. Various foundation representatives were there as well, and certainly USAID not only from Washington headquarters but also the mission there locally.

So it was a really good group of people from various perspectives and points of view and backgrounds. And yet they were all there, convened to try to develop a plan.

And so I was very impressed, to be quite honest with you, because I didn't think that this kind of activity went on. And it was of great benefit I think to me to see as a member of BIFAD the real implementation of this idea to coordinate at the planning stages very much manifested at this workshop.
So as I understood it, our purpose was to enhance collaboration, and that's why all these people were invited, and minimize duplication of effort among all these stakeholders.

Obviously, agricultural production in Ethiopia was the main focus, but not only. There was lots of other things in keeping with the Feed the Future mission.

So the aim was to develop a plan that would help improve field and production efficiency over mixed crop and livestock system through sustainable intensification, the time that we have all come to adapt and adopt, I should say, as a way to go.

Rob Bertram was there, as well as other people from Washington. And so, he stayed the whole and participated. And again, that is impressive to me, because having been at a government agency myself a lot of times, you know, the big shots show up and leave.

And you didn't do that, as big of
a shot as you are. So I'm just saying this
because Paul is here, so you know he actually
was there the whole time and worked very hard.

And of course the increased market
opportunities through improvements and the
value chain, and our hosts were everywhere
ever extremely good to us, I have to say, provided
all the things that one needs to engage in an
activity like this successfully.

So in health and nutrition and
health of women and children, economic
prosperity, conservation, natural resources,
taking into account climate change, gender
issues, all of the Feed the Future themes were
certainly there.

There were breakout sessions to
try to develop this plan. And I will tell you
that the discussions were pretty spirited, at
least at the table where I sat, and then later
on as they made us move around.

But very collegial, very much
people wanting to get at not what their
individual agendas were from all their various institutions, but really what needs to be done in Ethiopia.

        And so I found it to be very refreshing and fairly devoid of those, you know, individual agenda pressures that sometimes we see. So there you see a group of folks we, as happens at these kinds of workshops, you paste a lot of papers on the wall and do all kinds of crazy things like that.

        And so at coffee break time we all try to read them and make some sense out of them. So, very much a working workshop from the very first in the morning till the end of the day.

        One of the main, I think, aims of this was to try to connect with similar projects and similar efforts. So the minister of agriculture plan and then the center projects for the CG Centers that were represented.
There's CYMMT and ICARDA, ICRISAT, IFRPI, IWMI and ILRI, as well as the CRSP projects that were represented there. Other USAID-funded projects, and certainly the research projects of Ethiopia itself.

So there was a real effort, like I said, to try to integrate this as much as possible which, you know, may have been something that reflects what is done all the time.

I wasn't familiar with it so I was certainly impressed by it and thought it was a great way to do this. It takes time, takes effort. The more people you involve in an activity like this, you know, the longer it takes to arrive at the end.

But the end product is going to not only have the buy-in of people, but it is going to have the thoughtful input of all these people that will make it a better work product.

So in addition to participating in
the workshop, I did not get a chance, unlike
Dr. Deaton, to go in the field, unfortunately,
in Ethiopia. But I did get to pay some
peripheral visits, is what I am calling it,
visits to other entities or to specific people
there in Addis.

One of them was a visit to the
U.S. embassy. And, you know, you are not
supposed to take pictures of the embassy, but,
you know, I was able to snap that real quickly
in the car as we were coming in. So that was
it.

And then they confiscated my cell
phone. So, we needed to -- I needed to talk
to mission folks there at AID and I found them
to be very open, very willing to share with me
their opinions and their thoughts, which was
definitely what I needed to do.

And so, after some very
interesting conversations with some AID folks,
you know, they came up with what I would say
is two over-arching needs. And this is
frankly true of any government agency, you
know, that is large and that extends itself
into various places.

The need to be included in
decisions early in the process, you know, you
will find that field personnel always have
that as a concern. And then the need to
ensure that headquarters understands what they
live with, their realities on the ground.

And, you know, these are not new.
These are the kinds of things that they are
concerned with all the time. Sometimes those
contems are more than other times.

The good thing is that they had
someone who had been at the mission who is now
at headquarters. And I can't remember her
name but those kinds of, you know,
interactions where you have people who have
been at the mission for a number of years and
then they get to go to D.C., or vice versa, is
what will help bridge these gaps more and
more.
And then we visited with the ambassador, a very interesting person. I basically told about who BIFAD, what BIFAD is. He wasn't all that familiar with it, as most people are not, Dr. Deaton, so I need to continually talk about us and what we are there to do to help the agency.

And certainly he did not need to be convinced about the importance of agriculture and development. He understands it, knows it very well, and was very -- had his finger I would say pretty well on the pulse, you know, for -- on agriculture as very, very important for Ethiopia.

So I found that visit to be, you know, very useful. And then I was able to visit with the State Minister of Agriculture, Wondirad Mandefro. And he gave me a good insight as to the educational needs, talking about capacity building.

One of the things he told me, he says, you know, in Ethiopia, as I think
happens in most other countries except the United States, for the most part, is that you have extension folks are the ones that do the training of the farmers and industry folks and what have you.

And they are not located at universities. They are usually under the Ministry of Agriculture. But people who come from universities are the ones that train those folks, train the extensionists.

And his point to me was, is that the extensionists need to have very hands-on information to help farmers and others. And they don't often get that hands-on from the university-educated people.

University-educated people have all the theory in the world, but they don't have the practical knowledge. And so he was telling me, if you guys are going to do anything at universities here, you need to help them get educated and trained, you know,
whatever it is in a way that is very practical education. It is not just pie in the sky education.

So I thought that was certainly useful for BIFAD to know. And then, of course, the importance of the livestock industry in Ethiopia, he impressed me as really thinking that that was one of the big keys for Ethiopia to do well.

And so we talked a little bit about some projects that had been done already and that are being done in livestock industry so that they can export meat products, for example, to outside of Ethiopia and in that way really enhance their economic development.

I visited also with a representative from the Ethiopian Institute of Water Resources which is, as it says here, collaboration between several Ethiopian universities and University of Connecticut and some other American universities to educate at the master's and Ph.D. level Ethiopian
students doing research in water.

So that certainly is one of those projects where we will -- we should keep an eye on to see if maybe it can serve as a model for other similar efforts.

It is funded by USAID and Higher Education for Development. This is a picture of the minister. But then down here is the entry to the Ministry of Agriculture.

And he is very personable, one of these folks that, as soon as I sat down even though I had just come from lunch and had a nice lunch and coffee and all that, he insisted I taste coffee from his special reserve.

And I thought, well, I don't need any more coffee. But I ended up drinking it, Dr. Gebisa Ejeta, because it is just the best coffee there is. I will tell you that. You can't say no to a cup of Ethiopian coffee.

So in conclusion, I would say that the efforts of the agency to try to integrate
a multitude of projects and partners and so forth obviously is a very sound approach and is one that they are not just, at least in this example it is not lip service.

It was being done. It was happening. The emphasis on sustainable intensification and combining crops and livestock certainly is what needs to be done there in Ethiopia.

And Ethiopia itself is a great place to work because there is somewhat of the infrastructure that they need. Not completely, but certainly a commitment, I would say, from the government entities as well as their universities.

We again need to ensure that the mission is included in planning as well as execution and that long-term planning, as difficult as that is because we all live in the short term, give-me-the-results kind of world, we need to include those as much as possible in order to really eventually make a
big difference.

With that I am going to end, because I know that my colleague, Marty McVey, he went to lots of places so he has got a lot more to say than I did. So thank you very much.

(Applause).

MR. McVEY: Thank you. I am going to stay seated because I have got all my notes all around here, so if folks don't mind that. Thank you.

And in an effort for the CRSP study that is currently going under way right now, I won't go into great detail on opinions and that like, but I also want to recognize John Bowman, who was on the trip from AID, and what a great resource it was to have him accompany me and the team as well as Muni is here as well from Virginia Tech.

So it's a great resource to me to be able to have these folks on the trip as well. And I share with the other members how
important these trips are.

The BIFAD members are able to get into the field and see the work that is being done and make recommendations for the future and be able to participate in the success of the CRSP or any mission that USAID is funding.

So we'll start, I think -- you're going to start with some slides here. These are basically just some photos. And we started the trip in India and we visited the trade and intellectual property department and spent the day reviewing the socioeconomic research on impact assessment and gender equality.

Discussions covered primary data collected on full and partial adopters of IPM/CRSP technologies on onion, eggplant, okra, tomatoes and cauliflower.

Considerable discussions focused on the papaya mealybug, which we renamed the "Munibug," which has a huge impact on not only papaya but also mulberry and other fruit.
crops.

With additional funds we will be able to qualify the impacts of the mealybug on other horticultural crops and environmental impact. During this discussion it was discovered that there was limited work done on the gender equality group.

And a plan is in place for year two, for 2010-2011 gender difference in the level of IPM knowledge on how to control crop pests and access to assets.

The scientists at this workshop prepared a book and packages for several vegetable crops and distributed to the farmers during the meeting.

The meeting was attended by over 700 farmers and was covered by all Indian radio and local newspapers. So a great deal of media coverage was experienced with this. We also were welcomed by the mission.

And William Hammink is the mission director for USAID and very knowledgeable,
too. Also, I briefed on BIFAD and what our role is and the charge by the administrator, and very receptive in any of these countries that I visited.

And I have already heard it said by the other members today that the missions are really responsive to our travel there and I think it is good dialogue. So the IPM/CRSP was about to give the mission director a good briefing on what they had been working on and how to work together for the future.

Mr. Hammink gave us an updated on, you know, what the priorities of the mission is right now. And it is public-private sector partnerships and development innovations, partnership innovations, food security, clean energy and global health.

We also discussed U.S.-India-Africa trilateral program. So India is, you know, already into clean energy, obviously, and global health. So they are advancing at a very rapid pace.
We also had the opportunity to meet with the Indian Council on Agricultural Research and got the update on biological controls of papaya mealybug. So that was very helpful.

