BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD & AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

160th Meeting

October 12, 2010

Des Moines, Iowa

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Robert Easter, Chairman
Catherine Bertini
H.H. Barlow
William B. DeLauder
Elsa Murano
Timothy Rabon

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ron Senykoff
Kerry Bolognese

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(PAGE 2)

WELCOMING AND OPENING REMARKS

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I would like to call the 160th meeting of the Board of International Food and Agricultural Development to order. It is very pleasing -- it is a pleasure for the board to be holding this meeting at the same time around the World Food Prize in recognition of those who made enormous contributions in our area of interest: The world's food and agricultural system.

Let me begin with some introductions. My name is Bob Easter. I have the privilege of serving as the chair of the BIFAD. In my day job, I serve as the chancellor and provost at the University of Urbana-Champaign. If I appear to be dozing off, it's because I got back from India a few hours ago, so there are still cobwebs in the cranium this morning.

Catherine Bertini is known, I think, to just about everyone here, recipient of the World Food Prize a few years ago, with the Maxwell School in Syracuse and a person who has enormous demands on her time. Catherine, thanks for being here this morning. I know they will pull you away for other meetings and you will be back, so we appreciate your commitment to this board and commitment to the world food supply.

Sitting next to her is H.H. Barlow from

Kentucky, who brings much practical agricultural experience to the board, has been involved in the board now for three years -- four years so has provided significantly to us.

You are probably our most senior member, Bill. President Emeritus DeLauder from Delaware State has been associated with the board for several years. Now in his second term, I think, in this role and has served in many, many different roles during his time of leadership. He is a very insightful person who brings also an enormous commitment to economic

development and particularly to the world of agriculture and the need to provide sustainable food systems to people of the world.

Elsa Murano is sitting to my left, and I'm envious that she gets to go to my alma mater and footballs games that I never get to go to. But, Elsa, thanks so much for being here. She does come from a food science background. She brings the perspective of the food system and protecting, preserving food as they move from the point of production through to consumption and most recently involved in the task force on Haiti.

Tim Rabon from New Mexico, a person who has enormous experience in livestock production, beef

cattle, and we made an official trip a couple years ago to Kenya and looked at their food systems, and remind me, Tim, that many of the people of the world have animals as a source of food, and it's something that we sometimes fail to appreciate as we focus our attention on vegetable production and cereal. Not to diminish the importance of those, but also to keep blindfolding ruminants from people, a source of high-quality protein is necessary.

The schedule for today reflects the activities of the board, and we will go through it in due course. We begin this morning with a presentation from Allen Christensen. I will introduce Doctor Christensen in just a minute.

Then we come after that to a signing ceremony, which we have been developing this document for some time now. It's a reaffirmation, I think an important reaffirmation, of the relationship between universities with the capacity to contribute to the food and agricultural system and the agency, the U.S. Agency for International Development. Doctor Alex Dehgan is here to sign that with me, and I will introduce him as we come to that point.

We then move to a panel presentation that he will chair and the panel title is "Science,

Technology and Innovation." We have a break and then an update and a panel that Doctor DeLauder will chair, and I just would commend him for the work that has been done over the past year and a half to develop our relationship with the minority-serving institutions.

I think in the process of doing that, Bill, we have come to appreciate your very significant, significant capacity within those organizations, those universities, to contribute to the mission of BIFAD.

We come after that to the public comment period and just a word about that. The BIFAD had adopted a couple years ago a protocol that facilitates or provides an opportunity for public comment both in the morning and afternoon sessions. We would ask that you register with our very able executive officer, Ron Senykoff. Ron, Doctor Senykoff, is over here. If you would like to speak to the board at some point, please do that.

After lunch we will be back to talk about the Administration's Global Food Security Initiative, and there are a couple of panelists that will make that comment. And then at 1:45 the role of universities in the future of science, technology and innovation. Again, a very well-known person in this community will lead that conversation.

Doctor Murano will report on the Haiti Task Force; have some updates from Kerry Bolognese, the staff member on our board from APLU on some of the activities they are doing and then we wrap up.

So with no further ado, I will introduce our first speaker.

Special Presentation: "Reflections on BIFAD and Our Record in Development"

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Doctor Christensen is well-known for many things and particularly his enthusiasm and passion for international food and

agricultural development. He has a storied history, a long-time faculty member in California, eventually serving at Fresno --

DOCTOR CHRISTENSEN: Cal Poly Pomona.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: -- and throughout his career, has had a role in both USAID and JCARD, one of the earlier organizations, and comes to us today to present some thoughts and reflections on BIFAD and our record in development. One of those whose bond of history -- it seems as my children tell me, the older I get, my fondness increases proportionately, and I know there is real value in understanding what has worked in the past and what might not have worked quite as well, and I know you can bring those

perspectives to us very personally.

Thanks for coming this morning. Your comments are prepared in written form. Is that available to the audience?

DOCTOR CHRISTENSEN: I don't know. The board has them.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: They will post it on the Web site.

DOCTOR CHRISTENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the board.

Good morning, fellow practitioners in the field of international development. I am delighted to have this opportunity to share with you some of the history of the development of Title XII and some of the things that have occurred in the year.

This is something that began in the 1970s. I think the legislation was enacted actually in 1975. Congressman Paul Finley was one of the principal coauthors of this legislation, and he was invited to come today but cannot be here. And hopefully you can get to hear from him next year, but I understand he is 92 years old, and we don't have a long lease on life after that point.

But it was a visionary piece of legislation. In my judgment it provided a grand

vision of what ought to be and what could be. The purpose was to use, in a cooperative manner, the expertise of many of America's land-grant universities and other eligible universities for the benefit of the many who had so little. Provision was actually made to strengthen the capacity of those universities to act in addressing the pressing problem of inadequate food supplies in much of the developing world.

The legislation was intended to assist in the economic development of the poorest of the poor. The developmental community frequently pointed to the African continent, especially sub-Saharan Africa, as the place of greatest need.

I must say, parenthetically, that I have always thought it worrisome that we have tended to overlook our neighbors to the south and I think that there are still definite needs among a number of those nations as well.

BIFAD, or Title XII, was to be a joint effort between USAID and these universities, or the Title XII universities. Both the agency and the universities have unique strengths and many of those universities enthusiastically threw themselves into the fight against poverty and hunger.

The question of how to effectively combine

the expertise and the idealism of AID and the universities into a functioning system to accomplish this grand purpose resulted in numerous high-level conversations.

Initially there were two committees that were a part of the BIFAD structure that addressed this area. One was called the JRC, or the Joint Research Committee. The other was called the JCAD, or the Joint Committee on Agricultural Development. These committees had both agency personnel and they had university personnel. Very prominent people in many

cases gave their time and energy to this effort.

The Joint Research Committee had the responsibility to determine what areas of research and strategies to get that research done and applied in-country. That was their function. The Joint Committee on Agricultural Development was involved in proposing and determining priorities for international development.

In 1982 these two committees were combined into one and called the JCARD, or the Joint Committee on Agricultural Research and Development. It was a large committee at the outset -- 22 members. It included -- it was co-chaired by Jack Robbins of AID, who had been the dean of Washington State; and

Francine Fireball, who was in the provost's office at Ohio State University. I know the Ford Foundation was represented, and there were a number of other prominent people on the committee, some of whom subsequently served on the BIFAD board. And it became the key spadework committee for the board to look at the various issues which confronted it and to determine what the priorities for international development initiatives ought to be.

An original initiative that came from those first years was called the "strengthening grant." Strengthening grants were awarded to many universities to enable them to enhance their capacity to deliver the needed technical expertise, thereby finding and applying effective solutions to the twin challenges of hunger and poverty.

Universities frequently had language training as an ongoing component of their strengthening grant program. A key intent was to internationalize the university and particularly to institutionalize the discipline of agricultural development, to build an institutional memory where development was concerned, and to develop the needed foreign language fluency to effectively serve in the international arena.

An expressed intention, especially on the part of those who authored the legislation, was to effectively make us an international university community and to help position the university community for an emerging global economy. The objective was to mobilize and effectively involve the entire eligible university community in order to address the problems confronted by the poorest of the poor.

It was not simply a process that resulted in contracting with universities on a random basis. It was to involve many, and it actually went beyond the land-grant system. I was at a university that was under the heading "other eligible universities," and we had some strengths, we thought, in order to be able to make a contribution as well.

The noble minded saw these efforts as key to promoting peace through enhanced cultural understanding. That is there was to be a cadre of able, internationally minded faculty who would build an institutional memory at the participating universities, both at home and abroad. A number of universities saw this as a long-term commitment on the part of the agency, the federal government, and they began to appoint faculty for that very purpose.

One of the things that grew out of this initially were the CRSPs, or the Collaborative Research Support Programs, and they were conceived to be a joint endeavor involving generally several universities in the United States, as well as the cooperating universities abroad; the intent to discover science and technology that was relevant in addressing the scientific needs of the nations in which they proposed to work.

And there were a number of them. There are still a number of them. One aspect of the CRSPs was

to bring graduate students to the United States, have them get their advanced degree work here, but to return home and do their dissertation work in-country on a problem that was confronting that particular nation. Many received such graduate training at U.S. universities. In fact, I think at one time there was something in the neighborhood of 15,000 sponsored foreign students who were involved in that sort of activity. Largely, they became fast friends of the United States. Now many of them are retiring or have retired.

And what should be the role regarding that in the future and what should be the role of the CRSPs in the future? How can BIFAD, USAID and the Title XII

universities collaborate and effectively point the way toward research activities that are a part of the global developmental strategy? Many hard questions still await sound answers.

Various JCARD panels were appointed to evaluate the effectiveness of such programs. Others, such as the Human Capital Development Panel, were formed to consider improved ways and means to build the human resource at home and abroad. It was a time of energy and great enthusiasm in international development, and many people wanted to be involved and many were involved.

By the mid 1980s, priorities began to shift, national economic priorities began to shift. One factor in causing the shift was diminished financial resources, not unfamiliar to what we face now. Some saw international development expenditures as an unwarranted use of tax dollars. American agriculture, in some quarters, saw the effort to develop a flourishing agriculture overseas as creating additional market competition during a time when U.S. domestic agriculture was suffering. Why add to an abundance of crop commodities in the international marketplace when prices were already depressed?

Resources had been abundant in the 1970s.

However, by the mid-to-later 1980s, there had been a paring back in federal funding to support education programs for international students. In order to stretch the agency's budget, USAID began asking cooperating universities to accept these students at in-country tuition rates. There was a push-back on the part of the universities where that was concerned. They felt that this sort of thing was a responsibility of the federal government and the state government should not be asked to subsidize the federal government in this initiative.

I think perhaps as much as anything over the next several years, the number of that as much as anything resulted in a decline of USAID-sponsored students.

Now please permit an analogy. A shortage of resources tends to make any marriage stressful, if not downright uncomfortable. There are those who were never keen on the legislation that mandated a marriage between USAID to the Title XII university community. With AID resources increasingly going to private-sector firms and in short supply, the international programs at some universities and university consortia tended to fall into disrepair.

Given their budgetary constraints,

university interest in international activity diminished, I guess is the kindest way to put it. The university community won fewer contracts. Consequently, over time the role of BIFAD and Title XII suffered from benign neglect.

With a lack of financial support from USAID relative to the university international research agenda, the university community turned increasingly to cutting-edge basic research and away from the applied research so much needed to address the agricultural problems of the developing world. The

criteria used for appointment, promotion, retention and tenure, those decisions were given less weight where international service was concerned.

Rather, deans and department chairs and others weighted most heavily peer-reviewed research that led to cutting-edge scientific breakthroughs. New faculty members could not afford to jeopardize their future tenure, their promotion, by spending their energies on international work, if, in fact, the university's retention, tenure and promotion committees did not value that.

There was another problem and it still remains really. It was this: African universities and their internationally educated faculty aspired to

build institutions like the ones in which they had gotten their PhD. Where agriculture was concerned, they became more heavily involved in research that addressed the agronomic requirements of developed nation agriculture. They would produce papers that could be published in the prestigious journals of their profession, and the solutions to problems facing their own country's farmers went begging. Sadly, experience indicates that situation is still a problem.

Budgetary constraints saw the elimination of the BIFAD support staff. It used to be a large staff. It had a number of prominent people on it. People rotated in and out from various places to serve on that. I think about Glen Taggart who left Utah State University to serve on that board; Fred Hutchinson, who subsequently became the president of the University of Maine, served as the executive director. Many will remember there were prominent people who really were so highly motivated that they pitched their heart and soul into this work.

So by the time I came on the board in 2006, BIFAD had only one part-time position, and that position reported to a very low level in the agency, when the board was supposed to report specifically to

the USAID administrator.

Now, the contract to provide financial support to the BIFAD, which had been substantial in the past, was awarded to NASULGC -- now APLU -- and BIFAD itself had come to be viewed by many as simply an advocate for the CRSPs and not as a policy-recommending board to the administrator of USAID.

The appointment of a number of new BIFAD members, most of whom are sitting before you, led to an activist frame of mind and they began to vigorously tackle that issue. The university leadership was keenly interested in being effectively involved. Two national Conferences of Deans of Agriculture were held beginning in 2008, and they expressed a very definite desire to want to be involved in a meaningful way in this whole process. The skyrocketing prices of 2008, of course, served as both an intellectual and economic stimulus to move this again forward, and to do so boldly.

Between 2008 and now, most see the world as having lost ground in the fight against hunger and poverty. Foundations and others, including the World Food Prize, began to highlight the challenge that we are once again confronted with a hungry world.

Candidly, the situation in Africa is not much different from 1975, despite the fact that billions of dollars have been thrown at the problem.

The international community has raised the voice of alarm. There has been a call to boost foreign aid to Africa. Doctor George B.N. Ayittey, in a landmark address to the BIFAD in May 2007, asked if any of these plans would be helpful to Africa. The distinguished economist at American University and a native of Ghana said in part, quote, most Africans are skeptical. They have heard of these righteous calls

before. Helping Africa is a noble cause, but the campaign to help Africa has turned into the theater of the absurd -- the clueless leading the blind. More than $400 billion in foreign aid -- the equivalent of six Marshall Plans -- has been pumped into Africa between 1960 and 1997 with negligible results. Instead, it has created an inscrutable dependency on aid, close quote.

People speak of an Africa agribusiness export model. Some are promoting monocropping, growing crops for export to developing nations. What will happen to the small-scale farmer or the small holder, if you choose, when the international market for a commodity he has grown or she has grown is

flooded and there is no sale? Simply put, when the international agribusiness firm cannot make a profit on the commodity, the small holder is left holding the bag.

In this past year the Malawian farmer who had grown cotton for export and could not sell it was faced with the fact that neither he nor his family could eat the unsold cotton crop. Eventually this seems to happen to small-scale farmers who are strictly engaged in monocropping for export. Where they have borrowed money to grow this crop, their financial situation is even more desperate.

Fundamentally the foundation stone of all development is human capital development. There are 750 million people who live on these small farms. The first step for developmental initiatives ought to be, in my judgment, to help those small-scale farmers and their families become nutritionally self-reliant. When their children are well nourished and attending school, then it will be easier to teach effective and profitable risk assumption.

This is much better than trying to overcome the risk-avoidance approach that accompanies a survivalist mentality. Furthermore, nations who wait for overseas remittances to fuel their economy and

care for family members who have been left behind suffer during a global recession. Those of their citizens who do nothing and simply wait for overseas remittances do not exercise a needed initiative to improve the local situation. They simply wait. That attitude, no problem exists. It needs to be addressed through training and in providing local opportunities. Without incentive or without the possibility that you may starve, nations and peoples who have been at rest will remain at rest.

In the final analysis, you can only lift those who are willing to participate to the maximum that health and body will permit. Work is necessary. It wins, where hopefully wishing for better days does not. If a man or a woman cannot get to work because they need a wheelchair, that is quite a different manner than one who waits and hopes that a cab will come by and offer him a ride or that some agency donor or company will invite him to participate in a job that is pleasant.

We are now in a global recession. Some wonder whether or not rich countries will be able to keep their commitments to poor countries which have been given to repeated financial folly. Are we really responsible for those given to repeated folly? Are

the careful always responsible to care for the careless? One of the reasons the Marshall Plan succeeded was that the Europeans went to work and they even helped one another to the extent possible. The situation is similar for Japan, Korea, and Taiwan; and the Chinese are now moving boldly forward. The time could come when those who have been consistently careful may rebel at the notion that they are always responsible to provide for the careless.

In addition, that reluctance is magnified when the so-called "wealthy" nations are facing

serious economic problems of their own; hence, any developmental initiative needs to address building human capital, including work ethic, beginning with the parents and children of the small rural farms and the villages of the countryside in less-developed nations.

Poverty may appear at the door, but it need not be invited in to become a welcome house guest. Less developed countries should not rely on the hope that a compassionate person or an NGO or a donation will see their plight and provide aid or relief that will enable them to continue doing that that they have always done which practices have led to their present plight.

Human resiliency can be improved through education and training, and one element of that training is this: The individual has the primary responsibility for his care and well-being.

There are two basic treatments that are required as a part of the development package for the small farmer. First, relevant training and coaching for farmers and their farm families; and secondly, needed inputs such as tools, improved seeds, fertilizer, chicken coops and other resources. Both are necessary, perhaps mandatory, in order to help an individual and family get started. Training and motivation without resources leads to frustration. The gifting of resources without training leads to wasteful consumption, leading to little sustainable change.

It's difficult to get a family's foot on the first rung of the developmental ladder. In fact, of all the rungs on the developmental ladder, it's the greatest to reach. The child of illiterate parents who earns a B.S. degree in agronomy has traveled a much greater distance than the child of a physician who becomes a physician. We need to keep that in mind.

The evaluation of the effectiveness of any

developmental program needs to take in mind how far people have come, the intellectual and economic distance traveled by the participants.

The U.S. governmental community is an important fork in the road. Are we willing to take the road less traveled? Are we willing to think outside the box or will we continue to sustain that thinking that put us into the box? Are we going to try to continue that which we have generally done? Are both USAID and the Title XII community ready to recognize that being involved in development is a long-term commitment on the part of both entities? They have to accept each other as needed and able partners. Many university students and faculty are idealists. They want to help.

It may well be that we need to assign heretofore untried boxes. Will USAID and other governmental agencies work effectively within themselves to avail themselves of the tremendous potential of the universities? The greatest need is really the small-scale farmer and his or her family. They represent 75 percent of the world's poor. They need both training and resources, and, as I have said before, you need to couple those two together in order to achieve maximum results. And where those coaches

are people that you have developed from their own people in-country, it's much more effective.

We must build the capacity of the small-scale farmer and his or her family and the supporting of local agencies that are involved in development. If we are in earnest about addressing hunger and poverty, we should begin with them.

It will not be an easy in and a quick out. Development is not an event. It is a process. Building self-reliant families takes several successful crop cycles. It requires that they save

for reinvestment. It requires that they send their children to school. It requires that they have their children immunized against preventable diseases because they will spend everything they have to save the life of a child.

While this may not be glamorous, it is, nonetheless, effective if one is attempting to build sustainable change among the poorest of the poor. Institutional building takes 20 years. We must sometimes be willing to start small.

I will conclude with an example from the Ezra Taft Benson Agriculture and Food Institute. The Benson Institute began in 1987 to work to assist in development of the Centro Universitario de Oriente in

Chiquimula, Guatemala. It goes by the acronym CUNORI, one of the regional centers of the University of San Carlos. When we began in 1987, there were 120 students and two baccalaureate degrees. By August of this year, there were 25 Baccalaureate Degree programs, several master's degree programs, and a Doctor of Medicine, and the students' numbers have grown to 5,000.

What has happened there has been remarkable. On August 17, 2010, they honored the Benson Institute as an "invaluable bastion in the development of CUNORI during 22 consecutive years of continuous cooperation, and for the contribution to improve the conditions of life for many inhabitants of the region."

This recognition came during the installation of a new director, who, interestingly, some years ago had been able to complete his bachelor degree thesis with aid from the institute.

Emergency relief is a quick fix. Development is a long-term proposition. Organizations -- be they Title XII universities, NGOs, USAID or World Bank -- which say they have come to help, must do what they say they have come to do and they must stay long enough to get it done. The

cooperating university or other developmental agency needs to become a part of the cultural fiber of the community. There is frequently an unexpressed fear about becoming involved long-term.

In my experience, five years is too little time for making lasting changes. Long-term involvement and a firm commitment to the stated objectives of the region you say you have come to address are factors that made Norman E. Borlaug so eminently successful. You must build what you do into the fabric of that society and then you must nurture it and nurture them to self-reliance.

One should not assume that the humble farmer, perhaps one lacking in formal education, is unaware of the process of development or the actions of his government. He or she has seen much of broken promises. If we are to make a sustainable difference with these 750 million people, then we must begin to think outside the box.

Agricultural technology is location specific and development has a large component of location specificity. New approaches are called for. Repeating what we have done before that has not previously been especially effective is unlikely to work now. We must pursue those approaches that are

directed at building self-reliant families. Lasting change really comes with one family at a time. Achieving self-reliance must be considered as something of a generational process. Education is vitally important. It is perhaps even the primary means by which positive improvement can be accomplished.

The effort will take time. It will take resources. Yet the efforts must be undertaken. In my judgment, it must be directed at the people who require development at the in-country universities or

agencies which support them. That was what was foreseen 75 years ago. I think the vision is still active.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I am always impressed with your ability to pull together thoughts in all perspectives. As you were speaking, I was reminded of the role that strengthening grants have in coaching universities to make investments in agricultural development, and I was reminded that is actually a discipline. There is a discipline of agricultural development, and you have been a dean of agriculture, Doctor Murano has that role, and we have all grappled with that challenge over the last decade of sustaining

those development faculty and making commitments to replace them as they have retired in an era where there hasn't been the kind of support those (inaudible).

My recollection is a few years ago in Illinois, we had four faculty who specialized in agricultural development. Today we have one. My expectation is if that individual were to take a position, it would not be filled because there is no support for that position. So that is a real issue as we think about capacity and perhaps something this board may want to think about in terms of its recommendations to the agency.

Any questions quickly from the board members or comments before we move on?

Doctor DeLauder.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: Allen, when you look over the history of Title XII and the relationships between U.S. colleges and universities and USAID, what was the relationship at the very beginning as opposed to what it is now and why the change?

DOCTOR CHRISTENSEN: Bill, you have an unusual capacity to get me in a position to make some career-limiting remarks.

I think we are a visionary people in both

the Title XII community and the agency that wanted this thing to work. They wanted it to work well. And, in fact, a number of people from the university community moved to AID and took the positions. However, there is an undertone of resistance in the agency about this had been basically their territory and this was viewed by some as an invasion of that territory. And so as the people who had been very forceful and effective in leading the effort from both sides moved on or passed away, retired, that same level of energy did not continue.

Then, coupled with the financial resource problem, people pulled back until the point of, as you remember, four or five years ago there really wasn't that sort of thing going on. Now there is a new energy I see again, in part due to the activities of this board, and the need is as great now as it was then. And if we get together and pull together, it will work.

As I said in the meeting yesterday, it's more than -- we have to be involved as institutions and agencies. We have to be there on the ground. This is not a case of alimony development. You cannot throw money at a problem and assume it will go away.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I think we should move

forward. Thanks again, Allen, for putting a significant amount of time into this.

Signing Ceremony Memorandum of Understanding

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Before we do the signing of the MOU, I want to introduce the person who will be moving somewhat center stage for the next couple of activities. Alex Dehgan holds a PhD and a Master of Science from the University of Chicago's Committee on Evolutionary Biology. While a graduate student, he focused on extinction and adaptation of 12 lemur species during environmental change in tropical

forests in Madagascar. He holds a J.D. from the University of California Hastings College of Law, and a B.S. in Zoology and Political Science from Duke University.

Prior to coming to USAID, Doctor Dehgan worked as senior scientist and policy adviser with the science adviser to the Secretary of State, where he worked on science diplomacy issues with the Muslim world, including assisting implementation of the S&T aspects of the President's Global Engagement Effort announced in Cairo, working to rebuild science in Iraq and seeking to use science as a diplomatic tool within our most significant foreign policy challenges; including in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Doctor Dehgan also recently served as a senior adviser for the government in Southwest Asia, where he developed a science diplomacy engagement strategy with the Republic of Iran, advised on internal political dynamics and served as the liaison to Ambassador Holbrooke and the Office of the Special Representative to the President for Afghanistan and Pakistan. Doctor Dehgan was the Afghanistan country director for the Wildlife Conservation Society's program in Afghanistan, which he founded, and we are very pleased that he is here with us today.

And beyond that we are pleased that the administrator of USAID, Mr. Shah, has been willing to bring into his portfolio as a close adviser an individual with these credentials, and, Alex, we very much appreciate your accepting that responsibility and also we appreciate the experience that you bring to this position. You understand the university community, which you have also substantially been involved in development issues in a very modern context, and that's important.

So now we turn to the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding. And this actually was a conversation that came out of the Second Council of Deans meeting more than a year ago, and it was that

there was a need to reaffirm the relationship between this board and the agency and, more broadly, the university community that has a capacity to contribute.

So the MOU was developed. I won't read it in its entirety, but I think it's important for those in the audience to be aware of what is said here and so I will.

