

IPM CRSP Board Meeting  
September 26, 2008  
OIA Building

Present: SK De Datta, Muni Muniappan, Debbie Francis, Larry Vaughan, Miriam Rich, Maria Elisa Christie, Gene Ball, Annie Steed, Jim Foreman, John Dooley, Alma Hobbs, Bobby Moser, Larry Olsen, Bob Hedlund, George Norton

Absent: Thomas Schwedler, Johnny Wynne

**1. Introductory Remarks – Larry Olsen, Chair**

Olsen welcomed everyone, asked everyone to introduce themselves. Olsen asked Muni to explain all the documents sitting in front of them, which he did. Rich explained what's in the binder.

**2. Welcome Remarks – S.K. De Datta**

(Printed. Attached at the end of this document.)

**3. Approval of Minutes and Review of Proposed Agenda – Olsen**

Dooley motioned that the minutes be approved; Moser seconded the motion; everyone voted aye. There were no changes to the agenda.

**4. Election of Chair and Rotation of Board Members – Olsen**

The group agreed that Olsen should complete his term as chair on Sept. 30, 2009. Dooley thanked Olsen for serving as chair.

De Datta suggested that someone from Penn State be elected to serve on the board. There was some debate on this—as to why Penn State over Washington State, but it was explained that Penn State has a much larger involvement. Hedlund explained that the board represents the universities having a major part in the CRSP, and that conditions were that one have a sub-award competition. Then, depending on who wins the sub-award, that determines who's eligible to serve on the board. Dooley motioned, and Olsen seconded, that Penn State be invited to have a seat on the board. The ME was asked to approach Bob Steele at Penn State and have him find someone there to serve. Everyone voted aye.

**5. Program overview – Muni Muniappan**

Muniappan presented a PowerPoint giving an overview of the IPM CRSP.

**Broad impact of the IPM CRSP**

During the presentation, Moser commented on the impressive spread and number of countries involved. This generated some discussion. De Datta explained that in the early phases of the IPM CRSP, people asked why it was important to go to Africa. De Datta responded that he didn't know any globe without Africa. The lead proposal did not have Africa in it, and while that may not be the reason they didn't win, it could have been a

contributing factor. Moser noted that the band of countries where the IPM CRSP has its programs is around the equator, an area of the world with 20% of the wealth and 80% of the poverty. Muniappan noted that yes, it's like Tom Friedman said: it's an area that is hot, flat, and crowded. Dooley asked if there was another CRSP that has as broad a footprint as this, and Hedlund said no. Furthermore, he said, next month, the World Food Prize will be held in Des Moines, Iowa. USAID is going to present the Title 12 report to BIFAD, and will use the IPM CRSP as an example (of how well Title 12 programs do). Dooley noted that this means that the IPM CRSP leverages resources to a much greater degree (than other CRSPs). Hedlund agreed, but noted that one criticism of the EEP and AMR is that it might be spread too thin.

### **Vegetables versus fruit**

A slide on the percentage of the project focused on vegetables and fruit provoked some discussion. Why so much effort focused on vegetables, and not fruit? Muniappan noted that that is where the needs are. De Datta added that when the RFA came out, it was for horticulture crops, but we took a stand that vegetables are an integral part of food security. There was some question about IPM in the tropics; even the basic pests of vegetables were not known. Vaughan also noted that the RFA said you need to prioritize crops according to men and women growers. So, for example, mangoes are grown primarily by men. For this reason, we decided to exclude mangoes. Furthermore, vegetables are more of a staple crop.

### **Gender parity in grad students**

A slide on the percentage of men versus women raised a discussion on this issue. Is this where we want to be? Muniappan noted that the numbers go up and down. If we could bring it to 50%, we would be happy. Hedlund noted that that is a requirement, but that it's impossible to enforce. De Datta noted that if you look at statistics in this country, you don't see 50%. In this country, too, Christie noted, we have a patriarchal culture in the agricultural sciences.

Hedlund reiterated that the requirement is 50% women, and Christie noted that the rules say, "If this is possible." Muniappan noted that economics play a significant role here—men go for IT areas now. Olsen asked if we are encouraging PIs to recruit women, and Muniappan said yes. Christie noted the lack of a gender specialist on the team. De Datta said it's important to have a pool to recruit from, and that one must recruit and not just advertise. Christie suggested having a scholarship fund to increase the representation of women among the IPM CRSP grad students. Hedlund said he would like to see the ratio of male-female students in the United States by way of comparison. Christie mentioned that people have said having Sue Tolin as a role model for female faculty has been very helpful in supporting their aspirations. Our dean in the College of Agriculture (Sharron Quisenberry) is a woman, too, she noted. Vaughan suggested reminding program leaders that we do want to have a pool of female students. We can make sure that the host country people are aware of this need. Moser agreed.