We travelled to Nepal and met with the mission director, David Atteberry, who is a very experienced and well-versed director there. And he had mentioned to us about the RFP and prefers the project to facilitate the mission focus programs.

So I think that the RFP on IPM, the new RFP is already out by now, I'm sure. We travelled to Pohkara, which is in the north, and a very beautiful place and we visited fields that are using biofertilizer and biopesticides for production of cauliflower and other vegetables.

Very beautiful scenery up there as well. We visited farmers who graft tomatoes from tomato root stock to overcome bacterial wilt disease and nematodes as well as the
longer longevity.

So it is very interesting and consistent, you know. Paul mentioned in his presentation about the role of women in these programs. And that truly is working. I think it is something that should be expanded on.

Because all of the women that we talked to and what do they do with their profits or their excess capacity is that they reinvest into education for their children.

And out of 10 probably that I have talked to, nine were reinvesting in education for their children. One is reinvesting in better seeds, you know, but putting it back into the farms.

In Bangladesh we attended a meeting for IPM/CRSP activities in Bangladesh Agriculture Research Institute, BARI, which is a very impressive setup there. And we discussed successes of IPM/CRSP over the last 13 years.

We had BARI scientists that
presented their research and extension activities in developing IPM packages for different vegetables and disseminating the information through field days, farmer school days and mass media.

I was briefed about by the ABSPII project in Bangladesh and the quarantine fields that are there in the BARI project. Also is the BARI Soci (phonetic) economic group. It will host a student for the next seven months.

Altogether they will implement another survey to be used in the impact assessment work. I travelled to Bogra and visited pumpkin fields where pheromone traps were set up for the control of melon fly.

I think it might be -- that's Bogra there, and visited a village where women were producing trichodermic compost in fields where trichodermic compost was applied.

Many of the farmers expressed their appreciation for introduction of the
trichodermic compost production and use in the field. And you can really see some good results from that increase in their yield.

We travelled to meet with the ambassador, Don Mozena, who is also -- who grew up on a farm in Iowa, so he has a lot to say about the agriculture, and of course briefed him on what BIFAD is and what a good group of folk resources that the missions could take advantage of. And he was very receptive to that.

We had attended the international training workshop in Dhaka. It was conducted on diagnosis and management of insect pests and disease in horticultural crops under the IPM/ CRSP international plant diagnostic network at BARI.

That is a mouthful, which is really fantastic. The program provided theoretical background for identification of bacterial and viral disease in vegetable crops, identification of biocontrol agents,
and use of modern molecular and serological
diagnostic methods.

The hands-on laboratory that they have there and the subsequent training provided three major case studies:
identification of the papaya mealybug,
identification of causative in bacterial wilt
and identification of tomato leaf curl viruses and whiteflies.

A manual will be developed on IPDM by the IPM/CRSP as a result. Here's some other farmers.

So I think that some of the observations, again without skewing the CRSP study that is under way right now, is that certainly there is an opportunity to have more collaboration between the CRSP and the mission.

The CRSP, at least in the three countries that I visited certainly could benefit by having more access to the mission and the staff there.
Another opportunity is to identify the true impact of the capacity building that is going on, what are the results, and how do you measure those.

I think that more documentation, and we talked about this at the Memphis meeting with the group there, more documentation of what the successes really are.

We need to be able to demonstrate the use of the funds that are going into these projects and provide those to the administrator for additional projects that may come up. And how do we learn from those?

I think as the study goes on and as the mission gets more involved with the CRSP it is: How do we get from farm to market? I think that is lacking in how we are putting these projects into application.

So that is the development piece of the research that needs to go hand in hand. And I think if we can focus on that, then that
ties back to the engagement with the private sector.

You know, involving them in the -- at an earlier stage, not necessarily developing or doing the research and here it is. What are the needs so, you know, the benefits can be shared by the masses.

And I think that's certainly -- these trips, again, are very important. I encourage other members to travel on these trips and see the projects that are under way.

I look forward to going back, especially to Bangladesh. I see a great deal of opportunity there to grow their -- have 160 million people in the country.

Ten percent of that is within the capital so they have a great deal of labor that is around to do these projects. I would also recommend that the farms that are being used for the studies be expanded so you can see more, you know, more study impact.

Thank you. If there is any
questions?

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Marty, thank you very much.

(Applause).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Well, those are the three perspectives from those of us who were travelling. And any questions among the board here?

We are going to move to Rob Bertram in just a moment for a reaction to the entire panel. But it is clear that we saw different things in different places.

We have not had -- we have had a limited opportunity for comparing notes ourselves and the observations of getting to market, for example, problems that you saw.

For example, in Tanzania, my sense was that was being pretty well addressed, you know, by the private sector and they were involved in the workshops anyway.

But the transportation workshops are different from this -- the visit for the
trip, too. But those are the kinds of issues that we'll refine and look at as we go forward.

Any reactions from anyone else?

Otherwise I'll --

DR. EJETA: I don't have a question, but with your permission if you may give me a couple of minutes to embarrass Rob Bertram.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Rob, let's go ahead with your -- did you want to do that after?

DR. EJETA: I would like to do it right now while I have the chance.

You know, the whole concept of this Feed the Future research strategy development process has been really and excellent process that has been put together.

I'm sure his staff had contributed greatly, but I have had -- I have been perhaps one of the very few people that have been involved in the process since the early days
when he and Josette Lewis started thinking about it.

And it's really a very impressive process in terms of how thoughtful it has been and in terms of building on the experiences of agricultural research in developing countries, agricultural research in the CGIAR system.

And then how consumptively it has been a process in terms of thinking about what has worked, what has not worked in the past, defining them and concentrating them to these three or four areas that they came back to; and engaging people at various levels to bring in lessons from the past in projecting this research agenda.

I really thought this inception workshop concept was a very brilliant concept in terms of bringing it to the areas where these researches are being conducted.

And also, many of you may not have picked on this, but this is something that I have been enrolled in in the dialogue within
the CG system that there was an attempt to
bring in all of the research dimensions into
ecological areas.

And in a process that we have
really not succeeded in moving the agenda
within the CG system to get that done, and
then now you will see ID approves Mark's
leadership, is really beginning to get that
done.

Not only is that going to bring in
the research into the areas that are
strategically selected in both in India and
these African regions, bringing in ecological
based agricultural research systems, but in
doing so it is beginning to influence
decision-making within the CGIR that now they
are thinking that with a very small investment
from the USAID there is an opportunity to
influence a research agenda that the entire CG
system may begin to adopt and do that.

And doing all of this, I know just
personally I worked with Rob for years and it
is just leading from the back with a lot of humility, deference to people and it just has been very, very impressive to me, Rob. And I just -- I give you my applause. I respect all of what you said in there.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Gebisa, thank you. And, Rob, we will turn to you. And let me, while you are moving up here, just say Rob was thoroughly involved in the Tanzanian workshop.

I believe you were each of the three inception workshops, as was Julie Howard, and clearly demonstrated a lot of leadership, and obviously have a lot of respect among the communities involved in that, with those discussions.

MR. BERTRAM: Thank you, Brady. Frankly, I was afraid it was going to be a different kind of embarrassment, so thank you very much, Gebisa.

And, you know, it is totally a
team effort. I want to single out one person in particular. That's Jerry Glover.

And for those of you who were at the workshop, you know how Jerry's vision and leadership and his incredible background in systems work and the literature, and as Gebisa said, what has worked, what hasn't worked, why, is making a huge difference.

And then I also want to -- there's a lot of CRSP people here who also were key participants and key drivers. So like Elsa and Gebisa said, we were so fortunate to bring together such a great group of people from the national side, from the international, and from our U.S. community.

Well, thank you. I wanted to start this morning to just remind us how we got here a little bit. This is the cover of what came out of the consultation that we did with APLU and with the blessing of BIFAD this started out at the Purdue workshop in January of last year.
Bob was there and it has continued through the research forum where many of you participated last June. We had 1,000 -- more than 1,000 participants in the online conversation.

It was worldwide in terms of scope and participation. It was very, very gratifying. And I wanted to say that last fall when we met in Des Moines, speaking of the BIFAD, we -- I laid out how we were implementing the strategy of USAID.

So I think what I would like to do today is just kind of hit some highlights. And you have already captured some of those in your comments. But in just a few months I think we are making significant process (sic).

I want to try to cover some of those areas this morning and I also want to flag a few areas where I think maybe there is more progress to be made or we are not doing enough.

And I have to say your first hour
this morning when you were talking about your areas of concern that many of you raised was really music to my ears because it was -- I think there is a real connection between the board's thinking and our thinking inside AID.

So a few things just to say sort of generically. We are building bridges across our staff and programs. I'm really excited about the participation we just talked about with the CRSPs and the CGIR and the NARS.

But we also have our lead staff, our AOTRs, our AORs, the agreement officers, people like John Bowman and others who are managing both CRSPs and the relevant CGIR programs or international programs.

So Vern Long manages INTSORMIL and the peanut CRSP. She also is the lead for the CGIR programs in dryland grains and the things to do with peanuts.

Lots of other examples: Larry Beach with dry gain pulses and the legumes
program. We also, I think we are really excited, for example, last summer the grain legumes. CRSP had a global research strategy meeting at Penn State that involved people from USDA, from the CGIR, from the universities, private sector.

Similarly, in Malta the peanut CRSP brought together a global research community to talk about our work in peanuts.

And I am very pleased that later this month and early next month we are sending U.S. researchers -- not just from the CRSP; there's several from the CRSP but also some from outside the CRSP -- to the CGIR planning workshops on the legumes program and on the dry grain cereals program, and some of our staff as well.

So we are really getting this global partnership and I think it is really encouraging. Another thing I wanted to flag and Paul and Julie have already I think flagged this this morning, is how -- what a
different environment we are in in terms of the fact that we have these 19 or 20 focus missions now who have major investments in food security and agriculture.

And it is such an important opportunity for those of us on the R&D side to try to connect with those. It has already come out several times today.

But I also think it has some bearing about what we do in R&D. And how do we pass off? How do we make that jump from the innovation in terms of the research side to pass off to the implementation in the field?