There is a bit of a preamble, which I will not read. It identifies the parties and the usual things.

USAID and the BIFAD desire to clarify the role of science, technology, and innovation in our collaboration efforts over the course of 2011 and beyond to help achieve a safe, secure and sustainable global food supply in 2030 under the conditions of global climate change. The overall purpose of this MOU is to set forth the understandings and intentions of USAID and BIFAD with regard to shared science, technology, and innovation goals in mobilizing the capacities of U.S. universities and colleges to implement the program components under Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as follows:

The elements identified: Building and strengthening the institutional capacity and human

resources of agriculturally developing countries; providing long-term program support for United States university global agricultural and related environmental collaborative research and learning opportunities; involving United States universities more fully in the international network of agricultural science; and providing program support for international agricultural research centers, support for research projects identified for specific problem-solving needs, and developing and strengthening national agricultural research systems

in developing countries.

Let me just refer to some specifics within science and technology. Many development solutions are based on the appropriate and timely application of science and new technologies in a manner that accelerates problem solving and scales up effective solutions. The joint USAID and BIFAD consultations should clarify priority regional and global agricultural development challenges, identify the best scientific and technological applications to solve the challenges and clarify the role Title XII programming can play to assist USAID.

Rebuilding Policy Capacity. The Office of Science and Technology is an important part of the new

Bureau of Policy, Planning and Learning that will promulgate cutting-edge creative and evidence-based development policies. The joint USAID and BIFAD consultations are intended to examine how BIFAD Title XII program operations analysis can best assist the Office of Science and Technology to make evidence-based, informed decisions to fulfill their responsibility in the new bureau to reintroduce a culture of research, knowledge-sharing and evaluation in USAID.

Last of all, Talent Management. USAID's goal is to attract and retain the best people who reflect the wide diversity that is America and who share one common trait: The ability to be problem-solvers. The Joint USAID-BIFAD consultations should explore ways to leverage the enormous talent within USAID's Title XII public universities and colleges partners to deepen USAID's agricultural science, technology and innovation staff capacity, particularly at the mission level.

I am delighted that we have been able to develop this language jointly and more delighted that we can come together today to sign it. So if I can offer the official pen to you.

DOCTOR DEHGAN: As a representative of

Administrator Shah, I want to say thank you for the work that you have done in the past and for the work that we are going to do in the future. I think there is a recognition that making progress is insufficient anymore; that we actually must move to solve global development challenges and that science, technology and innovation underlie how we are going to be able to do that. It is a key.

We need to actually develop sort of the transformational changes, the scientific technologies, and empower people in developing countries, as was so eloquently pointed out today, for people to be able to solve their own problems, for people to be able to have access to knowledge and to connect the unconnected, to limit the space between those who have access to knowledgeable science and technology and those who don't, and we are very excited to reinvigorate this relationship with BIFAD.

The administrator continually asks me about the status of this relationship. I have been charged actually to bring and welcome back the university community back into international development as partners with USAID. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Don't go away. The next item is the panel that you are leading.

Science, Technology & Innovation: Role In Transforming International Agricultural Development Panel Discussion

DOCTOR DEHGAN: Would my esteemed panel members please join me up here. We are going to be talking today about science, technology and innovation and its role in transforming international agricultural development. We have three esteemed panel members, who are also three esteemed friends, and it's really great to see all of you up here. I would like to introduce the three of them and then be

able to make a few comments introducing the panel in general.

Sara Farley is the chief operating officer of the Global Knowledge Initiative who helped coauthor the World Bank's new Science and Technology Strategy for Development with the chief scientist at the time, Bob Watson. She has a degree with honors in Science, Technology and Society from Stanford University's School of Engineering, as well as a Master's Degree in International Policy Studies.

She has worked in many different countries around the world with many different foundations, including a start-up in San Francisco. But I think her biggest role is yet to come in terms of expanding

the Global Knowledge Initiative, and we will be hearing about that in just a few seconds.

Amanda Rose has received her Master's Degree from the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University where she focused on international security and development, focusing on how science and technology can inform interventions in pre- and postconflict environments. She graduated summa cum laude from North Carolina State University with degrees in Chemistry and the Social Policy of Science and Technology.

She has worked as science adviser to the Secretary of State and the Agency for International Development, and I had the complete honor to work with her in that capacity. But she has also gone out on her own in terms of work in developing countries such as Kenya with the Kenyan Ministry of Health, the World Health Organization, and the UN Foundation. She is a very impressive person, as is Sara in her own right.

I don't actually have John's CV with me, but let me just say when I started off actually at the State Department and I was very interested in science and technology for development, one of the very first papers I came across that had inspired me that had been written over a decade earlier was written by him,

and I sought him out. He was working with the F Bureau, which is a bureau that helps -- it helped deal with funding decisions at USAID when we started some of our discussions.

Then he has had a tremendous career in international development but has been a proponent, even during the dark age, for science and technology and development, and it's an honor to be sitting here with him.

To start off I think the basic idea with science, technology and innovation is we don't want to repeat the last 200 years of industrialization. We don't want to build the economies of 1950, but we need to be thinking about how do we position developing countries so they are ready for the future. That is based on also an idea that the challenges we face are nondeveloping-country challenges. They don't happen in far-away places. What happens around the world increasingly washes up on American shores.

That means that we are not just bordered by Canada and Mexico, that we actually need to find solutions in developing countries. We need to partner with developing countries that, in fact, if you know met that population biology from one of my own fields that we actually need to put pressure on the entire

system, we actually have to have the entire system respond to the challenges we have.

This has been a new focus at USAID, is how do we actually identify what are the biggest challenges that face us as a global community. This underlies -- President Obama's foreign policy of global engagement is based on this idea of partnership. The power of science is the power to connect. It is the framework on which we build relationships with other countries. It is not the relationship itself, but it is the foundation that

provides us a common culture, a common language and a way to connect scientist to scientist, biogeographer to biogeographer, chemist to chemist. And what we need to do is make those connections, empower those connections and help reach out to those people who are the unconnected in the failing and failed states.

The role of the universities, I think, are key, and we are looking very much forward to a partnership. But I think that there needs to be a recognition that we can't do things the way we have done them in the past. We actually have to be very outcome focused. Is every development investment we are making going to achieve an outcome for the betterment of those countries? How do we actually

apply the research that we have to translating it into an improved livelihood for people in those countries?

Someone pointed out today actually that USAID is a translating agency, and I think that is very correct. But we also need to help AID itself improve that translation function. We need to actually deliver that last mile to AID to be able to understand what those translations are. The partnerships are doing so, but we can't just think of AID as a national science foundation. It really needs to be a partnership that works to strengthen those outcomes and that also needs the ability to use metrics to measure the effects of what we are trying to do and make sure that every investment dollar that we put into the developing world is well spent.

I think AID, the administration, is key to bring back science and technology and innovation, and it is one of four priorities at the agency. We are recognizing AID is a technical agency -- I think we have forgotten that in the past -- and we want to make it a center of excellence. That means increasing capacity, providing excellent technical people. We already have the tools and incentive. They need new institutions to support the use of science as well as creating a senior technical career tract.

For instance, to actually bring scientific leadership into the leadership of AID itself, and thinking a little bit with our university partners what development looks like in 2030. What this means, how do we position the agency to think about that long-term perspective, as Allen was pointing out this morning.

Second, our focus is going to be on grant challenges and development. What are the biggest problems that we need to address? What are the critical barriers that we need to cross to be able to really transform development?

We have a suite of tools. My office is using a subset of tools that includes open innovations in terms of what we can we use from developing country counterparts. How can we use medical advances that are low cost but have the same outcome?

Technology platforms. For instance, using cell phones to evaluate where centers of corruptation are; and finally, empowering people to solve their own problems, which is getting back into cooperative research, which is getting back into training and which is providing people access to knowledge through digital science libraries.

We don't want any more welfare states -- I

think that is clear -- but we want to empower people to be able to solve their own problems, and we want to be able to bring cutting-edge knowledge back to USAID itself as well.

Finally, we have an approach using innovation which is based on a venture capital model. It's called our development innovation ventures, which is seeking to scale-up ideas and inventions that can have a profound impact on the developing world. It is a new way of doing business at AID, and with that I would like to turn the floor over to Sara.

MS. FARLEY: It is such a pleasure to join you, and I think the most appropriate way to put us all on the same wavelength is to begin with a quick encapsulization of the Global Knowledge Initiative. We evolved from the 2008 Higher Education for Development Summit. That was attended by university presidents, convened by the Secretaries of State and Education. From that summit there was a very strong and dynamic conversation around collaboration and mechanisms that would draw universities into collaborative arrangements to respond to development challenges. There were follow-on summits that happened in Rwanda as well as Bangladesh.

Two of those people, Nina Fedoroff, who

many of you would know and formerly was the boss of these two -- Nina Fedoroff; and Sam Pitroda, who is currently the prime minister of infrastructure -- those two really thought that the best way to actualize the call from the summit would be to bring together some thinkers and doers around collaboration to solve science, technology, innovation-related development challenges. That spoke to the National Academy of Science. They agreed to incubate the idea.

I left a decade at the World Bank to become chief operating officer of this organization. It's been the first year and a half, very focused global need (inaudible). Through the network of universities, we are delighted to be part of this conversation, and I think for us we were requested by Alex to join John and his colleagues at USAID to think about the contours of the new strategy around science, technology and innovation within the USAID.

The test, I suppose, was to help to respond to the need of USAID to draw this all together. So that is why we are here. It's how we have connected ourselves to USAID, and Amanda and I are going to tag-team.

MS. ROSE: Absolutely, Sara. Thank you.

This slide gives a bit of an overview of

that process that we participated in with USAID. It culminated this summer in a conference called Transforming Development Through Science, Technology and Innovation. It brought together heads of the federal agencies, university administrators, other experts to really talk about these issues and give USAID just an astounding amount of information to carry with them as they took forward their strategy process.

As you can see, we had 26 different breakouts across two days. It was really a rich environment for feedback, and there were a lot of takeaways. These are some of the major ones:

That really participants are drawn to very integrated challenges. They see this as where the future lies in trying to address development challenges. No longer can we exist in this disciplinary style as we really have to start working together; that critical untapped partners abound. You are sitting here in this room today. They were there at that conference. People are ready and willing to participate. It's just questioning how do we all engage on these issues together.

We really have to think about not just bringing challenges for government as one opportunity

to engage. Really how do we marry these challenges with sustained partnerships. So, as Doctor Christensen was saying, about really thinking about the capacity-building needs as we deal with these challenges.

Realizing as we look forward, the takeaways. A lot of excitement around the idea that USAID is kind of back in the game when it comes to STI. Really the question right now is how do we take these linkages that were made apparent at the conference and really begin to actualize them around

making a difference.

As we have heard today and as we heard at that event, a new approach is needed that is really going to align these resources that are existing with the partnerships to do something positive.

MS. FARLEY: As to the perspective that we have gleaned on the ground and in this first year and a half and for many of us involved at GKI, this is a culmination of (inaudible) for science, technology and innovation. And it's perfectly in tune -- and that was the point you were making -- that this shared challenge terrain is where it's at.

Of course, there are big challenges in developing things pertinent to STEM -- science,

technology, engineering, mathematics -- education, pertinent to innovation, pertinent to scientific research. But that shared challenge space means many of these shared problems truly at their core are shared opportunities.

These are the examples we are hearing during our needs analysis, and they are very diverse. This is just a little taste test for you. We have folks like this group of Stanford, researchers saying We have been working on the technology. It's a hand-held diagnostic tool. We know this is germane, especially in a world community where we have many hours and many miles of a lack of transport infrastructure to get to an emergency room. Help us find communities where we can bring this technology to life.

We have got universities -- this is one of many that we are talking to. Some of these universities are in the room, which is great, so we can continue the conversations. But universities saying that we understand the level of discrete faculty, that we have a lot going on in Africa. What we are trying to figure out is, one, how to consolidate that; how to focus our efforts so we have a more strategic, long-term engagement that doesn't

just speak to the kind of ad hoc problem constellation but really gets to the core challenges. How can you help us do that?

Then we have USAID saying, Help us think about the way to use challenges as a mechanism, a way to open the cupboard to federal science agencies, all of the resources that U.S. taxpayers have paid for that are pertinent to development challenges. How can we use challenge as a mechanism to draw those resources and challenges together?

And the developing countries are also very heterogeneous, the landscape there. I just returned also from India from the U.S.-Indo Summit on Higher Education. There are 800 universities represented. It was an astounding event, a lot of talk about deepening collaborations with a real appetite for American engagement.

COMSTECH, all of the Islamic countries of the world, through the OIC, looking for a method to train future generations of science, technology and innovation policymakers in the skills of policy (inaudible).

And then groups like the Library of Alexandria have very specific technological capacities, and one of the interests there is to

harvest lectures from scientists and make them available widely across the globe.

Now, we understand those data points, those articulations of need. There is a science, technology and innovation backdrop that we try to stay very abreast of as we move forward in articulating our programs. We can call these the "big picture trends."

Amanda spoke to this, that the multidisciplinary research is on the rise. This is a change from several decades back. My undergraduate program still befuddles my parents: Science,

Technology and Society. This is where students are expressing an appetite to bring their studies and bring their real-life exposures.

New technologies are advancing global connectedness at unprecedented rates. It was amazing the constituency at the USAID event coming from the mobile (inaudible) community. You had groups like Google there talking about the role of developing agencies as being smart routers, the idea of connecting and moving information through the system with greater efficiency and ease.

Simultaneously, we understand this growing demand for open access to knowledge resources. Increasingly people want it for free. They want to be

able to find what (inaudible).

We are also seeing that there are higher returns on investment through collaborative research, that we can actually get a little more bang for the buck.

The disconnects. Against those big-picture trends, there will still be these disconnects. Call for some repair mechanism, as it were, that the findability of resources is now a new problem. We all experience that, using Google or whatever search engine. Just because you know your search terms, do you know which element that comes up in your 10 million hits is the first place to look?

Decreased budgets to bring scholars together. In real terms this financial picture, which is very depressed across the globe, is one in which universities, even here at home, do not have the same budgets to put their scholars together on planes to go to conferences. And that is the number-one predictor of why they collaborate: "I met her or him at a conference."

Developing country STI contributions often going unseen due to lack of exposure. Weak linkages with scholars, especially in the poorest, the least-developed countries, and insufficient

coordination between solvers to bring together these multidisciplinary, cross-border collaborations.

MS. ROSE: As we think about all these trends and considering where best to kind of jump in, we really are trying to get away from "business as usual," which is what we talked about earlier today, that there are critical resources out there; whether they are knowledge-based; technological, human-based -- as what is represented in this room -- but that there is still not an opportunity to utilize those resources out there and we often cannot find and collaborate with those who have them. We are trying to get away from that business as usual.

So our organization is trying to implement a new vision that was really inspired by those individuals at the initial Higher Education for Development Summit, and especially those individuals who have been involved in our leadership.

And manifesting this vision requires a number of things, but really it comes down to locating, enabling, connecting, and solving. And we work across a number of partnership types, and this is just to give you an idea of the breadth.

A lot has been said about research collaboration. Certainly that is an important aspect,

but we also see the contours of other types of partnerships that are important. And when we think about trying to line up these partnerships to really make strategic movements and development challenges, it's going to take working across a number to make institutional development open to education and research.

Finally, this is just a tool that we use to help partners like potentially yourselves and others we're working with in the landscape of how we are talking about really moving the needle when it comes

to development challenges.

You can see at the very top -- or maybe you can't. I'm sorry about that -- we're really talking about how do we increase the income of Ugandan farmers? That is a big, just gnarly challenge out there just sitting. But really you can start to break this down to think about how might we utilize open education resources to inform that larger goal.

You can see across different partnership types and also across different disciplines. So if you are a university administrator, you can really start to see how all the elements of your universities start to feed into this really gnarly, complex challenge. And this is a tool that we offer our

partners to help think through complex landscapes.

MS. FARLEY: So, for example, with USAID we partnered with more than 800 development challenges. So what do you do with 800 challenges? You can start to knot them and you can start to see threads between the integrated (inaudible) challenges and think about what are the disciplines? What are the formulations of collaboration? This is just one of the tools we use.

We are going to close the presentation with pitching this to you in a way that takes a single challenge, and it walks you through what this can look like in practice, and so we will give you a challenge. This is a very real one that has been posed to us by one of the networks of universities.

This is a network of universities in East Africa with a few Scandinavian universities called Bio.Earn. Maybe you are familiar with them. This is one of their specific challenges that many of the universities within the Bio.Earn is grappling with: How do we boost sorghum productivity so that each plant can feed more people and explore industrial and other agronomic uses in the hopes of raising farmers' incomes?

It is a challenge that -- I have a feeling

many of you have dealt with this very same challenge within your universities. By initiating partners like Makerere University, just Uganda (inaudible) at the development of agriculture, and they are dealing with this challenge.

So the question is the role of GKI. What the realm of GKI becomes is catalyzing a realm of resources and partners to respond to this challenge, which includes understanding the knowledge partnership landscape, framing the challenge, finding a collaborator, incentivize solvers, and supporting the implementation.

So breaking it down in clear -- the "Request for Engagement." This can be parallel to those other requests and demands for collaborative assistance as expressed earlier in the presentation, and we know that these universities can do this -- and you know this better than we do, living in the university community. The universities are holding a repository of people that express this demand in very different ways. It might look like a request for specific research information. "How might I increase the productivity of sorghum?"

It might look like a request of a student to gain more international exposure over the course of

their degree, so we clarify what kind of partnership is being sought here.

Second, we make sense of the context. So in this case at the front end of this process, we are seeking to explore and make clear the political and legal context, market and business context and the cultural context of science, technology and innovation in that geographic domain. It's really about clarifying this ecosystem for action. I think this piece of the process is very often the bread and butter of development institutions.

Working for the World Bank for ten years, I did a lot of this in different committees. But within that kind of twinning arrangement, this piece you kind of assume, "When it hits us in the face, then we'll deal with it." And we need to bring both of these pieces together in a process that gets everyone on the same page.

After we have this sense of the science, technology and innovation context, now we are looking at assessing the knowledge partnership landscape. So here we go to the level of the institutions, and we ascertain -- it's really about constructing a baseline, a baseline for collaboration activity against which we can start to measure are we moving

the needle with respect to new collaborative activities, added collaborative activities that respond to these shared challenges. So the result is a knowledge partnership landscape analysis.

Now armed with a sense of the context, the knowledge partnership landscape analysis, now we begin to open up the question of which are those challenges that offer the sweet spot, that area of a possible shared problem with a shared opportunity that is going to galvanize solvers from elsewhere. And we look at different candidates, and we provide a collaboration profile and recommendations. Within this area of sorghum productivity, agri-industrial development, here are concise challenges that you can pitch to others that might bring in the solvers you are seeking.

Now we go on the lookout, and this is where being aware of activities, such as those of BIFAD, are extremely important because we want to be able to look out into the community of potential solvers and put forth these recommendations for collaboration in a community that will hear them and be able to respond.

So this is really about scouting. From there we now bring the partners together. So let's say this is an imagined experiment here, that it was

Rutgers -- that for many reasons made sense with this particular challenge. Together with Rutgers and Makerere, we work on framing and mapping this science, technology and innovation challenge space. And this is something the partners do together so jointly they can see that relationship that they put forth in the beginning. How might we increase the income of Ugandan farmers? And we dissect it into risk components, institutions, collaborations, knowledge, et cetera, human resources, as well as to the disciplinary subchallenges that are required for response to this integrated challenge.

Now, again, we scout for solvers because through that challenge map, when you realize that this twinning arrangement, that while it may be very strong and robust and say (inaudible) are specifically germane for staff exchange or students exchange.

We now have a map that shows us, you know what? Part of responding to the sorghum challenge is about transport. It's about transport from sorghum areas to markets. That may not be something these two universities are equipped to solve. And if we are not aware of those elements of the challenge, we're not going to solve it. So this means that in looking to a global world of solvers, we now have a map that

enables us to think about probably a much more diverse constellation of solvers that need to be aware of this challenge.

So we identify scouters and now there is this realm that connects back to the utilization of this new tool for collaboration of technological platforms, how we are able to broadcast these challenges.

Around the technology platform there is a (inaudible) -- Scientists Without Borders is one of our first partners. They have members of thousands of

scientists that are in the platform scouting for challenges and posting resources. We then go through a vetting process (inaudible). Having as well as the (inaudible) as our partners, we have a host of scientists together with, in this case, Makerere, and we're imagining Rutgers would be a part of the vetting process.

Now, once we have our solver and institutional teams, we focus a lot on process skills. It doesn't become the role of GKI to solve the problem for empowering the solvers. Here we take the perspective that collaboration itself is a set of skills and again needs to be taught and can be trained. We as content experts tend to focus a lot on

the content.

Our PhD's in soil science and the like are important for the solving solution, but collaboration and process skills are also required. So we are trying to demystify collaboration, take it from that magic process. It just happens to be a process that can be learned. Now the role is sustaining and supporting this implementation team.

It's the case that one need only travel through the subregions through any of these continents -- Africa being the one I'm most familiar with -- you see so many of the same projects happening not that far apart, definitely by different donors, do not have an organization or group charged with being the periscope out in the world finding those complementary initiatives.

This is something that we are bringing into this process so that we are not duplicating efforts. Over time, as this complementary initiative blossoms and unfolds, we are looking to partnering to scale the solution and ultimately get from research and ideas to action.

MS. ROSE: I know we want to get to questions, so I will fly through those great numbers of slides.

Certainly there are a number of slides that we are all interested in confronting. For us we need to surround that by a few certain criteria just to make that a little bit (inaudible).

These are our criteria: We are talking about science, technology and innovation challenges. We are talking about challenges that the solution of which will impact the lives of people living on less than $50 a day and that the impact will be two dollars a day and that the impact will be in the thousands, not the millions.

It's about building the capacity around that solution, so that's really a much more sustainable process, and that those that are involved are really saying we're going to stick with this through the implementation process. As Sara mentioned, we are working with a number of institutions and as well as our advisers, some of our core university affiliates, and we're happy to explore some of these later with you.

Just to note other pilot geographies at this point are Eastern and Southern Africa, the Middle East and North Africa region, with a specific focus on leveraging activities in the region to support Pakistan and India and the U.S.

We certainly have a number of outputs and outcomes that we expect; and namely, you will see that all of these really have to do with quality of life and increasing the standards of living in these developing countries. So until we get to that point, we don't really mark off a success in our activities.

DOCTOR DEHGAN: Great presentation. I have been asked to actually maybe take some questions before moving on to John's presentation, but I'm going to take my prerogative to ask the first couple of questions.

And that is, what have you seen as sort of the biggest problem to collaboration? When you have looked at where these partnerships have come forth, how do you deal sometimes with the disconnected?

I can understand collaborations that work really well with India and China because we have freely made those investments. How do you develop those collaborations?

What are the challenges that you see with countries that don't have the same level of science capacity or investment -- where the country has an investment in science, what we as individuals -- that we want to support. How do you prevent a replication of the West in terms of how do we get them to focus --

the focus being on agriculture rather than nanotechnology, initially, for instance, and where does science policy fit in?

MS. FARLEY: There are a few questions bundled in there.

I think to answer the first: What are the key -- I will share the tough lessons we are learning as we go along. One of the tough lessons was at the start of GKI, we look at who is behind our organization. We have the vice president of Google and some people that hail from the West Coast, my backyard, and there is a sense that this added heart, the big challenge here is a platform that can connect us. And it's the lack of a platform that really could boil a lot of this down to kind of Craigslist. I have a bike. I want to sell a bike. What bike is available?

If it were strictly a technological platform challenge, (A), we would have solved it. It would have (inaudible). We know that the connectivity grades are so low that to use (inaudible) in some of the countries that we need the existence of a technological platform -- of which there happen to be quite a few -- and they're not connected. They're not interoperable, so the preponderance of a GKI platform

is going to add a little more noise to the universe.

The kind of connectivity quandary means as we see it, using skillfully these technological platforms as something we are committed to doing, there is this kind of human center, partnership exercises that needs to happen to top that. That speaks to the real disconnect that providing a framework to navigate between this world of virtual communication and seeking solvers, finding each other on Facebook, on Twitter. Yes, that is happening. That is the contour to the era we live in. But without the relationships into a community of solvers and some mechanism to focus the efforts of these willing solvers, these are really two divided worlds.

So it's what I think GKI can deliver, as we learn and we are continuing to learn, is a marriage of this technological platform element with the -- as to how do you bring to light the notion that the challenges may not be nanotech. They may be pertinent to small farmers. Uganda, I was there in part to evaluate a World Bank project that I was one of the instructors of, the Himalayan Science Initiative Project, but was also there for National Science Week which brings together the policy of Uganda. It looks like it would apply possibly here in the U.S. It is

grand, it is macro, it is everything but the kitchen sink.

And then you look at the very stark data point, which is the national R and D budget which is $75 million. So there is a hard challenge there which taking these lofty goals and starting to think about really tough trade-offs in the realm of science, technology funding. Actually, we will be going to Uganda in November and December to do the launch of a strategy exercise there to do just that based on three years of research that looked largely at SMEs and

largely in the agricultural sector, what are the cross-cutting areas in science and technology when your whole system -- in what field should they go? Into what crops? Just agricultural? Where should they go?

