

IPM CRSP Technical Committee Meeting,
External Evaluation Panel Meeting
May 7-9, 2007

Inn at Virginia Tech Skelton Conference Center

Meeting Minutes

Present: Jeff Alwang, SK De Datta, Mark Erbaugh, Debbie Francis, Mike Hammig, Bob Hedlund, Barry Jacobsen, Robert Kenny, Sam Kyamanywa, Karim Maredia, Wondi Mersie, Sally Miller, Don Mullins, Muni Muniappan, Roy Nishimoto, George Norton, Dely Pascal-Gapasin, Doug Pfeiffer, Ed Rajotte, Naidu Rayapati, Miriam Rich, Sue Tolin, Greg Traxler, Larry Vaughan, Yulu Xia.

Monday, May 07, 2007

I. Introduction and Welcoming Remarks – S.K. De Datta

The meeting convened at 8:00.

De Datta Opened Meeting, Described Challenges Facing IPM CRSP

De Datta welcomed everyone, had everyone introduce themselves, and framed the day's events. He explained the change in EEP—moving ahead the evaluation, as per USAID's directive. He encouraged EEP to make sure that it guides the program appropriately, given the current situation, and emphasized the importance of the EEP. "From our perspective, IPM is an integrated systems approach; it can't be done piecemeal. It isn't just crop-specific or pest-specific." He spoke of the challenge from AID that IPM CRSP is not needed because others are doing it. To us, this is not correct.

He mentioned the question regarding SANREM CRSP and its viability, as it is also in danger. It will either be re-bid or eliminated. These CRSPs (IPM and SANREM) are being eliminated to make room for the horticulture CRSP.

He urged all TC members to produce good, impactful results with documents. "We must ensure that we are doing everything we said we would do and that we are making progress. We must make sure that to the last day it is a first-class project."

De Datta mentioned another important issue that's looming—that USAID is thinking of reorganizing the ME into one super-ME that manages everything. "We are asking full partnership of all concerned universities."

Finally, De Datta expressed thanks for all the condolences he received from those present regarding the recent tragic event at Virginia Tech.

Discussion About How USAID Made Decisions

Bob Hedlund was asked how the decision was reached about the CRSPs. Bob explained that they (USAID people) had a series of meetings over several months in the agency to do a revision of the CRSP portfolio. What appeared on the website was the decision-makers' interpretation of the results. BIFAD later reminded USAID that these are five year awards with some assumption of an additional five years. Before you take them off the table, they should be reviewed at the end of three years to see if they should be left on the table or taken off. That's where it stands now." The official word is that they will be reviewed in early CY 2008.

Communications Strategy Key

It was mentioned that having a communications strategy in place that targets congressional members would be key, and that the communications strategy needs to draw on what has been done earlier.

II. Program Overview – R. Muniappan

Muniappan presented a PowerPoint called *IPM CRSP Program Overview*.

Discussion About Tech Transfer

Following Muniappan's presentation, there was a discussion about tech transfer and the importance of disease diagnostics. Erbaugh noted that "this is so relevant, and we're emphasizing export-driven growth, but if there's no disease-diagnostics in place—we can't move forward. This sets us apart from commodity-based—not just looking at plant breeding—looking at various components. This does make us unique."

There was also mention of the amount of money going to the management entity and it was explained that that amount is capped at 20 percent.

Discussion of Ways to Showcase Necessity for IPM CRSP's Existence

By way of helping advance the viability of the IPM CRSP, it was suggested that one go back to some of the commodity CRSPs and show that they [USAID] think it [the management of that particular CRSP] is already working, and it's not. This could be a key strategy.

Other ways that were suggested were: stressing the importance of farmer field schools; the examples of world-wide problems such as parthenium and thrips—they aren't just crop-specific. It was also mentioned that IPM's pioneering use of host-free periods was key and should be stressed. Furthermore, regarding the commodity CRSPs, a lot of them are focused on subsistence crops. "We are really the only ones looking at income enhancement. There's a great demand for this kind of information." Additionally, the horticulture CRSPs may not focus on pest management.