### **Expansion of the IPM CRSP from the discipline of entomology to other disciplines**

One slide provoked a discussion of the development and growth of the IPM CRSP from just the discipline of entomology to other disciplines as well. Hedlund noted that it's important to look at what the need is in a given country. Moser asked if the heavy balance on agricultural economics is justified, and De Datta said yes. Dooley noted the importance, as we look ahead to Phase 4, of seeing growth in the areas at the bottom of the list: plant breeding and plant biotechnology. De Datta said yes, but noted that plant breeding is heavily covered by the CGIAR centers and that we don't have a comparative advantage there.

Moser suggested that in Phase 4, it would be a good idea to have a discussion of what the needs are so that we appropriately develop human capacity. It's important to have a variety of disciplines. Hedlund said that from an IPM augmentation standpoint, what's really important is to see what's needed in a given country. There was some debate about the numbers of students in each discipline and the breakdown among social sciences—what *kinds* of social science.

De Datta noted that when it comes to U.S. vs. host country students, we always think host countries need more IPM specialists, but we need more in *this* country! There is no pool here. We should not forget, we need to train U.S. scientists in tropical IPM issues. There are jobs—there aren't enough American grad students.

Moser expressed a desire to see some joint degrees. This raised the question of visa problems and the difficulty in bringing students here. Furthermore, for American students, there isn't an incentive for them to get degrees from universities overseas, such as Makerere University, for example. Practically speaking, it's a challenge.

There were a variety of other comments about the benefits of short-term training, the impressive list of publications put out by the IPM CRSP, and the importance of collecting information on how much the IPM CRSP leverages funds. A final question related to impact measures, and Muniappan responded that among these are: improvements in the quality of people's lives and the enhancement of people's health.

Dooley described the impact his field visits have had on his perception of the value of the IPM CRSP. Local scientists gave presentations on impact, the impact related to average income, and relating to that, production increase. He had not fathomed the degree of impact that this program has had on the economic well-being of an entire country. Moser said he saw the same thing in Uganda.

### **6. Communications – Miriam Rich**

Rich gave a PowerPoint presentation on how the IPM CRSP does communications.

Moser asked if we have gotten into cell phones or pod-casts. Rich mentioned the program in the Philippines where cell phones are being used to transfer information. De Datta also pointed out that we let the national program do that.

De Datta recounted an encounter in DC where he spoke with a USAID administrator who was highly impressed with our fact sheets and other information.

### *Coffee Break*

George Norton arrives.

## **7. EEP Report – Muniappan**

Muniappan gave a PowerPoint presentation on the EEP report.

### **Tech transfer – soil quality**

The issue of soil quality came up. Many areas are phosphorous-deficient. Moser asked whether the goal was to use more biological control and fewer pesticides, and Muniappan said yes. Muniappan was asked to talk about his visit with Barry Jacobsen to India; he reported that Jacobsen was very impressed with the tech transfer that was going on. TERI (The Energy Research Institute, funded by TATA; the head of the institution is Rajendra Pachauri, who won the Nobel Peace Prize along with Al Gore) is doing an excellent job.

### **Info tech and database project**

De Datta asked Muniappan what he wants from the board regarding the EEP report, what areas they need to respond to. Muniappan noted that one of the things that came out was regarding the Info Tech and Database Project. It is supposed to be covering all the programs in the IPM CRSP, but right now, it isn't. It's not completely taking into account all the projects in SE Asia. Hobbs asked if the key recommendation on p. 117 (of the EEP panel report) has implications for the board. De Datta noted that one of the main concerns was with the IT program. The ME shared this with the PI, Yulu Xia, but he said he didn't have enough money. Norton noted that the problems are even more fundamental than just one project. He pointed out a need for some restructuring, and the importance of interaction between regional and global theme programs.

Some discussion ensued as to what to do about a project that is seen as under-performing versus the need to have representation in a given area—whether topical or geographical. De Datta asked the board for guidance—how should the ME proceed? What would you advise? Moser advised that the ME tell the project PI, “We need to see you do these things next year, and if you don't produce, then you're gone.” Furthermore, if the project didn't get all the funding they expected, they probably should have scaled back their expectations.

Hedlund noted that the difficulty in making progress is not all their fault. He explained that when the proposal came in, they had certain goals and that they then did not get funded well enough. Part of it also, he said, is that there isn't really a need for this activity anymore. IT progresses so fast. The information that the project provides can now be met by other means. That said, USAID doesn't need to continue to fund it. Olsen noted that both the AMR and the EEP evaluations recommended not continuing the project.