So I think the answer is what is the role of science and technology policy? The role of science and technology policy is to provide a framework. And I think more than ever before, it needs to be a framework that speaks really intelligently about incentives for collaboration because the other sad thing about these 25 PhD's that are being produced in Uganda, a lot aren't getting jobs. So you think about a whole agricultural -- 95 percent of the economy in

agriculture. They must need hydrologists. We must need these highly trained people there and yet they are not being employed.

So thinking about where the skill gaps, what is the relevance to industry, these challenges are all challenges that fall, I think, under the rubric of intelligent STI policy making, and I think it does take a community of activists to support the emergence of those policies.

DOCTOR DEHGAN: Some questions from the audience?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm John Yokee (phonetic). I was just wondering -- I'm going to make a joke here -- wondering how many acres of sorghum do they grow in Delaware? And with Rutgers and describing that relationship, you described the CRSP program, and it's very unique.

And one of the key things I got out of this was that you talked about a collaboration boot camp. This is a unique idea to me because we have collaborators all over East Africa, Southern Africa and Central America.

It would be a great idea to have a meeting of the people where they could learn how -- how to be a good collaborator. I don't know very much about the

Global Knowledge Initiative, but where is -- is it a source -- is it coming out of World Bank? Is it coming out of where?

MS. FARLEY: We're an NGO, so we are independent of government. In fact, we are working with World Bank on a few things including a STEM constellation effort in East Africa. But we're independent, so hopefully a little more nimble in some ways.

But your idea is right in the pocket of what we have been doing. For every one of the challenges, the pilots that we roll out, part of that concentric ring that grows, the way we germinate those rings is an annual collaboration that brings the facts together.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We have a scientist from the University of Nebraska who has an extensive collaboration with (inaudible) on the sorghum. We have another scientist, a breeder, who works -- we have a really pretty integrated program.

One of the things I think would be very, very useful -- and this goes across most of the countries in Africa where I have experience -- is how we develop better linkages between the universities, the national agricultural research systems and the

national extension systems.

MS. FARLEY: First, I utterly agree that the disconnect in those linkages equals a lot of squandered resources. I look in the Uganda context being the recent big example there, to try to cement those linkages between extensionist agricultural programs and the (inaudible) that has more or less fallen apart because it's hard to do.

If you look at the skilled program of a lot of the extensionists just in the last two years, you're not necessarily bringing people who went

through university-level training in these disciplines. So I think the conversation seems to be happening, the level was steered by the Ministries of Agriculture. Where actually we're giving Uganda (inaudible) -- the Uganda National Council of Science and Technology what is, in fact, that policy level on STI has a role to play because they can be the experts on let's move this out from an innovative systems aspect. So they are coming at it from a different framework, which I think is beautifully applied to the challenges in those disconnects that you noted.

So I think there's hope, but it's hard, which is why the attempted remedies aren't coming out

so beautifully.

DOCTOR DEHGAN: I think the CRSPs are incredibly valuable and have been incredibly useful, but I think we must look beyond the CRSPs in terms of what are the additional things. One of the ideas that I heard about just yesterday is this e-extension, how we can incorporate that into some of our digital knowledge initiatives and tie that into the supercourse which is this collection of top-tier PowerPoints that have been developed.

MR. WITTERS: Irv Witters, Michigan State University. I am director of the CRSPs, but forgive me for that.

My fundamental concern is you are making quite a few assumptions, and, yes, science and technology do provide tremendous promise. As a professor, I always challenge my graduate students to challenge themselves and ask what are the assumptions you are making? Not all knowledge that is generated by universities has a solution.

What is the peer-review process? You know, within the CRSPs, we have communities of practice. We call them "networks." We have scientists that collaborate and research multidisciplinary themes, and there is an internal peer-review process that occurs.

We have professional societies where publications are reviewed by their peers before science or knowledge or technology is released. I have worked with Makerere. I've worked with my own institution, and I know that not all -- there is good science and there is not-so-good science. My concern is that we're going to be releasing knowledge that has the promise of solving solutions, but it's not based on good science.

Do you understand what I'm asking? What is the peer-review process that you are incorporating into this?

MS. FARLEY: I think the peer-review process is a very classic one, and I think it appeared in the slide that had that kind of broadcasting and adjudicating the challenge. So request for proposal, short list of the proposals, vet proposals by experts and anoint a winner.

So in that case it's the NSF model. It's an inherent part of the model, I think, that the notion of peer review is the gold standard to move forward in all of this. So in no way are we looking to ignore the peer-review group dimension but spoke to another point that the assumption that all university knowledge is useful knowledge.

I agree we're trying to -- the solvers are everywhere. I think one of the most bold statements that USAID made at the event, which I loved, is we need to migrate from a notion of development of a small community, relatively small community, of development professionals to 6.7 development professionals, and what that means is there is a solver in all of us.

Part of this notion that needs harvesting that is antithetical to the fact that a small holder can tell you a lot of their challenge. We don't need

to define for them their challenges, so I couldn't agree with you more that universities have a monopoly.

That said, we do look at programs like CRSPs that have established that there is a lot you can get from a very classical twinning arrangement, as it were, but how can we use all of these other tools and the availability of other solvers that you can reach in different ways to layer a top of a kind of barbell configuration of wider, broader communities. And I should add that this was one iteration of how this plays out.

We are also very, very deep into conversations with IBM, as an example. The IBM University Development Program touches hundreds and

hundreds of universities worldwide focusing on challenges for cities, and there the universities are part of that challenge. But this is being driven by the private sector so is very agnostic institutionally.

That would relate to a final point I would make. This is really not about the institutions. It's about the people inside of them. It's a blessing that we have 200 university presidents calling for this, but they're not actually our collaborators. Our collaborators are the people within these institutions. So this needs to resonate and excite people within the institutions, and hopefully those people are spending their time in universities, but they're spending their time elsewhere.

DOCTOR DEHGAN: I think you moved above "n equals 1." So in terms of your collaboration, as you move to the higher level, you move to the departmental level. You need a community of researchers in that area. You move to an academic societal level, you have sort of a natural peer review that happens. We should be thinking about that model. I think that's a really great point.

Other questions?

DOCTOR HANSEN: I'm David Hansen from the

Association of Land-Grant Universities.

Over the past year we have been working with the science, technology and innovation group at the World Bank. They have been trying to find a pathway forward and have been looking at many of these same issues. I know that one is approach is to look at the details and the existing technology and to focus on that and its role in generating innovations, but they have taken a broader approach. And, in essence, what they are saying is one looks at sub-Saharan Africa, for example, the real challenge that these societies -- much as our society -- if we are to prosper in the future, must be knowledge societies; and therefore, where do these innovations -- how do they participate in science and technology?

And their point is that many of the existing scientists in these countries are retiring. If there is to be an innovation base for these societies, it has to come from these societies, so, therefore, they're focusing on partnerships as a way of -- networking as a way to bring up science and innovation in those societies. And I would hope as you look forward, you might take a more macro perspective on this also and consider the role that

institutional partnerships between U.S. institutions, European institutions, Japanese, whatever, with a developing society institution might play in prospering science, technology and innovation.

MS. FARLEY: I think it's a great point. The macro perspective, I think if you look at our first partner, it's embedded in what we're responding to, so COMSTECH is the committee of administrators of science and technology. Being the head of COMSTECH -- who is one of the founders. The notion is we took this down to one very granular level to show you

step-by-step what this looks like, but the picture ultimately is one of aligning at the global level resources, which is why it's so exciting to see USAID back at the table and because it does take integrations at -- of the highest global level. But I materially agree.

DOCTOR DEHGAN: We have time for one more quick question.

MR. BECKER: Let me begin with a little bit of background with regard to the Title XII 15/30 Higher Education Collaboration Foresight Program, just to point out that this is an idea -- this is an idea and nothing more at this point in time. There is no program. We're trying to get it out there for review

and comment by the university communities and so we're just putting it on the table at this point.

First a word: Where does the idea come from? The idea comes from the fact that for several years now the agency has been looking at science, technology and innovation, and there was the National Academy of Sciences study that we commissioned in 2006. Prior to that we had worked with Caroline Wagner and the Rand Corporation looking at the role of science and technology, so the STI issue within the agency has been growing for several years now so we need to respond to that.

Secondly, we have the Lugar-Casey legislation, and this afternoon there will be a little more said about that in the context of where is it at and how it's going to do. However, if the Lugar-Casey legislation were to pass today, we have 90 days to tell Congress how we're going to operate that program and expand higher education collaboration, what are eligible universities here, eligible countries, eligible universities. So we would be driven on a fast track to respond to this issue of higher education collaboration.

Thirdly is Title XII. Title XII deals with the Title XII universities and it's an attempt to say,

What is Title XII really striving for? We have heard a great deal about the long-term and you have heard the preamble in the MOU. But the point for Title XII at this juncture is how do we help countries come to grips with a safe, secure and a sustainable food supply in 2030 under conditions of climate change?

Do we know what those issues are and those very serious trade-offs between agriculture and water, agriculture and energy? Are we going to eliminate their dependence on food aid? What is it going to take? So that's basically the challenge for Title XII.

The process is how do we put something in place to move ahead on that, and that's what the 15/30 program is all about, and I will explain the 15/30 concept a bit. I'm going to run through these very quickly in light of the time that we have.

Title XII, I think people are generally familiar with that 15/30 program principle. The purpose of Title XII again is to mobilize the capacities of U.S. universities and colleges to achieve mutual goals among nations in sharing food security, human hold, ag and sustainable natural resources. It's a very wide mandate.

The 15/30 Foresight Program. The Foresight

Program is a program that assesses a current set of conditions in light of long-term objectives; i.e., to 2030. If you know where you want to be in 2030, the question then is it identifies the near-term, immediate objectives in 2015 that are required to reach that long-term.

Some of you may be familiar with scenario planning. It's an attempt to look way ahead, see what you need to be doing and what do you need to be doing in the future to get to that long-term issue.

So that's the basic point about a 15/30

Foresight Program. We're talking 2015. We start now in 2010. What do we need to have in place in 2015 to make certain we are on track for 2030?

When you are making these commitments to PhD training and scientific capacity, that's what you are really dealing with, national scientific capacity, including participation of global and regional networks.

Another thing here to come to grips with is these countries that have the responsibility of their scientific nationalism. They are dependent on the CGIAR, perhaps the CRSPs. They have domestic folks involved who are really looking at the science and technology as it relates to the global food supply.

We are talking about higher education, collaboration in education. That's the PhD, MS, baccalaureate, and, as importantly, the associate degrees. We had a workshop a couple weeks ago, and it was pointed out there were more associate degree folks than there are regular baccalaureate degree folks now, so the associate degree training is really very important.

All collaboration on basic and applied research, as well as R and D and agriculture, and then we are talking about all collaboration in agriculture and related sciences. There are three phases to this concept.

The first phase is a comprehensive assessment of the country's scientific capacity using the Title XII basic higher education collaboration assessments protocol. That takes about a year. That's a mouthful. But the fact of the matter is before you go in with a program, you better do an assessment. So what would be the assessment? It's a higher education assessment.

Phase II is then simply implementing what the results are going to be of the collaboration, discussions in terms of grants for about three to four years.

Phase III, you actually evaluate in 2015 what you have accomplished and then decide whether or not you want to go to a 2030 higher education collaboration and move it the next step forward.

The Title XII basic assessment protocol has five steps to it. First is you want to go into a country and clarify their national higher education system. In Iraq, for example, I think there are 11 universities, nine universities that are dealing with agriculture and related sciences. You want to know who you are talking about, what institutions are doing what.

Second, you want to do a clarification of relevant national strategies. You go to any of these countries, they're going to have an ag strategy. They're going to have STI strategy, energy and water strategy. They're all driven by individual ministries. They are siloed and have no interfaces amongst them; and, more importantly, between the strategies and actual strategies and relationship of the higher education community to set up and support the implementation of those strategies may be a very serious disconnect between that.

Then you want to clarify the national

scientific collaboration network. One of the points that Caroline Wagner makes in her book, "The Invisible College" is that there are self-organizing networks out there. Federal budgets are not the only source of funding. If you are a good scientist, the principal investigator and the network is out there, you are going to find multiple resources.

So if you are a country principal scientist, does the country even understand that capacity that you have to organize and so that part of the national scientific capacity may be being funded

by a number of different sources.

Then you want to do a -- complete the national scientific 15/30 foresight analysis, which is simply a GAP analysis saying what is it that we say we are trying to do in terms of agriculture? Are you putting in the higher education collaboration investments necessary to achieve them?

The point is this is not total. This is an attempt to simply say, Are we clear on the three or four key issues in 15/30, the elimination of food aid dependency? Do they really have an idea of what commodities they need to focus on?

If they recognize they've got an issue with water, do they really understand in mobilizing what

it's going to take to address that water issue?

So you are not talking about all of science and all of agriculture. You are talking about what they are concluding are their real priorities in making certain they are aware of the trade-offs.

Then the national policy and strategy for Title XII higher education and collaboration. This simply goes into -- with that GAPs analysis, where might the CRSPs fit or a (inaudible) program support.

I'm not going to go through the parts of this. But very quickly in each of the steps, it's inventory, it's a classification, it's a heavy reliance on geographic information systems. We want -- these are usually geospecial characteristics coverage on universities, and then you want to be able to layer that on agri-ecological databases so you make sure you are matching better.

I have also talked with the Carnegie classification folks. When we look at institutions overseas and we are trying to inventory, we use the basic Carnegie classifications. It's the same one that universities in this country use. These are the criteria from the database. Again, second stage inventory in mapping public health, agriculture, water energy. What are those strategies that are there?

Again, third step: Inventory, relevant donor, higher education. What are the CRSPs doing? What are the CGs doing? Who is doing what domestically as well?

The fourth step: Clarify the national opportunities for collaboration, review the programs, best practices, clarifications review and collaboration of challenges. Does the national scientific capacity -- i.e. the education, research and extension -- meet the national strategic programming requirements, or is there a disconnect that is long on the strategy and really short on having the capacity to implement it? That's what the idea is here.

If not, does the national external network scientific capacity meet the national strategic programatic requirements? In other words, to what extent are they really relying on regional wheat programs to address the very serious national (inaudible).

And the higher education collaboration opportunities, domestic public sector, domestic private sector, domestic civil society. What are the multilateral global and what are the multilateral regional? And, finally, what are the USAID bilateral

relations?

Then the foresight analysis. Review the Title XII 2030 national science capacity standard for safe, secured, sustainable food supply and conditions. These standards don't exist. The question is the challenge of the Title XII community. Do you want to set forth what developing countries and what you think they ought to be at, what is doable to actually come up with a set of standards? So when they ask you, do you have a set of standards and this gets translated into carbon footprints, it's the water metrics, the

dependency on food, et cetera, identify the grant challenges to meet those 2030 food supply standards and then clarify the GAPs.

Again, the safety capacity standards. I think food safety is a key one. Particularly with the rights of urbanization, these countries are going to be vulnerable to the activities that they need to have a good, safe food safety system in place, a secure food supply, commercial as well as what relationship the food aid, sustainable food supply, in terms of then implementation of the Title XII higher education collaboration grants.

USAID is going through a great deal of procurement reform. We've got the conventional USAID

Title XII grants. I don't think there are any more of those. I don't think we use the mechanism on the operating units. We have the conventional USAID Title XII partner grants with Title XII subawards. We have direct-recipient country grants and third-party funding collaboration.

The evaluation phase of this would then evaluate the 15/30 activities for continued support and then evaluate 15/30, clarify where the merit of initiating 2015 or 2030 Foresight Program and the draft.

We welcome comments and questions you might have, and we will make it available, but again it is an idea of how to proceed.

DOCTOR DEHGAN: I think we're actually out of time. We're supposed to be at the break, but is there one question that someone would like to ask John? If not, I encourage you to talk to him. I think we will move to the break right now.

Thank you very much.

(A recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I would like to ask you to return to your seats.

BIFAD: Minority Serving Institutions Working Group Actions, Report to the Board, Panel Discussion

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I really think that is part of the opportunity. We will begin to think seriously about the next steps. So with no further ado, Doctor DeLauder. Who will chair this task force.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: Good morning. I wanted to begin by giving a little background information in terms of how we got to this point and then we will hear from the three panelists, who were individuals who participated in the workshop, and they will then convey to you some of the things that came out of the workshop.

I want to begin by saying that the minority-serving institutions have a long history of international development funded by a variety of sources, but mostly in terms of grants from foundations and some from USAID over the years. Played a major role particularly early on in educating African leaders, and I point out (inaudible) was educated at the (inaudible).

I remember that during the days of apartheid in South Africa, that a number of South African students were educated at historical grant colleges and universities with grant money coming to help that country educate future leaders and a number of other outreach projects, and we will hear a little

bit about that, I think, from other panelists.

So there has always been that interest and that involvement to a degree in international development, but not getting the kind of support that we would like to see from our institutions for USAID, and this is something we talked a little bit about at the board level.

I think about a year ago we had a panel, primarily of the 1890 land-grant university representatives, talking about some of the projects that they had been involved with in various developing

countries to sort of give a taste of the capacity and the kind of involvements that some of our institutions have had.

As a result of that, a task force was put together by BIFAD on minority-serving institutions, and the task force then was given the charge to come up with some initiative that would allow us to make some end roads into this process. And what we're interested in this is trying to get minority-serving institutions more involved in the work of USAID because they are the great spans our institutions bring to our table.

We have a working group that I had the honor of chairing. We have representatives from three

minority groups. Particularly the 1890 land-grant, from Hispanic-serving institutions and from the tribal colleges, and one of the unique things about this is it's probably one of the few times that these three minority groups have been brought together in an area of collaboration and partnership to address the interest of each of those minority groups, and the richness of that interchange was quite something.

I had the honor of being involved in another one of these groups, the leadership funding that was addressed by Frank Kellogg, senior administrator in the minority-serving institutions. That's how it got started. The working group started in the early spring. We came up with the idea that we would have a working -- a working group forum, a seminar of sorts, in which we would bring together representatives from minority-serving institutions and representatives from USAID so that we could exchange ideas and come out with ideas on what could be done to enhance the involvement of minority-serving institutions in the work of USAID.

This workshop was held on the 29th and 30th of September, and we had representatives -- we had as a minimum ten representatives from each of the major groups, and we had involvement with a number of

individuals from USAID. We must have had at least 50 people at that seminar, and what we want to do then is to have our panel members to talk a little bit about the institutions within their particular group, a little bit about what happened in the seminar and what we may see in terms of the way forward.

So that is a little background information. I will come back later and say a little more about some other recommendations, but I'm pleased that we have representatives who participated in the conference and two of them also were part of the working group that put together the seminar.

Walter Hill is the dean of the College of Agriculture, Environmental and Natural Sciences from Tuskegee University. He's held a number of other administrative positions at Tuskegee. He was educated at Lake Forest College, from which he has an honorary doctorate. His PhD is in Agronomy, Master of Science degree in Soil Chemistry from the University of Arizona, and I already indicated his bachelor's degree. He's done a lot of research in a number of areas. What might be of particular interest to you is he has carried on the legacy of George Washington Carver with innovative work with sweet potatoes and other crops.

Chad Waukechon is from the Menominee Nation. He is the dean of Community Programs for the College of Menominee Nation. Chad is an enrolled member of the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa and he leads a dynamic and unique division within the College of Menominee Nation that deals with outreach and community-type projects, education outreach and extension programs. He was raised in Keshena, Wisconsin on the Menominee Indian Reservation and attended the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, and most recently he completed his Master's Degree in

Education at the University of Minnesota-Duluth.

Then Lewis P. Salas has a Juris Doctorate degree from Wake Forest University, and he joined Florida International University in 1975, and he is a full professor in the School of International and Public Affairs. He's an expert on justice systems of developing countries and is the author and coauthor of nine books and numerous articles on the subject. He coordinates a vast portfolio of programs, in excess of $50 million at Florida International, with awards coming from a variety of agencies: USAID, NIH and DoD.

He is the director of the Florida International University Center for the Administration

of Justice, and that center has received over $40 million in grants since 1985 and is involved in projects in some 11 foreign countries.

Those are our panelists, and we will begin with Walter Hill.

DOCTOR HILL: Good morning. I want to first thank Doctor DeLauder and all of the different organizations and individuals who have developed the MSI workshop. It was phenomenal. It was a great beginning. My role here is to present the perspective of the HBCUs, and then we will hear from our other panelists and we'll put it all together.

First of all, about the HBCUs. You can see the information here. Most of you are probably familiar with that. I want to point out the diversity in Bullet No. 3. It includes veterinary schools, medical colleges, but we also have the 1999 land-grant universities that focus on food and agriculture. If I was going to give you a quick assessment of the workshop, first of all, the presence, just when we got there; and, first of all, from the 1890 and the HBCU perspective, those institutions were represented and there were more people there than we had actually invited. We didn't turn them away, but it was very good and they were enthusiastic, so it was fantastic.

Secondly, preparation. The program format was one where we did layer presentations from the agencies, et cetera. But it was the participation, the proactive dynamic, from the very beginning really that set the stage to know that it was our meeting and not just a meeting somebody was making for us.

Then on the interactions, I want to talk about what happened between the minority-serving institutions because it was a great revelation for me as an individual, for us as a group of HBCUs, to hear from the tribal colleges and Hispanic-serving and to see how much we had in common and also to appreciate the uniqueness of each group, each university, and that was a blessing.

Finally, not only do we become aware of each other, we realize how we could complement each other in very unique ways, and, again, our strengths will be a blessing for our nation if our leadership wakes up and properly uses us, so onboard for recommendation, and I'm sure there will be some overlap with others but that's okay.

First of all, out of our group, the HBCUs, we have been at this awhile now, the 1890's, and we work some with USAID, but we learned a lot of lessons from working with USDA that we brought to the table.

So the first one was to develop a USAID-MSI task force. I'm sure Doctor DeLauder will talk to you about that. That model is a successful model that is working, has worked, with USAID, and it involved the presidents and USAID decision-makers, those with budgets, so that when decisions are made, actions actually occur.

And parallel with that is a working group of deans, directors, administrators, who do the groundwork before they work from both sides and things get done. Once that group is developed, that puts in

place a modus operandi that allows change to occur. These are just some of the recommendations that that group might take up that our group decided to present.

First of all, to fund a competitive MSI capacity-building grant. We heard talk about strengthening grants earlier. We were a part of that. We can call it strengthening grants, capacity-building grants, but this set of funds which allows us to build those partnerships, deal with our curriculum and internships, gets us warmed up, the hors d'oeuvre, if you will. I will talk about that a little more in terms of how do you keep going when the money gets cut, and some of us have learned how to do that.

The second one is to initiate USAID-MSI

liaisons. Now, we have USDA liaisons at our institutions, so we said let's try to do the same thing with USAID. We know they have limited staff, so we would go to regional levels and subregional, and believe me, we will figure that out. So if we can get the concept going, it's very critical to have that dialogue and someone there responsible for carrying messages back and forth and getting things done.

The third thing was to initiate the MSI-USAID IPA, the intergovernmental assignments, and we have people within our group who have had these assignments with the National Science Foundation, and they explained the power, the nature of how they learned when they went back and forth and how they helped NSL to better understand it. So we feel that this model would work.

We would place the people within USAID. They would be there on a day-to-day basis for the short-term. We were very clear when we heard from HED that they needed to take another look at MSIs. I will leave that. I think the people were open, but based on those institutions involved at this point, we need to move further on down.

The review panels is a natural, but the matching funds was taken up -- I think each group may

end up talking about that. In USDA there are several programs where we have removed the matching over years because we don't have a lot of the state funding and other sources that the 1862 and other universities take for granted. So to get us at the table, that has to be dealt with in a different manner.

The third bullet may seem small, but as I listened to people this morning and listened to the grandiose perspectives and the models and what have you, I was just sitting here thinking, you know, it would do a couple of people -- it would be very informative if they would just spend two days with me in the black belt of Alabama or if they spent time on a Native-American or tribal college reservation or Hispanic-serving institutions. Because it's clear they don't know us because some of the things they said, they would have said differently. They would have learned some things that would have allowed them to see that a lot of integration has to occur in certain environments that we can take some real lessons from.

Then we liked the annual meeting. That may be biannual, whatever. Our group, we felt we should have that to strengthen the dynamic between the minority-serving institutions. We felt that the

USAID-HICD policy paper needs to be rewritten with stronger input regarding the Title XII institutions and with an MSI focus there.

Also because procurement is so dynamic that we had one person who had experience with procurement in our group, and he really insisted that we come up with ways to have the MSIs involved with those big groups that are dealing with procurement work.

My final note. We had visitors from Ghana this past week that goes back 15 years. And when funds were cut periodically, we sustained those ties.

And the people who came last week was a woman farmer and her husband and some of the young people who work in that village, and I remember going there 12 years ago. And when we remembered each other, we were just hugging.

But they have come such a long way with that particular work. I will have to get into details, but it has expanded to many, many villages. There are new businesses that are developing from that, and also the biotechnology that the counterpart scientists have come up with. It's just this range from at the farmer level really happening with the villages and with the biotechnology all integrated in there.