Also, it was noted, we need to mention that we have institutionalized many of our innovations. Some of the things IPM started are being picked up by the commodity CRSPs. This should be documented in IPM CRSP reports.

USAID: Fifth-Year Projection of \$2M is Optimistic

Finally, Hedlund cautioned that the fifth-year projection of \$2 M is probably extremely optimistic, and urged program leaders that as they discuss what they're going to do about cutting back on activities, to remember that there will probably not be any reprieve.

III. TC Meeting Overview – George Norton

Norton gave general guidance as to how to present information, how to proceed, how things will unfold.

Regional Programs, Overview:

IV. West Africa – Don Mullins

Mullins presented an overview via a PowerPoint presentation: *IPM CRSP: West African Regional Consortium of IPM CRSP*.

Among other things, he noted that their pesticide residue analysis method is unique. He presented his web site and reviewed its features. West Africa IPM web site:

<http://westafrica.ipmnetwork.net/eng/index.cfm>

It is in both English and French. There is an educators' side of it, and a chemists' side. It includes pesticide safety lessons 1-10 that they developed. Their pesticide analysis is not only quick and easy, Mullins said, but also cheap.

V. East Africa – Mark Erbaugh

Erbaugh presented a PowerPoint entitled, *IPM CRSP: Improving Lives Worldwide, Regional IPM Program in EA*.

The presentation, he said, is a combination site overview and progress report. His project focuses on Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda.

Web portal: <http://www/aaec.vt.edu/ipmcrspuganda>

(Dan Taylor at Virginia Tech is in charge of building and maintaining this web site.)

They have worked with ASARECA (Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in East and Central Africa).

Importance of Tomato; Problem of Over-Use of Pesticides

Tomato is the most highly ranked crop in the strategic planning.

1. It's a very important small-holder crop, and a commercial crop.

2. Its production is associated with the heavy use of pesticides. “They are addicted to pesticide.” This is a real problem.

They have created a training manual in the local language of Luganda.

Rajotte suggested having part of the CRSP web site devoted to crop by crop packages.

VI. Central Asia – Karim Maredia

Karim presented a PowerPoint on his work in Central Asia, titled *Ecologically-Based Participatory and Collaborative Research and Capacity-Building in IPM in the Central Asia Region* in which he described biolaboratories.

He noted that IPM calendars have been developed and adopted for cabbage, tomato, and carrot in several languages: Russian, Tajik and English. He also noted that they are currently publishing three papers about this.

Importance of Environment, Health

Gapasin pointed out that two areas hadn’t come out yet in the presentations. One is the environmental aspect—it hasn’t been talked about yet, she said, in terms of achievement. Also, landscape ecology—will this contribute as an environment sustainability issue. The other issue is: health. “If we’re going to see more support—these two areas need to be looked at and written up.”

VII. South Asia – Ed Rajotte

Rajotte presented his work in Bangladesh, Nepal, and India via PowerPoint.

In Bangladesh, Rajotte talked about the high effectiveness of pheromones—cuelure. Pharmatech said it was the largest order they had ever had. In Nepal, they have transferred technologies from Bangladesh. Nepal in fact is like a mini-Bangladesh. They don’t have a lot of resources there. In India, they are doing farmer IPM training.

India as Tech Transfer Hub

De Datta noted that Jacobsen mentioned during the evaluation of the initial proposal that India should play a major role as a hub to transfer technology to neighboring countries. As a result, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University trained quite a number of Bangladeshi scientists. The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) collaboration is excellent. So with a small investment, one gets a big multiplying effect.

Break – 10:15 – 10:30

VII. Southeast Asia – Mike Hammig

Hammig presented a PowerPoint titled *Ecologically-Based Participatory IPM for Southeast Asia*.

Hammig described his work in Indonesia – West Java, North Sulawesi, North Sumatra; and in the Philippines – Nueva Ecija / Nueva Viscaya, Batangas, Cotabato, and Benguet.

One of the truly successful activities they had last year was putting on a workshop in Bogor, Indonesia. At their site visit this August 7-9, they will do same kind of workshop in Jakarta.