And of course part of what those sustainable intensification programs are about is just that. So I won't spend much time on this. I think you have all seen this.

This is the areas that we are working in. In a nutshell, our sustainable intensification is about climate resilience. It is about reducing risk. It is about
increased efficiency in use of water and other resources, as Paul mentioned this morning. It is about productivity gains, but through efficiencies as well as other ways, and it is about market efficiencies, too. It is not technology separate from the context, the human and the institutional context.

Livestock, key issue for nutrition, for income. Biomass, another key issue both for livestock feed, but also for soil fertility and great resilience. Drought, the whole issue of soil and water conservation. So these are all the things that the workshops that Brady and Elsa and others have discussed are -- that is what we were really trying to grapple with.

Now, I want to just -- we are calling our program in Africa, Africa Rising. And I wanted to put the definition up here just so you can see that we have the hunger
and poverty, which Paul talked about, and we also have the women and children and the nutrition piece that is very important, and of course the natural resource base.

We tried to capture that all. I think that is actually still a high bar, and we will talk a little bit more about that.

Now, this is just a screen shot. You can go to africa-rising.wikispaces.com and we can send that to everyone so that you know where to go.

But again, as I said, Jerry Glover, Elizabeth Skewgar and others have just done -- Eric Witte has done incredible work on this. And of course the other thing that came out, I think in Elsa's comments, we had Gates involved.

But we also have strong interest from DFID, the U.K., and also from Australia, who are also interested in the concept of sustainable intensification. Now, this is Jerry's creation and it is a little bit much
to look at.

But what I wanted -- what it does show you -- the main focus of our program is here on production. We are connected through extension, equipment, fertilizer, market, seeds and breeds.

But our research in these programs won't fund those for sale. And then this is past the production end to the post-harvest, milling and packaging and marketing.

So our main thrust is here but we have connections up and down. And I think those connections, of course, are critical to the success of the program for a longer term.

Now, as I think came out in the comments, one of things that we did at these workshops is talk about how do we get this community engaged? How do we show something in a short term? We are not starting from scratch.

And we came up with the quick start approach. And both the Ethiopia and the
East Africa workshop have done -- are doing that.

And so here, the point here is to really energize some of the partners -- many partners, frankly -- and to generate results by September to tap into the knowledge and engage people in the program going forward.

And we have six projects in the Ethiopian highlands. I am going to show a few examples. And we have 10 in Eastern and Southern Africa.

And then in West Africa, it was a little different but there are still a lot of programs that have gotten started. Here are some examples.

In Ethiopia we have the regionalizing fertilizer rate. That involves IFPRI, the SANREM CRSP, University of Tennessee, the ATA, that is the Agricultural Transformation Agency in Ethiopia -- it is hugely important -- and the Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research.
We have value chain analyses, again spanning CRSPs, local universities, mission-funded projects, a couple international centers. And then in West Africa you can see another effort that involves ICRISAT, but also the peanut CRSP, INTSORMIL, SANREM CRSP, IITA and the national program in Mali and Ghana.

So lots of real partnerships here. We also have groups like World Vision involved. We have local private sector. We have seed companies, small, local seed companies.

And I am happy to share the list if anybody -- Jerry and Elizabeth have compiled a list of those grants. So if you would like to see them, just kind of get a deeper flavor of what they are about we'll be happy to do that.

Then I want to also mention CSISA and Saharah Moon Chapotin, who leads the research team that's here. And this is really
her creation along with partners in the Gates Foundation and the national programs of India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Pakistan, and the related international centers.

This has been going for a while. We are funding it with the Gates Foundation in four countries. It is all about climate resilience. And again, it is about this issue of system productivity.

We are not looking in isolation. We have an example here where we are talking about -- what do I do there? Postpone, right?

So, for example, if we don't use flooded rice, if we use irrigated rice we can get the wheat in earlier. We can plant wheat into cotton stubble.

That can give us an extra ton of wheat by missing the drought. If you don't have a flooded field, you don't have to wait two or three weeks for it to dry out in order to plant.

The other thing we have a lot of
emphasis on is on livestock and grain legumes. And, you know, grain legumes have become relatively expensive and declined as a portion of the diet, to the detriment of poor people in particular.

So we are looking for ways to remedy that. A little bit more here on some impact data. The partnership, a lot of households adopting these conservation technologies. These result also in savings in energy and water.

We have policy demonstrations. We actually have our influencing policy in the Indian State of Bihar, so the government actually subsidized the development of this locally-produced conservation tillage equipment to try to encourage their uptake.

So that is quite a feat, actually, for an agricultural research program. There is also -- Saharah Moon has been very involved in the development of transition strategies to really hand this over to the local public and
private sector; both are involved.

And we are now scaling up in Nepal. There are new hubs in Bangladesh. The MYAPs, M-Y-A-P-S, those are our NGO Title II programs, another incredibly important collection -- connection in terms of moving technology from research into the hands of small holder farmers, very important partners to us.

And then finally Pakistan is coming on line in a bigger way, we think. And the point here is that even though that is not a Feed the Future country, it is a country where the R&D that we do is extremely relevant.

So we are making those connections to the mission in Pakistan and to the Pakistani organizations and also connecting them to their regional partners, the four countries that are involved.

Now, I said I wanted to say a bit more about stuff we are not doing enough of,
perhaps. And before I do that though I want to just say that the programs we fund have incredible leverage. 

We were talking yesterday with some of the CRSPs. They are leveraging researchers who have USDA grants from NIFA, CAP grants, AFSI grants. They have NIH grants. They have NSF grants. They have a lot of grants from industry here in the United States. 

So USAID in this program, and I am mentioning this now because as we think about this very consciously as we go into new areas of effort, can actually integrate all these other streams of funding and resources around a focused agenda for food security-related R&D. 

The other thing I want to say, and I checked this is on the Web, Paul. So our budget is significantly improved this year. Our R&D budget, Dr. Shah has pushed very hard for this and he has pushed hard for it on the
basis of climate resilience: crops, livestock, and some of the kinds of systems work, too, that they're talking about here.

So our budget is actually up about $60 million over FY2012. We have no knowledge of what the future will be yet. But, you know, the best defense is a good offense and that is to have really incredibly smart, strong, well-thought-out programs.

And so that is why I wanted to flag here for BIFAD this morning a few of the areas where I think you have already done it in your earlier comments.

So, for example -- oh, I first want to come back to this slide. This was the first slide. If you take a look there you see a child and a mother.

You see a handful of grain legumes. I think those are cowpeas. You see fish, cereals, animal source. You have livestock. You don't see vegetables but where's Bess? They should be there. And
Muni. The horse folks will want them to be there, and we believe that, too.

But, you know, it just -- this is to remind us of what Feed the Future is about. And as we look, for example, at sustainable intensification what do we really need to do to build nutrition in?

I mean, we know we want it. Everybody agrees. We had some nutritionists -- not enough, but some, at the workshop. But I think we have got a real opportunity and I was glad to hear the board mention it this morning.

I would really like to see if we couldn't convene with the Global Health Bureau at AID an effort to really think through how we can engage the two sectors together to see if we can drive the nutritional gains that we are on the hook for.

As Paul said, I mean, we are on the hook for something, reductions, and if we are serious about that we are just going to
have to think more clearly about that.

So I would like to really invite BIFAD to work with us and help us reach out to our partners across the aisle, as we might say in AID, in terms of another bureau to take that forward.

Another area for -- I think that I wanted to flag for you is this new -- is the climate-resilient cereals. This is actually something we started from last year's budget.

The call on this just closed but we are very excited that it is going to lead to a series of new partnerships, some with universities, no doubt some with the private sector.

It is procurement-sensitive. I can't really say much more than that. But we know we are going to be leveraging again a huge amount of other resources from both public and private sources here.

And I also want to flag -- wish Max was here because I have to say this. It
is not just about private resilience crops. This one was, but we are also interested in climate resilience and livestock.

And we have some thoughts about that being another area that we would like to develop going forward. Wheat research, another area where we actually do a fair amount.

We are -- our programs like FIFA, but also our CGIR program in wheat are screening heat and drought tolerance and disease resistance, germ plasma.

You are familiar with our ref work with the CGIR, Bill and Melinda Gates and USDA. We are building a new greenhouse at USDA's cereal disease lab in St. Paul to help them play more of a global role.

And we are -- we have the hope of some more drought or heat-tolerant work coming out. Issues of drought and heat tolerance in wheat are huge and this is probably one of the most sensitive crops in some of the areas that
are most sensitive, say South and Central Asia, Ethiopia.

We really want to be ahead of this. The other thing I want to flag on something like wheat is, not a lot of our missions have this as a value chain but we know it is incredibly important to food security.

So it was a question of, even if it is not necessarily a total overlay, we know that for a lot of our countries the performance of the wheat crop is incredibly important for their food security. Places like Nepal, Bangladesh, but also Afghanistan, Pakistan and many others.

And then finally -- I think this is my last slide, I wanted to -- I think this was already mentioned again, the issue of water. And it is an area that we flagged before, Brady, in conversations.

But AID had gotten out of the irrigation business about 20 years ago. And
of course our work used to be very much around large-scale systems in places like South Asia. But now when we talk about sustainable intensification for small holders in places like Africa, we want to think about water because there is nothing more important in terms of reducing risk.

Irrigation, also water use efficiency, and I know SANREM and some of the other CRSPs are working on this and some of the centers, but I think this is an area where we could again do some convening and really think it through.

You have big investments being made in U.S. universities. The Daugherty Center in Nebraska is one example but there are many others.

And again, it is an issue where we can -- we have a lot of experience to bear. There's a lot of U.S. universities that have worked globally, so I think maybe the time is ripe to bring -- reconvene on that.
And then the last point you don't have a slide on but I want us to let everyone know we are not forgetting policy. And we have a new policy activity under design now. It is still in developmental stages.

So we have a policy team in the Agricultural Research and Policy Office headed by Jeff Hill. We have people like Jim Oehmke from Michigan State and Dave Atwood and others, a strong group.