So I just want to conclude by saying that the poster sessions and the dialogue between the different MSI groups led me -- I'm just talking for myself now -- to understand we're stronger than I ever thought we were. We have so much to give in terms of already-existing connections, our ways of working, our respect for the connection between the small farmer and science, and how we have to do that on a day-to-day basis anyway, and how we have had to leverage minimal resources. So working in an environment where small farmers have to work and live allows us to be comfortable there, and we love it. And now we see with our partners, with this partnership here, we can really -- in this new wave of USAID, we should be front-runners. We should be among your front-runners. AID, we should be among the front-runners.

Thank you.

MR. WAUKECHON: Good morning. I'm glad to be here at this gathering. I'm glad to represent our president, Doctor Verna Fowler. She was more excited about this meeting than I think I can really describe, and Doctor Fowler is not someone who just gets excited about the potential for partnerships because they come up all the time, but there was something about this

group that really grabbed her attention, and we have talked about it many times since we returned.

She sends her apologies. She really wishes she could be here. I know that she actually pulled her administrative assistant to clear her schedule for this meeting, but there was something that couldn't be cleared. She sends her apologies, but I'm glad that she put her faith in me to come and speak to you. I hope what I say can be heard in a meaningful way.

I work in a noncredit realm of a tribal college, and my role is to build the capacity of the community. And what we are is we're a developing nation. I don't think a lot of people truly understand that, but that's what we are. What I would like to talk about in my brief time with you this morning is who we are, who we serve, and why that makes us a potential partner for the work that goes on.

Most tribal colleges are very young. The oldest tribal college in the nation is 40 years old. The youngest is probably less than five. There are 36. Most are west of the Mississippi, a few are east. Diné College on the Navajo Reservation is the oldest. That was formed in 1969.

The College of the Menominee Nation is 18,

so we have yet to even leave our adolescence. We are still in that rebellious age of being a teenager. Most are chartered through tribes, and I think it's very important to be brutally honest and focus on this for just a minute.

Doctor Fowler, in her brilliance, recognized how volatile tribal governments could be because she truly understands the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act, which makes tribes very unstable because there is constant elections of officials, so there's constant turnover in leadership almost every

year.

So what she did when she formed the College of Menominee Nation, she was the colony president, she used an article of the tribe's constitution and chartered the tribal college through the people and not through the governing body of the tribe, which keeps politics at arm's length; which is very, very important to understand.

And it's very important to understand not just about the College of Menominee Nation. I think it is in that whole realm of international development. I think it's very important to understand that.

Most of us are offering two-year degrees,

some of us are offering four. College of Menominee Nation offers one four-year degree right now and we have been approved by HLC to offer two more. There is a movement among some of the tribal colleges to offer more four-year degrees.

We're all 1994 land-grant institutions, which Doctor Fowler was a key player in making that happen nationally. And I'm always interested by that because of all the land-grants, the land was granted by Section 3(d) for Native-Americans and that's always an interesting topic for us.

But I think what is important for us to understand is we're offering educational opportunities to Native and non-Native as well, with a long-term eye towards community development starting at the individual, and we're reshaping and rebuilding our nations through education. That's really what tribal colleges are all about.

Most receive all of their funding from the federal level. Very few receive money from the state, and I can speak only from my perspective coming from Wisconsin, that where we're from the state government doesn't recognize us as citizens when it comes to doling out education funding. They consider us separate and not part of them. And we get very, very

limited dollars from the state, pennies on the dollar in terms of our money. So the money that we rely on is soft money.

One of the ways that tribal colleges have been referred to is "chronically underfunded," and that's important because it's going to come up later, but it's important we can squeeze a dollar like no one else, and we can build like you wouldn't believe with next to nothing through very wise strategic partnerships and very wise money management.

Before I move off that, I would like to mention that most of the international work that tribal colleges are doing is where other indigenous groups are coming to us and saying, "We're just now beginning to manage our own resources. Show us your success. Show us what you have done." And they come to Menominee because Menominee has been recognized many times over for our sustained yield forestry program -- which some are aware of, some are not -- but the tribe has been recognized internationally by a number of different groups for its sustained yield lumber practices. When they started harvesting lumber there, after 150 years of constant harvesting, there is now 2.7 billion cord feet of standing timber on the reservation.

When indigenous groups begin to start managing their resources, they look around and say, Who did it somewhere else? And they see Menominee and they come to us. But they don't just see Menominee. They see Haskell and they see all these others as well. But that's really where the bulk of our international (inaudible) is happening and what's its focus. The folks we serve are immersed in generational poverty, and I think that's the only way to say it.

On the Menominee Reservation last month,

the unemployment rate was 17 percent. According to some federal statistics, where they actually count the people who fall off the unemployment radar, it was 28 percent. So you can understand that we're extreme poverty, high unemployment, and we have a limited infrastructure. Something like 85 percent of the kids in the local school district are eligible for free, reduced lunch, so you have a lot of children living in poverty.

I think what is very important to understand on an international level as well is that many of the folks we're serving have come from families who have very limited experience in education and yet much of that experience in education has been

painful.

Now, if you look at the tribal colleges, most of the folks we're serving have the boarding school legacy in their background. Menominee was one of the very few tribes that was terminated by the federal government. There is no way to talk about it other than to say it was forced assimilation. It was an act of genocide, and it occurred from 1954 to 1973. With a stroke of a pen the government said there is no longer any such thing as a Menominee Indian, and the tribe lost all of (inaudible) and sent all of the children off the reservation to a racial border town where racial animosity (inaudible) and most of our kids were encouraged to drop out at 16 or encouraged to go into the military, which we have a huge percentage of our community in the military.

But I think the last point isn't for us to say, "Oh, poor us, poor us." We're doing wonderful through the tribal college, and we're doing it because we understand how to work with people who once saw the education process as painful, and we're changing that, and kids are now expecting to go to school. And not just K-12. They're expecting college and graduate school as they're middle-school kids, which was never happening before. So it's a wonderful thing,

actually. But that's one of our strengths.

Which brings me to why I want to point out some things as to how we will be good partners in this. We can squeeze a dollar because we don't have many dollars. We're very money wise. If you ever get a chance to look at the College of the Menominee Nation, you will see this wonderful campus in the poorest county in the entire state of Wisconsin. At one point we were one of the poorest counties in the United States, and we built it all debt free. And it was under a very strategic, money wise management we were able to do that.

We focus all of our educational opportunities with an eye towards its long-term development. We understand how to work with people in poverty. But, more importantly, if there is nothing else that I can convey at this meeting, it's that we have a unique firsthand experience with failed development, forced development, that has been pushed on us since 1630 that has been ineffective. I don't think there's a lot of people in the country that can come before you and say we understand what it's like to have someone come in and say, "I know what's wrong with your community. You need to do this. Well, you know what? That's not working. Now you need to do

this. Well, you know what? Those two things were bad ideas. Let's try this." And we actually come from that with firsthand experience.

So we understand how to build community consensus, and we understand how to build development that is meaningful because that's what we are doing in our own communities. The things that we know how to avoid is to not push development that is not wanted by a group, how to avoid development that only benefits the partners in the development, not the people that are receiving it; and how to avoid development that

seeks to change people.

Because that's what has been pushed on us: Development that seeks to change us and make us someone other than the people of the wild rice, which is who Menominee are.

I think the best way I can put it is for a gathering like this, we would normally have an invocation at the beginning because we would be talking about coming together and forming partnerships and helping people, and we would kick everything off with an invocation. But one of the actual lines in the actual prayer that would be said is, "We beg you to hear us. We beg you to understand what we're saying," so when you leave, you will have an accurate

representation of what we are looking for.

I think that really puts the entire thing in perspective because we have dealt with development in a way that most people haven't, and we understand what works and what doesn't, and we understand from a completely different framework how to help others.

With that I thank you. I hope I was able to convey what tribal colleges have to offer and what we can do and what our possible role could be.

MR. SALAS: It's going to be hard to follow that presentation, but I will try to do my best.

I was not born in the United States. I migrated to the United States, and I owe my tenure promotion to USAID projects. I began working on these projects on the World Bank project dealing with a very broad, a very expensive initiative to plot land. I was involved in land registries and catastrophes.

And while it was a wonderful project, all of a sudden farmers found that all of this land that they thought that they had, they didn't have anymore, because now the new technology had shown them that the barriers or the stones that they thought were the limits of their land no longer were there or that the access that they had to the river was no longer the access.

So our job was to figure out how to solve this problem and how to prevent technology from (inaudible) of the complex that was over there before. I will just give you that story because it was my beginning with trying to understand how these projects oftentimes have unintended consequences.

Our group, which is Hispanic-serving institutions, has about 450 colleges and universities with the -- my university being the largest one. We're the largest Hispanic-speaking institution. We also have the largest junior college with Miami-Dade was (inaudible) so we are exploding in terms of population and in terms of students, but our mix is very different. We're spread out through the United States.

We often do not know each other. Half of these institutions are community colleges. We are much like the tribal. Some are very big, some are not so small. The main problem that we face with international development is access. I think that is true with the both the tribal colleges and the HBCUs. That is a problem with universities in general. We are faced with a procurement system that is flawed, corrupt and not accessible. It's a system that banks on the easier procurement mechanism that makes the

life of a contract officer as easy as possible and to prevent audits.

That's the only target. They could care less about success or the merit. It is a fixed process where insiders coming out of USAID, coming back in, readily feed in the trough. The trend now is even worse because now you have large defense contractors buying out the development companies and now national security or development of national security has become an even worse situation than it was before.

So for us procurement is a critical issue. Not just for -- and especially for minority-serving institutions. Our people generally are -- universities do not have -- are not known by the developing communities. Neither by USAID nor by the large consulting companies. We face oftentimes award projects, projects that are worldwide that we cannot bid on, and people do not know what resources we have or what we can bring to the table.

Normally HSIs do not have adequate funding or financial mechanisms that make them eligible for USAID funding, and they do not have the grant-writing skills. They often do not have knowledge of each other, which is another problem. What do we offer?

What do we offer a USAID or what can we offer a developing country? We look like the people you serve. We taste like the people you serve. We dance to the same movement and we understand that culture better than the Becky or a Buster.

So that's what we bring to the table. That's oftentimes what people forget that we can do. I worked in Guatemala for a long time, most of Central America, and I do not understand the tribal problems of the Miskito Indians or the other Native-American groups in that region. Tribal colleges probably do to a large extent. I do not understand necessarily the problems -- I'm just dealing with Central America -- the problems of black people that can relate much better to historically black colleges than they can to me.

I was in a meeting once where it was a celebration of Columbus Day. It has different meanings to different people, but one of the questions in that meeting was, you know -- it was largely what -- especially with tribal groups -- how do we deal with this issue? How do we deal with the land system that they believe is totally different for the white population, not minority of population? The settling of disputes is completely different. They

have tribal reports, things that we cannot relate to but that other groups here can relate to. A lot of the experiences that they have here can be shared by them.

We believe in long-term involvement. We don't believe in quick fixes. I normally go into countries where big development institutions out of Washington come in, basically burn the ground, spend the money, take the money and that's it. They're gone. We have a long-term commitment. I live in an area which has the largest Haitian community in the United States. I have to deal with Haiti no matter what happens with USAID.

We have received four grants from NIH on Haiti. We received nothing from USAID on Haiti, so we have been involved with Haiti. So has the University of Miami and other universities in our region because these are the families that go to school with us and the groups that we have to deal with on a regular basis.

We would like to look at capacity-strengthening solutions so that we can render services. We cannot do worldwide IQCs, which I think are the worst instruments for procurements that you can have where one organization is managing worldwide

products. They are merely a channeling or employment mechanism. But we can do regional. We can do smaller countries. We can do capacity-strengthening. Not capacity-building. We're not into that.

We talk about set-asides. I don't personally believe in set-asides. I think set-asides are a double-edged sword. They can become a token mechanism whereby the USAID, the federal agency, can check us off. We get up to 5 percent. We're gone. It's a mechanism that you oftentimes go in the back door and never in the front door. Most of these

projects do not result -- where set-asides are there, do not result in strengthening or building the capacity of the institution that got the set-aside, but that is something that we had differences among our groups.

We need to know again how can contractors know who we are or what we do. One of the mechanisms is with the department (inaudible). They hold conferences or workshops where they invite contractors as well as minorities where they get to know each other and to talk to each other. They don't always hold them in Washington -- which is what USAID tends to do -- but, rather, they hold them in regions, oftentimes Atlanta or other places. I have never seen

USAID at this.

We would like to have a greater focus on educational strengthening. There are very few projects now where we are taking in students who are involved with other educational institutions. We're not involved. The Europeans are definitely involved and a lot of other people are involved, but we have very little involvement. Even though we have a network, we work with these people and oftentimes the results of having these relationships with these students produces the future leaders of these countries.

I do not know any development company, private company, that promotes leaders. The president of Costa Rica is working on a project that I directed. The head of one of the chambers of Guatemala worked on a project that I directed. The head of natural resources in Honduras also worked on a project I developed. These are all projects of USAID educational policy that had a concept that USAID never planned for, which is you have leaders coming out of the projects, private companies (inaudible).

MSI did do that to a certain extent better than large institutions because we know how to take students and bring them into our home to treat them as

our family. We don't just drop them off in a very cold climate and they are coming from a different area and all of a sudden they don't know what to eat, they don't know how to dress, and we put them into a dorm.

Right now we have two Tanzanian students. How do we manage these -- how do we handle these students? They have never been to the United States. Our tax office all of a sudden wants to tax their scholarships. They don't know what -- they have never eaten some of the food that we have. But, then, because they like beans and they have rice and (inaudible) and our roots in the Hispanic-serving colleges oftentimes are their roots, so they can relate a lot better. But we took them in and treat them as family. But something that large institutions or white institutions normally are incapable of doing.

We have diplomatic resident programs, and we have diplomatic residents from the State Department. We never see a diplomatic resident from the USAID, and we never see -- and then they always say, "Well, we don't have enough people." Well, they have a ton of foreign service nationalists who really are the decision-makers at the official level who go to Washington regularly for their meetings and training but never go out to these institutions that

they would get to know if they were there. That's another way that we can improve our situation.

Then, finally, mentoring relationships, ways in which we can maintain a long-term relationship. Not just the private and, therefore, I pick up my bags and I go home, but rather having to establish a relationship where in a nonpaternalistic way, I can actually mentor the other -- on the other side of the long-term. Not just short-term. How can I take different projects that are coming out of USAID? For example, Tanzania. The project that we

have now is a water project, a 50-million-dollar project, but it has no training or education in the United States. Another leadership program paid the scholarships of the students coming in. We are willing to waive out-of-state tuition.

So basically I think the gist is that USAID passing through what I would call it's "darkest period" has now got a chance to be reborn again, to discover and to keep up with the organization and the institutions that really care and they really have a stake. And that's not only the large university but also the minority-serving institutions that in this case are the Hispanic-serving.

Thank you.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: I'm going to have some summary comments, but first I would like to see if there are any questions from the board or Allen.

DOCTOR CHRISTENSEN: I would like to talk to these guys afterwards.

DOCTOR BERTINI: This was terrific, and there were so many interesting ideas. I'm wondering if we can, following our role as advisers to AID, take not the whole speech but just specific recommendations, like scholars, different things that each of the speakers said and just make a list of (inaudible) AID these are some of the things.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: We are going to do a white paper and we will submit a formal list of recommendations, so that will, in fact, occur.

Other questions? Anyone in the audience have a question?

MS. EGNA: I'm Hillary Egna. When I was a director of the aquaculture CRSPs, we had projects with the IEN. That's the Indigenous Environmental Network. We had a project called the "Eagle of the North." It involved many different tribes and it worked very well except for the institutional connections. It was very -- a lot of transaction costs. That's something that -- it was a great

experience, but on our side we couldn't get over that. So it was something really ridiculous, like, bureaucratic, that we would need help with in terms of contracting.

I don't know if you can, so we didn't work with the universities. That's when we didn't have a connection. That's something that I imagine is still potentially there.

We also worked with FIU for a long time. I don't remember if you remember us with Chris Brown. We also had similar problems, and that is not at our level, researcher level or on discovery of knowledge or building capacity. It's an institutional level which is beyond us, and it's very problematic because it takes a lot of time away from good people doing this kind of work.

When we were sending people down to Peru, we were sending people from a number of U.S. tribes to work with the tribes that we were working with down there. So it became very problematic just how to spend the money, having to organize this in a way that wasn't going to expose us to audit. And that is something that I would like you to explore, especially you with -- working with USAID to open that up, create flexibility in a more nimble contracting arrangements.

Because we do want to work with you, but just like you, we only have a fixed amount of time and we want to see those resources go to their eventual intended end users.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: Other questions or comments?

MR. SALAS: We always have the issue of how we can process things, but we are a state institution. The federal -- the federal government is not Speedy Gonzales. We have to adapt. It's very difficult then to understand why on the other side they don't adapt.

Development companies can react very quickly because they're small. They're more flexible. They don't have -- if they fold up, they fold up. It's a different mechanism, but it's hard to imagine. Listen, we're 43,000.

If you can imagine what a three, four, five thousand dollar total student body school can manage dealing with USAID. That's not why it's not only capacity strengthening, but focusing on things instead of cost reimbursements contracts, things that are going to be much more easy, manageable. It costs a lot of money to bid on a project and to set up the infrastructure.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: As I indicated, we will

do a white paper that will lay out these issues and the recommendations, and you heard some of the recommendations from the three speakers. We talked about also the idea of forming a consortia of MSIs so that we could capitalize on the collective strength of institutions. So as you are going after a grant or contract, you go in as a consortia.

We talked about using the model that comes out of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is called the USAID 1890 Task Force, which again is a mechanism of which you get mutual benefits from the partners. Because I'm a big believer that partnerships don't work unless there are mutual benefits that come from all the partners, and partnerships that don't work, it's because you don't get those mutual benefits. But using a model like that so that we can have a sustained effort and sustained involvement with USAID and we will come forth with the details on putting that together.

You heard Louise talking about the procurement issues, and we do know that there is procurement reform that is in the works. And there are some things that will be helpful, if, in fact, you want to utilize the strength of these minority-serving institutions. And I think you have a feel for what

are the strengths coming from these institutions, which is very different. And so if that is the case, then you need to make sure that we have access to be able to partner with USAID and to utilize our strengths to help USAID in the work that you are trying to do in terms of overseas development.

The strengthening grant -- and you heard Allen talk about the history of the strengthening grant, and they were designed to help to strengthen institutions to be able to be strong partners in the work of USAID. That's what this is about. The USAID 1890 Task Force is one in which you enhance the capacity of the 1890 so that they can better be a part of the agriculture enterprise and help USAID in aggressive issues, and it's a very successful model.

We went in knowing that for the most part, USAID undervalues or underestimates the strength of our institutions and what we can bring to them to help them to solve the problems that they're trying to solve. And that's why at the beginning we had poster (inaudible) sessions where we had some of our researchers and others who have done work in overseas development to display and show the kind of work that has been done.

And I think there's going to be an

effort to put some of these posters -- is it, Kathy, are we going to try to put those on the Web? We are going to try to put them on the Web site (inaudible). And this was done ultimately to show some of the capabilities.

We did talk about the idea of putting together a database on capabilities so that folks who are looking for individuals or institutions, if they have the names, can find out where they are. So these will all come together in a series of recommendations.

One thing, Mr. Chairman, I want to do is I

want to keep our working group together until we have something to pass it off to sustain the effort.

Let me see if my three colleagues have any closing comments they would like to make. Any questions or comments?

DOCTOR SENYKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a recommendation that based on the outcome of the MSI workshop and then also a little bit later today on the (inaudible)workshop, that we not only do a white paper, which is in the plan, but to discuss with the administration -- Doctor Dehgan, are you here? -- to have a presentation inside the building on the white paper and to bring in other folks in the conversation there as well. Perhaps a

direct presentation and briefing to the administrator.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: I didn't want to neglect to say that we did have strong representation from USAID at the workshop. Karen Turner in particular had some very positive things to say and indicated her commitment in this effort, so I think that we are moving forward. And if we continue to move forward, then I think that what we will find is that our institutions can be in the work of USAID.

We thank you for giving us this opportunity.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Let me express, on behalf of the board, our appreciation to the panel members this morning. I found each of the presentations to have real insight and very much concur, Doctor Senykoff, with your recommendation that we bring this forward to the administrator.

I also wanted to take a moment to commend Doctor DeLauder for the leadership that he has provided. This would not have happened had it not been for someone who was very, very committed to causing things to occur in a very logical and focused way. Bill, we are very much in your debt and we will continue to call on you to provide leadership in this effort. Quite frankly, it is in a sense a game-

changing activity. I appreciate that.
Public Comment Period
CHAIRMAN EASTER: We are now in the time that is set aside for public comment. Doctor Senykoff, do you have individuals that you would like to invite forward?
DOCTOR SENYKOFF: I believe DeeVon Bailey is going to speak.
MR. BAILEY: Thank you very much, Chairman Easter.
Let me begin by expressing the appreciation that we have another -- people from different land-grant universities represented today for this support that BIFAD has given to the concept of a water CRSP over the past five years. That shows vision on the part of the BIFAD and also recognizes the importance of a water CRSP.
We think, though, that there is a real opportunity now to look not only at the water CRSPs, but also water as a strategic issue that land-grant and other universities can be working with USAID to try to solve some of the problems in a very integrated and multidisciplinary fashion. We have heard President Obama express the importance of water and the promises that he has made, and we have heard

Secretary Clinton also mention that water is a vital issue.
We have just -- the door is opening to these kinds of discussions where we bring the expertise that the universities have to play with what USAID would like to accomplish there and also the broader private community too.
I was just very encouraged by meeting Doctor Dehgan yesterday and the comments that he made relative to water. We know that this is a cross-cutting issue. It's not just irrigation, although

that's very important, as water is -- certainly that is going to be a very important part of that. It's a health issue. It has to do with climate change. It has to do with plant breeding and very, very many different sorts of issues where water is the basis but really ties into many, many water issues.

So I would just like to encourage continued support of BIFAD for that issue. Not only in the formation of a water CRSP, but also a more strategic -- looking at ways that the university community can be working with USAID on this issue.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Thank you. We are very conscious every day with the growing challenges of

water. Not only adequacy but the issues of quality as well.

DOCTOR SENYKOFF: Do I have any more public comment?

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I think with the board's permission, we could open up the microphone, if there are individuals in the room who have comments. If not, I would like to deviate from the agenda briefly.

We have an item of business that because one of the board members will need to leave before the time we come to operational management at the end of the day, we would like to deal with that.

Mr. Rabon, do you have a resolution?

MR. RABON: Yes, sir. I would like to make a motion to acknowledge Doctor Senykoff, if we could, and I would like to read it.

"Whereas, Doctor Ronald S. Senykoff has shown extraordinary dedication and commitment to the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development to advance the critical role of colleges and universities in international agricultural development.

Whereas, no one has worked harder than Doctor Senykoff.

Whereas, Doctor Senykoff has served the

board above and beyond the call of duty and often at significant personal and professional risk.

Whereas, many of the board's most important initiatives, such as the two Conferences of Deans of Agriculture, simply would not have occurred without Doctor Senykoff's unique intellectual diplomatic skills and tireless innovation.

Whereas, Doctor Senykoff's vision and his understanding of agricultural development has given the board a renewed sense of purpose.

Therefore, it be moved that the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development expresses its deepest appreciation and utmost gratitude to Doctor Ronald Senykoff for his outstanding service to the board during his tenure. The board wishes Doctor Senykoff the very best during his future endeavors.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Is there a second? Discussion? All in favor say? The board seconds.

DOCTOR BERTINI: I would like to move that we add he has helped us in very significant ways in terms of being able to reach out to the community which we are here to represent, to get their input, to make that input known and within the context of AID and other places has been dramatic, as well as his

work to have AID really pay more attention to all of this input. Not just from BIFAD but from the larger community.

We would be nowhere close to where we are today without his very, very great contributions. I think the resolution that Tim read says it well, but I didn't want to say, yes, let's vote without adding how much we appreciate his work.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I would just acknowledge also Ron's tremendous partnership and the diligence with which he has continued to encourage us as a board

and particularly to keep my feet to the fire to move things forward. I think truly we are in a different position from where we were several years ago. I think the extent of which that has occurred is very much to his credit and in a minimal sense to our credit.

So, Ron, on behalf of the board, we really truly appreciate what you have done for us, and as we call -- Allen is an emeritus member of the board, and we could well call on you in the future as an emeritus to offer thoughts and advice as we move forward.

All in favor say "Aye." Oppose by "Nay," and there are no "Nays."

MR. RABON: We have a plaque we would like

to present to Mr. Senykoff, if we could.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Ron, would you come forward, please.

MR. SENYKOFF: I greatly appreciate this. I'm reminded from this spiral binder of 1975 sitting on the 17th floor of the United Conference Center talking about water. This is a fact, 2000, and the number of issues associated with it was after the first water drilling conference in 1975.

In 2001 I was back in the same room in the same chair, with the curtains now deteriorating significantly, and the only difference between the conversation in 1975 and '74 was the date. The spiral binder looked like I had left off from the meeting I had left in 1975 and came back and sat and talked with the same group.