VIII. Eastern Europe – Doug Pfeiffer

Pfeiffer gave a PowerPoint presentation on his work in Eastern Europe in Ukraine, Albania and Moldova: *Eastern Europe: 2005-2006 Accomplishments / 2006-2007 Activities*.

Pfeiffer described work in Lviv, Dnipropetrovsk, and Odessa, among other places. After privatization, farmers got large amounts of land, but had little experience making farm decisions. There were problems with incidences of food storage happening in the same area where pesticides were being stored. There were also incidences of child labor.

On the Eastern European IPM CRSP web site, there are two presentations in English and in host country languages (using Breeze) – Albanian, Ukrainian.

Eastern Europe web site:

<http://everest.ento.vt.edu/Fruitfiles/Albania/EasternEuropeIndex.html>

IX. Latin America/Caribbean – Jeff Alwang

Alwang presented a PowerPoint titled *Crops for Broad-based Growth and Perennial Production for Fragile Ecosystems*.

He described work in Ecuador, Honduras, and the Dominican Republic—efforts on cacao-plantain intercropping and farmer field school effectiveness. They produced a publication on the cost-effectiveness of farmer field schools for the dissemination of IPM in potato. It's a good method, but they learned that it's expensive to do.

They have worked at transferring plantain and vegetable IPM programs from Ecuador and Central America to the Dominican Republic. Hondurans are very interested in collaborating with Dominicans.

Global Theme Programs, Overview:

X. Insect-Transmitted Viruses – Naidu Rayapati

Rayapati presented his work via PowerPoint—*Integrated Management of Thrips-Borne Tospoviruses in Vegetable Cropping Systems in South Asia and Southeast Asia Region*.

He described his work on tomatoes and peanut bud necrosis; discussed the wide economic impact of the three most damaging tospoviruses, including Peanut Bud Necrosis Virus, which affects many vegetable and legume crops; he also spoke about the crop-specific impacts of watermelon bud necrosis virus, and iris yellow spot virus. Via diagnostics, he said, molecular tests are available for three tospoviruses.

XI. Insect-Transmitted Viruses – Sue Tolin

Tolin gave a presentation via PowerPoint titled *Insect-Transmitted Viruses*.

She spoke about their work with ecosystem analyses and mentioned that their test kit will soon be available for \$25.

X. Regional Diagnostics Laboratories – Sally Miller

Miller presented her work via PowerPoint: *IPM CRSP International Plant Diagnostic Network (IPDN)*.

The IPDN was modeled after the system put into place by the U.S. government after 9/11 as a security measure (the U.S. National Plant Diagnostic Network).

They are having to move from Benin to Nigeria.

Miller reported that she gave a presentation in Belagio, Italy for the Gates Foundation two weeks ago.

She mentioned that there is a supply chain issue of getting stuff into Africa, and difficulties with a consistent supply of electricity and Internet access.

Web site: <http://www.IntPDN.org>

Lunch Break 12:15 – 1:15

XI. Invasive Species, Parthenium – Wondi Mersie

Mersie described his work via PowerPoint: *Management of the Weed Parthenium in Africa*.

Mersie spoke of how parthenium is a problem everywhere. He described pasture management of parthenium and techniques such as burning.

Rayapati mentioned that the eradication of parthenium is also a big problem in India, and Tolin said that in Jamaica, it is a host for aphids.

XII. Information Technology and Databases – Yulu Xia

Yulu presents his work via PowerPoint: *Applications of IT and Database in IPM Global Themes*.

There was some discussion about how to maximize the usefulness of the database.

Mullins offered that the way they're doing theirs is: they're going to have local ownership by West Africans. The way we looked at Yulu's system—he links to us, we link to him. What we're looking for is a place where you can go, streamline info. When we first met with Yulu's group, we were asking some of the same questions. I think now's a good time to discuss this, but I have to warn you—one template doesn't fit everyone's need. His link gets us there, and then we can do cross-linking.

XIII. IPM CRSP Impact Assessment Global Theme – George Norton

Norton presented his work via PowerPoint: *IPM CRSP Impact Assessment Global Theme*.

He said that one cannot do impact assessment separately from the regional programs. He discussed strategic global impact analyses, and noted that they are getting help from Gates money—for using models to predict with.