And we -- that's another area where again we are going to be looking to the U.S. university community and others to help us ensure that those -- both those upward and downward linkages that I showed in that slide slanting the production focus get the attention they deserve.

So thank you very much.

(Appause).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Rob, thank you very much. Let me turn to the board itself for any comments or further discussion.
regarding any of the presentations we heard, Rob's particularly.

Catherine?

MS. BERTINI: I have a question, Rob. I'm not sure if it's for you or one of your colleagues. I just read today that Canadian CEDAW was considering some significant cuts in their AID package and it would impact on some of the Feed the Future countries.

Notwithstanding whatever they do, I am wondering how USAID interacts with -- you mentioned DFID with others and how you support each other. And we go up and down ourselves in an effort to try to sustain support.

MR. BERTRAM: I think Julie could speak to this as well because it is very much in our minds right now with the G8 planning and G20 planning coming up.

But I would say that there are ups and downs, and hopefully not all donors or development agencies move the same direction.
at once. So we do get some smoothing out.

We certainly believe that the processes like the L'Aquila process that President Obama and other world leaders launched on in 2009 has paid off tremendously.

And I think one of the challenges we all have is: How do we maintain that central focus for the issues? The price rises are not transient. They haven't gone away.

And the driving forces, which are the shift in diet and the demand for more food for a richer diet by emerging middle classes on the one hand plus, frankly, a declining rate of productivity growth in agriculture on the other, those two things are still there.

So -- but let me ask Julie. It is a concern, but having sharp priorities and focus and being able to articulate always helps. But, Julie?

DR. HOWARD: Well, so it's a great, great comment and question. I think both through our G8 and the G20 discussions
where we are getting to a better place, it is not without pain.

But, say, you know, for the G8 discussions on around technology and innovation, really, you know, the things that we are talking about with our G8 partners is how we do specific things to better coordinate in especially technologies already developed and making sure they get commercialized rather wide-scaled and let farmers know about them.

So it's, you know, I think that is the bridge that we haven't been able to cross yet, you know. And it is a very important bridge to go over, you know, as we continue to develop from L'Aquila, you know, into actual what does this need for donor coordination and corrective recording of impacts against a common target?

On the G20, you know, I think that is also -- we are beginning to have some interesting conversations there, you know, about how we get better even at reporting what
we are spending.

I mean, we really have a very, very loose idea of what we are spending on agricultural research and development. It is kind of -- it's very shocking.

Until we get better at knowing what we are spending, you know, we also can't get better at knowing where are the gaps. What do we really need to focus on, and all the things that you need really to go into ex/ante impact analysis.

And so that is critical to the smoothing function that you are talking about. So even if a donor drops down, you know, that we can highlight it early enough to say, look, you know, we really need a surgeon in rust research or something like that.

MR. WEISENFELD: Just a couple of quick points to add, Catherine. Canada has been a critical partner of ours, not just in funding but as a critical thought partnership on the formation of the global agricultural
food security program, on really being a
leader in thinking about the Ag Pull
Mechanism, which you may or may not know
about.

But in the current economic --
worldwide economic environment, this is
obviously a big concern of ours. Nonetheless,
I do think that in our discussions with Canada
we are extremely hopeful that as their budgets
are constrained they will still prioritize
food security.

And I am -- just to repeat, I
think we are very hopeful on that score. The
G8 I think is a real forum coming up that can
help people prioritize food security and
nutrition issues in the constrained global
economic environment.

The other thing I would add is,
the European Union has already approached us
about their design of programs over the coming
-- I forget if it is a five- or seven-year
transfer. Seven.
But they are about to re-think where they are focusing and they are very interested in focusing on food security. And they have a big envelope of research. So as Rob says, not everyone goes up and down at the same time.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Other members of the board, comments? Questions?

Rob, let me just say you really outlined a series of very rich initiatives, areas where additional research and planning and strategy would pay off, from dropped tolerance issues to the global nutrition, the water issues.

And in every scientific conference I sit in, I see some new insight comes forward, that I'm sitting there thinking, gosh, I wonder how fully incorporated that is in the various missions around the world.

And in a sense, we need almost a querying system to determine that. Or in fact, as you know, I send you Bill Davies,
some information on him because he is talking about these very innovative ways that plants are using water with root systems and the kind of molecular biology work or pathology work that they were engaged in.

And it appeared new to many in the conference I was in. And so that is just an example. But it's just to make the point that some very, very powerful findings are potentially there that could really change the nature of the way we are looking right now.

DR. MURANO: Can I just ask one question? It just occurred to me. If you could comment a little bit, as you said, the agency works pretty much in that middle part of production. Not only, but from a -- okay.

Speak a little bit to the post-harvest area, because not only obviously is that important for markets and so forth, but also when we think about health.

And we were talking about that earlier this morning. Nutrition obviously is
an important player, but other things such as
food safety and things of that nature.

MR. BERTRAM: Right. Thank you, Elsa. The slide there was really clearly just
about the sustainable intensification
programs. And even there, there's some real
challenges.

And what I would like to propose is, the next time you meet that we get Dr.
Glover, maybe some of the partners, to talk about where they are coming out on the
research design.

You will remember, Brady and Elsa, that we were going to have this intense period
of designing a longer term program even while we got these quick start activities up.

So there is going to be -- because going from the household level to the
landscape level, for example, if you want to
deal with natural resource issues is no simple
thing, as Dr. Ejeta knows.

So we would like to come back to
you on that. On a couple of the points, water and also post-harvest, we have been thinking hard about what's the real R&D entry point there?

There's a lot of technology that we know can help. And some of our programs are dealing with technology applications. The hort CRSP is a good example to really see how our technology can be adapted and utilized and then hopefully transformative in a small holder production system.

So what I would like to do, I am going to pass the mic to Saharah Moon for a minute because she has been -- is that okay? She has been thinking about this issue of post-harvest and research in some of the areas.

And I want to just ask her -- well, I'll give her one second to think about that.

Oh, okay. You're right, you're right. John is our lead on that.
But the other thing I wanted to flag I left out. The reason I mentioned the budget, the fact that we have this positive scenario, I wanted -- I don't want to say that we are talking about cutting one thing in order to do something else necessarily.

I mean, there may be reasons to do some that but we have the scope here of actually, I think, thinking a bit more boldly.

And another one that I forgot to mention -- I'm always challenged if I have to operate the PowerPoint and look at my notes -- is there is another crop that we don't talk about much and yet it's incredibly important; and that's soy.

And it has been sort of a third rail for us in terms of development, and yet we know that the U.S. soy community could benefit from international research collaborations.

And it's so important we are prioritizing grain legumes. It's a small
holder crop. It is being used -- it's being
used as human food in a lot of countries.

So I recently had the opportunity
at the World Initiative on Soy and Human
Health to talk to the audience about that.
And I think people are a lot more open to
thinking about this.

But again, that is another case in
point where maybe it's time for a re-think, a
re-look. And let me pass it now to John or
Saharah Moon.

DR. BOWMAN: Well, I have only
been on board for about a year but I have kind
of been asked to look to caretake two areas
that are extremely important to ask that the
food security, which are post-harvest losses
and then the general area of food safety.

Because for whatever reason, you
know, for whatever, you know, we don't have
any high profile signature kind of centrally
funded project out of our research portfolio
right now in these areas.
But there's not to say we are not doing them throughout Feed the Future. We are addressing these problems fairly aggressively through the mission-led projects.

Post-harvest is seen as one of the key components you have to address in the value chain, whether it is the value of either grain or horticulture or fish or legume, whatever.

And so, the difficulty is finding, making linkages between, you know, centralized research programs that are trying to find things especially that are reseachable.

And where our research community, the academic community and the CG systems, for example, have particular leverage on the situation that can look at longer term, post-harvest food safety issues that could essentially complement the mission-led value chain project approach to post-harvest which is, you know, you've got extreme losses.

You have to have -- you've got
storage, infrastructure problems. You've got transport problems. You've got, you know, loss getting -- so much loss in just getting the crops to market.

And we are losing a lot of our, you know, our front-end investment on productivity. So everybody wants us to work on this. There's been -- there's been and there will continue to be conferences and symposia on this.

And there will be a constant kind of demand on AID to do more. I mean, I can see that coming. So we are working on it and we are -- we've got some funding set aside.

So I think, you know, to think about, you know, how we can catalyze, you know, some new AID research interests in this area. But, you know, one of them -- one of the most visible ways that we are working in kind of -- in a microcosm in this area is the area of, you know, our work on aflatoxins and mycotoxins, which again we don't have, you
know, one particularly centralized activity.

But many of the CRSPs are working on aflatoxin, in particular the peanut CRSP doing, you know, great, you know, academic work as well as practical work.

We have -- we are building a relationship with USDA and we'll be working with them. They have already -- they have got a scope of work in front of us which will be a combination of work in aflatoxin in terms of their breeding and biocontrol.

Those are the two main areas. And our, for example, our sister office, the Office of Markets, Partnership and Innovation, they have got several GBAs going now with Gates and Meridian to look at appropriate storage structures.

And they have already got efficient -- there's many efficient storage technologies, some of which have been devised CYMMT, for example. CYMMT has been funded to look at galvanized steel, farm level storage,
this kind of thing.

But the Gates project will look at other types of storage like plastic bin containers at farm level. And we will be getting some results out of those aspects.

But these are -- yeah, so you can kind of target me in terms of, you know, what's going on in this area in the future. We are trying, we're thinking.

These are areas that are spread over health, you know, as well as agriculture. And we are planning a handle on them. That gives you some insight.

MS. CHAPOTIN: Thanks for that. If I could just add a couple sentences, thinking about this as John said, we don't have a huge signature program on this issue at the level of the research team here in Washington.

But much as Rob said on water, I think we are going to be doing some thinking over the summer.
And my challenge to John and others on the team has been to -- are there some really kind of out-of-the-box thinking or research activities that we can do as a research team that, given the wide range of investments in areas like post-harvest and mycotoxins that are happening across the agency and other donors, what are some of the things that none of them can do that we can do?

And, you know, he mentioned breeding for aflatoxin as one thing. But that has been going on a long time and with mixed efforts or mixed results.