Mr. Chairman, I would want to say it is a distinct honor to have had the chance to serve on behalf of USAID on this committee. It's absolutely a humbling honor to do that and to serve with the university community to try and bring together what is needed in today's complex development content.

My last words, I'm really concerned. Paul Finley was to be with us, as you had mentioned, Doctor Christensen, and, Chairman Easter, we discussed this.

I have talked several times with Paul Finley on Title XII. He's 92, still committed very much like Norman Borlaug. And when he called and said he couldn't make it, he said, "Ron," he said, "Ron, Title XII is still really important." He said, "My concern is when I look at this, famine is just around the corner again. We have got to mobilize. And in Title XII is a critical operative line, the word has been used this morning, "mobilizing" the capacities of the U.S. university system, land-grant universities and other capable institutions in the United States.

Paul and I had several conversations -- you were in China at the moment -- on the word "mobilize" in the legislation, what the intent of CREFs at that time was. They were coming out of the Green Revolution, the success of that, but at that moment, there was a vision. He said there was vision. We have to get to another level. Alex Dehgan and STI and our conversations here -- our conversation was a little later (inaudible), but the MSI workshop this morning, listen to the language that is going on.

We are in a stage of a paradigm shift clearly, in my mind, on where development has to go if we are going to achieve (inaudible). As you said earlier, we don't want dependent welfare states. It's

clear.

In '75 and '70 we were discussing the issues of the demographic challenges against us. The one piece that we didn't have in 1970 in the discussion was "conflict." That's in the lexicon now. Now "conflict" becomes an overlay in the geographic information system. When you start to put the soils and the water and the agriculture production together, it's there. Just look at the countries we're in and/or the pressure that is coming in the various countries that are associated with that.

So I thank you for this opportunity to serve the board, and I thank the university community for having the chance to try to represent AID in the middle as an honest broker. That's been difficult. This exercise I've been involved in has been a true adventure. I thought Iraq was an adventure. This has really been an adventure.

The MOU that was signed this morning is a new opportunity coming. This is a representation of a substantial dialogue that has been going on for several years. Now we have an opportunity. It's open for raw discussion, all aspects, to bring the whole community together to do this. We have got to look at leadership for new frontiers. There is no question

about it. That's where Doctor Shah, Doctor Dehgan are, in trying to look at that inside bureaucracy of AID, and that scares me. It really does.

But the paradigm shift always is a wrestling match, as though scientists here know when you look at the whole structure of scientific (inaudible), when you go from an earth center to a solar system.

Systematic, this is another worry of mine. Can we get systematic inside USAID and systematic with the universities' past individual projects to look at the systemic element that will move in a way that creates a mobilization level that achieves a scale that moves. This is not easy. AID is (inaudible). They say look at all these reports and why are we still hungry? Every country I've been in, I've had that conversation with the minister of agriculture resources or whatever.

At the individual level, the projects have been good. Many of them double the project in this region. The problem is they never achieve scale. 1974 in Kenya where we started, we could drink water out of the tap. You sure can't do it now. Yet AID has been there since 1950.

The challenge to mobilize the capacities of

the scientific, technical and institutional capacities, these three pieces of the university community in tandem with the development work that we're doing, is going to be significant. Leadership is required on the university side to grab hold now.

We have a couple humble beginnings. This is only humble to bring this back round, to grab hold on both sides and say, "Folks, we've really got to move forward."

The last piece -- because I know time is short -- is listening. My agriculture work started with what we used to call "dirt," "soil." I understand what a soil Eden is now because I did formally study with Nile Brady, who was one of our folks at Cornell who came to AID. I was really small, so I started actually what we called the Georgia steam shovel. I was on a shovel learning how to dig a trench in order to move water off the land when he had a hurricane. In Florida we didn't have (inaudible). I started to understand what it meant.

It also started -- and this is a personal one -- with a grandfather who talked about George Carver. Walter, you guys are here; Aaron, you know the story. Tuskegee, Booker T. Washington "Working With the Hands," a tremendous book. It's one of the

greatest books. I must have distributed a hundred copies overseas in the last years. On development from the inside, development to take care of yourselves.

Tuskegee built their institution. They didn't hire contractors. They brought people in to build the bricks themselves and taught them the vocational training so that they could move forward. And when George Carver came down there, when Booker T. invited him from Iowa, the folks are saying to him, "How are we ever going to grow anything in this

burnt-out cotton land?"

And when George said to them, "When we learn how to improve this soil, we'll be able to grow and do agriculture anyplace in the world." That's a paraphrase, but that's what he said.

Another important lesson out of that was one day George was in the field with his agronomy students, and he noticed they had left the plow out overnight, and the mules had gone back over to the barn. And he pointed to the plow and he said to the fellows, "You see the rust that is on this now because you left it out overnight. We cannot afford to buy another one." That's as true today now as it was then. (Inaudible) We may not have Involvement in

every one of the countries that we deal with.

We have the technology that can make these things change. We also -- it may not look like a plow now. It may not have a mule hitched to it, but it has that adaptation requirement that is still there that we must drive forward to make this happen for the future.

Ever since '75 I have carried this piece of paper. It's folded. It's been reprinted. It was actually written in hand in 1975 in Kenya because we didn't have a computer. So now I've actually got it on a word processor. These are the things that I have carried in my pocket along with -- I will admit this, I freely admit it -- along with the bible my father gave me in 1978 the second time I went to Kenya, the last time I saw him, and he said, "Don't come back without doing a good job with the people overseas."

And in the bible it said, "To the people of Kenya, best wishes." That was the last time I saw him. It was at the airport when he said that, "Don't come back without doing a good job." In this quote, a couple things that are really important. Now, this one I have to label development literature somewhere because I've literally forgotten where I got it. But it says: "The farmers wanted researchers that

understand their problems, who laugh at the same jokes, and were willing to call the Yawkey Valley home."

The other one is by George Carver, Tuskegee, 1865-1868, "Learn to do common things uncommonly well. We must always keep in mind that anything that helps fill the dinner table is invaluable."

I leave that with you because with -- we could get clinical in our work. If we flip ourselves over to just go down the road to eastern Uganda, eight hours' hard drive, a dirt road, a mud road, you will find this stuff is really still true. And our research can solve these problems, but we need to be there. The Yawkey Valley quotation speaks volumes, and it says, "Let us still listen to the people overseas. Bring them in."

What is missing in our meeting here -- we haven't got there yet -- is folks from developing countries. Let's bring them in. Let's figure that out, Mr. Chairman. We go through the new charter, which under new leadership will have a chance to increase the budget and all. These are the thoughts, Tim and H.H. and yourself had a chance to go to Kenya to hear the people. You came back with some things

that were, I thought, very interesting in your comments and impressions. Let's do more of that.

Catherine, you were involved with the World Food Bank. You came back when I was director of the food aid program on that. How many times did we look at the refugee camp and wonder what is really go on with food aid and what it means to listen.

Elsa, you were down in Haiti; and, Bill, in your work on the MSI thing, listening to what we heard, I think it's here. Thank you, folks. Development has been a pleasure for me. I tried to

make myself a practitioner. I'm not sure I achieved it yet.

I'm going back to physics and astronomy. I'm building an observatory to deal with the unstrict analysis. It's something I left off a long time ago. It's going to be fun to bounce signals off the moon. I'm going to do it myself and a whole lot of other things that are all within the realm of electrical and physical engineering.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Thank you, Ron. You continue to challenge us. There has been a process to identify someone to step into Ron's very large shoes. The process is not quite to full fruition. I think we

will adjourn now until after lunch.

(A noon recess taken.)

CHAIRMAN EASTER: This meeting of the board will come to order. We would like to move into our afternoon section.

I have been reminded that this morning when Doctor DeLauder read his excellent report, that we did not take action to accept that report. I would like to do that at this time. The chair would entertain a motion to accept the report from the Minority-Serving Institutions Task Force.

DOCTOR MURANO: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move. The motion is that the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development applaud the efforts of the Minority-Serving Institution working group and the excellent leadership of Doctor William DeLauder and the strong commitment of USAID to expand the role of MSI and Title XII programs and activities. The board approves the recommendations of the working group and instructs the task force to proceed with developing a white paper to provide a road map to ensure the dialogue between USAID and the minority-serving institutions continues.

It is the board's intention to use the white paper as a benchmark for evaluating the agency's

performance in its relationship with minority-serving institutions.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Is there a second?

MR. RABON: I second that motion.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Thanks. Any discussion? All in favor say "Aye." Opposed, "Nay." The resolution is adopted. Thank you, Doctor DeLauder, again.

The Administration's Global Food Security Initiative, Feed the Future, Panel Discussion

CHAIRMAN EASTER: The next item on our agenda this afternoon is the Administration's Global Food Security Initiative. The first speaker is Tjada D'Oyen McKenna, and she comes to us from her role as a senior adviser to the U.S. government's Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative, Feed the Future. Prior to joining the government in April of this year, she was with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, where she was a senior program officer in agricultural development.

Thank you so much for being here with us.

MS. McKENNA: Thank you for having me.

You will meet my colleague, Anita Regmi, shortly. The way we have broken this up is I will do a quick overview of the broad principles of Feed the

Future, and then Anita will go deeper on some of the research so that you get a sense of what we are trying to do with the initiative.

If you will bear with me, I don't know how much people have heard about Feed the Future. I will quickly go through it. Feed the Future is our U.S. government's Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative. It came out of the summit in L'Aquila. Global Hunger and Food Security Initiatives also have their own commitments and their own way of spinning their commitments against the summit.

As many of you know, the food crisis is really what prompted the food security initiative and world leaders to act, and it forced us to (inaudible) that there are over a billion people that are suffering from chronic hunger and the demand for food is going to increase; and that with climate change and other pressures, we're not going to improve without some drastic changes.

A lot of people in my family have asked me what food security is and why I'm working on it, and they wonder if we are barricading food. We have recently decided that the four main components are availability of food locally; the access to food, the ability to purchase it and to have a reliable supply

of food nearby; the utilization of that food.

The initiative looks at both malnutrition and incoming (inaudible) and that malnutrition is all around the utilization of food and how we use it. The stability with the population that we are serving, resilience, improving the population's resilience is very important, so stability is a key commitment.

I want to spend a little time on this page because Feed the Future is part of the Accra summit but continued at a meeting in Rome at the FAO, so all the donors have agreed to five principles, and from here I will talk about those and how we are implementing on those principles.

The first is that we will invest in country-owned plans. We are committed to sustaining a framework which really guides how countries put together strong country plans. I think one of our challenges now is speaking about a similar framework or organizing mechanisms for our countries that we're serving in Asia and Latin America. The food security issue is different in those regions, but really coming up with a common framework for countries' investment plans is very important. Strengthening strategic coordination -- globally, regionally and locally. Like I said, it is a country-led process.

Also locally we are very interested in engaging all stakeholders at the local level, including civil society and the private sector. We do not believe that a donor-driven effort alone will get us there. Looking at comprehensive approach, as I said before, this is an agriculture growth-led initiative, but it is also a nutrition initiative, looking at reducing undernutrition specifically in women and children, looking at humanitarian food assistance and looking at how to improve the nutrition aspect and also having used that to develop markets.

Leverage the growth of multilateral institutions, working really closely with the World Bank, other multilateral banks, with our UN agency colleagues. One thing we have in place is called the Global Agricultural Food Security Program, and that is a multidonor trust fund that we established. The World Bank hosts this institution, but it's actually -- it's run independently of the World Bank, so the World Bank doesn't say who gets the initiative. But the way that it separates that, we have a few different entities that we call "supervising entities"; that is the World Bank, multilateral banks, technical assistance point of view. We have the food and agricultural organization and the World Food

Program. So what happens is countries present applications to the trust fund that they designate a supervising entity that they work with.

And that's part of our effort, to make sure that multilateral institutions are following the lead in country plans, really changing the way that they do business.

Another piece is deliver on sustained and accountable commitments. We at USAID do not have the authority to have a multiyear budget commitment to countries, but we are very much approaching this

(inaudible).

There a few cross-consulting authorities that we have in this initiative. One is around global research and innovation. And as I said, my colleague, Anita, will go into a little more depth.

The other piece is private sector engagement. Donor funds alone will not solve the problem. We believe that a strong, healthy private sector is key to that, so that's looking at both local and international private sector. Also climate change and how we put climate change into our program and how we use our strategy with the climate change in mind.

And finally, but most importantly, I think, is gender. We were focused on women and children in

this initiative. Women do the bulk of the labor in the regions that we are serving, and part of the reason that revolutions haven't taken hold is because we have not served women effectively. So we are focused on that. The way that we have done it in the U.S. government is we have chosen 20 focus countries: 12 in Africa, four in Asia and four in Latin America. What really drove those decisions were the level of need, the opportunities for partnership, the potential for agricultural growth, and the opportunity for regional synergies and other resource availability.

As we said, it's a multidonor effort, so sometimes we may my not -- other countries where we really can't partner effectively where the government would be hostile, obviously, wouldn't be included in this as well. Twenty countries is a lot of countries, so we have broken it into two phases we call Phase I and Phase II investment.

Phase I is really where we are making foundational investments. So that is technical, political, financial support to assist a country in developing its country investment plan, but also some preliminary work on productivity and value chains and really setting the stage for what agricultural transformation will look like in that country. Some

countries may stay Phase I for a long time.

Phase II will actually be a much deeper level of investment and look at much more deeper agriculture as well as nutrition investments. The Phase I, Phase II decision is really made primarily based on the country's progress, investment planning process, its policy environment, and how we think they can absorb Phase II funding. We will not be able to provide every country with Phase II levels of funding, so that is a criteria important (inaudible) we have kind of outlined. We have highlighted a couple countries where we think they may be Phase II but they have not been finalized.

So in addition to the focus countries, the World Trust Fund we talked about, we also have a few countries that we are considering strategic partners. Right now that is India, South Africa and Israel. Those are countries that we will not make direct investments in food security just solely for the benefits of those countries, but we are really looking for them to be our partners in helping them become more food security.

Brazil makes their technology (inaudible) and that they are working with the World Food Program to create a center of excellence, so those are the

types of investments we are looking at. We're in similar conversation with India and working in Africa together, but also making investments in India that can help further inform what our funding might look like.

I talked about gender a little bit. It would be dishonest to say that we have fully figured out how we are going to include gender in all of our activities, but what I will say is we are working with our partners to include gender and the result of the process is on. We're looking at the gender across all

of our investments.

One of our principles will be ensuring that women have equal access to technologies and also the income that will come from some of the investments that we're making. This is not something that is cookie-cutter that you can just do everywhere. I think it's a great challenge for our organization as well as others towards moving -- towards best practices in serving this population.

As I said before, the private sector really is -- it's another piece that we will be investing in, looking at their investment alongside ours as donors in terms of looking at key value chains or key areas. We will be asking them to -- so understanding what

policies and what infrastructure can make this better as well as kind of bringing more private sector companies into the fold in a way that is sustainable. It doesn't distort market incentives in any way.

The final piece that is critical -- this is our results framework. Monetary evaluation is going to be very critical in this initiative, and we have a whole team that is working on how to do baseline studies, putting them together, how to strengthen capacity of both local and international institutions, monitoring the valuation. In this environment we have to show results, and we need to show results to encourage others to continue the investment.

I will now turn it over to my colleague, Anita, to look at it in more depth.

MS. REGMI: Thank you. And I just wanted to express my thanks to all you for inviting me here. It was really interesting the discussions from this morning. I learned a lot and the few take-aways from the issues that you brought up this morning were the ones that we were working on Feed the Future, our strategy joining with USAID, so let me carry on here.

As Tjada mentioned, the Feed the Future strategy is focused on looking at the country level and regional level. What we are working on is a

global strategy. So we are looking at it at a global level. However, the global level will be connected to the country level. So it has different regional and country level as well, but how we approach it is a little different. But the strategy is to take into consideration the whole aspect of it.

It is also comprehensive strategy that will look at research policy; however, the way the money flows is a little different. So even though we are thinking of a big -- the government -- what might come out of it might be just the global but the strategy is comprehensive.

In moving with this strategy, what we did is we had what we call a top-down and a bottom-up approach. At the top-down approach, we did analysis and examined what might be the important topics that we need to focus on, the regions that we need to focus on. And at the same time there was a bottom-up from the country level that came up through the missions, the country plans, et cetera; to item five, what are the important issues that we need to look at.

This strategy will build on break-throughs in science and technology that can have impact. At the same time, it will also consider what might be the innovations that can be created that will begin

changes. It's keeping both the long-term and the short-term in mind.

In keeping with the principles that Tjada talked about, we will look for partnerships with the multilateral institutions, with the local and regional institutions, and a key aspect also will be to strengthen the capacity in the countries that we are focusing in, so along -- we will be making investments in building the capacities, the financial research and councils and institutions in the country, the government capacity, to data that will be important

for monitoring evaluations. So the strategy sort of covers all these issues.

The other thing is rather than look at open and the top, we will invest in the first worries and important issue, important constraint and then think about all the different ways that we can address that through research. That was again something that came up this morning. I'm looking at it sort of a multidisciplinary focus and address the problem from all different angles.

That comes to the systems approach in using productivity, integrate multiple technology components and research and development, and the other important issue would be focus on sustainable intensification,

and, again, as we heard over and over again, you cannot make a difference in the short-term. It has to be a continuing effort of partners of long-term commitment. I know the issue again of the budget, can we promise that, well, to the extent we can, that's where we are going.

As I mentioned when we did the top-down approach, was to look at and identify key agricultural systems. And using the poverty and nutrition lens, I have a few charts that target specific constraints that can have large-scale impact. What are the constraints of production? Establish some criteria and think of a plan that will build up short-term, medium-term and long-term. I'm sure many of you have seen these charts over and over again. This is based on global charts.

Sub-Saharan African, South Asia, some countries in Latin America, and overly with the stunting and malnutrition, and again the same set of countries come out and finally the agricultural systems to look at what are the crops that are important for those specific regions. When we went through this sort of analysis, what came up was the systems in south Asia, the wheat and then rice, then the mixed crop systems, root crops and maize in

sub-Saharan Africa. Some of the key areas in the regions where we might have to focus and the crops to focus on.

We had a couple of workshops early in spring where we did bring experts and we talked with them. So based on the consultations with them and our analysis, and like I say, the bottom of the system where we get feedback from the missions, we have some teams that came up.

Analysis and consultation process and essentially what we are thinking about is looking at how can we advance the productivity front here in these few chosen areas, and then the other is to transform the agricultural systems, particularly, like I say, the South Asia or maize and wheat system in sub-Saharan Africa. Those are the areas we will not just look at research, say, the environments, time and change, soil conservation, the whole package, to make sure that this is the system is improved.

As we do these, same as bigger Feed the Future goals that we had, we have the same set of cross-cutting issues. We will focus on policy to make sure that it is an enabling environment. Gender will be very important, both in building the human capacity for research and agriculture and production, as well

as perhaps try and see if there are certain crops and products that are important for women and focus on those; and climate change is going to be an important topic in making the decisions, and, finally, of course, strengthening the national systems; productivity, advancing the productivity frontier.

Some of the issues that we will look at is first to increase the yields of crops and livestock. We will look at genetics an breeding for these crops and livestock. Biotic stresses, especially keeping in mind the climate change and what that might be. Then

the other thing is to the next level, but with perhaps wheat and rice and nutrients and water use efficiency.

Another key area is livestock and infectious diseases and management of -- (inaudible). On the transforming the key production systems, again, I have already sort of discussed this, but it will be looking at technology with site-specific resources, soils, water, management, social science and market and market research. What we will do is global research will be matched with the research at the mission level, so that is going to be a key connection and this connection will have to happen with the institutions in-country and perhaps with a multilateral partners and CGR and other institutions

as well as the government institutions in the country. The focus areas will be the rice, wheat system of south Asia, southern and east Africa maize systems and west Africa -- (inaudible).

Enhancing the dietary quality and safety. We are considering grain legume as an important issue, animal and crop source, diverse nutrition, probably even vegetable for improving the nutrition and content. Again biofortifications will be an important aspect to consider. Whose safety is going to be -- earlier when I was talking about they mentioned microtoxin as being an important consideration, that is important from the health aspects. Reducing postharvest losses and environmental health.

Other cross-cutting issues, again, they are going to be key in this strategy: Gender, climate change and strengthening the normal system. Somehow this is going to be done. One, the key element will be the Norman Borlaug Initiative that was signed between the USDA and USAID. That has different components within that. Number one will be, of course, we are realigning to the extent we can with a mandate, and the authority that we have the research support that we do with the USDA.

For example, I don't know if you were aware

recently we had a grant to look at how the nutrient content of food could be improved. Just a few weeks ago it was announced, $28 million. Similarly, the after free grants that were later in the year, again to the extent that can be realigned, we are going to look at that and do so.

We are also having conversations with other agencies to see if we can -- similar to what was discussed this morning -- examine the problem and think of the multidisciplinary way of supporting such research and maybe bring other agencies to support the components that we ourselves are not able to support and sort of bring together within the government like that.

The second will be direct collaboration between USDA and USAID, and that might be USAID initial support of USDA research or use the USDA mechanisms to support new grants, and they USAID is also realigning what they traditionally support, and you know more than I do on that.

As Tjada mentioned, this is a very ambitious and just to the government by ourselves might not be able to do it, so we are talking with other countries, and we are also talking with other FAO and other CGR agencies to see -- realign so that

what we do and match our resources together so there is a lot going on in that.

Finally, we will be working with the institutions in the country too so the global research and outputs and innovations that are developed are taken to the field.

The next steps where what we are doing right now is we are creating working groups with members from the USDA and USAID, and to the extent necessary and the way it is appropriate, we hope to make these working groups be a little larger to focus

on some of the six, seven areas that we have identified. And this working group will develop what are the specific questions that might be immediately considered for funding and how will the next steps evolve from that. So even as I speak, we are putting those working groups together and that's why we are moving.

There will be a point when we deal with the university communities and others that might be interested and they will give us feedback, and we hope to do that in the next few weeks, next few months, so that's the stage we are at with this right now. But I know that (inaudible) at USAID are going to be announced by December and our goal is all these steps

are worked out and we have a process in place before then.

Any other questions? I will be glad to answer them.

DOCTOR BERTINI: First of all, Tjada and Anita, thank you very much for your presentation and for all the work that has been going into this very important issue in the future.

You talked about "bottom up," and I wondered if you could give us some concrete examples, some examples of what "bottom up" means. If a country -- for instance, one of the top 20 countries says, "We would like to triple our wheat or develop our own goat industry," how does that translate back into how specifically is Feed the Future going to help them?

Second to that is how do you connect the U.S. universities and especially the land-grants who have those kind of expertise? How does that ambassador in country X know where to go to get the resources to develop its goat industry; and then as connecting them, all part of that is you didn't touch a lot on the role of U.S. universities in this context and also are they stakeholders in this as well. How do you expect them to be involved?

MS. REGMI: I think those are very good questions. In the last few weeks, I had visited Nepal and the mission director, and I explained to him that USAID does have connections with the university. So if the mission director then needed some assistance to work through or tap into the system (inaudible), but beyond that, the resource strategy itself, some of these -- what we have talked about in the proposals and projects and priorities, these would be areas that the university community would be working on with us.

And even in building this strategy, we do intend to take inputs from the university, and right now the first draft of the rough draft has gone through to some experts.

We know the university has a very important role. This is not something that we can do ourselves. We definitely need the U.S. university system to be part of this.

MS. McKENNA: Your question touched on a good point about how we're coming out with country investment plans. What we are finding is that they are very broad. What we have asked our missions to do, because we are really trying to drive our transformation at scale, is to work with other stakeholders and develop a more focused strategy. So

even though a country's investment plan may have ten value chains, what's happening is our mission has decided to put this on three to four value chains, taking gender and nutrition into account, rice, horticulture. There would be some maize as a third and working with poor women.

They will also do some small rudiments and looking at increasing the animal protein. They have also picked specific subregions to focus their efforts, and they have identified the areas that are the most insecure and focusing their efforts there.

They also are joining with the government of Tanzania and other donors to invest in a trade corps that is being developed along the southern corridor of Tanzania. So in that question, if the government of Tanzania had picked goat intervention, that is something that the U.S. government -- our priorities would focus on the other pieces of this set, but we would certainly be looking at other donors or other ways to help them feed into that set.

In terms of universities, you are right. You are a key stakeholder, and I think part of the reason I didn't think about it is universities are kind of in the DNA of how we do our business, how we do our grant-making, the collaborative research

support programs, and also involving people in the monetary evaluation. And where there is expertise or extension or other direct things, we're hoping to link those in.

DOCTOR BERTINI: In the sample you showed in Tanzania, horticulture is something that Tanzanians want and it fits into Feed the Future. But unless the USAID director is a horticulture expert, where does he/she go in order to get whatever advice -- whatever they're going to give to Tanzania about horticulture?

MS. McKENNA: You are right. They will go to the university community. Both local universities and also looking at the international research, what they can offer. They will probably pick a subsegment of crops and go from there in terms of who has the most expertise in terms of what that looks like and bring in other examples.