Moser recommended asking the other regional programs whether or not they'll miss the program at NC State if it is discontinued. Ask them what they need and whether or not they are having their IT needs met internally.

De Datta said that the ME would talk to the concerned project leaders, based on the annual workplans and ask the PIs to check the deliverables. Olsen noted that the board does want some actions and results from the ME as a result of this discussion. Moser moved, Hobbs seconded, and everyone voted aye that action would be taken on this issue by the ME.

Hedlund noted that it's hard to terminate an award and that this is the last year of the project. He recommended that the ME find something that NC State can do and suggested that they modify their workplan to build on NC State's strengths.

### **8. AMR Report – De Datta**

De Datta referred board members to the document in the binder, which shows a shortened list of recommendations that the AMR made, and to which the board needs to react. He noted that the ME did not have a board meeting last year (2007), but that they did have a conference call in April, 2008, and that served as ME oversight. He said the ME plans to have a face-to-face board meeting this year (in 2009).

He pointed out that the Policies and Procedures, or POP manual, should be revised to reflect the current program.

#### **Issue of leaving some money unallocated to provide for unexpected changes in direction**

De Datta referred to 3.6.6.4.: a recap of AMR findings and recommendations about the TC and the ME's response. He noted that one discrepancy between what is in the POPs manual and actual practice is that the ME said it would spend the money before it came in. He noted that the ME said in its proposal that it would allocate all the money, but recognized that that is not a good thing, because then you are locked in. What the ME would like is for some funding to be withheld, so that it can strategically allocate funds and not have it all spent out. He asked the board what it thought of that idea.

Moser said he saw the value in that, but noted that you can't leave too much flexibility. Hedlund also noted that this was one of the suggestions from the AMR, but pointed out that at USAID, they wouldn't be happy to see 25% of the budget unallocated. Debate ensued about this issue. De Datta noted that if there were some extra money, it could be allocated towards gender, for example. Moser suggested setting aside 10% of the funding for re-allocation purposes. There was general agreement that the 25% suggested by the AMR was too high. Moser noted that it will be important for there to be some review process in place and that that will have to be developed.

De Datta accepted and agreed to this suggestion, on behalf of the ME.

## 9. Gender – Maria Elisa Christie

Maria Elisa Christie presented a PowerPoint on gender relating to the IPM CRSP.

After her presentation, several questions came up. Christie noted that what's important is being sensitive to the fact that women's needs may be different from men's. Simply asking and observing is important. The question of gender awareness and training is also important for our PIs. Just because a PI is a woman does not mean that she is a gender representative. She also pointed out that a gender scientist is not the same as a gender researcher.

Moser asked if we require any training of the PIs, and Christie said no. De Datta said this will be built into the next phase; our PIs say they are not gender specialists. Christie concurred, noting that while they are not opposed to looking at gender, they just don't know what to do. And it's not possible for one person at Virginia Tech to do it all. At most of the sites, she noted, there's in-house capacity that needs to be brought in. They're often unaware of it. It's important to incorporate a social scientist into projects.

Moser asked if the IPM CRSP gets resistance from cultures that we're trying to change. Christie responded yes; that there are two responses: that you can support women, and that we're not going to create something new, but that it's important to see what the obstacles are to benefiting women; and secondly, that in any meeting of women, there needs to be a few men. If you don't have the men participating to some extent, they're afraid you're riling up the women and that the men will lose control. The main goal is to provide access to education. That will improve things for everyone, but saying that is not enough. As an outsider, Christie said, the most effective way for her to push this agenda is to support the local people who are already doing it.

Christie continued, noting that having one woman in a group is not good enough to say women are involved. We need to be sure to support the professional development of the women on our team. That requires a whole lot more resources than we have. In Africa, Christie noted, the Rockefeller Foundation put money into gender because they saw the importance of that.

Gender needs to be integrated throughout the whole program.

De Datta noted that one problem is that the PIs have written proposals saying they will do gender, then they say, "I don't have enough money to do gender." So we need to challenge them on what they will do (for gender). Norton suggested one way of enforcing that would be to say, a part of your budget won't be funded because we don't see you doing gender.

Christie cautioned that gender research is not just gender-disaggregated data. She suggested coming up with mechanisms for the PIs to meet the minimal requirements that are part of the USAID requirements. Ask them if they can they address a gender research question within their research.

De Datta said that in the next RFP, the ME will be much more specific. The PIs will be told that if they don't do gender, there will be a consequence. Moser noted that the PIs might need some help in writing the gender section since they are not so knowledgeable on the subject. Norton suggested hiring someone additional like Maria Elisa who could help.