They are doing two workshops in the coming year: one in English, one in Spanish in El Salvador, with the INTSORMIL CRSP. They expect participants to have some training in some kind of economics. The workshop in English will be at IFPRI, in Washington.

Importance of Impact Assessment

After Norton's presentation, there was some discussion about the most important thing being impact assessment, in a systematic way. This is a powerful tool. It was noted that for the IPM CRSP effort, which started 13 years back, we already have info—we have saved money here, solved problem there, etc.

Importance of Communicating Benefit of IPM CRSP to USAID

There was some discussion about the importance of getting the word to USAID that they need to continue to support IPM CRSP because if they don't, there will be many great projects that are going on now that won't be funded by any other CRSP. One example of this is Miller's project.

USAID's Review of the IPM CRSP – Process Explained

Hedlund spoke about the review process, and said that, "First of all, we're no longer calling it an EEP. It will probably be largely a paper review. They won't be doing any review of CRSP activities on their own. There will be a document review. They'll be using the EEP report, which is scheduled to be completed by the end of this year. They'll be looking at USAID development objectives and priorities. It's a review of AID's program objectives. It's a little different from what we thought it would be before." He continued by noting that the Program Assessment Panel is charged with making a recommendation to USAID of whether or not to continue this project for the next five years, so prior accomplishments are important, but not sufficient. It will all depend on how "transformation diplomacy" fleshes out.

Hedlund was asked, with the change in head administrator of USAID, how things will change, and responded that the reform process is an initiative of Department of State Secretary Condoleezza Rice, so it is expected that the current process will continue.

He continued, "This EEP has to evaluate this CRSP on what they've done to this point. One of the things that you all know from the BIFAD letter of a year ago, they will be looking at other CRSPs to see if they're using IPM. We want to emphasize in our report *what IPM means*. We need to make sure that this panel can see from this report that what you're doing is much broader than simply addressing a simple pest. Of all the things, showing that the IPM CRSP is unique and is covering things that no other CRSP is doing, will be easy. The harder thing: to show that IPM CRSP contributes to transformational diplomacy. The argument that others don't do it has a major weaknesses. It's really hard to show within the IPM CRSP reporting process. One of our objectives is capacity-building, and this should be emphasized in IPM CRSP reports as it is unlikely that any IPM activities of other CRSPs would not be emphasizing this."

Norton suggested that Bangladesh illustrates how IPM has become institutionalized, and recommended that the EEP visit there.

Transformational Diplomacy Explained

Hedlund said that there's a page on the USAID web site that describes "transformational diplomacy"—the theme of the new Framework for Foreign Assistance. There are five categories—from countries in conflict to countries graduating from assistance. Economic growth includes both agriculture and environment. All of us are working to fully understand the framework.

Miller looked up transformational diplomacy and found a fact sheet on it. "It seems like we're doing what they say. This *is* what we do."

Vaughan noted that although we may be doing important things, we might be doing them in countries that are no longer important. He also suggested that since we would be writing a new proposal anyway in 2008 or 2009, we should write to our potential.

Importance of a Communication Strategy

There was discussion about the importance of having a communication strategy—for example, sending out a press release every two weeks or so to highlight something we're proud of.

3:05 – 3:20 Break

XIV. Discussion: Collaboration between Regional Programs and Global Themes

Norton moderated this session.

Hedlund stated that the EEP report is to come out at the beginning of December. De Datta recommended having one site visit per country.

Site Visits by EEP Members

Hedlund suggested having each Program Leader indicate what opportunities exist as perfect opportunities [to coordinate with a site visit by the EEP] at each location. E.g., when is your annual meeting in your region and who will be there, etc.

It was mentioned that sites have to use the resources that are currently allocated to them by September 30.

Norton asked each Program Leader to write down their schedule of events, and give that to Muni or himself by tomorrow morning.