Let me give you another example that ties in with how we are doing it and actually brings other stakeholders together. Costco: (Inaudible) They have a cashing processing facility, and what do we do with the excess cash that aren't useful for packaging, they can't sell them, but at the same time it helps to keep our processor running. They have gone to Mississippi State looking for a more stable nutrition barn.

I like that example because that's where we are collectively looking at a technology innovation. It's not typical research. It will be who -- as we go through each country, we'll look at where that should be.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Were you going to suggest that the BIFAD is the actual natural connector between the university and USAID?

DOCTOR BERTINI: That's what our mandate is.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: So I'm interested.

MS. REGMI: That would be excellent.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: This isn't intended as a criticism of the presentation, but it does point to the challenge that we have in getting the visibility so that people working within the agency understand that, the opportunities of using this board and its resources.

DOCTOR MURANO: At the risk of piling on -- because this is not what this is about. We appreciate your coming here -- I think what we are getting at here is, yes, universities are part of these kinds of things in terms of when a university gets a grant. But at the planning stage, at the stage where you are (inaudible) come up with what is needed and how can it

be addressed, what technologies are out there, what research needs to be done.

Those kinds of questions are better formed when we get the scientific community involved in one form or another. We have -- obviously, BIFAD can be very helpful. We have the structure of CRSPs. We have directors that have working teams and specific areas of horticulture and what have you, and we're just kind of encouraging you, as you finalize these plans -- because, obviously, it is not completely all done -- that you somehow inject the community at the

start of things, at the planning stages, at the stages where we can be the most comfortable to you.

MS. REGMI: In the next few weeks, I think we will be doing that as these working groups get together and examine a specific area. These are really concrete next steps.

MS. McKENNA: The countries we have asked to come up with strategies, none of them are finalized, approved strategies. I think it's a great idea.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: I wasn't sure on how a country plan is going to be developed and who will do it.

MS. McKENNA: There's the country's own

investment plan and there's kind of our USG approach for how we're going to support that country. In Africa there is an institution, the Conference of Agricultural Development Platform, that actually has a very good step-by-step process for how a country develops its own investment plan.

We, as USAID, have contributed support and expertise to countries as they have done them. I think they have also used a bunch of outside consulting support. A lot of that consulting support does come from the university community, I think in looking at developing a similar comprehensive concept, so that's another piece where we may be able to come back to this group.

MS. REGMI: I think the actual plans, some of them are at Feed the Future's Web site right now.

MS. McKENNA: Was that your question? I apologize. Some of them are on feedthefuture.gov. Because they're actually the country's plans, we haven't figured out how to distribute them or post them because they're not our own. They're the country's plans, so they're in different places. So if you reach out to us, we can get you where they are.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: When is all of this going to occur?

MS. McKENNA: Because it's country-led, every country is on its own timeline. Rwanda was the first country to have a CADELT (phonetic) process. It's reviewed. It's finalized. Bangladesh was one of the earlier countries. They're still reviewing it. There are other countries that are barely started in terms of the planning process. Because it is country-led, that also impacts how we do our Phase I and Phase II investments.

MS. REGMI: Once we have money, there is funding --

CHAIRMAN EASTER: This has been very, very good. Thank you very much for coming in. If we in some sense pick up on the question and carry on to what has already been put (inaudible) what is the role of universities in Feed the Future in science, technology and innovation.

We will have the international programs director at Pennsylvania State University come forward and introduce the panel.

The Role of Universities in Feed the Future and Science, Technology and Innovation; Panel Discussion

MS. BEHRING: You heard earlier today from some of the youngest land-grant universities, and I thoroughly enjoyed the panel that Bill put together on

the MSIs. This afternoon you will hear from some of the oldest -- and I know my Michigan State colleagues will disagree -- but Pennsylvania State University is the oldest land-grant university. So we hope that what you will take away from this session today is some of the information and experience that these land-grants have accumulated over the decades in rich times and in some lean times, as of late.

But I think what you will see is through the ups and downs and the support and resources that we've had, we have kept going because we see the

international engagement that makes agriculture so important to our mission, and I think that will become clear from the remarks today.

The approach we are taking is to start with Dean McPheron from Pennsylvania State University for a fairly broad scan of the universities' perspective on science, technology and innovation partnerships for development and why it's important for development that takes place outside our borders, but also for what happens inside our borders and how we at universities are preparing the next generation of people who will take over this role because this is a long-term issue, and we will get to that 15/30 vision. Okay, John?

Let's see, we'll then turn to our two other panelists for a more in-depth look at two key approaches that have been used over the years to extend the reach of the U.S. university to the global development enterprise.

What I will do is I will introduce our first panelist, Bruce McPheron. He has served as dean of Penn State College of Agricultural Sciences since July of 2009. But before that he served seven years on our research team and director of the Pennsylvania Agricultural Station; and as a research dean, he was extremely supportive of the international programs that developed in our college, and so I am very grateful to him for his vision and support.

As dean he has taken on many roles and is currently serving as the chair of the board of directors of Lead 21, which is one of the institutions that helps to prepare some of our up-and-coming leaders to carry the agricultural enterprise into the future, so it's a very important role that he plays there.

There are a very large number of other boards that he serves on as well, and in his role as dean engaging quite frequently with the industry, so some good things that he can share from that.

He has degrees from Ohio State University and the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign. But before that he actually worked as a county extension agent with 4-H in Ohio, so he always brings that down-home kind of perspective to his work that we all appreciate at Pennsylvania State.

He also did a postdoctorate at Louisiana State prior to joining the Pennsylvania State faculty in the Department of Entomology. His corn team fruit fly populations and that has taken him to 16 countries over his career and his work has been widely adopted by federal, state and international action agencies.

Despite his busy schedules he maintains active research and collaborations in China and Brazil. We just hosted some of his colleagues from China last week, and he's involved in teaching an undergraduate class in agriculture. He practices what he preaches and he preaches a lot.

DOCTOR McPHERON: First of all, Michigan State is older than us by about ten days. I knew you would want me to correct that.

This morning, Chairman Easter, you started out by saying a few words about not getting to the football games at Texas A&M. After this past weekend where my graduate alma mater came visiting at Penn

State and didn't give us a very nice homecoming, you should be careful what you ask for.

Yesterday morning I greeted about 105 prospective agricultural students and their families. They were visiting Penn State as part of our fall open house. My first words to them were that by some estimates, during their professional lifetime, the world is going to have to produce as much food as we produced in all of history to date. Pretty daunting prospect. But I told them -- what I told them also is not just food production. That food has to be

distributed appropriately, and the distribution and the production have to be done in an ecologically sustainable manner. Small pressure to put on them as incoming potential students. But I promised them if they came to Penn State to the College of Agricultural Sciences, we would make them career-ready graduates but globally career-ready graduates.

Whether you grow up in the forest of Bradford, Pennsylvania or the small farms of Malawi, I think it's safe to say they face some of the same challenges. Tom Friedman, who has been oft quoted over the last several years -- I think he's right, "The world is flat." But despite the world being flat, it's not level, and I think that's one of the

big challenges that we face into the future.

Addressing these kind of universities is actually the philosophy of the agriculture universities of the U.S., and I am pleased to see that we are moving forward to engage these systems. This follows as a segue to our previous presentation. Let's remember we don't have to reinvent the wheel, that we bring a rich history of engagement, and, in fact, we need to bring that -- as the board has pointed out, we need to bring that to the fore early in the planning process. Not at the end. Otherwise we run the risk of a reinvention that misses some of the rich texture developed over the years.

I think right now I should acknowledge the current administration of the series of developments that we are seeing around the whole issue, especially of reintroducing science, technology and innovation as a key priority. I think we are -- in fact, if I can remember to do my slides here, turning the tables on some of the things that we faced over recent decades and hopefully addressing years of under-investment in some of these critical areas.

I'm here today representing the Conferences of Deans that you heard Allen refer to this morning. That work began in the spring of 2008 and resulted in

a white paper just as that food crisis was really hitting full stride, and it's really, I think, gratifying to deans who have engaged in that to see some of the key ideas that were presented there beginning to be implemented and -- certainly discussed, but hopefully implemented.

I would -- and this is my take-home message just to say what you will see in the end to BIFAD. I would suggest that we are not fully engaged as a university system and the continued request to BIFAD is to be that Africa and make sure that the capacity that we bring is fully at the table.

Just last Friday USAID released a progress announcement on its new development innovations program (inaudible). And as a representative of the group, I do thank you for that. We are pleased to see the rebuilding, regrouping of efforts to use science and technology in the service of development.

Universities have been exceptional partners with the U.S. government in this country since the Morrill Act, and it's incumbent to really build on that history. I say it's high time that we really help both USDA and USAID move forward and fully embrace what we have to offer.

You just heard about the government's Feed

the Future Initiative, and it calls for employing proven strategies, and I would argue that we have one. In 1862 President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act which established the land-grant system. Michigan State was early on, but we were close on their heels. Over the 150 years that have passed, we do celebrate that sesquicentennial, we have demonstrated that we are here to meet the growing and continuing demand for agricultural education in the U.S., established the research connection that land-grants firmly implanting the notion of discovery of new knowledge along with

the educational mandate.

And then in the early 20th Century, we had the cooperative extension, and I think that that has proven to be an exceptional tool to ensure that the discovery of our egg-head scientists (inaudible) gets out to people in forming that really is truly useful to them.

We are able to serve agriculture in the public. We define "agriculture" very broadly including a wide swath of natural resources. We have enhanced human development across the globe, and, most importantly, I think we have been able to meet local problems, again resonating back with that notion of country ownership as we talk about global development.

We were partners with the government throughout. During World War I extension mobilized food production and stressed adult and youth education. During the Great Depression, the New Deal, the land-grant universities were there as partners. In the '50s and '60s, extension partner as a private sector developed and moved technology and farm practices forward, and we see the powerhouse agricultural economy that we have today. With our research teaching and extension mandates, we are great innovators.

As we look ahead, especially to those countries that have been identified as partner countries in the Feed the Future initiative, it is helpful to reflect back on successes in India and Brazil. These are highlighting some of the documents that have emerged around these various initiatives. And a lot of that success can be traced specifically to the partnership that was put into place between the U.S. land-grant systems.

I know in the early '60s, USAID provided funding to the land-grants to work in India. Penn State was one of those and nine Indian universities as partners. We now look to them not as a nation where we need to continue this kind of an investment, but a

nation that will help us with investments other places.

So let me borrow from the Feed the Future document itself. The approach aligns with the four C's: Country-owned, coordinated, comprehensive and characterized by commitment. The Feed the Future document refers to global research and innovation as a complementary investment. BIFAD, in my opinion, should work to make sure that this is a completely integrated part of the systematic approach to success.

When countries and partners define their needs, we can help global capacity in-country to achieve these goals for the future; things like reducing production, set risks associated with pest diseases and weather patterns, increasing agricultural productivity and resource efficiency, contributing to market development and enhancing food quality as well as safety, things that you have heard echoed time and time again in presentations today.

Any meeting would be remiss if they didn't take advantage of a forum like this to illustrate the success of the land-grants largely by illustrating our own successes, but let me just point out a few things about Penn State, but reminding you that Penn State is just one of many incredible land-grant universities

across the nation, each of which could tell a story similar to this.

We awarded the nation's first baccalaureate degrees in 1861. We have been partnering international activities for well over a century. I was fortunate to be in China to celebrate at the sesquicentennial at a Chinese university. Penn State currently is in the neighborhood of $100 million invested in research and agriculture each year, so as I said, the same story is something you hear across any land-grant that is sitting here. Just to continue

the phrase, we will doing what we can on our own, but partnerships will be more important to continue into the future.

Over the past decade we have increased in our college the number of students studying agriculture at an international level from .5 percent to 18 percent. We are pushing to keep up with Purdue who just released some pretty lofty goals, but we think this is pretty remarkable progress in the course of a decade. We already offer an undergraduate minor in International Agriculture, but our graduate students, not our faculty, have asked for a curriculum to help them work in an international context.

So we are in the process of launching a

dual title degree program in International Agricultural Development so that students can gain experience in designing -- I was struck by Sara and Amanda's presentation this morning and I think what our students are asking us to do is exactly the kind of capacity that the GKI is looking to develop for a global perspective. Our college recently announced an ag African initiative to work with key partners in Africa to promote the objective, building extension outreach programs and providing opportunities for student involvement.

We use our old partnerships as well as seeking new partnerships. You will hear momentarily from Tim about the CRSPs, but -- we're actively involved in several, but the IBM CRSP led by Virginia Tech has allowed us to implement a variety of programs and (inaudible) our work to introduce basically the Chanel No. 5 for melon fruit flies has resulted in about a 300 percent increase in net income yields for small holders within Bangladesh. I had to give a fruit fly -- sorry, my students just roll their eyes. Feel free to do the same.

But we also look for new partners to help us to really participate fully in the global rehab. We are very pleased that Penn State is engaged, in

fact, leading to the initial 15 NSF bread awards that were just recently announced. We are working with Howard Buffett and his foundation in South Africa to allow us to extend some very basic research in root biology to understand how that works with drought and nutrient stress in the African continent.

So what can BIFAD do for us? Well, you have had and you continue to have an extremely important role to play of being an advocate for the capacity of the universities. I would encourage you to (inaudible) support the science and technology. We have heard this articulated today to support the science, technology and innovation initiatives that Alex has put forward and the message that he has conveyed that science-based knowledge has to inform USAID decision-making for food security and agriculture.

Perhaps BIFAD might consider a cross-cutting examination broader than the CRSPs. We have CRSPs that have been highly successful in different areas, but are there new ways to look at that process that would enhance the capacity of those CRSPs?

BIFAD can serve as a gateway to the universities. As you just heard this from several of

the board members after the previous talk, they can help to mobilize the science and technological and institutional aspect of the U.S. universities, land-grant and other ag universities.

BIFAD might consider establishing a brain trust to access the best the universities have to offer. I think this is a concept that might deserve some more discussion. We have got creative transdisciplinary researchers. We work in business and civil society partnerships. We have overseas networks. We have a long-term perspective.

We are very concerned about the sustainability of the programs, and we represent a potent perspective to advocacy, both directly and through the constituents, to support the land-grant mission across the nation.

BIFAD needs to help us advocate and ensure that universities are invited to participate; indeed, are at the table when the planning is taking place for programs, both here and in-country around the world.

The land-grant university of the future will serve and lead by global food system, and we look forward to a partnership with the U.S. government to realize these goals.

Let me conclude with a second "yesterday"

story. I started with one and I will finish with another. This is the centennial year of cooperative extension in Pennsylvania. In 1910 we had our first county extension agent, and yesterday I gave a short presentation to my fellow deans and to the chancellors of my 20 Penn State campuses to talk to them about extension into the 21st Century.

A decade ago the Kellogg Commission argued very cogently for the role of the engaged university. The university not only engaged in science and technology but also the innovation of translating this science to practice. You heard Alex refer to the administration's focus on global engagement.

BIFAD, let's synonymize the engaged universities with the mandate to make this engagement global. I think that is the greatest thing that we have to offer as the university system here in the U.S.

MS. BEHRING: Tim Williams is the peanut CRSP director at the University of Georgia, but he comes from a very varied past. He was born in South Africa, grew up in Zambia and Zimbabwe and worked with the Zimbabwe Agricultural Research Service as a peanut physiologist. He's also worked with the CGIAR system in both India and Niger before moving to Georgia.

In 1996 he joined the peanut CRSP and he has joined that since 1998. Although his basic training has been in the area of plant sciences, his background and (inaudible) capabilities has allowed him to contribute across the full value chain of peanuts; producing innovative solutions in the areas of management, environment, systems analysis, energy and mechanization, production, processing and marketing and public health. So, Tim, please.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am representing all of the CRSPs. I'm not going to talk a whole lot about what my CRSP does, but it is just one of many. I think what's important to me is that the CRSPs derive from what I consider some of the best legislation that is out there.

So often you find legislation that is not necessarily good, that's fraught with all sorts of problems, but this isn't. This is really inspired legislation, and the CRSPs were developed out of this by inspired architects. We heard talk about -- from Allen Christensen that goes back to that time.

Those people that set this up were really inspired. The legislation of that is just fantastic. It is all embodied in the CRSP program; which as we went through the ups and downs of agricultural

interests in the part of development agencies like USAID became almost the sole part that was preserved, I think the part that was preserved because the university valued its -- it would have gone away and more agriculture would have gone out of USAID if it hadn't been for this little part that the university went to bat for. They fought at the political front. That was an indication of how much the communities has valued them through time.

Title XII, for those people that don't know, includes this language of (inaudible) and the

purpose is to achieve the mutual goals among nations of ensuring food security, human health, agricultural growth, trade expansion, the wise and sustainable use of natural resources.

That is just what we heard that Feed the Future is going to do. This is legislation that predates it, but you can see how appropriate Feed the Future is to this particular legislation. It says that to do this, we should mobilize the capacities of universities. We talked about this again early this morning.

I think we have here the four provisions, and again it fits into this general thing that we are talking about fixing on a world scale. We are going

to do research to address the problems of food, agriculture, forestry, fisheries. We are going to improve human capacity, institutional resources for this activity. We are going to work in the areas of trade and extension services. We are going to use applied sciences to solve this. That is exactly what the Feed the Future is about.

The CRSP approach that we have inherited from the beginning is embodied in this segment that the CRSP council put together probably five years ago. The CRSPs empower host-country institutions to address recognized needs and constraints through the creation of new technologies and knowledge while concurrently developing human resource capacity and competencies. That in the end will lead to institutional self-reliance and sustainability. That is a really consistent goal with what we are talking about in Feed the Future.

In twenty years' time we don't want to be in the same countries that we are going into at this stage and have them not able to do it themselves. We want them to be where India and Brazil and China are now.

Existing CRSP models tend to have a thematic focus, either commodities or resources or

approaches. Typically I listed the peanut one. Then the other theme is to go along the problem or approach with agriculture. I think a really important thing is that this is a multiuniversity system, and it is that multiuniversity system which actually provided the constituency which enabled the CRSPs to survive the windows of change that came in the early 1990s.

You know, you could drop Penn State from a project that was only Penn State, but you ran into a problem if the universities could mobilize seven senators or seventeen senators and go out there and say, "Hey, you don't cut us." As we deal with the changes that are going to happen politically through time, (inaudible) have been in this game sufficiently to see one administration replace another administration, and it gets replaced and the administration that at most this eight-year horizon, but we're trying to do something that goes beyond that, and I think that having this mechanism that gives stability and political support is important.

The management is by a single university, but that is something which -- how that identity was chosen has changed with time. It used to be by consensus universities that were involved in the CRSPs elected who was going to be the leader, and they could

actually de-elect them if they didn't do a good job. Now it's by (inaudible) process. I think participation is open and it's established by a competitive process.

It's multilateral. We engage multiple individuals and teams from the universities and partner these with scientists in developing countries, and we take the money that comes into the system and the plans are developed and that satisfies a lot of the stakeholder issues that are involved.

The nine CRSPs that exist at the moment

involve more than 60 universities, and they involve more than 130 developing-country institutions so that we touch a lot of people with actually very little resource. We provide both research and capacity development outcome.

The recapacity development exploits research, so we actually turn out to be, by USAID's assessment, the most effective capacity development model that exists -- I won't say "that exists," but that they evaluated in that -- in the last evaluation.

The program research and capacity development has been built in long-term. We are allowed to have five years with a renewal once. Programs have tended to actually stay in place and get

the institutional change that we talked about earlier, that 20-year and 25-year time horizon to get an institution that is self-sustaining and has the competency. And in a number of presentations, you actually end up with the host countries then turning around and offering that same extension of benefit to their neighbors.

Thailand does this, Malawi is doing it, and progressively we are starting to talk about India doing it so that those capacities can be achieved and that transformation is achievable through this mechanism.

The CRSP strength. I think small slices of many people is a strength because you don't have one single person that developed it. That isn't necessarily popular with individual universities because they like to take a big grant, which is good for image, but the majority of people that are involved in the CRSPs at the scientist level actually are -- they don't want the administration. That's the less attractive part. They want the exposure with international colleagues and the opportunity to go to a country and do something.

Because of the multiple participants, we have a greater time of stimulating creative solutions

and we end up again with that strong constituency because we have this multidisciplinary, multiple-institutional involvement.

Another very important thing about the CRSPs as a thing is that they do sustain mentor relationships, and the numbers of people who have returned from training and actually had jobs to go to has been very high, and those are the people -- 95 percent of CRSP training has resulted with the person being back where he came from or in that immediate vicinity and being -- achieving the purpose of the money that was meant for.

CRSPs can be configured in all sorts of different roles. In our particular case, we deal with a whole sector capacity. We work from production all the way through to the consumer interest and making our particular commodity important because that drives demand for the product.

CRSP challenges have to exist because the world is not all upscale for CRSPs. One of the things that has been a value for CRSPs is the scale-up of results. We don't carry that kind of budget that supports that. We have to depend on other mechanisms, other total takeover of the scale-up part of the regime. Again, we're speaking if you have got

something that is worthy of scaling up, you can find someone that will go and do it because there are lots of people out there looking for things to do. The NGOs and government agencies that are in the business of transforming populations are looking for ways to do it.

Gauging commitments, teaching commitments, are a problem because that very often restricts when a professor might be available for a CRSP deployment. That does represent a challenge, but it's overall, I think -- again, I think we could have enough

flexibility in most things, but it doesn't respond to the mission's need for answers now.

CRSP achievements. We have been in host-country capacity and we developed that in a cost-effective manner, and some of these countries really are developing and cascading that capacity down into the neighborhoods. We have been able to change institutional cultures and through that long-term engagement -- and I think that it's being done in a pretty cost-effective manner.

We have developed evidence-based recommendations and technologies have been developed, so we have done all of the things that we were supposed to do, and any single CRSP can point to

benefits that greatly exceed the amount of money that has been invested.

I would like to finally point out that actually every time USAID has gone out and got external evaluation of the CRSP system, the results and the findings of that have been very, very favorable. And I think that is what the professional approach and status reflects, the professional status of people that get involved in CRSPs.

How would you adapt this and what could you do better for the future? I think the -- not all my fellow directors agree with this, but I think you could conceive of a CRSP that was focused on a country as opposed to be focused on a commodity or some theme. Theme works when you have got to spread yourself. But if we had gone to work on a country, you can then put together the package of skills and disciplines and commodity expertise that are needed for that to happen. Those projects can respond to the host country's plans to a great degree. There's no reason why that should not happen.

I think we need to look at the future as needing this sustainable capacity development that the CRSP does provide. I think that could be actually linked with the educational part because if we're

going to start working with some college of education, college of agriculture, and we can actually do the capacity development around that single college or system as opposed to spreading it right now across multiple -- vertically as opposed to horizontal, as we tend to do now, I think the missions could focus -- could support a CRSP.

There's no reason why they couldn't, as long as in their mind they understand the CRSP model and that you are making a long-term commitment. I think there are opportunities to integrate and take this into the health part of the floor plans.

I have great difficulty separating food from public health. I think that you could -- I touched on this earlier, the idea of having -- working this model into the educational development capacity where you actually engage multiple U.S. universities to deliver that capacity development into the universities.

Thank you.

MS. BEHRING: Our third speaker for today is Doctor Dave Hansen. He is a Senior Fellow at APLU. His major responsibilities there are related to the U.S.-African Higher Education Initiative which promotes partnerships among U.S. and African higher

education institutions. In addition, he retains a part-time appointment with Ohio State University. In this capacity he works on issues dealing with international programs in agriculture.

Prior to these appointments, he was a tenured faculty member at Ohio State University and also served as the Director of International Programs there as well. He holds degrees from the University of Notre Dame and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He is a returned Peace Corps volunteer who has served two years in Bolivia.

DOCTOR HANSEN: Thank you very much, Deanna. It is a pleasure to be here. I am well aware of the fact that I am the only thing standing between you and a well-deserved afternoon break, so I will try to be brief here.

In discussing what I term here the nexus between the African-US Higher Education Initiative and the (inaudible) -- but before getting involved in my presentation, I would like to mention and recognize several other people that are involved as staff for this Feed the Future Initiative.

Among our core staff is Tag Demment, who is sitting in the back there who is our associate vice president of international development. I'm sure most

of you know Tag. And Claire Hervy, who came to us from the Congressional Hunger Fellows Program. I'm sure she would have been here today except for the fact that she had a new addition to her family last February and there are priorities. These other priorities that she needs to establish.

Kathy Olson is our vice president for international programs who has been involved in this; and Kerry Bolognese and Elizabeth Armstrong have also provided important staffing and inputs into this program.

As I round out our team, there is one person I can't forget to mention. That's Peter McPherson. He has provided a lot of leadership in terms of conceptually this program and mobilizing support through the Partnership of Hunger and Africa and other partners.

So I would like to preface my remarks with a few key assumptions here that I think underlie this initiative, and the first pearl of wisdom that was shared with me by Tag Demment -- he swears that it's an original of his -- and that's that a focus on short-term solutions to problems including food security will result in a persistence of long-term problems.

I think that it's important here to bear in mind that when we're talking about capacity development, we have this long-term perspective in place.

Secondly, higher education professionals will gravitate to work environments in which they can effectively ply their trade. That's true here in the United States. It's true overseas. And, therefore, the emphasis on institutional capacity development I think needs to be there, as well as individual capacity development.