Christie said one has to be careful in mandating gender because there are so many gender mandates everywhere that people resist it. It has to be strategic. She pointed out that there has to be some gender research to show why it's important. The ME needs to be careful to manage gender in such a way that it is embraced.

Dooley asked what the ME would do if there was a group that does not meet their technical requirements as part of the RFP. De Datta said there would be a phased intervention. The ME would work with them; then, there would be a consequence.

Hedlund suggested that the same strategy be used for gender as was used for the IEEs.

*12: 45 Lunch break.*

#### **10. Perspectives of Technical Committee – George Norton**

Norton presented issues from the perspective of the Technical Committee, outlining the key issues as these four: Global Themes, Regional Themes, Transitional Phases, Graduate Students.

He noted that the cuts are hurting programs. There are 13 themes, he said, and the budgets are small. There are 32 countries involved—more than ever. He expressed hope that the budget might be bigger in the next phase. He suggested considering cutting one regional program.

He noted that there are different ways to talk about how to integrate global themes more. The idea was good, but didn't always play out in the way that had been planned. Nonetheless, issues need to be tied in more closely. There's a tendency to take a global theme and make it your own little project, he said.

He also noted the importance of transitioning from our current program into the newer phase. The last time, he pointed out, we lost productivity in the transition phase. We don't want to lose a year in the process this time around.

Dooley asked Norton to explain why the most of the programs aren't working to the level of the global diagnostics program.

Norton responded that with viruses, we saw the need for this and wound up with two programs. One was on tospoviruses in India, and one in the Caribbean. They become their own regional programs not serving the other regions. For the same amount of money, we might be better off putting the other virus money in the regional programs.

Norton said it was still open for debate. With parthenium, it may not be possible to make that a global theme given the resources we've got, he said.

Moser noted that if it's a global theme, it shouldn't be restricted to one area. The PIs should be thinking about how they can work with other areas and figure out how to do that.

Norton noted that the ME is trying to take a more strategic look at where the pests are in the world. In the next phase, he said, we're going to have to do the RFA differently than we did last time. We have to be more specific and make sure that when the external panel reviews these proposals, that they follow the RFA, and that this is then followed up by the ME later.

### **Graduate training**

Norton then spoke about graduate training. First of all, we have trained a lot of grad students: In the first phase, we trained more than 70. In this phase, we have trained 22, up until now. And, over time, grad students have become more expensive. The trend in students returning home has gotten worse over time. This brought up some discussion about students returning to their country of origin, and in certain cases, students who apparently weren't doing research that was related to the IPM CRSP. Everyone agreed that it was important to comply with TrainNet Sevis. Hedlund noted that regarding the issue of students not going back to their country of origin, that will change under new laws. You will sign a form saying you'll go back; if you don't go back, you have to re-pay everything, *and* you're here illegally. When you try to re-pay, they nab you. Olsen noted that this needs to be made clear in the POPs manual. Muniappan agreed to make sure that it was. Hedlund noted that neither the CRSP nor the university are an enforcement arm. You just have to make sure you're not aiding and abetting students [in doing something illegal]. As long as you are following the procedure, you're OK.

In a brief discussion of global versus regional themes, it was decided that the two need to be more closely integrated.

## **11. POPs Manual Revisions – Larry Vaughan**

### **IEEs**

Vaughan noted that a sub-committee was formed to look at IEEs (or PERSUAPs)—Doug Pfeiffer, Jeff Alwang, and Annie Steed. The issues were consequences and timing. It fell on the ME to enforce the filing of the IEEs. The consequence was withholding the budget. The law states that one cannot use any of these products until they are approved.

A discussion of the language in the “ME Response to PAB’s request to develop POPs manual text” ensued. Moser motioned and Hobbs seconded, that on p. 4, the language of the heading be changed from “Implications on Budget and Implementation” to “Compliance: Budget and Implementation.”

Everyone further voted that the document include the statement, “A pesticide table will be supplied upon request. See samples on the web.” Everyone voted aye on this.