Calendar of Events on IPM CRSP Web Site

It was suggested that there be a calendar of events—events that each program is having—that is posted on the web site and sent out to everyone. If an e-mail is sent out to the Program Leaders, send it to the regional site coordinators as well. The information can be disseminated simultaneously via press releases, web site, e-mail, etc. De Datta assigned Vaughan the task of coordinating this. Vaughan asked that people send the information to both him and to Muniappan. Individuals need to let the ME know what they are doing. It's important for everyone to be open to helping everyone else.

Mark: There isn't a clear-cut mechanism for these two—regional programs, global themes—to work together. There needs to be a discussion about some sort of resource-sharing.

Ways to Share Financial Expense

There was some discussion of cost-sharing and ways to collaborate on the sharing of expenses. Collaborating can be difficult when institutions and people change. Whatever is decided needs to be clear.

4:10 Group broke; EEP split off to meet.

XV. Initial Environmental Examinations (IEE) – Larry Vaughan

Vaughan explained the process for when one needs to do an IEE. He explained that we need to show from a management perspective that we have a policy in place. We have a template which will be on our web site.

There was some discussion about having the ME do this work themselves. Vaughan assured everyone that the ME will work with people as much as possible, but cannot write the whole thing themselves.

XVI. Developing Regional Stakeholder Communication Plans – Larry Vaughan

Vaughan asked Program Leaders to talk about the gaps they have found in their experience and share with each other what they have found. E.g., what are ways that they are getting their message out?

Communicating with the Missions

Erbaugh cautioned people to not bombard the USAID missions and it was remarked that the Missions don't often respond anyway. Some USAID missions ask, "What is this IPM?"

Miller noted that she interacts with people when there's something she needs to tell them. She has not interacted with West Africa very much, or with the Central America site. Yes, there are gaps, but how do you get around them? It's frustrating dealing with the missions. You can have nice conversations with them, but get nothing out of them.

Communication From the ME

There was a complaint about communication in general from the ME, that it is deficient. An e-mail once a month, for example, would be enough, with a calendar of events. Or possibly more often, but with small amounts of content. For example, using bullets to communicate key things. Or, send out a one-page communiqué once a month. Another suggestion: send things when they come out, even if it's just a small thing.

Rajotte suggested that everyone think of one thing that they want to brag about, write it down, and send it to Miriam.

Finally, Vaughan reminded people of a clause in the cooperative agreement that any associate award that begins before the end of the current phase (30 September 2009) can extend up to five years beyond it.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Tuesday, May 08, 2007

Present: Jeff Alwang, SK De Datta, Mark Erbaugh, Debbie Francis, Mike Hammig, Bob Hedlund, Barry Jacobsen, Robert Kenny, Sam Kyamanywa, Karim Maredia, Wondi Mersie, Sally Miller, Don Mullins, Muni Muniappan, Roy Nishimoto, George Norton, Dely Pascal-Gapasin, Doug Pfeiffer, Ed Rajotte, Miriam Rich, Greg Traxler, Larry Vaughan, Yulu Xia.

The meeting convened at 8:08 am.

XVII. Program Budgets and USAID Allocations for FY2008 and FY2009 – SK De Datta and Debbie Francis

De Datta reviewed the status of the current budget for the IPM CRSP. Right now, we are short by 10.7%. It's safe to assume there will a 15% budget cut. The ME expenditure up to this point is 14%.

Francis presented handouts with budget info on them.

Possible Re-Allocation of Funds at Year's-End

De Datta explained that the purpose of showing this is that the Board has given the clear directive that if you have more than 10% remaining at the end of the year (Sept. 30), it can be re-allocated.

There was a discussion of what would be done with the extra money that hasn't been spent. It was noted that there might have to be another meeting at that point (the point of decision-making) to figure out what to do.

Funds Spent by Certain Date or Encumbered by Certain Date?

Question: does the deadline of Sept. 30 mean that we have to have invoiced by then? Our research foundation requires 2 months, so that means we have to spend everything by the end of July? That's impossible. Answer: It just means it has to be encumbered.

It was suggested that in July, the ME send out a note saying that "this is the current pipeline—take the difference and explain how you're going to spend it."