The third one is that by pulling together, we are more likely to achieve our common goals than by acting separately. I must admit that I was really heartened yesterday in a meeting that we had in the afternoon where our chief science adviser, Alex Dehgan, came in to interact with the university community.

We also had BIFAD staff there. We had a very robust discussion about where do we go in the future. I think that we need to have more of these conversations and to make sure that we're working together to attempt to meet our collective agenda.

What I will do today, and I will try to be very brief in doing this, is first of all describe our

partnership accomplishments today and then discuss our immediate priorities -- that is, over the next year -- and then discuss several of our long-term goals.

Many of you are aware that several years ago using fiscal year '09 data, we were able to undertake the planning grant program that partnered African and U.S. higher education institutions to develop strategic plans, five-to-ten-year plans, for collaboration focused on specific problems; but through the addressing of these specific problems, leading to a greater capacity for addressing problems

in the future and partner institutions.

Peter was able to secure a million dollars from then Administrator Henrietta Fore. We worked with the Office of Higher Education for Development that is affiliated with the American Council For Higher Education to develop a request for applications. That went out to the field.

We anticipated getting 100 to 125 applications. But on that last day for submission, as we were sitting around the Higher Education for Development office, we suddenly came to the realization that we had over 300 applications thrown into our lap. Now, that showed the high demand, but I think also it really created a dilemma for us because

we only had funding for 20 planning grants of $20,000 each.

We had to scramble to get the peer-review committees in place to undertake the peer-review process, but over time we were able to identify additional funding for 13 additional very meritorious planning grants. Then last year the U.S. Congress supplied us with an earmark of $15 million to fund some of these strategic funds that emerged from that planning process.

So again we kind of scrambled putting together a review committee to identify 11 of these very meritorious 33 strategic plans that have been prepared. And we have done that and we have involved African educators in the process. We have involved our own higher education faculty. We have involved USAID and (inaudible) in the process, and we feel that we underwent a very legitimate process and the one that really yields the most meritorious partnerships.

Now, if you go back and look at the planning grants, I indicated that we had identified 33 planning grants for funding, but 11 of these actually dealt with food security or food-security-related issues, and they're listed here. I would like to say just a few things about this list here.

The first is that it involves institutions in ten Africans countries, many of which have been identified as eligible for food security funding. The second point here is that if one looks at this list here, one finds that we do have three institutions that are members of our 1890 community. And if one looks at this, one sees Tuskegee was partnered in the planning grant process with Burkina Faso, and also Cuttington University was partnered with the Southern University system to work on food security in Liberia.

What is not reflected here is the fact that three other partnerships also involved 1890 institutions. Hawassa University with Oklahoma State included Langston University; the University of Malawi and Michigan State included Lincoln University in Pennsylvania. Not our Lincoln University in Missouri, but rather the Lincoln University that was referred to earlier this morning.

The third one is the partnership between the University of Juba and Virginia Tech University and that involves Virginia State University.

Now, when we went through this process of reviewing the strategic plans, we did select seven of them that were related to agriculture and food security. They are listed here. I will not go any

further for the time being.

In looking at our immediate priorities, there are several things we wanted to do. First of all, it took us a gestation period of two years to come up with these 11 partnerships, and we feel that it's going to take some time to nurture these to make sure that they are able to stand on their feet and survive into the future so that nurturing is going to be very important.

Secondly, we hope to create new partnerships focused on food security; and third --

and this is a more immediate goal here -- is that we hope to represent the partnership at the November Kampala Ministerial Conference and other major African policies in order to make sure that the partnerships are truly Africa-driven.

With regard to nurturing partnerships, one of the things that we have done is we have formed a management team collaborating with Higher Education for Development. Tag and myself have formed this team, and we're going to be working together to make sure that this management process is undertaken in a very serious way. And from our perspective, we want to make sure that the university perspective, the U.S. university perspective, is fully represented in that

process.

Secondly, we are seeking additional funding for support for these partnerships. When they began we talked with these partnerships about their planning process. We said make sure you include funders in this because we don't know where the funding is going to be for these strategic plans when they emerge. Obviously, we have been able to secure some USAID funding, but the demand out there for these specific partnerships is much greater than the money that we are able to provide them through this USAID funding.

We are going to be working with foundations, the private sector, other funding. We are going to align the partnership activities with USAID country mission priorities, and we look to Feed the Future. We will look to the countries' mission priorities and how we can work best to achieve their priorities, and we're going to align partnership activities with the Feed the Future related -- Feed the Future and other related government initiatives.

Here I'm speaking specifically health and climate change initiatives. Health is more related to (inaudible), but certainly global climate change is also going to be enunciated as a major priority.

Now, in looking at new partnerships, we are

going to probably focus our efforts on the Feed the Future initiative and food security. We do have a good likelihood of an additional $15 million being available in FY '11.

We are going to focus on food-security-designated nations in Africa. We're going to focus on the Feed the Future initiative and what has been enunciated as priorities for this initiative by President Obama's Secretary of State Clinton. We are going to focus on national priorities, and in this regard we're going to take a heavy or a very close look at CAADP country compacts.

We heard that USAID missions are going to be looking closely at the CAADP country compacts in identifying where they're going to go with their programs in order to ensure that this process is Africa-driven. Well, we feel that this is also a very valuable approach to take in identifying where we're going to go with these higher education partnerships, so we're going to look for ways to, in a sense, link what we're doing back to these country priorities. We're going to focus on USAID mission priorities, and finally we're going to be involved in the development of applications for new partnerships.

I might mention here very briefly that when

we went through this process initially, we went through one RFA, and we're going to do it -- I think do it quite differently if we have the opportunity to be engaged in FY '11.

One of the things we're going to do is go to the missions and ask them about their priorities. That may very well involve identification of specific institutions that missions hope to work with and invest in as they hope for their own Feed the Future activities. So I suspect that whatever RFAs may emerge from this -- if indeed they do emerge -- will

be substantially different, but we want to be involved in the process.

What about the Ministerial Conference in Kampala? These are ministers of finance, ministers of higher education and ministers of agriculture. This conference is being put together in large measure by RUFORUM together with CHEA. The focus is on education and higher development. The interesting thing here is if you go out and talk with this leadership in Africa, they're all saying, Why can't we go back to the old programs that we had back in the '80s, those under which we were trained? We feel that without this capacity in our own countries, we're not going to be able to sustain development to create programs that

will be sustained over time with minimum input from the outside.

So in regard to the way the conference is being organized, it's being organized around several themes. There is one that is a direct interest to us, and that is higher education partnerships and agricultural development. And, indeed, over the past eight weeks, several months, Tag and I and others have been working on attempting to figure out how we approach this theme, and we are in the process of organizing some panels, together with partners from Europe, that are doing higher education partnerships.

Another is CAADP compacts and agricultural development. The formulation of panels to address this theme is being led by agriculture and rural development of the World Bank Africa Bureau, and we have again this close coordination with them also in attempting to define the content and the panels for this discussion. The result of these early panels will be recommendations that are going to be made to the ministers about what we do to bring about more effective higher education contributions to agriculture development.

What we expect here is out of at least these two things I've mentioned, that we will be

making some recommendations on the role of higher education and agriculture development, needed support for higher education and partnerships, and needed programs to support higher education and our related partnerships.

Let me conclude by talking a bit about the future. What I have done is borrowed a term from Jim Collins. He used to be the CEO of General Electric and has done a lot of strategic planning in the private sector as well as a number -- he talks about our "Big hairy audacious future goals." We have a couple of those also for our partnerships. Our first one, we hope to establish a large number of new partnerships and have them in place over the next five years.

Assuming that we get funding next year and we're able to develop 11 new partnerships out of that funding, we will have already gone a long way towards accomplishing this goal by the end of fiscal year '11.

The second goal is to assure that U.S. and host-country governments provide a commitment of five to ten years of support for African-U.S. higher education partnerships. Again, the sustainability issue, the long-term commitment that is entailed here really needs to be addressed; and, therefore, although

I know that this probably runs somewhat counter to what is current in USAID today as evidenced by that seminal work by Andrew Natsios, "Counter-Bureaucracies," we really intend to push hard to secure this five-to-ten-year funding report.

The final point is -- and this was addressed yesterday -- at least is what we hope will emerge from this is an increased relevance of African and U.S. higher education institutions to meet development challenges in the future. This focus is on solving problems. That's what we are about.

I would like to say thank you for allowing me to be here, and also that we hope the results of this conversation and others we've held will be a more robust and substantial conversation about how we hold together in the future.

MS. BEHRING: In the interest of time, Chairman Easter has asked that we hold questions until the public comment period later this afternoon so that everybody could have their break and keep on schedule.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Did you want to say a few words?

BIFAD: Task Force on Haiti Action Report to the Board

DOCTOR MURANO: I am also a member of the board that BIFAD appointed on Haiti reconstruction. I

will give credit to Chairman Easter for -- very quickly after the earthquake hit in Haiti, for getting us together on a conference call, and out of that conference call we began forming a task force to see what we as a board could do to advise the administrator of USAID regarding how to rebuild Haiti or maybe we should better say how to build Haiti's agriculture because it really wasn't in all that of good shape before the earthquake.

Just to give you a little bit -- kind of a refresher -- because we were all focused on the TV when this earthquake hit and we were horrified by the pictures and the reports that we heard. This earthquake hit close to Port Au Prince on Tuesday, January the 12th -- and I don't have the date on there -- but January the 12th at 3:53 in the afternoon. January the 12th. Today is October the 12th, so nine months to the day is when this earthquake hit very close to the main city of Port Au Prince; a magnitude of 7.0, and about a depth of eight miles below the surface with at least 59 aftershocks that happened in those subsequent weeks and so forth.

It's been estimated -- and I don't think we will ever know the exact number -- but it's been estimated, at least, almost two million people

homeless. That's a lot of people, 1.2 million people homeless.

You see from the map of Haiti -- and this is one of those UGS maps -- the degree of the earthquake in terms of severity. And the redder the color, the more severe, and all the way to the most red is extreme in terms of the impact of this earthquake.

On the left you see a chart that I found very interesting. It basically gives you the deaths from earthquakes since 1900 in all kinds of places around the world, from an earthquake in Chile in 1960 -- some of you may remember that -- to just earthquakes all over the place. And I want you to notice from this chart, you see all those dots. Those are all the different earthquakes. The bottom axis, the X axis, shows you the magnitude of the earthquake. So the Haitian earthquake was a 7.0. So if you go to the second line, you can see of all the earthquakes that had a magnitude of 7.0. Those are all those dots that followed that 7 magnitude vertically, and you see the Haitian earthquake all the way at the top, it has a red circle around it.

It basically -- the total of that quake was more than twice that of any previous magnitude 7.0

event, and the fourth worst since the 1900s, so a tremendous disaster that we can't even yet comprehend.

You can see in the lower right hand of the picture the city of Port Au Prince. It looked like a bomb hit it, basically is what it looked like, if any of you have been in a war zone before. So sometime after certainly there was a concerted effort by the international community -- and you heard a little bit about that this afternoon -- from representatives of USAID to try to match the needs of Haiti.

And on the left side is a chart that was

constructed from the National Agricultural Investment Plan that the minister of agriculture in Haiti came up with. It basically said we believe in these three areas, infrastructure, production of value chain development, agricultural services and institutions, we require this amount of money to build that up. And this totaled about $790 million, is what the Haitian government plan says that they need.

The donors have pledged helping Haiti's agriculture reconstruction -- basically pledged a total of about $465 million. The U.S. pledged about $200 million of that. So certainly not enough, and obviously there's got to be an examination of whether they really need 790 million. I would suspect that

they do, having been there myself and having seen examples of the devastation.

Let's talk about Haiti before the earthquake. It's not that things were great before the earthquake. Certainly not in terms of Haiti's agriculture. On the left side you see a graph that is a production of sugar cane in Haiti, 1962 all the way to 2007. The dark line is tons of sugar cane produced and the red or purple line is area harvested.

Basically what I want you to notice is that in 1980 or '81, more or less, you see a sharp decline of production of sugar cane in Haiti. You might ask yourself, Why did that happen? What happened kind of in the beginning of the '80s is that high-fructose corn syrup began to be used by the food industry as a sugar cane substitute, if you will, so Haiti -- certainly the global prices of sugar went down and Haiti could not compete in a market like that. That's one of the things that happened.

On the right side you see consumption of rice by Haitians. And from 1988 all the way to 2008, the jagged line going up is how much rice Haiti imports, and the red line going down is how much does Haiti consume that is domestically produced rice. Again, a decline in domestic production of rice. A

country that before that had been completely self-sustained in terms of production of rice, hardly had to import any rice at all.

There are various reasons for that. One certainly being soil erosion affecting the ability of Haitians to produce rice, some other economic reasons, tariffs going down and so forth. The important thing to note is that Haitian's agriculture was not in great shape before the earthquake.

Lastly, I will show you another graph from 1995 to 2008. The red line is food aid to Haiti and the green line is really the agricultural sector, what it's producing. And, again, you see that divergence where at some point Haitians needed much more food aid because the production of food has declined so much.

You wonder -- you know, there's many reasons. We talked about the high-fructose corn syrup shifting of the market, but there are some other reasons inherent to Haiti, and, frankly, to a lot of developing countries, and a lot of you in this audience know about this.

On the left side is a picture of the border between Haiti and the Dominican Republic. You know that these two countries share the same land mass, Hispaniola. And you can see the difference. On the

left side is Haiti, on the right side is the Dominican Republic, and you see sharp contrast in terms of deforestation. In Haiti almost no forest that you can discern.

On the right-side picture, you see more closely a picture of the Haitian terrain. When you don't have forest, soil erosion follows and watershed management is very much a problem.

Other challenges that Haiti has is it is a mountainous country, so a lot of the land area that is used for planting is up on steep hills and mountains.

That is difficult to plant and harvest. But a third of the land is used for agriculture. Actually it should be much more than that, but the limit is because of the mountainous ranges that they have. And then because of soil erosion and poor watershed management, you see riverbeds that are completely dry, full of rocks and sand. It's because those mountains, without having any trees, and they have had their share of hurricanes, that water floods. It comes all the way down. There is nothing to stop it going down to the ocean and washes away with the rivers and everything else.

So on March the 3rd of this year, BIFAD officially launched the Task Force on Haiti

Reconstruction, and our charge from Chairman Easter was to develop recommendations for BIFAD to provide Doctor Shah for the long-term rebuilding of Haitian food and agriculture sectors for the long-term. We saw this strategy as an opportunity to really do it right for Haiti.

You can see there a list of the members of the task force. Let me point out to you a few people you know because they're here this afternoon. John Becker; of course, Ron Senykoff and Kerry Bolognese; Doctor Dennis Shannon is at Auburn University. He is a professor there. He has decades of experience working in Haiti. He has been a tremendously valuable member of our task force.

Walter Bowen from the University of Florida; Doctor Henry Bahn from USDA, who had the role of Special Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture regarding Feed the Future and some other initiatives. And both Henry and Dennis were in Haiti when the earthquake hit, so they were there and saw for themselves the tragedy, saw for themselves the human toll that it took, and they have unbelievable stories to tell that they will never forget and had a lot of trouble sleeping for weeks on end afterwards because of the horrendous pictures in their mind of what they

had witnessed.

We launched the task force and one of the first activities on the calendar was in April we had our brainstorming workshop in Orlando, Florida. We had certain notions of what Haiti would need to rebuild its food and agricultural sectors. Certainly, Dennis Shannon, from having been there for decades, he knew pretty well what they needed and so forth. But we thought we need to engage the Haitian people to the greatest extent that we could to get their perspectives as to what should be done, and not so much what should be done in terms of specific projects.

For example, we know that we need to address soil erosion. We know we need to do certain specific things as far as growing certain crops and so forth, but more of the big picture. It's a systematic approach of what they need. To make a long story short, we had former Haitian officials, the minister of agriculture and education and so forth, who are now working in the U.S. They were not official representatives of the government of Haiti but had the experience of working there, having lived there and being born there.

We also had some land-grant universities

who joined us, some representatives, not meant to be comprehensive by any way. We needed to have a small enough group that we could brainstorm very effectively, so we just needed some representatives. So we had really some great exchanges.

Anyway, there are several recommendations. The top five that they came up with is first there's -- the extension system in Haiti is practically nonexistent, and it is very different than our extension system in our land-grant system here. It is directed by the minister of agriculture as

opposed to being in the universities.

The research system as well. Very little support from the government of Haiti for research by the agricultural universities of Haiti; a budget of, I think, a million dollars to do research in food and agriculture a year, and that is certainly very inadequate. They all recommended that we needed to help the universities there, the State University of Haiti needed to be supported for capacity-building purposes and so forth.

They noted that, sure, we can produce certain crops. You can help us produce certain crops, so we need the value-added portion of food production to really be built up in Haiti so that they can

actually become economically viable.

And then, of course, sustainability of natural resources and everything else, for that matter, over the long-term was a recommendation.

Now, we felt very strongly that we needed to go to Haiti and talk to some folks down there as well, and so Doctor Shannon and I went to Haiti in May. We met with technical personnel who worked for the Ministry of Agriculture. We also made some official visits to some ministry leaders, and we also met with public and private university representatives. Let me share with you some of these pictures.

On the top left, you see an example, of course, of the devastation that even in Haiti was still very prevalent. Lots of rubble, buildings about to topple over on top of people and yet people walking around through the rubble on their way to wherever they needed to go. A very, very difficult and dangerous situation.

On the top right -- I know it's a little difficult for you to see -- but you see a group of people in the middle and there's piles of garbage. This is a street. It's covered with garbage, about six-or-eight-feet-tall pile of garbage. Is that a

human tragedy or what? It's not only agriculture, but, obviously, human health is what we are dealing with here.

On the lower left there were a lot of people who were selling food and other things on the street, setting up their little tables with tents. I'm a food safety microbiologist, so to see eggs and chicken and meat sitting there in the heat of the day for hours on end covered with flies was not something that should be allowed to continue.

Finally, on the lower right-hand side, you see some young people sitting under a tent. This is the State University of Haiti. This is where they're holding their classes. Imagine that. Certainly no projector and PowerPoint. It's open-air in the parking lot. In fact, we visited the university and most of their buildings are unusable. They're completely destroyed, so they're going to have to physically rebuild that university.

So in a nutshell, from all of the visits with people, from our own experiences of those of our task force members, we came to the conclusion that the conventional approach of working in Haiti and doing projects of agriculture and food in Haiti had not worked. Now, before the earthquake Haiti was ranked

149th by the Human Development Index. That's not great.

We knew from looking into it that part of the problem is the way that the projects that had been done in Haiti over the years -- and many, many projects have been done in Haiti -- have not been approached in the right way.

For example, there was a coffee revitalization project in the 1990s. After that coffee revitalization project, the goal was to help coffee farmers grow more coffee and be more

productive. Only 3 percent of coffee growers were impacted about this project. This was evaluated by a third-party review. In spite of the fact that it was obvious that the project needed to continue. The project was discontinued. So whatever that effort was, it was a waste of time and money.

There was a productive land-use system (PLUS) project in the 1990s. This was a project that previously had been called the Agriforestry Project, but then there was a coup d'etat in Haiti and, of course, overlaid on all of this is the political situation in Haiti, which is not very good.

The original idea was to plant certain bushes and certain kinds of grasses for soil

conservation to stop that soil erosion and trees that would help in that regard. But what happened was after the coup d'etat and after the project was started, the goals were changed. The agency said, "No. We're going to now plant fruit trees. We're not going to do it for soil erosion or conservation. We're going to do it for producing fruit."

It just basically negated all the projects that had been done up until that point. The soil conversation aspect just eventually ended in spite of recommendations to continue the project.

And then lastly, the development assistance program in '02 to '07. There were several organizations that were part of this project, and they each were assigned a certain region of the country. They were each to do about the same thing, but they did it different ways and didn't talk to each other and so the results were all over the place.

There were delays in seed distribution to the farmers, which was part of the project. The farmers were not included in the planning. So again, limited results -- limited success, I should say.

So the task force concluded that there were six things that you might call the six insufficiencies that we concluded; that all the projects that

apparently have been done in Haiti or, let me say, most of them, in a general way, lacked continuity. Projects were very short-term -- you know, three, five years. Five years seems like a long time, but it is not in agriculture production. We all know that here. I forget who it was who was talking about an event horizon of 20 years. I think it was John Becker who was talking about that. That's more like it.

So it resulted also in lack on continuity in projectization effect; where you had a project here, a project there, a project here, and very short-term projects. No continuity, no connection one to the other and so projects were of limited success.

Secondly, insufficient coordination among the participants, and also in between individual projects. No cross-pollination of information, Insufficient integration. Research was done without extension components. Land-grant universities, NGOs, industry, government agencies, really were not all integrated in these projects. There were just pockets of folks working.

And may I add when I say "research," a lot of times the research was not as robust as it could have been or should have been. It really wasn't -- didn't have all the science behind it that it should

have had, so it wasn't very successful.

Insufficient support for Haitian universities. Very little capacity-building of people in Haiti, as far as them having a sustainability to conduct these things on their own.

Insufficient inclusion of the scientific community -- I guess I alluded to it earlier -- and of the Haitian community. And that's understandable to a certain extent. If you have a government that you don't trust very much, how they handle the resources that you provide, it's very understandable that an

agency will say, Well, then we're not going to bother with them. We're going to do the projects on our own without including them. The problem is if you don't conclude government officials, the project is never going to really be embedded in what that country's goals are, and certainly that goes hand-in-hand with insufficient accountability.

Locally funded projects were awarded non-competitively. The progress and the results were not tracked very well, so the accountability factor just was not very strong.

So these are the six findings, if you will, that we concluded. Part of the reason that these things happen is because sometimes there's a lack of

understanding that agriculture is -- it's a continuum. It's a circle. It's a sphere. You can't do one thing in agriculture and not do another.

For example, you can't go and install some irrigation systems and think, Hey, we got that done, without helping to manage the watershed issue. It's just not going to work. You can't improve soil fertility and have better varieties of crops and implement some good cropping systems if you don't have a good irrigation system to go with that.

You can't establish really a good system of education there and training of the people who are going to be there in the country without having some influx of resources that are going to support that.

What do those resources come from? Well, when they're partnerships with business between farmers and businesses or cooperatives so that you can actually have a self-sustaining agricultural base where you export products and you can get some resources in and that you can then reinvest in the country that has not had an opportunity. You're not going to have a good educational system and so forth. I think everyone understands that very well.

So the bottom line here is that we have come to the conclusion that we need a new paradigm,

and it does no harm and a lot of good, and I can't wait to report to my task force members to tell them how much I have heard that from USAID and from all kinds of people getting up here talking about how business as usual won't work.

I think it was Albert Einstein, wasn't it, Mr. Chairman, who said that if you do the same thing over and over expecting a different outcome, it's the definition of insanity. So what we are proposing, would like to propose to USAID, is a different kind of a structure. There are a lot of structures already in place to do different things on behalf of the agency. The way we looked at it is we thought, well, if we have a consortium of land-grant universities that is in charge of developing plans and coordinating efforts across every activity and that will also be the one to oversee the implementation of the plans and review the progress, right away you have then the scientific capacity, the input that we were talking about a little bit ago of the scientific communities, land-grant experts right at the planning stages at the implementation and review monitoring stage.

At the left side you see a box that is called "Funding." That's obviously where the agency comes in and other agencies. CHECK it is very

important to note the future initiative talks about having that partnership between AID and USDA and others, and we recognize that as well. And having a funding group or committee get themselves together would also facilitate not only providing the funds for all the projects that would come out of this master plan that the land-grant university consortium would develop, but those agencies would be participating in the development of those plans too.

And then, lastly, on the right you would see that there would be an advisory board of sorts

where we would envision having representatives from the Haitian Minister of Agriculture, Haitian University, private industry foundations as other stakeholders that would also participate in that planning process. So the planning would be the mandate of that land-grant university consortium but with participation from the funding entities, as well as from these other stakeholders.

The idea would be that this consortium then would be in charge of doing these things on behalf of the agency, of the donors, and would be accountable to the agency and the donors so that it would be a true integrated collaboration. In fact, we believe that this new structure would ensure, first of all, that a

long-term plan is developed, a master plan, if you will, for ten years, 20 years, a plan for Haiti; that the plan and individual projects would be science-based because you would have science experts in agriculture and food production developing that plan.

It would ensure that the projects are well coordinated and are integrated across all the stakeholders. It would certainly enhance the inclusion of Haitians as well as land-grant universities. It would enhance support of those local universities in Haiti which really, really need it, and would certainly ensure accountability through this progress -- of monitoring the progress that we would engage in.

This is a very "big picture" kind of a recommendation. It is not the specific detailed recommendation that I think has been put forward in a lot of plans. Right after the earthquake lots of people, lots of entities, lots of organizations, came out with their plans that here's all the projects that need to be done in Haiti.

We decided that it was better for us to look at the process of doing those projects. How do we get them done so that they fit within a master

plan? It doesn't matter if it's funded through CRSPs, through the CGs, through the missions themselves. Whatever the funding mechanism is, all the projects have to fit in with that plan that is developed by that land-grant university consortium.