### **Branding strategy**

Regarding the branding strategy, Dooley moved, Moser seconded, and everyone voted aye to replace what's on top of page of 25 in the POPs manual:

*This [publication, video or other information/media product (specify)] was made possible through support provided by the Offices of Agriculture and of Natural Resources Management, Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade, U.S. Agency for International Development, under the terms of the Award No. EPP-A-00-04-00016-00. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development.*

With what's on the bottom of the handout ("POPs Manual Changes on USAID Branding"):

*This project was made possible by the United States Agency for International Development and the generous support of the American people through USAID Cooperative Agreement No. EPPA-00-04-000 16-00.*

### **Trip reports**

The issue of when trip reports must be submitted was reviewed; they now have to be done within two weeks, whereas it used to be 30 days. There was some discussion as to whether two weeks was the right length of time, or 30 days. Whichever is decided, it just needs to be consistently stated. Another issue with trip reports is simply that the PIs weren't getting them turned in. It was finally decided that 30 days was an appropriate amount of time in which to require that trip reports be turned in by U.S. PIs. Moser motioned, Dooley seconded, and the motion was approved that trip reports must be submitted within 30 days of the completion of travel, or future requests for travel will be denied. Everyone voted aye.

### **Further changes on wording in the POPs manual**

It was suggested that on p. 12 of the POPs manual, the words "and budgets" under the second bullet be scratched. It was also suggested that "PAB" be changed to "ME," and that "and budgets" be stricken from after the word "actions" on the next-to-last bullet. Alma moved that these changes be made, Dooley seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

Further changes: Under the next section on p. 12 regarding meetings, strike "to discuss the review of the annual" and the rest of the sentence. Change the word "will" to "may" in the same sentence. [In the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet, strike the whole bullet.] [NOT CLEAR ON THIS. OF THE PREVIOUS SECTION?]

Regarding the listing of members on pages 35-36, it was mentioned that every time the membership changes, we need to technically make a new version. The group decided that these changes be made on an annual basis, and that they just be done. This doesn't need to come before the board. Moser moved that this change be made; Hedlund seconded it, and the motion was unanimously approved.

## **12. Financial Report – Debbie Francis**

Francis reviewed the IPM CRSP budget.

The question arose about pipeline funds, and how much of the funds need to be spent before more money can be released. There is a difficulty with that; you can't have 100% spent before more can be released, or even 90% recovery before more can be released, or the sub-grantors will be totally out of money, De Datta pointed out. Dooley asked if that number could be reduced to an 80% threshold. Francis pointed out though, that if you change the wording, the Office of Sponsored Programs would have to change every sub-contract. There was some discussion as to what the number (% recovery) should be, and in the end, the group agreed to leave the written policy as it is. Dooley said this would give the ME the opportunity to manage things as they deem appropriate.

Olsen congratulated the ME for its excellent management of money.

Francis reported that the billing has been improved; that is, that sub-grantees are submitting their bills more promptly. She noted that they are always going to be at least a month behind.

It was noted that with a new award, if the IPM CRSP gets a new award, that the same rules will apply.

## **13. Associate Awards – Vaughan**

Vaughan explained what associate awards are and why they are important. Our original award from USAID said that we may receive associate awards. Vaughan pointed out that the IPM CRSP has had three, and at this very time, the IPM CRSP is completing paperwork on another one.

### **Importance of associate awards**

Via the following story, Vaughan showed why associate awards are important. The first associate award was received in January of 2005. It dealt with the biological control of locusts in Senegal. We got it because we already had a program in Africa and had worked in Senegal. In 2004, there was a desert locust outbreak in Africa, and the USAID mission there wanted to react. They were given emergency money from Washington; and so we were given the money. We were at the right place at the right time. At the same time, many missions were having their budgets cut. The Senegal mission had to let go of 40 national hires with a lot of institutional experience. The point is: by virtue of the fact that we already had experience in this region, we were perfectly positioned to receive this associate award when it came through.

Vaughan explained that this was the last associate award until last year when we got Egypt. Hedlund mentioned us to the Egypt mission. It was a small, \$20,000 award, from which we produced a large product. This award created a relationship that we now have that might one day serve us well.

The third associate award was received July 10<sup>th</sup> of this year, from the USAID mission in Senegal. Again, a serious problem showed up: an invasive fruitfly landed in West Africa by 2005, causing 60-80% loss to mangoes. This happened in Burkina Faso, Mali, and a number of countries in the region. Vaughan noted that while we are appreciated by the USAID Mali mission, we are not necessarily funded by them. The food security crisis, however, has caused an influx of funds to the missions in Africa.

**Importance of cultivating long-term relationships with mission people and others**

Vaughan also noted that relationships change as USAID people leave, so it's important to develop relationships with the host country institution people as well.

Hedlund was instrumental in getting us the Egypt award. He will be instrumental as well with the African Food Security Initiative, which we will operate in Senegal, Mali, and Uganda, for \$1 million.

Vaughan noted that it is often difficult to convince the missions of the importance of supporting funding for these problems.