But perhaps there are new tools out there. And I can say pretty confidently that no one else in the agency is probably going to support a topic like that. But perhaps it is one that needs more thought.

So, looking for other -- welcome BIFAD’s input on this but we are looking for areas where we can -- where we have a unique,
I guess, advantage in the types of resources we have to invest in some research that really could have -- have wide-ranging impacts even though it may be a little bit more long-term.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Let's turn to -- do any other members of the board have comments? I didn't see anyone raising their hand.

So I do want to open up here for any other public comments. Many of you in the audience, we do have a few moments, and would be open to any comments you would like to make. Okay.

DR. ARES: Rob, can you please comment more about the concept of new hubs?

MS. CHAPOTIN: You mean hubs?

DR. ARES: Yeah, hubs, H-U-B. And how are they funded?

MS. CHAPOTIN: You mean when he mentioned the CSISA program in South Asia?

The new hubs?

DR. ARES: Yes. I think Rob
mentioned several.

MS. CHAPOTIN: In Bangladesh and -

DR. ARES: In Bangladesh and

Africa.

MS. CHAPOTIN: Yes. So this is --

the CSISA program, as he explained, is a

regional program across four countries that

was initially funded by USAID Washington and

the Gates Foundation.

And our investments were primarily

out of our research project. However, the

program, due to the success it has

demonstrated on the ground and the relevance

for the USAID missions, two of missions so

far, and likely to be a third.

So Bangladesh and India are ready

and Nepal likely coming on board, have chosen

to scale up that project by funding the

establishment of new hubs, in addition to the

five hubs that we established at the beginning

of the project. Five, I think.
So as the Bangladesh mission provided additional funds to CSISA to establish hubs in Bangladesh, similarly there is going to be a new hub coming on, on board in Orissa in India.

And those hubs are -- they vary from hub to hub. They do happen to have a physical office but that is not really what the plans -- they are areas where CSISA is working with a range of partners on the ground from state and national government partners to private and local partners, universities.

And much as has happened with the Africa Rising project in Africa, I am trying to now start to build connections between the CSISA efforts and the other university -- U.S. university CRSP efforts on the ground to build those linkages.

For example, I know that there is a CRSP project in Orissa under the SANREM CRSP. As the CSISA hub in Orissa gets going, they need to link up and see where there are
opportunities for collaboration.

MR. BERTRAM: If I could add one point, coming back on the nutrition side, in Nepal the nutrition CRSP is working, led by Tufts University.

And there is also CSISA working there. And I think as a result of Saharah Moon's recent trip there and work with our other staff, those two programs are coming together.

And it's an example of the kind of coming together that I think maybe we need more, you know, sort of a formal think-through in terms of the convening and such that I mentioned that Catherine and I were talking about last night at dinner.

DR. EJETA: I'll go back to the post-harvest research issues that have been discussed. In view of the fact that the CG system generally have gone away from food processing post-harvest technology research, what kind of vision do you have in terms of
leveraging for greater impact in terms of very 
small investments in post-harvest research,
you know, whether it is with the U.S.
university community or the private sector?

What path may you have in terms of 
getting more for the bank, whether in fact you 
may even capitalize the re-engagement of the 
CG system into this very, very important 
agenda, particularly at this particular time?

John or Robert or anyone who wants 
to -- ?

MR. BERTRAM: Well, the CRSPs 
actually, some of them have some real 
strengths here. And it does strike me that 
the value chain approach that some of our 
missions are taking, many of our focus country 
missions are taking, offers an opportunity to 
plug in our food technology work into those 
value chains.

And some of the things we have 
been talking about is, well, how could we 
facilitate that kind of connection? That was
what I meant when I was referring to some of the handoff where you go out beyond the research into a delivery and to the uptake in the private sector.

In terms of approaching it in a way that would be useful for others, I guess the key is really through value addition and somehow, having that value addition, Gebisa, feed back to the ability of small holders to access the market and somehow do better because of it.

And I think, frankly, in the missions there is probably a lot of thinking going on in this way around the value chains.

I should flag that on the nutrition and agriculture side, I think Paul referred to this this morning, there is a lot going on around value chains where it is not as clear as in research and R&D how to make those connections.

But it's as Saharah Moon suggests, maybe it needs some more thinking. And your
point is a good one that it is an area that a
lot of places have pulled back on, and so we
do have some opportunities.

John, do you want to add?

DR. BOWMAN: I'll just add a
little bit. A reminder also that when we are
thinking about post-harvest losses it is not
just grains and horticulture.

We have also got to think about
losses in dairy and livestock and in fish.
And I think, I mean, there's a lot of, you
know, research we could be doing essentially,
you know, in terms of the physiological
aspects of this.

When you look at the work, the
center of expertise at U.C. Davis on post-
harvest technologies and horticulture, for
example, it's just one example of research
that can essentially, you know, postpone the
degradation of products to, you know, fairly
sophisticated, you know, controlled atmosphere
adding certain types, you know, mainly
ethylene, this type of thing.

A lot of this is being pursued aggressively in the U.S. but small holder context in Africa, Asia, it's not getting out there as much.

We are entering into a -- we have made a small pledge. A World Bank Food Safety Trust Fund has just been set up similar to the Global Food Safety Fund. This is a new World Bank-led trust fund on -- I'm sorry, it's the global one on food security at World Bank, which is quite large.

But we now have a smaller one dedicated to food safety. AID is contributing to that, as is the private sector. And it's another way we can start to -- start the work on these issues.

But part of the problem is, part of the thinking is that, you know, look at the U.S. or Canada or Europe. Despite all of our sophistication, you know, we have these huge problems in food safety ourselves and a huge
amount of food post-harvest losses and food wastage.

And despite all of our efforts, you know, we have these problems. You know, what can we do on small budget levels in large African countries, for example? It's daunting, you know, how we can make an impact.

So we have got a lot -- a lot to think about and often we think of the private sector as the solution, and not us. So we have to work together with private sector and together with the value chain privates to find our niche.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: And with that --

DR. BOWMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: -- thank you very much, John. And with that, it has been a very rich discussion and we want to break now for lunch. And at 1:45 we will have a presentation by Ticora Jones on update on the Higher Education Solutions Network.
And I know everyone is looking forward to that, so we will start sharply at 1:45 back here. Thank you all very much.

(Whereupon, the meeting was in lunch recess from 12:35 p.m. to 1:58 p.m.)
A-F-T-E-R-N-O-N  S-E-S-S-I-O-N

(1:57 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Thank you for being here. And after this presentation and board discussion with our next presenter, Ticora Jones, we will then have time for open discussion with you on subjects that we have covered today and any issues you want to bring up.

So again, thanks for being here. Our speaker at this next session for an update on the Higher Education Solutions Network is Ticora Jones, who earned her Ph.D. in polymer science and engineering from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst and received her B.S. in materials science and engineering from MIT in 2000.

She is an NIH Fellowship recipient, a Ford Foundation pre-doctoral fellow during her graduate career, and a Materials Science Society's Congressional Fellowship.
She served as a AAAS science and technology policy fellow at USAID, where she helped establish the new Office of Science and Technology.

She now serves as a senior advisor in the Science and Technology Office and is leading the latest agency university engagement effort: Higher Education Solutions Network. And, Dr. Jones, we are very happy to have you with us.

DR. JONES: All right. Well, good afternoon everybody. I know it is after lunch so we will keep it short and to the point. And I would really like to get to the point where we could actually have some dialogue on what I am going to talk about.

But thank you for that introduction, and I am happy to be here. So, just a show of hands. How many of you all have heard about the Higher Education Solutions Network?

I am not going to ask how many of
you applied because then I can't talk to you afterwards because of our procurement rules, so I don't want to know.

But it has been an exciting last nine or so months at USAID in our office as we have been putting forward the Higher Education Solutions Network.

And so today, I am just going to give you a kind of brief overview of what has been going on in terms of the objective, the status of this particular effort, and the timeline as it relates to what has happened.

As you would imagine, there has been a great deal of enthusiasm for this particular effort on many campuses around the world, and we are really excited about that.

But with that excitement comes lack of sleep. I'll put it that way. So, you know, one of the challenges is that in terms of the academic landscape, it continues to evolve and we know that there is just so much enthusiasm...
for development and for people applying their knowledge to problems where they really feel like they can make a difference.

And this is happening by and large on many campuses. And one of those examples that Alex always uses is that when he went to Duke University to give a talk, they talked about how the global health program had gone from, you know, maybe 30 or so students.

They were getting 400 students and completely oversubscribed classes. And this is happening on many different campuses.

As a student at MIT, there wasn't anything in particular related to international development that Amy Smith -- three years after I graduated I always tell her that I am a little upset that this happened after I graduated -- started the D Lab

And they have grown from what was, you know, about 12 students in one class to 400 students, 12 classes, completely
oversubscribed. There is just so much
enthusiasm from students and from faculty to
apply themselves to development challenges
that we, as an agency, really wanted to find
a way to harness this.

The administrator's interest in
leveraging the activity on campuses really is
rooted in that enthusiasm. And the way that
USAID currently works with universities, it is
difficult to actually be able to capture that.

And so, one of the objectives of
this particular effort is really to be able to
create new relationships that allow us to
leverage the resources, intellectual power and
energy of universities around the world and
other institutions to address global
development problems in a very
multidisciplinary fashion.

One of other objectives, as I am
sure most of you if you were interested in it
and you may have applied for it, you probably
read the RFA already, is to really get at
multidisciplinary approach to data and analytics for development.

The relationship that you all have to your CRSPs and the relationships that other people have through a variety of other entities are very focused sectorally.

But we wanted to think about ways that we could use this particular network to create relationships that span the sectors of development because it is a systems -- a systems discipline.

One of the other things was to think about how we approach solutions in development. We know that cook stoves are something that have their controversy, but cook stoves in many different contexts require a whole lot of different data around them and an understanding of the context of that situation before you could make recommendations.

But we don't have people thinking about development problems in that particular
And so we wanted to encourage that kind of thinking as well.