Spend the Money You Have

Hedlund said that a project can only be funded for the remainder of the fiscal year at its current burn rate [rate of spending money] plus an additional 12 months. "Where this really hurts is

when the award is scheduled to end on Sept. 30, 2009; we can't give money past that. We, CTOs, have been reminded that it is part of our job to monitor the project's pipeline. The final year of a project is the hardest to manage. You cannot save money to use at the end. We don't reward that." In other words, it is in the best interest of everyone to spend all the money you have.

There was some discussion of lag-time—time between when you spend the money and when it gets onto the books. It was noted that spending in the first year has been slow as Program Leaders have gotten things up and running. Question: We've got 5 years on this thing—why is there this push now, for this year? Answer: Because the allocation is by year. The CRSPs have been running for 30 years in an easy-going manner. Then as money got tight, USAID started looking at things more closely.

It was noted that when a CRSP is hit by an involuntary budget cut, one's burn rate can't be higher. The point is: if they allocate you down, your burn rate has to go down, you're always ratcheting down; you can never go back up. This is a problem.

Program Leaders were asked to speak with their Sponsored Program Office, to make sure things are running as smoothly as possible there.

Discussion of Budget Cuts

There was more discussion of budget cuts. De Datta noted that "if we assume that we will receive \$1.83 million for next year, we should be able to figure out budget projections for next year in a month's time. If we agree on the principle that any savings up to this point are added to the \$1.83M—the savings will be strictly on merit. There are so many unknowns in the whole thing—I can't just give you a number. I need your help; we need to spend out whatever money we get."

Recommendations by Hedlund / Does AID Understand Us?

Hedlund noted that there's resistance to no-cost extensions. The least amount of resistance, but still some, is to funding students. The bottom line is: you should not take on any students now that you do not have a way to support *with other funds* if the CRSP ends at the end of five years.

Alwang pointed out that they have really only done about 16 months of the program—has that been debated? It's essentially taking a five year project and only funding it for four years.

Hedlund responded that yes, it has been debated. "It's hard to explain to non-researchers [at USAID] how research is done. What they're looking at is not allocating more money than is needed. There is no wish to "punish" anyone.

Program leaders noted the ways in which USAID's review of the IPM CRSP does not seem fair, for example, evaluating a five year project after 1.5 years, effectively, of it being in operation.

Hedlund said that the new CRSPs are promising a much shorter time frame. After IPM and SANREM, none are funding preparation grants.

De Datta assured everyone that the ME will try to make sure that no particular project is unfairly advantaged or disadvantaged.

9:10 – 9:30 Break

XVIII. Technical Committee Business Meeting – George Norton

1. Approval of Minutes

Norton asked for approval of the minutes. Vaughan motioned to approve; Mullins seconded; minutes were approved.

Need for External TC Member

It was noted that there isn't an external TC member. Mike Irwin was suggested, and others as well. Nothing has happened. We need an external member; there are some budget implications.

2. Publicity for IPM

Rajotte chaired a session on publicity for IPM; that is, soliciting headlines from everyone to help Rich with publicity efforts—writing press releases, etc. The group went around the table, and everyone contributed at least one headline, as follows (and, as spun by Rajotte):

- Mike Hammig, SE Asia - Grafting revolutionizes Indonesian vegetable production.
- Mike Hammig, SE Asia - Poinsettias make strawberry fields forever.
- Jeff Alwang, Ecuador - Profits through the roof in naranjilla industry. (Naranjilla IPM package increases profitability).
- Don Mullins, West Africa - Next on the NYT bestseller list: pesticide safety training manual. (Pesticide safety training manual online).
- Mark Erbaugh, East Africa - Pesticide use on tomato production reduced by 75%.
- Mark Erbaugh, East Africa - Ugandan graft benefits. (Grafting saves tomato crop in Uganda from bacterial wilt).
- Mark Erbaugh, East Africa - 100s trained to reduce pesticide use. (Trained 300 pesticide dealers).
- Mark Erbaugh, East Africa - Thousands benefit by international education programs. (IPM reaches 1,000s throughout the world through farmer field schools.)