Muniappan spoke about the papaya mealybug problem, and what he discovered in India and Indonesia. He brought it to the attention of the mission, but they said they didn't have any money to give. He has also brought this to the attention of the mission in India, but they have not responded yet. De Datta said that USAID in India will not fund any agricultural project. Their funds, he said, are going primarily to environmental issues.

De Datta noted that garnering over \$5 million in associate awards is an extraordinary achievement and that the award itself is an interesting instrument: it provides money without requiring one to go through a competitive process. If there were no IPM CRSP, there would be no global research in IPM. If IPM CRSP were not in existence, no one would do it. It's important to remember with every mission that we deal with, that this is a long-term relationship.

**African Food Security Initiative**

Vaughan spoke about the African Food Security Initiative and explained that this was a title that we strategically chose (in light of the current global food crisis). This title gives us a platform that other CRSPs cannot necessarily match. We hope the title will resonate better with the needs of the missions. Vaughan asked if there was something we could do better (in getting associate awards funded). While some may claim that we are spread too thin, in a sense this is strategic: our presence is everywhere (and we're better positioned to get an associate award this way). Vaughan noted that both Obama and McCain have stated they plan to increase the budget of USAID.

**What can we do better?**

Vaughan asked if there was some maneuvering we need to be doing in regards to the missions. We get a lot of pats on the back from them, but are not necessarily funded.

De Datta reminded the board that there are no actionable items here, but that this was just to explain the situation to them and to provide them with the information. Mission buy-in

is critical, and yet we aren't allowed to say, "Give me more money." We cannot use federal dollars to get federal dollars. Instead, we present what we're doing and say, "How can we help you?"

#### **Importance of mission contact**

Olsen confirmed that networking and mission contact are critical. De Datta noted that the PIs are supposed to contact the mission of the various countries they are in.

Hedlund said that USAID was going to have a Presidential Initiative on Food Security, but because there is not enough money, now it's going to be a Presidential Response. There is going to be \$750 million to begin in 2010, and this is to go up by 1/2 billion per year to address food security. This includes an amendment to the Food Security Act that funds the CRSPs now. Up to \$35 million *may* be given to the CRSPs. Up to \$45 million may go to the IARCs. But this would start in 2010.

#### **Importance of U.S. stance on food and agriculture**

Moser noted that governments can't ignore food and agriculture anymore. De Datta concurred, noting also that developing countries copy what we do, and that when we don't put enough resources towards food and agriculture, developing countries don't either. What the United States does has a tremendous effect.

#### **14. Renewal of the IPM CRSP, Phase IV – Bob Hedlund**

Hedlund gave an overview of USAID's intentions regarding this CRSP, which, he said, are to renew it. USAID has got a continuing resolution to fund the current budget until March of 2009. This includes a \$27.7 million earmark for the CRSP. USAID expects the funding level to remain the same. The renewal of the IPM and SANREM CRSPs will increase the 5 year funding. It will be a \$3 million/year allocation for the next 5 years. USAID expects to get the letter out for a renewal proposal in October.

This time around, Hedlund said, the competition needs to take place in 2009 so that we'll have 5-year awards and not 4-year awards. We will put in a requirement that 25% needs to address hunger in Africa. We won't change the matching requirement. Hedlund reiterated that it is USAID's intention to fund the IPM CRSP at \$15M for 5 years.

De Datta asked if a change in administration would affect anything, and Hedlund said no. USAID expects the earmark to remain the same. The Soils CRSP is out at the end of this month (September), and USAID is adding horticulture. USAID is also looking at a nutrition and water CRSP.

#### **15. Renewal Process – De Datta**

De Datta outlined what he expects the IPM CRSP will achieve in the next five years. First, we will make sure that we have a vision. We understand that we have the responsibility to do everything possible for world food security. Secondly, we will make sure that we show impact. Thirdly, you've heard that we have too many projects. But I have seen that working on fewer projects doesn't necessarily mean greater productivity.

Dooley clarified his earlier remarks: yes, he mentioned that we have an impressive footprint, but asked if we had over-extended ourselves. Norton said that it's not that our footprint is too large, but that our programs are over-extended. He added that we've just heard from Hedlund that we should be able to plan for a slightly bigger budget. He is not sure there's a compelling argument at this point to reduce our footprint.

De Datta brought up the idea that some money needs to be set aside to look in-depth at projects. If there is a sudden emerging pest, for example, if we don't have flexible money, we can't address the need. To this end, we will set aside, not an undesignated holding, but a budget flexible enough to make sure that if a priority comes up, we'll have the flexibility to address it. It's a question of priorities.

De Datta further noted that when a proposal is written, there will be a competitive process. There will not be any pre-proposals this time.