In addition, as I said before, really engaging students in creating new approaches for development, it is not just the students. It is also the faculty and NGOs and private sector and all these other different actors in this space to try to find creative ways to do this.

And one of the challenges was that, you know, the RFA as it was written was very open. We didn't require any regional focus. We didn't require any sector focus.

We did point people to the strategic framework that USAID put out so that people would actually be in development. But we did not specify because we didn't want to limit the creativity of the applicants because we knew that there were things out there that we didn't know about.

And so essentially opening it up to see what we got is kind of where we are.
And we did get a lot. I'll talk to you about the logistics of what we got on the back end shortly.

Now, how does this issue from our existing relationships with the university community? USAID's relationships with the university community are very diverse, but they are also very diffuse.

One would think that they are only focused in the sector areas, but there is more than that. You know, there is the human and institutional capacity development that we do. And some of that could be the scholarship work that is done.

But some of that is also the work that is done through the CG centers for agricultural research. There is also a very specific relationship that we have with countries and the relationships that they have with U.S. universities. And so there's kind of scholarship programs.

Then sectorally there are also
some very specific programs that go on as well. And each of these has their value. We know that the peanut CRSP and the horticulture CRSP and all these other different activities are very important to agriculture and development.

And they have their place and should remain. But then, how do you connect those things? And so that is one of the questions that I would actually like to get some feedback from this audience on, how this new network will work with our existing relationships.

Because on the back end, you know, we may only award five to seven of these, but we have a number of applicants. We have a number of existing relationships, and we want to find ways to actually leverage all the knowledge that is generated by all these other actors and actually start to put it together.

So the way that I think about that is, you know, very simplistically is in three
different spaces. There is the information piece, because if we think about people who are very interested in development but don't necessarily know what to do about it or people who have connections to agriculture but not as much of a connection to health, or a connection to environment but not as much with agriculture.

How do you create information so that it is disseminated both through this network and throughout the rest of the university partners that we have, throughout other academic partners that we have?

How do you find ways to connect those two people? One of the interesting things that happened at the development exchange for the Saving Lives at Birth Grand Challenge was, you had 77 nominees that came together in July of last year.

And as they were all there, there were a number of them that were actually from academic institutions. But as they were all
there, there were some people who were looking at each other from across the aisle because they had setups where it was kind of like a science fair.

And they were like, "Oh, wait, that's what you work on? Oh, I work on the same thing." So just the conversations that need to happen.

And USAID, as a convening force to bring some of those people together to actually connect them in ways that they hadn't necessarily thought about because they didn't always know what else, what other people were doing.

I think that one of our responsibilities to this network is to help promote those kinds of connections. The other piece is action.

Because there are so many people acting in development through their NGOs, through other partners, through the private sector, through all these different spaces,
how can we use the network to help inform them
so that the actions that they take are the
ones that actually do promote development most
effectively?

So those are those three spaces.
There's lots of things under that. And one of
the other things that is happening, supposedly
from May 5th to 6th is that the Geospatial
Center, in partnership with the Development
Credit Authority, is actually opening up a
crowd sourcing activity.

And this is one of the things that
they would actually like to involve students
in. So they register in data.gov and
basically scrub data sets to help understand
what the lending power is for the Development
Credit Authority is for USAID.

And so this is a pilot that one
could imagine in terms of information and
action using the network to find other data
sets that are relevant to development and
other things and essentially involve people in
very short-term things that inform them but also allow them to add, even if it is not necessarily connecting them.

So that is just another thing to think about. In terms of the application process, it has been two stages. We asked for five-page concept notes that were due March 22nd. We got over 450.

So as I said, back to sleep. And we are currently in the process of winnowing those down. We have about 80 reviewers from inside and outside the agency that are in the process of helping make the decision on whether to invite or not invite.

Because essentially, the next stage of the process will be to invite a select number of concept notes to the final, to the full application process.

At this point, we haven't determined what that number will be. It could be around 40-ish. We'll see. But that kind of depends on what we come out with on the
back end.

In terms of what will be awarded,
we are looking at potentially five to seven
awards. But the composition of those awards we
haven't made that determination.

Some of them are $1-2 million.
The single institution awards are $1-2 million
for 5 years and the consortium awards are $4-5
million for 5 years. And in terms of the
application pool, we are putting together a
press release on this but we haven't released
it yet.

But in terms of the pool, there is
a good mix of those two separate award levels.
So timeline-wise, we will essentially
requesting full applications within the next
couple of weeks and the full applications will
be due July 17th.

In theory, awards will be made in
September. So you can see that this is going
to be a rapid process. But we were very
heartened by the enthusiasm that we received
as it related to just the webinar that we did
on the draft that came out.

So we did release the draft in
January, January 13th. And basically, we are
doing it as a webinar, did a webinar to
essentially kind of answer people's questions
and, you know, just be able to socialize it.

We released it on Thursday. By
Monday we had 500 registrants for the webinar
and I realized that I didn't know if the
agency capabilities could hold any more than
that. So we set up another one and capped it
at 750 for the first and then 750 people for
the second.

So like I said, the enthusiasm is
there in terms of the response that we got.
We also did the analysis on the pool that we
had and we had about 49 or 50 states
represented in terms of the concept note pool,
about 20 percent from outside the U.S., and I
think a little more than 300 -- more than 350
institutions, separate institutions.
So as I said, we are very excited about what we have seen and I really would like to get your feedback on how you think this network could connect to USAID's existing relationships.

This is a conversation that we will continue to have because there's a lot of different audiences. And so, I welcome your questions, your comments, and thank you very much for your time.

(Applause).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Ticora, thank you very much. And yes, we will first turn to our board here and see if there are any specific questions or follow-ups that they would like to, and then we will open it up to others who may want.

DR. JONES: Okay, thank you.

DR. MURANO: If I may, Mr. Chairman. You talked about the 80 reviewers. Can you speak a little bit about, you know, what walks of life, if you will.
DR. JONES: We've got a little bit of everything.

DR. MURANO: The composition.

DR. JONES: The composition of the reviewers is a little bit of everything. We've got some youthful folks reviewing. We've got some seasoned people reviewing. We have some professors. We have some people who are private sector. We have a little bit of everything in terms of the review panel. And so we are really --

DR. MURANO: Agency, too.

DR. JONES: Agency inside and outside. So, no, we've got a little bit of everything.

DR. DeLAUDER: Again, how many applications did you receive?

DR. JONES: We don't have a final-final number, but over 450.

MS. BERTINI: Hi. Were a lot of them, like, consortium -- consortia people?

DR. JONES: Almost half and half,
but a few more individual versus consortia.

DR. EJETA: Anything you might do to encourage linkages with existing programs or new initiatives in the USAID by way of encouraging the finals with their preparations?

DR. JONES: State your question again?

DR. EJETA: In terms of the connections, the thing that you have been worrying about. Would you be more deliberate in your request for proposals in encouraging that any more in the levels?

DR. JONES: I'm not sure that we need to be that deliberate on this side of it. But as we think about the convening of the network in out years, you know, we don't want the convening of the network to only be the network partners.

We want it to be people who do sit in other relationships that we have. And so, ideally, the network as it is convened would
be, yes, the network partners and their
associated kind of individuals within it.

We actually also want to -- we are
really thinking about how we have the student
track that is convened alongside the rest of
the network. And so that is also of interest.

But then we also want to make sure
we reach out to the existing partnerships that
we have to bring them to the convening as
well. And so how that is structured we are
not sure, but it is definitely of interest to
have it be something than broader than just
the network winners.

DR. MURANO: One more question.
Regarding the funding I am assuming that a
certain amount was carved out of the agency as
a whole.

So if you receive, for example,
applications that have to do specifically with
agriculture, is that something that then is
expected that the Bureau of Food Security
would fund? Or how -- can you speak a little
bit about that?

DR. JONES: I can and I can't.

DR. MURANO: Okay.

DR. JONES: Just speaking that there is funding; what and where and how is all still kind of coming together.

DR. MURANO: Okay.

DR. JONES: Anybody else have any other questions?

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay, and you are open to questions from the public here --

DR. JONES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: -- on this particular project? Because there is a lot of national interest on this. So if anyone wants to ask any questions on this specific topic at this time, feel free to ask. Larry?

MR. BEACH: Having not specified the topics and throwing it wide open, you have a privileged point of view to see what has come in from a large number of people, a not large number of institutions.
And you have a huge review task. With over 450 applications, it is hard to put out any feedback. But that will be an extremely valuable thing to be able to do.

Do you have in plan to review the concept note, provide feedback for the concept notes or provide maybe a higher level of feedback that you invite, those 40 or so that you invite?

DR. JONES: Yes, we are working to make sure that the reviewers do provide at least some feedback that can help. That is one of the challenges with this, that because it is new and because we don't have solid examples that we got a lot of different things.

In terms of thematic areas, we asked people to self-select into thematic areas, but they feel their application addressed. And we included basically everything that USAID does.

And we got everything. On the low
end we got fewer that associated with democracy, governance, gender, and those kinds of areas. In the higher end there was more global health and agriculture.

But we do hope that we are able to provide at least minimal feedback to each of the concept notes that we received, yes.

Anybody else? Oh, come on. I didn't cover everything, did I? Oh, we've got one.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: The question was --

DR. JONES: You just want to see it again. Yes, these are the things we know. After that, we'll see what happens.

DR. MURANO: I do have one. I was just curious. You talked about if I got this right that 20 percent of the consultators were outside the U.S.

DR. JONES: Uh-huh.

DR. MURANO: Can you speak about that? I mean, was it Europe? Was it -- just
DR. JONES: It was a little bit of everything. We -- I don't have all the numbers in my head right now exactly where. But we did get a couple from Europe but we did get Sub-Saharan African, Middle East and Asia and Latin America. So we did get something from everywhere, yes.

MS. OWENS: Hello. How are you doing. Thanks for your presentation. I was wondering about the projects that will be funded. You said five to seven projects. But is AID making a commitment for five years for each of these five to seven projects?

DR. JONES: Pending availability -

MS. OWENS: Pending availability of funds.