So our next step this afternoon is to get the green light from BIFAD for this concept. And there's a draft document that we have put together, the task force put together, which the BIFAD board members have in their possession that lays all of this out. If we are given the green light today, then we would proceed to obtain comments -- additional comments, I should say, from the land-grant community.

How we might do that: I think there are several approaches. One approach is to seek the input of land-grant universities that have been involved in Haiti. Also at the APLU annual meeting that is coming up in November, we could also make that an opportunity for university representatives to provide us some more input.

Last, but not least, is to seek the final approval from BIFAD so that we could then provide that document to Administrator Shah, maybe others, share it with the State Department, request a meeting with them so that we could suggest that he would appoint a

committee that would then flesh out the details of how this three-box structure would work out. And, of course, we owe some information to Congress. We visited with members of Congress in March when we started the task force, and we owe them a follow-up on our activities, and we would do that as well.

So my last line is to tell you that time is of the essence. I don't know if you have been following the news or not, but this is a story that came out October the 6th, just this last week. It says: "Haiti: Still Trapped in the Emergency Phase.

"Nearly ten months after the January 12 earthquake, the people of Haiti are still living in a state of emergency, with a humanitarian response that appears paralyzed. Camp inhabitants are protesting against their living conditions and threats of evictions and objecting to the arbitrarily appointed or completely absent camp managers.

Gang leaders or landowners are intimidating the displaced. Sexual, domestic, and gang violence in and around the camps is rising. More experienced United Nations personnel and resources for humanitarian protection are urgently required. Further, agencies must focus much more attention on developing livelihood opportunities that would enable

people to transition out of the camps."

That's really the name of the game here: Providing them the tools to rise above this horrible, horrible situation where these people are still living in tents, 1.2 million are still living in tents, and God help them if there's a big hurricane living in those conditions.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I think I have finished. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Earlier Doctor McPheron referred to the university construction projects in the 1950s and '60s, and I did a little reading last night and I couldn't help as I listened to you but be struck by the actual similarity between the planning process that led to that, in essence, foundation of the Green Revolution and what you described here. It does show that within the university community there is real capacity to think about these problems and collectively cause things to change.

With that, any comments or questions from board members?

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: What were USAID's priorities prior to the earthquake?

DOCTOR MURANO: I don't think I can answer that question. But based on the projects that were

done, there were projects that had to do with soil conservation. But as I explained, they were changed.

I think the problem was that lack of continuity, the short-term kind of projects that you are not going to see results if you are just doing a small project here or there. So it was all over the map. To be honest, I didn't see any kind of a strategic plan.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: I asked the question because of those dramatic reductions that you were showing, so I guess it means that you weren't doing very much in those areas.

DOCTOR MURANO: We were not very effective.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Other comments?

DOCTOR BERTINI: Thank you. Very comprehensive, and you dug into a lot of different areas. Thank you very much. But you started by saying -- instead of "rebuilding," you said "starting from scratch," were the words you used. And I think that's part of the issue, is that as long as people say, "Well, let's just fix this and just fix that," this is going to be a continued problem. And unless somebody really tries to redo the system, obviously, with the concurrence and enthusiasm of the Haitian people, we will have the same discussion that Ron said

he had 30 years later. We'll be doing the same thing 30 years from now.

Anyway, I think it's a great report. I think you should go to the administrator. In terms of other people that it might go to, I think if there is anybody else in the administration it goes to -- copies of what is sent to the administrator could go to others. But since we are an advisory committee, I think -- Shah is the administrator. Our communication should be sent to him. Not to others. That is separate from the Hill.

MR. BECKER: I think USAID programming in Haiti prior to the earthquake was one of a great deal of optimism with some breakthroughs on government and the election coming up, so things were beginning to look positive, and they were completely compromised. It's not to say that the performance would have been any better except to say there was a positive spirit.

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: Mr. Chairman, if it's appropriate, I would like to make a motion. The motion reads as follows:

"The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development accepts the report of the Haiti Task Force and instructs the task force to work with the Association of Public and Land-Grant

Universities to provide an opportunity for the Title XII community to review and comment on the report.

"The board further directs the task force to make the appropriate changes based on the feedback from the Title XII community for consideration at the next meeting. In the review the board considers that Haitian support be made in the context of broader mechanisms or enhancing Title XII activities in the Caribbean. The board commends the leadership of Doctor Elsa Murano and the hard work of the Haiti Task Force members.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Second?

DOCTOR BERTINI: Second.

It is a long time frame for a project that is supposed to be done yesterday and having people comment on it. If we have to wait until February or whenever in order to move this, it seems the one-month return, it's not going to take a long time to go through those comments.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Is that a friendly amendment?

DOCTOR MURANO: If you accept it.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Would you be specific so we can get it into the record what the change is?

DOCTOR BERTINI: I would suggest it be sent

to the committee but we give a 30-day time frame for comments and we have a meeting shortly thereafter. We are going to have to figure out what works so we can move this without waiting until the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Thanks. Other comments?

DOCTOR SENYKOFF: Mr. Chairman, after "consideration at the next meeting," strike "consideration." Insert "30 days."

DOCTOR DeLAUDER: The 30 days, the meeting would follow shortly thereafter.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: We could do a conference call to take action. Very good. Are we ready to vote? All in favor, "Aye."

DOCTOR BERTINI: Could we also have an understanding if there are not a lot of very significant comments that don't need a lot of additional review, that the task force or the chair can send it on?

CHAIRMAN EASTER: All in favor, "Aye." Opposed, "Nay."

Thank you so much, Doctor Murano. We are excusing Mr. Rabon for a flight. It's not the easiest thing in the world to get back to somewhere in New Mexico.

Aaron, the show is yours.

Status Reports: Iraq, Afghanistan & Pakistan

MR. MILES: I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you all today to share some general information on Afghanistan and Pakistan primarily based on my reintegration into ODP.

I myself had been serving on the Haiti Task Force that Doctor Murano reported on for about seven months, and about two years ago I returned to the BIFAD secretariat and wanted to follow up and see how we could get reengaged with Afghanistan and Pakistan and what is going and what we see as opportunities for

university engagement within the two countries.

Just to give you a little bit of background, some brief information, there was a regional stabilization strategy that was put forth by the U.S. government to the Congress as a part of our supplemental budget request for additional funding into the region.

Some of the primary focuses have been identified as job creation and increased confidence in both the Afghanistan and Pakistan governments and working towards increased funding for agriculture and infrastructure in both Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Right now there continues to be dialogue. I should mention as well -- I think I forgot this

already -- if it's not available to you right now, we do have a timeline of actions that we have been tracking between USAID and USDA as representatives of the university community so that you all have that additional information just to see where we've been working and where we have been going in terms of creating a projection of where we would like to go. That's why they posted that we have continued dialogue with USDA, and specifically with Foreign Ag Services and NIFA.

Sort of parallel there is a cash transfer for agriculture-related activities that was sent from the USAID to USDA. It's called a 632(a) transfer, which very often, if not all the time, implicates nondirect involvement on the part of the giving agency to the receiving agency. But understanding the role that BIFAD plays with university engagement, we see this is still an opportunity to coordinate with foreign ag committees for the work they are doing. Not so much with USAID but as advocates.

There was a recent follow-up from the January 2009 Trilateral Conference between the U.S., Afghanistan and Pakistan in Doha Qatar; and the one most recently held was September 28 and 29 in Istanbul, Turkey.

We had just been provided some information about that meeting; given the time constraints of when they had their meeting and their return and the date of this BIFAD meeting, we have not had the opportunity to follow up to get some more information from them in terms of what they are interested in doing, so to speak.

Directly to Afghanistan, the strategy and the information that is provided, and the strategy deals with increasing the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock. And it's also going to include watershed and the infrastructure project. And there's also going to be agriculture credit, market development and research and extension services.

I pulled a -- I don't see it here, but we also want to make sure -- which is included in the strategy -- is that the environmental policy of neighboring nations are affecting the Afghan country at large, that the environmental policies and the health services are going to be those that are beneficial to support the economic growth in this sector.

One of the things that we're also doing is that we're looking at the universities who are already

engaged in Afghanistan, looking at the work that they have done and looking at their points of contact so that we can communicate with those folks together, get additional information and get feedback from where they see it moving forward and operations taking place.

For Pakistan I think it's really great that we have what took place in the mid 1980s and 1990s, the Management of Agriculture, Research and Technology; the MART project. It was actually run by Doctor Senykoff. We see that we have precedent for

additional input for work that is being done in Pakistan. During the time of this program, there were about 150 students that were participating in research, technology transfer and extension education programs, both of those being -- they were graduate-level students and they were both Master's and PhD students.

Within the strategy for Pakistan, there was about $65 million that is going towards that and 64 for expanded infrastructure as well, and we're also looking at the regional university partnerships. I just came across some information in terms of universities that are engaged in Pakistan. Not U.S. universities but Pakistani universities engaged in

their local programs and how they are reaching out to Pakistan and back to the U.S., as well.

The newest idea that is coming forth has been for a Pakistan Center of Excellence Program. The plan is for ten centers created over the next five years with new funding to focus on some of the primary issues that are affecting the country as a whole.

For us the Institute for Agricultural Technology would be our focus in terms of working with the USAID and Pakistan affairs at USAID. The only constraint is the shift of attention due to the recent flooding that has taken place. But as we are all aware, in a time of national disaster, programs have to be put on hold. But the attention never leaves completely, and the folks in the field, just letting them know that we stand ready to assist with those initiatives as they move forward.

Just to give you a little bit more background in terms of what is going on with the Centers of Excellence, they want to create these Centers of Excellence at the tertiary levels, and they're going to focus on developing highly skilled leaders in sectors critical to national (inaudible). That is also to reiterate the concept that we have been working with for some time at USAID called Human

Institution and Capacity-Building Development. So when that person returns to their organization and to whatever they may be returning to, then they will have the opportunity to thrive in an environment and it will sustainably be a true benefit to the country.

There is also going to be an extensive curriculum that is going to lead to Master's Degrees for these Centers of Excellence as well, so furthering the education. We also see that as being an incentive for participants, but always that there is a (inaudible) that goes beyond that. They are going to bring in faculty from all over the world, and there are also going to be virtual attendance classes. So increasing the technological capacity so all participants can benefit as well.

Another important note for that is between mission staff and USAID staff, the Higher Education Commission in Pakistan is also something we are going to have to focus on, clarifying their role and the work that they can do.

So when we look at all of those things, we just have a few considerations for moving forward and how we can be more concrete and systematic in our efforts. A lot of this will involve feedback from an Iraq Task Force and those actions that have taken

place there. But we want to establish some type of a BIFAD Middle East Task Force where there is going to be representation from both USAID and USDA and the university committee, but there will also be other representation as merited as well. It will be chaired by a BIFAD board member; and the inclusion, at this point we're just looking at Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq.

There's been a lot of discussion today on Feed the Future and the role that universities are going to play in there and the questions have come

forward, so I believe that's also an opportunity. But we can communicate with our Feed the Future colleagues in terms of how BIFAD can serve as the gateway that we have been speaking of. There won't be handpicking between the universities, but it can be a more systematic approach.

USAID is also embracing more coherently, so we are seeing that also as an opportunity to link up our U.S. universities with our regional universities and understanding how that can play a role in developing our program planning, so we want to take advantage of everything that is out there.

In terms of ODP strategic interagency communication, as of right now I am the program

analyst, so any work going forward -- for example, October is agriculture month, so any work that is going forward in terms of overarching USAID initiatives, and what they are doing reference developing and communicating that message, I'm taking part in as a direct representative of the BIFAD. Because if there is one thing that we have learned, not only is it important to garner all of our resources externally outside of USAID, but a lot of education has to be done internally as well because folks have to be made aware of what the land-grant system is.

One of the things that ODP does (inaudible) the Foreign Assistance Act, and it's a timely opportunity for someone like myself in support of BIFAD to say, okay, our Title XII legislation and mandates are part of a -- sharing that information and making sure that, one, they're aware of an opportunity to approach what has been taking place for quite some time. And I think that they would be more thoroughly interested in that, but it just takes time to make sure our folks are educated. So that's my personal multidisciplinary approach to how we can strengthen others. With that I hope that -- I wanted to provide that information to you.

I conclude my report.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: Very good. Thanks.

John, were you prepared?

Title XII Report: Status and Implication of HECTARE Legislation

MR. BECKER: I would like to give you an update on the Title XII report for 2009 and cover five things: Report overview, programming in FY '09, programming in the future five-year period, BIFAD activities in '09 and then the BIFAD role in FY '10-12, some of the issues coming up. Just a broad overview.

Section 300 of Title XII calls for an annual report. USAID reports to Congress. It is USAID's responsibility to report. The report is due September 1 of each year. It is late. It's normally submitted in October, so we're not that abnormal. But the fact of the matter is, it is late. BIFAD's separate view may be included, and it will be included.

Title XII report requirement calls for, with regard to Title XII activities, report details, activities in the preceding fiscal year. For example, the September 1, 2010 report covers Title XII activities in 2009, and the report shall contain a

projection of programs and activities in the subsequent five years. For example, the September 1, 2010 report will cover the period FY '10 through '14. So it's that far down the road that we're going to have as well.

The Title XII/BIFAD report requirement. The report shall contain a summary of the activities of BIFAD as established pursuant to Section 298 of Title XII, and it may also include the separate views of the BIFAD on the programs that were conducted or being proposed.

Title XII FY '09 reporting environment. The requirement for the BIFAD is every two years. As a federal advisory committee of the U.S. government, it has to have a renew of its charter every two years. So the first thing that happened in '09 was a renewal of the BIFAD charter.

In 2009 USAID responsibility for the Title XII report was moved to the Office of Development Partners. It was a transition period. It was the first year we had an agricultural earmark in the budget and additional funding, and then FY '09 funding levels increased modestly and a new food security strategy was initiated. Then BIFAD activities continued to expand.

Title XII programming. The key to Title XII programming is essentially Section 297. You can read a lot of things in 296, but that's the general declarations and the definitions. If you want to know if it's authorized, you have to go to 297. And my interpretation of the four components is a little different than what Tim had. And I'm not quite certain where the confusion is, but it's basically all the same.

But the first thing is build and strengthen institutional capacity and human development resources in developing countries. I'm labeling that "HICD." It's "human and institutional capacity development." USAID in 2009 was putting together a new policy directive on capacity-building. It was put into the directive system in 2010. But we need to be clear that the agency is emphasizing and has a new policy directive on capacity development, human and institutional capacity development.

Then, secondly, is to provide long-term support for the U.S. university global agricultural and related environmental collaborative research and learning. That's the CRSPs. I look at 297 and say, Where do you get the CRSPs from? It's from that particular section.

Then, thirdly, is involve U.S. universities in the International Network of Agricultural Science. I use the acronym "INAS." I don't think we're really doing anything in there. That's one of the areas where we have really fallen down, and I don't think we have been participating in some of these international networks.

Then, provide support for the IARCs and problem-specific research projects and to develop and strengthen national agricultural research systems. The keyword here is "program support." You got to do the job and you got to do the job for them, and it's either in the IARC or structural global research.

Fifthly is establish and carry out special programs identified by the administrator. I'm not quite certain what we are talking about there, and I'm working with the lawyers just to clarify just what we meant by that in the legislation.

Reporting issues. The objective is for 2009 we want to list the Title XII activities and the associated annual funding as a proportion of the agriculture development assistance. For example, in FY '09 the ag earmark was 375 million. The CRSP earmark was 29 million. So the question is: There was more than just the CRSPs, but what were they and

what portion of that funding was total ag? Because basically with the Feed the Future, which is a $3.5 billion three-year initiative, what you have is all Title XII is agriculture funding. All agriculture funding is Feed the Future funding. So we have got to know how it fits and then we can sort of see, all right, what fraction is the Title XII activities. That's the idea.

The first issue, however, is there are multiple USAID program reporting systems. There is the FACTS system using the standardized program

structure, which I was involved in setting up in the F Bureau. There is the Phoenix accounting system and then there are bureau accounting systems. And the bottom line is it's very tough to come up with a number that you can hang your hat on officially in the ag systems.

Issue: Title XII activities are by attribution and reported with annual program requirements. There are errors in reporting. It is not a control number except for the CRSPs. They have to keep track and report here's how we spent that 29 million.

Other Title XII activities. It's up to the operating units that are spending funds to say, Here

is a Title XII activity. It's a key issue that they have to report on. The problem is they're going to report projects which are not really Title XII, and you're going to have Title XII projects going unreported. It's a problem. It's errors in reporting.

Issue: Title XII activities by public and private partners. Title XII activities are not just monies that go directly to the universities, but they're monies that go to other people. And then in the subgrants, when you have got these very large contracts where they're all a subgrant, AID doesn't track subawards so there is no way of knowing when -- and I know, for example, in Haiti you have got a fairly large winter project and the University of Florida has a sub. We have no idea it exists unless the universities tell us. We don't track subawards.

Issue: FY '09 annual funding. FY '08 new obligation authority that is funded because we do two-year money as well as FY '09 money, so it's not a simple matter of saying the new obligation authority for '09 was agriculture, 375 million, and then figure out what the NOA of '09 is. That '09 money isn't going to be really obligated until '10. So we have got that kind of an issue in terms of trying the

simple what is the Title XII as a fraction of overall ag standard.

That said, there is the other problem with just what is Title XII activity. For example, the HICD, looking at Africa and the U.S. Higher Education Initiative that David talked about, that was coming under a Higher Education Initiative under Section 106 of the Development Assistance Appropriation Authority, which meant it may not have been ag money at all. And I have to track down and see if it was really ag money. Because if it wasn't ag money, it's not Title XII. Then you have got that at least they are reporting. India, Cornell and MSU were involved. Afghanistan, we had one (inaudible). With regard to CRSPs, straight-forward EGAT/AG was reporting. The Malawi mission brought in the three CRSPs, so that's fairly clear.

INAS, International Network of Agricultural Science, I can't find anything at this point in time.

Program support for the CGIAR. The funds -- it's a single contribution to the World Bank, the 26 million or something like that. The problem with that is it's supposed to be accounted to Title XII through U.S. universities. There is some slow response. There is some sort of rough earmark of

some fraction that is supposed to go to universities. We have no way of knowing. I can't track it. So as far as I know, I can't count any of the CG earmarks in Title XII.

There were famine funds in '09 for $20 million that was directed at wheat rust. That was mainly through the (inaudible) bureau. It wasn't the ag or econ bureau. But the sole issue about wheat rust was as potentially destabilizing the Mideast. I don't know where the money went in terms of if it's Title XII.

Then the NARS, we've got Afghanistan, Mozambique and Turkmenistan. Special programs. Famine funds, the wheat issue.

With regard to FY '10 and '14, we need to keep an eye on because of the HICD area and USAID policy directive on HICD.

Then we have the HECTARE legislation; the Lugar-Casey, which was talked about earlier in our discussion. The HECTARE does authorize 100 million in its current draft for higher education collaboration. It's not at all clear that it will make it into an appropriation. Like so many of the other things they have authorized that there is no direct earmark for the activity, but we have to follow that.

CRSPs, FY '10, there is an earmark of 31.5. And also if the Lugar-Casey goes forward, it does call for a BIFAD evaluation of the CRSPs. They would like to hear from us in the context of how things are going with the CRSPs.

IASN. I looked at the CGIAR reorganization, the meetings that are being held, the determination of the mega programs. I don't see any U.S. university people participating per se aside from Gebisa Ejeta, who is on the donor council. So I think there is a real question with the CG system. I mean, if you don't have here is how U.S. universities are linked to this whole process, well, I think we better do that.

Regional STI challenges, expanded NARS support for USAID. And then we have got this procurement reform. It was interesting -- I wanted to mention that when the MSI report was released, it very much -- and the workshop talked about procurement reform, Littleton Tazewell, who was with the general council in handling that process in part for USAID, took back seven recommendations because we are looking at a larger number of small-value procurements (inaudible).

So with regard to program support, you've

got these -- I think the numbers you were giving, 30 to 40, to me that is a pretty modest objective. When I look at 3.5 billion, the need -- I just think we really need to keep track of procurement reform.

Special programs. The one there that I think is quite interesting is when I hear about the U.S. universities that are working -- Cuba, Myanmar, North Korea, et cetera -- if you are trying to reach out to specific countries, there are some opportunities. And we have had some discussions about how that could work and there are some opportunities there.

Title XII/BIFAD performance highlights in FY '09. Public meetings, we had three topics. Ron was instrumental in looking at what the DoD was doing on IEDs, with the sustainable rice (inaudible). We looked at -- we had (inaudible) come in with the Lugar-Casey legislation on HECTARE; the Conference of Deans and the white paper that came out of that on food security; SPARE activities or discussions on food security, agriculture and the role of SPARE.

Then task forces. We set up the MSI task force and coordination activities for USDA on Afghanistan. In FY '10 and '12 what is coming up is the first thing after the meeting is over is we have

to focus on the renewed charter renewal. The charter expires October 27 of 2010.

What we are going to be looking for there is the role -- in the previous charter, the advisory role as a federal advisory committee is quite clear. Everybody understands that. However, the legislation calls for more than just simply advising the administration. It calls for monitoring and evaluation.

When we had the Title XII universities center in the past, you had the capacity for BIFAD to

do that. Our current budget and ODP precludes that kind of activity, so it's really up to the system to say, in terms of the new charter, what kind of Section 298 responsibilities they want to really support.

Public meetings. We're going to review and evaluate that, evaluate those meetings that are coming up. Stakeholder consultations, STI challenges. With the MOU that we have now signed, looking at those science and technology challenges.

Science policy, talent management, minority-serving institutions and the Conference of Deans (inaudible), where to go with that process.

Subordinate units. We did dissolve the SPARE. There were some discussions in 2009 about the

role of the SPARE. We concluded (inaudible) in the February meeting -- looked at it and concluded that we needed to go back to a policy subordinate unit and an operation subordinate unit as called for in the legislation originally.

And task forces. We have had quite a bit of discussion of those. And then we really have to track these global development policies and the new QDDR. These are very all-encompassing strategic administration initiatives that we have to pay attention to to make sure that we are totally consistent.

Public Comment

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I think time is open for public comment. Why don't we begin with any questions that would follow up the presentation earlier. Any questions for the other two? If not, are there public comments that anyone wanted to offer at this time?

Ron, do have you any recorded requests?

MR. SENYKOFF: Yes. Tim Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: I would just like to walk back to some of the issues to the existing relation in view of CRSPs. Some of them that are meant to be reviewed by this stage and that process hasn't happened and those particular CRSPs are anxious about

what in the future is going to happen, and I think that this is something that would have normally been a SPARE issue and would have worked through the SPARE arrangement, but that hasn't been replaced. And the board needs to take steps to have that process function and make recommendations for those CRSPs to be reviewed or some (inaudible) strategy to put it in place.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I'm really glad that you reminded us of this. Ron, can we make a note to have a call about this in the next week? We have a responsibility.

Other comments? .

MR. BECKER: In the context of the SPARE and the rules, you got to add there is the Bureau of Food Security which is being stood up and there is a reorganization going on, so when you look at the budgeting and the whole process for the CRSPs, that dynamic is going on. Of course, they did have a meeting when the CRSP directors met a couple weeks ago, and we will be tracking that whole process and they are moving closer to the reorganization.

MR. WILLIAMS: This evaluation is a contractual issue?

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I believe that's the

case. We need to check about this. Doctor Demment.

DOCTOR DEMMENT: Tag Demment, UC-Davis. I would just like to emphasize how important in this overall discussion this priority-setting process that goes on within the agency and, for example, goes on with the CG, that universities need to be at the table and they need to be functional in developing the priorities of the plans. We tend to get brought in on the back end.

I think it's been one of the major challenges to the CRSPs that the CRSPs have never been

integrated within the overall AID strategy. They have always been told they need to respond to something which they have not been a part of. I think there is tremendous effectiveness that the CRSPs could bring. But until you are part of the planning process or the universities are part of the planning process, then their effectiveness is only marginal. So I would just encourage BIFAD to try to get universities involved in the front on higher education, the initiatives, whatever, and that's a real challenge.

Particularly it's a challenge because now much of the planning is going on out in the country at the mission level. I just spent five weeks in Africa trying to set up partnerships as part of this U.S.

Higher Education Initiative. I can tell you coordination with missions is a very labor-intensive activity. How do we get university input into the decisions that are being made in the planning process at the mission level.

I think BIFAD has the -- hopefully, the capacity to be able to make this a priority for the agency itself and that to me is critical to solving a lot of problems that follow.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: I think, Alex, this is something you may (inaudible).

MS. EGNA: Hillary Egna, Oregon State University. I would like to invite the board to entertain the idea of having the CRSP directors meet with BIFAD at some very soon time to discuss quite a few issues of importance to us. Perhaps at the next meeting or at a separate break-out meeting.

CHAIRMAN EASTER: We can consider that. I know I met with the CRSP directors two years ago during a summer meeting, and it was very useful from my perspective to be part of that conversation.

Further comments?

Adjourn

CHAIRMAN EASTER: If not, I think we will

consider this a day well done. I do appreciate the participation by the board members. Again, thanks so much for being here and enjoy the rest of this wonderful event. Thank you.

(The meeting concluded at 4:20 p.m., October 12, 2010.)