### **Importance of gender**

He also pointed out the need to do more on gender—to add funding, coordination, and some research work to that. Christie wholeheartedly agreed on this. She suggested collecting some of the gender research and publishing it, for example, in a textbook. This could then be used at all of the PI institutions. De Datta further suggested ensuring that who is chosen to do more gender research be someone who has some knowledge of IPM, and not just be a gender person. Dooley concurred, saying he would like to see the IPM CRSP create a culture where gender is addressed as part of the proposal. Moser suggested using the same model as NSF uses: you have to have an impact component or your proposal doesn't make the first cut.

## **16. Closing Remarks**

Olsen thanked the ME for all the preparation and the panel for all the good discussion.

De Datta thanked the board members for serving and for having made it to this meeting. He commented that this meeting has been very engaging, very focused. We used the board as a board. Today, we have had two years of accumulated questions. We've had a real discussion. We thank you for that.

Dooley thanked Vaughan for facilitating the meeting today. Virginia Tech values greatly and takes very seriously its responsibility as the ME. As a part of that commitment, De Datta has put together a marvelous team of individuals who are talented, committed, and who do want to find ways in which they can leverage this resource to have a lasting impact on individuals around the world. Every one of these people are exceptional professionals. We want to acknowledge it.

Hedlund thanked the board, and stated that this has been the most interactive board meeting he has been to with this CRSP in the last 15 years. He seconded what Dooley said, that the team is outstanding and has kept this program up to par all the way through. He ended by saying he believes it will go a long way towards keeping the IPM CRSP successful. And he thanked all the ME and the staff for putting this together.

Finally, Moser added his thanks, and the meeting was officially adjourned at 4:41.



De Datta's welcoming remarks follow on the next page.

WELCOME REMARKS, IPM CRSP PROGRAM ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
OIREED, Virginia Tech, September 26, 2008

by

Dr. S. K. De Datta, Associate Vice President for International Affairs and  
Director, Office of International Research, Education, and Development (OIREED),  
and Administrative Principal Investigator, IPM CRSP

Good morning, everyone. On behalf of the Management Entity (ME) at Virginia Tech's Office of International Research, Education, and Development (OIREED), allow me to extend a warm welcome to this year's Program Advisory Board (PAB). We wish to particularly welcome our USAID IPM CRSP CTO, Dr. Robert C. Hedlund.

Although we had a board meeting via teleconference in April of this year, this is the first face-to-face board meeting in two years. We consider the PAB an advisory and oversight board, and the membership is drawn from major stakeholders of the IPM CRSP project. The board members are senior administrators from the Colleges of Agriculture or its equivalent and senior management representatives from our partner institutions. The board members are either nominated by their respective institutions or accept invitations from the ME with concurrence from the PAB. Each member's nomination is for a three-year term. A chair is elected from among the board members for a one-year term. Both board members and the chairperson may be re-elected if the PAB so chooses.

Let me now summarize the life of the IPM CRSP since OIREED/Virginia Tech competitively received the first grant for \$7.5 million on September 29, 1993. The OIREED at Virginia Tech served as the ME with a host of consortium members drawn from other land grant universities, private sector organizations, NGOs, IARCs, and a number of host country institutions. The first phase had four major sites in four important regions of the world. However, we positioned the IPM CRSP not just as a regional project, but as a global one. I served as the first program director, the administrative PI and board member representing Virginia Tech. After several months, we hired a separate program director to provide programmatic leadership. The first phase was completed in five years, which ended on September 30, 1998. Following that, we wrote the renewal proposal for an additional five years, which was approved through September 30, 2003 with a budget of \$11.9 million over five years. Just before the end of the second phase, USAID was deciding how the IPM CRSP should be reconfigured and re-competed or possibly, eliminated. During this transition period, USAID EGAT decided to give a one year with cost extension until September 30, 2004.

After considerable debates in BIFAD, SPARE, and within USAID, it was decided that the IPM CRSP would be re-competed for an additional five years. The OIREED/Virginia Tech consortium wrote a proposal and under a stiff competition won the Leader with

Associate Cooperative Agreement for five years starting October 1, 2004. This award carried with it a contractual amount of \$17 million: core funding of \$12 million, with the rest to be raised through associate awards. As part of the cooperative agreement, the IPM CRSP had to select sub-awardees through a competitive protocol. That took some time to complete the process and to move ahead with the program implementation. In the mean time, programs were carried out with the savings from Phase II which USAID had allowed us to use as part of a no-cost extension. The management of the current phase is considerably different from the previous 11 years of the first two phases. The process is considerably more decentralized in the management and implementation of the current phase of the IPM CRSP project. What does all this mean? That the IPM CRSP is 15 years young since the first award on September 30, 1993!