DR. JONES: -- of appropriations.

MS. OWENS: And then do you plan to do a similar competition each year?
DR. JONES: We haven't made that determination yet. But one of the things that we wanted to model this on is sort of the National Science Foundation Engineering Research Centers.

And so, you know, the solicitation that goes out from them goes out a couple years after we have to see what we get and see what is funded and see how that works.

But it is possible that if another solicitation were to go out, pending the availability of funds, that it might be tailored a little more differently because we will have had partners that have been established already.

MS. OWENS: And then also, how do you anticipate -- do you think these institutions are going to feed into a Higher Education Solutions Network that will be established and that will, you know, engender an ongoing dialogue among the institutions and --
DR. JONES: Yes.

MS. OWENS: -- among more institutions? Is that --

DR. JONES: Yes.

MS. OWENS: -- what your concept is?

DR. JONES: That is definitely our intention --

MS. OWENS: Okay.

DR. JONES: -- that each of these -- each of these winners, as it were, or apparently successful applicants when we get to that stage would not just be an entity unto themselves.

They would be a member of this network and they would be asked to share, disseminate, convene, do other things that are associated with the network, yes.

MR. BUTLER: The math on the back of the envelope tells me you probably got $2 billion worth of ideas.

DR. JONES: You need to add it up
that way so I can figure out exactly what we
do have.

MR. BUTLER: But you probably --
well, let's say it's $1, $1.5 to $2.5 billion.

DR. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. BUTLER: It depends on the
number of consortia and the number of --

DR. JONES: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: -- singles and all
the rest of it. But anyhow, let's say it's a
lot.

DR. JONES: A lot.

MR. BUTLER: And you are going to
award $100 million.

DR. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. BUTLER: How are you going to
-- what are you plans for taking advantage of
the unfunded $1.9 or whatever the figure may
be?

DR. JONES: That was actually
another one of the questions that, you know,
we want to definitely have a dialogue on
because, you know, we expect that whoever will be invited, you know, we know that only maybe 10 to 15 percent of those would funded, possibly.

We are not sure exactly. But that is another question that is open because in one sense you have a whole bunch of people that have put together concept notes that are potentially able to shop them around to other organizations.

But we also want to connect with other organizations who do fund these type of things. So we are in dialogue about a lot of things right now.

So that's another -- that's another open question for us because we definitely want the network to be able to reach out to the people who didn't win but find ways to involve them in ongoing convenings and activities.

Nobody?

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Well, this is
a topic, of course, that higher education
community obviously, advisedly understood them
and they demonstrated that, I think.

And so I appreciate Malcolm's
question because I think for all of us who
have a faculty investing time in these things
we hope that we will one way or the other find
time -- find a way to continue to stimulate
creative thinking and then take advantage and
build it into future forums that occur,
dialogue that occurs, or even potential
linkages.

So in the ideal world it seems to
me, and I know we can't operate that way, but
all these ideas and connections would be on a
map and then you award seven.

But those seven would know exactly
where to go to get three other key partners in
doing what they are doing, or to simulate what
they are doing, or to create the next
scientific forum.

Or if you are looking at a
scientific breakthrough, they will know where
to draw. And so it is that lost opportunity
that, let me say, we are not looking to use
specifically.

But I think all of us share that
responsibility to think about, gosh, how can
we take advantage of all this now and move in
a new direction. I know on campus when we do
these things we try to find a way then to
enable all to do something later on.

By formulating it, by -- sometimes
they don't win out in competition but then we
have someone else pick up something that looks
very valuable. It didn't fit exactly what we
wanted, but we actually shopped it ourselves
internally.

Or I have turned to our research
office on occasion. I have said, "Look, this
was not funded. It was weak in these areas
for what we wanted. But this is an idea that
could be taken to NIH and get funding."

So those kinds of things can
happen a lot of if we can find a way to
creatively form a team, you know, that looks
at them and is engaged in the continued
development of them.

DR. JONES: Definitely, just
because there are so many that people put
together so much --

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Right.

DR. JONES: -- to get to this
point. And they are finding a way to even,
for the people who aren't invited for the next
round, finding a way to keep them involved,
keep them engaged, keep them reaching out to
their students, keep them reaching out to
their fellow faculty members.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Right.

DR. JONES: And we are definitely
interested in doing that as well.

Okay, anybody else?

DR. WILLIAMS: It seems to me that
one of the great sources of data for analysis
that exists is in actual fact all of the
activity that USAID has done historically.

I think some of the challenge to that is actually accessing that data. And do you envisage that whoever does get awarded would have access to the historic data that USAID has acquired in various ways through its partners and that kind of stuff?

DR. JONES: I think that is a question that we should definitely consider, especially given the example that I gave of what is going forward with the Development Credit Authority.

And so they are scrubbing a bunch of the historical data and current data as well but had to go through a number of clearance processes to get to the point where they can do that.

But if that is something that not just the network has access to, but a whole lot of people have access to, it is least works to our transparency objectives. I think that that is something that would definitely
promote the kinds of thought and analysis that
we are talking about.

DR. WILLIAMS: Okay. And for the
-- and this relates to perhaps broader issues
than this. But for the proposals that don't,
you know, come through that might be perfectly
worthy but -- you know?

Is there some mechanism that could
be promoted through the whole of government
approach that those things could actually be
promoted into NIH and NSA or what have you?

DR. JONES: That's actually
something I don't know the answer to. Does
anybody else from USAID know the answer to
that?

Because for me procurement lines
would have to talk with our procurement
officers to see if that was possible. But I
don't know the answer to that. Anybody else?
But definitely something for us to think
about.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay, Ticora.
Thanks so much. Appreciate it.

(Applause).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: This has been a series of great discussions and I want to take just a few minutes to allow our own board to have any discussion about any points of the day that they want to bring up.

And then we will take a few minutes on that and then turn to you for additional comments on any other issues related to BIFAD or the program of the day.

So in that order we will proceed for the next few minutes. So, Catherine?

MS. BERTINI: We certainly have a consensus on this idea about working on nutrition, health, agriculture. So maybe we should just decide what our next step forward should be, either among ourselves or with USAID.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Sure. Okay.

Thoughts on next steps? On the human health-nutrition-agriculture interface
and how we are establishing it as a priority for continued emphasis and discussion? Any thoughts that any members of the board have on what -- maybe what is -- what is an appropriate next step for that?

And one could think, I guess, in terms of should we have a symposium, should we have a work group to address something very specifically? Or are there other issues or are there other events going on?

And, Catherine, you may have something specific in mind also. But I appreciate your bringing it up.

MS. BERTINI: No, I don't, but perhaps Rob does, too. I don't.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Let me just check. Gebisa, were you wanting to comment on this right now?

DR. EJETA: Any time you find it's appropriate I can make some comments.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Why don't you go ahead, and then we will turn to Rob.
DR. EJETA: Just following on what I had seen in the past, recognizing that finding a way to get some of these things done, particularly at the research level not being easy, requiring a lot of contemplative thoughts, probably what I would think would be forming a small committee to put together a program for a workshop of some kind and then selecting carefully the kind of people you would call upon to develop those thoughts further would be a good way to go.

And then naturally we cover the mix of skill sets that are going to be required, engaging people in health and nutrition and agriculture and I don't know what.

Maybe talk to the agencies where the environmental change ought to be as part of that.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Right.

DR. EJETA: And then getting a good mix of people would be -- would be
important. And it gets to be very enriching when that happens.

Not necessarily leading to specific things that need to be done at that time but really coalescing these thoughts into something informative that one can take and develop it further.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Right, okay.

Rob?

MR. BERTRAM: Thank you. Thank you, Brady.

Well, I am glad also that Catherine raised the topic. It is something -- there's a couple things that come to mind. One is the point we made earlier about reaching out to the health side of the agency.

And I think BIFAD's sponsorship and oversight of a process would enable that happening. And I expect the administrator would welcome that.

The second thing that Saharah Moon has just reminded me of is that we were
planning to sponsor a workshop at next year's AAAS meetings in Boston where of course Tufts, one of our main partners is, on this topic.

And not that that would replace that, but it might be a goal at which we could maybe jointly sponsor it with BIFAD if that is something that would be of interest to the board.

But then think of it in terms of some convening or workshop, as Dr. Ejeta said before then, but then with the idea of trying to, you know, go global in a sense with the larger community.

And we think this one of those topics that does really resonate outside of the Justar (phonetic) community to a much wider set. So that is --

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Has the AAAS program been set at this point in terms of resources or people?

MS. CHAPOTIN: The deadline is approaching for submitting proposals for
sessions. Perhaps we should say we are hoping that we will be able to have a symposium at next year's AAAS meeting, assuming they accept our proposal.

So we haven't yet thought through who would be on. We are going to have to submit a list of names and proposed topics and we have not done that yet. But the deadline is the 26th of April.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay.

MR. BERTRAM: So, I mean, we could follow up just in the next week or two through some e-mail contact in terms of your ideas on it. And if it sounds like something, then we could even then perhaps have it formally be BIFAD's sponsorship. Sounds interesting.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: So you are suggesting the possibility of us sending ideas in to Susan and --

MR. BERTRAM: Right. Well, why wouldn't -- we could do that, but we could also start with what we have, send you that.
And then I know -- I know you're going to have ideas. We have some. And then come together. But either way is fine.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: We've got -- do we have anything written?

MR. BERTRAM: We just have some brainstorming, basically. But we know this deadline is fast approaching. This has been very much on our mind, of course, this week.

So we're --

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: So we could iterate -- we could iterate by e-mail.

MR. BERTRAM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: And then get to the point where we would have maybe a board representative meeting with you or, say, or Helen.

MR. BERTRAM: Right. And then I think the other thing would be, I mean, in parallel we would want to think about the process between now and then in terms of some convening and that sort of thing.
CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Bill, you had a --

DR. DeLAUDER: No, I was going to say that other thing we can do prior to that is that the agenda is not set for the next board meeting. We could assemble a panel and identify appropriate individuals to discuss this issue at our next board meeting.