During this 15-year journey, the IPM CRSP has had some continuity and some changes. For example, the IPM CRSP is very fortunate to have had Bob Hedlund as the project manager/CTO for most of this time. During this period, we have had six program directors or interim Program Directors: myself, Brhane Gebrekidan, Short Heinrichs, Keith Moore, Don Plucknett, and now Muni Muniappan; and four assistant program directors or interim program directors: Kent Reid, Greg Luther, Keith Moore, and now Larry Vaughan. In all of these 15 years, the one constant in the ME that has meant consistent administrative, contractual, and financial oversight has been that I have served as the Administrative PI for OIRED/Virginia Tech. At no time have we allowed any slack or vacuum in the management of the project. This was possible because the OIRED/ Virginia Tech is the Management Entity rather than individual officer(s).

The current phase of the IPM CRSP is fully funded, although the release of these funds was erratic, which caused some difficulties in the smooth implementation of the programs. In addition to the core budget, the IPM CRSP was able to garner three associate awards. The first is *Biopesticides for Locust and Grasshopper Control* from the Senegal Mission, and the second is an *Initial Environmental Evaluation (IEE) for the Use of Pesticides* from the Egypt Mission. We are now in the final stages of securing another associate award from EGAT amounting to \$1 million for African food security issues. My good colleague Larry Vaughan will give you details on these awards as shown in the agenda. During the last two years, with Larry's leadership, we completed all the IEE reports, thereby meeting the PAB-mandated deadline. These reports have been approved by USAID's Environment Office and the IPM CRSP CTO.

The IPM CRSP Program Director, Muni, will share with you the programmatic accomplishments of the IPM CRSP in the current phase. During the whole of our 15-year history, we have been extremely fortunate to have had the guidance and oversight of Bob Hedlund, our IPM CRSP CTO. Whether it was under a grant, a cooperative agreement, or a leader with associate award, the OIRED/Virginia Tech ME has worked cooperatively and as a collegial partner with our USAID CTO. By doing so, we have avoided committing any major mistakes in managing and implementing the project. It also helped us do our job better and strictly follow all USAID rules and regulations, thereby fully meeting the expectations of USAID. We never felt that Bob was micro-managing the ME. At the same time, our CTO has helped us avoid problems before they developed.

In the current phase, we advanced regionalization and globalization by not allowing any single country program. The programs are strictly multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary with technical and social scientists working together to address major IPM issues. A Virginia Tech–led IPM CRSP consortium chose to support a geographically wide collection of competitive sub-awards under the strategic assumptions that Mission buy-ins for associate awards would follow. Conversely, it was assumed that buy-ins would be unlikely if there was no IPM CRSP presence in that country. In this phase, the IPM CRSP has seven regional programs. The IPM CRSP has also advanced “global theme” programs to focus on common elements that were recognized as problems at many regional sites in the prior phase. In this phase, 20 U.S. universities, 60 host countries, several IARCs, private sector groups and NGOs are involved in the IPM CRSP project.

Also, during the current project cycle we have undergone an annual External Evaluation Panel (EEP) review and one major review by an Administrative and Management Review (AMR) panel. Since late last year, the ME and the consortium have been particularly busy with the reviews conducted by the EEP and AMR teams. The burden and responsibilities were monumental considering that OIRED/Virginia Tech had a similar review of another USAID EGAT-supported global project, the SANREM CRSP. These reviews were successful, and both panels (the EEP and the AMR) recommended that the IPM CRSP be extended for five additional years starting October 1, 2009. We shall have a separate discussion on the EEP and AMR reviews and recommendations from the panel. We shall seek the board’s advice on their recommendations.

In the mean time, new challenges are demanding attention around the world. Peace and prosperity are threatened by a spiraling price increase in all major food crops. Besides the food price, increases due to a shortage of commodities, increased energy costs, water shortages, and global climate change are all contributing to unsettling problems. Economic and financial meltdowns worldwide are impacting all aspects of society, some more negatively than others. In this environment, the IPM CRSP needs to adjust its program in the next phase to take on some of the pest management-related production problems to generate newer and more relevant technologies to enhance production, food security as well as to increase farmer income. The IPM CRSP needs to show impactful results. That will only happen if we have a clear, over-arching vision and a coherent implementation plan.

The question then arises, “What does the ME need from this board?” We need the board’s guidance as we craft some of the program thrusts, shape managerial and policy issues, work to balance a resource distribution that will ensure high impact, and manage gender and equity issues for the benefit of the growers and other stakeholders we serve.

With these remarks, I thank all the members of the Program Advisory Board for their kind attention.