What were you, Rob, also suggesting? That BIFAD be a co-sponsor of this AAAS meeting or --

MR. BERTRAM: I was going to invite that, yes. I think it would add --

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: I think that would be excellent if we could do that and think of having a program. We would put together a program for the fall meeting.

MR. BERTRAM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: And then from -- and it would -- but that being a trajectory to the AAAS meeting.

DR. DeLAUDER: Right. Yes.
MR. BERTRAM: Exactly. They are not that far apart. And then we can also --
but we could plan something good for Des Moines. I assume we will be in Des Moines.

DR. DeLAUDEL: Right.

MR. BERTRAM: And then we can think about maybe something in the preparatory activity of some kind this summer.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay. Is that specific enough at this point, do you think? Any other thoughts on that?

Thank you, Rob.

MR. BERTRAM: The ball is in our court, at least for a few days.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Okay. And then we will reiterate and we will discuss it further also today. Catherine?

MS. BERTINI: If you are open for another topic, another thing we talked about was BIFAD Hill visits. And is there anything that we wanted? I don't have a proposal.

I just wanted to put it back on
the table for what we want to do or building
some sort of strategy for how we -- what the
messages would be and then maybe taking
advantage of members' times when they are
already in D.C. to make it --

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Right, right.
I like that and Administrator Shah has been
very positive on that idea, as I think we said
earlier.

And we can gain from the
secretariat sort of key legislative strategies
that are there. And then I like the idea of
certainly when we are visiting we can be in
touch with Susan and then add on individuals
and then coordinate so that we aren't over --
accidentally overpowering.

I don't think that will happen. I
think most of the issue is trying to free up
the time to be able to do this.

But just for the couple of visits,
one can sometimes have some impact and I think
it is important to those members of our
delegation -- those of us who visit a
delegation for a certain purpose, like in my
case Missouri, or food or science-related
issues to press these issues and bring up
something.

They aren't expecting it, but to
know that your university or your program area
is vitally concerned about food security and
in the role that USAID plays, the role that
our university plays vis à vis that, and your
particular on BIFAD certainly has some very
important impact, I think.

And it helps educate for the
longer run. And we often forget that while we
are educating the elected representatives we
also are very much educating the staff people.

And they may be there longer than
some of the elected representatives, so they
have long-term impact, as you know. I like
that idea.

So then they do something that --

Susan, would it make sense for you to prepare
just a brief statement about what the key priorities are, points to emphasize?

Just as a skeleton so we certainly don't undertake any -- we don't do any damage but we are able to add that to whatever our message might be otherwise or maybe be cognizant of it. And maybe some of the key committees are that we are interfacing with also.

MS. OWENS: We can give you some data, too.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Excellent, yes.

MS. BERTINI: Well, I would think the talking points are one thing. But the other thing is, I think if any of us said, okay, we are going to be in town on such and such a day, then I think it has still got to go back to AID to your multistoried office to say, well, we suggest that you might see so-and-so and so-and-so, unless we are already going to see somebody on our own because --
MS. OWENS: We have that communication open though. Yes.

MR. McVEY: Just a point, Susan.

I'll take you up on that. I'll be back in Washington on Monday.

MS. OWENS: Okay.

MR. McVEY: And my other board that I serve on will have meetings with about five members differently, and also at the White House. So if you have got some extra time this weekend, maybe you can send me something on that. I will be glad to carry the torch next week.

MS. OWENS: Yes.

MR. McVEY: If it's possible and on short notice.

MS. OWENS: Well, we'll dig it up.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Bill?

DR. DeLAUDER: I have been somewhat encouraged by the discussion of HICD. We are not doing nearly what we need to do, but at least we are moving in the right -- in
the right direction.

But I wanted -- and this is probably a question for Rob. When we met with the mission directors -- and I have forgotten when that was. Was it in the fall or --

MR. BERTRAM: In November.

DR. DeLAUDER: It was in November? We met with the mission directors. That was one of the issues that came up about the importance of long-term training and every one of them recognized that this was important.

But when you asked them why weren't they more engaged, they pointed out that they are being expected to show results for the work that they do and it is too risky for them to invest money in something that has a long-term outcome expected, as opposed to something short-term.

Has there been a change in the policy as it relates to the mission to make them more comfortable with addressing some of things that they think were important but
don't give short-term results?

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Yes, Rob?

MR. BERTRAM: Has there been a change? Well, I don't know that a significant change other than I think because the dialogue is active again that people are starting to recognize how strategic an investment this is for the United States.

And we didn't see the history. We couldn't see the graph this morning from Julie. But it really does go down. And that decline was exactly parallel to the decline in our bilateral mission funding.

So as I said in my comments, one of the changes in our landscape is that that funding is back. And so I think a couple of things.

One, it is up to us to advocate for this and there are several missions. Brady has the first-hand experience actually because of his visit to Sokoine, where the Tanzania mission is really investing in a
And I am going to be very frank here. One of the things that worries me a little bit in USAID Forward is, you know, the idea there is to shift resources to the local partners. Very, very, noble idea.

We ought to all ought to be working to that in everything we do to empower them and to build their capacities. That doesn't mean that we don't need the long-term relationships with our U.S. universities.

The comments came out this morning and showed how valuable those are. And I do think there's a lot of innovations going on that can maybe pick up the pace at which the local partners strengthen their abilities to manage funds and to be accountable.

The things that often come up, as you know, Bill, when we are making a federal grant.

So there's -- that's an area where I think we need more discussion about the
special role of higher education with respect to sustainability of the overall enterprise, the overall Feed the Future enterprise, not just in things like ag research and such.

Let me think if there's anything else I would add to that. The other point is two things that -- it is mainstream, you know, other investments.

But what you saw this morning in Julie's presentation were some platform approaches that we hope will be a springboard for the missions to actually bring out some of the best practices, get some good analysis and then move to that next step of a longer term, more substantial institutionally-oriented investment.

So we are certainly trying to put in place the elements of that. And as BIFAD considers this whole area of human and institution capacity building, we will continue to welcome exchange and advice and thinking on that to help engender those kinds
-- the actual long-term investment.

At the end of the day we have to be working with the missions. That's where the resources are. That's -- you are not going to get your numbers of trainees and graduate students and faculty exchanges just from central investments.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: At this time I think we can open things up generally for any public comment. If you have comments on any subject that you feel you want to add your voice to the concerns of the day, we would appreciate hearing that. Yes?

DR. RANGAWMAY: On behalf of the IPM/CRSP, personally I want to thank also Marty McVey for taking time and visiting with the IPM/CRSP in Nepal, Bangladesh and India. And going through the field trials and all, we really thank you for that. And also for attending the -- taking the committee meeting in Memphis. We greatly benefitted from your association with the IPM/CRSP.
MR. McVEY: Thank you very much, Muni.

DR. RANGAWMAY: And also I want to thank Chairman Brady Deaton for attending the IPM technical committee meeting in Memphis and participating in the meeting. And your input was very valuable. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Thank you very much.

DR. RANGAWMAY: And also I want to thank Dr. John Bowman for attending the technical committee meeting as well as the South Asia planning meeting. Thank you, John.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Thanks, Muni, very much. It was inspiring for Marty and I both on that.

MR. McVEY: Wonderful.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Are there other thoughts from the floor?

(No response).

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Well, if not, let me thank you. Any comments from anyone
else here at the head table, so to speak, board table?

MR. McVEY: I would just like to add a comment how much I appreciate the work that USAID staff is doing, and Susan and all the folks at APLU, and John and others.

We really do appreciate it. And we like to be updated and briefed, and I think that something that is very needed and it helps us in our volunteer work that we do.

So, thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON DEATON: Let me just say in closing that there were -- I noted this very top-of-the-head here -- five key things, kyl initiatives that were -- I feel like we have accomplished during this meeting and moved them forward.

And one of those, of course, is just what we have been discussing with regard to the agriculture-nutrition-health focus points. We are going to be pushing hard there.
And with the support, with staff, Rob, and the Food Security Bureau we want to really try to make an impact there because it is something I know that some of us have had a long-term felt commitment and need to be engaged in.

Second, the Higher Education Solutions report we heard and the potential linkage of that with a lot of the other things, particularly the human and institution-building components and the research components of CRSPs is something that we will be looking to see how that evolves.

That is going to be something very important. The CRSP evaluation, we really appreciate Robert Jones and other members and other members of the team being here to participate with us.

And we are looking forward to that evaluation process and to the potential that it holds for really doing something innovative to move ahead and capture the best of what we
have done and make it even sharper than we
have in the past.

Fourth, I would just like to
commend Bill DeLauder again for bringing the
awards program to action and implementation.
Bill, thank you, and we will be moving ahead
immediately on that.

And then the thoughts on
legislative affairs that we just talked about
I think could potentially be a very important
step for us to be taking as BIFAD.

Beyond that, we will continue to
be concerned about -- and I may have missed
something else that came up that I should have
noted, let me say. And if so, we will pick
that up later.

But I just saw the news in the
headlines this morning about drought
conditions affecting most of North America.
And you can't help but if you have worked with
food aid issues, as I know some of us have.

And Catherine particularly, you
have to be concerned about what effect on the national and international dialogue food -- potential food shortages may bring to U.S. and global food aid programs and that interface with development assistance and USAID work generally.

And frankly, as you are also aware, it changes the nature of science, even, the nature of what is explored in science. So these are just vital issues of today, coming at a particular time.

And the drought issue is one that, you know, it has been there in Africa and addressed in one sense. When it hits a major food-producing country like the United States it has different effects, of course.

So we will be looking to see what kind of impact that and other kind of global matters have on the way we do our business and the kind of dialogue that we generate. I want to thank all the members of the board for their cooperative work.
We send our best to Jo Luck and we will miss her throughout the remainder of this session and look forward to having her back with us next time around.

Thanks to all of you for being here, and a particular thanks -- I join Marty in thanking Susan and Malcolm, the work that you have done and the work that is so evident from USAID in so many, many ways.

And seeing so many of you at the inception workshop in Tanzania and then having you here is particularly enriching. So thanks so much for everything you have done.

(Whereupon, at 2:46 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)
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