- Mark Erbaugh, East Africa - International expertise comes to the rescue of California tomato industry. (Gemini viruses found in Africa now found in CA.)
- Karim Maredia, Central Asia - Native wildflowers enhance agriculture in Tajikistan.
- Karim Maredia, Central Asia - Central Asia opened up by farmer field school program. (Farmer field schools started in Tajikistan).
- Karim Maredia, Central Asia - Women in Tajikistan improve their livelihoods.
- Wondi Mersie, East Africa - IPM CRSP project stops parthenium hordes. (Abating the spread of parthenium, threat to biodiversity and livestock industry).
- Wondi Mersie, East Africa - African native plants spared by IPM project. (Saving African native plants.)
- Yulu Xia, Global - IPM Tech database – font of all knowledge.
- Yulu Xia, Global – U.S. invader stopped at border. (Fruitfully in Jamaica).
- Sally Miller, Global - Diagnostics reaches new levels of sophistication in African and Central America. (IPDN has trained more than 100 African and Central American diagnosticians).
- Sally Miller, Global - Science to the rescue for devastating banana disease. (High-tech diagnostic tool, quick and cheap (PCR assay) for bananas.
- Doug Pfeiffer, Eastern Europe - Kids safer in Eastern Europe due to improved pesticide training. (Safety in farmers and farm families through IPM.)
- George Norton, Global - Farmers saved millions (taka) using magic traps.
- Sue Tolin, Global – Amazing innovation revolutionizes plant disease diagnosis. (Tissue-blot immuno-assay).

3. Workplans

Norton introduced the next item of business—workplans, their due dates, etc.

Base Budget for Workplans

There was some discussion of the question of the base budget for workplans. Vaughan noted we can't allocate money we don't have. Norton suggested that for purposes of planning, to get it as close to the proposed budget as you can. We have to work on our best estimate. Norton also noted that in regard to carryover, we're going to reallocate that out; the EEP will make some decisions. Hedlund said that the EEP would have a report out in June.

Request for E-mail from ME Stating, “Your Budget is X”

Norton confirmed that Program Leaders will be working with a 24% reduction. The actual number is 23.75%. This is off of Year 3. “If you have money left, you can carryover. Be sure to budget that out.” Rajotte requested an e-mail from the ME to this effect, saying, “Your budget is x.”

Vaughan noted that reallocation is a matter of a letter. “You can reallocate as you need. You develop your own budget based on what is allocated to you.”

It was noted that the POP manual states that the TC can advise the EEP.

How to Inform USAID of Revised Projected Accomplishments Due to Budget Cuts

Hedlund noted that any significant change in the proposal has to be submitted to AID, because “otherwise we will hold you accountable for what you said you would do. You need to highlight significant changes. Say, ‘These are things we cannot do because we do not have the money.’ From AID’s standpoint, we have to modify the award. E.g., you say, ‘Here’s what we said we could do for \$12M; now here’s what we’ll do for \$10M.’” Hedlund also said he wants AID to put in a modification to the Cooperative Agreement to the effect that, “We recognize you can’t do everything you said you would do.” This protects everyone.

It was suggested that PLs include a summary up-front that states what the big changes are that they are making.

Norton noted that there are two things to keep in mind here: the due date and the review schedule. July 31st is when we’re asked to have it ready to submit to Bob. Last year we did the review concurrently. The annual report is due Oct. 31st.

4. EEP Site Visits and When

When Should the EEP Visit Sites?

The issue of site visits by the EEP was discussed. Certain specific site visits were mentioned: Jacobsen is coming to West Africa in August; Gapasin goes to Bangladesh the first week of August. Hammig noted that they are having an event in Indonesia the week of August 6th. Program leaders were urged to let the ME know when their big events are coming up so that the EEP can coordinate their trips with those.

5. Publications

The question was raised, Are publications important to USAID? Hedlund responded that “Scientific publications are a legacy of the CRSPs, but from USAID’s standpoint, documentation of development impact is more important.”

A program leader asked where we should place emphasis; perhaps we should put more emphasis on more of the soft stuff.

6. Training Plans

Disaggregate Training by Gender

In discussing training plans, it was noted that they should be disaggregated by gender. However, just noting how many women are involved does not convey what the impact was.

Also regarding training, it's important to mention how the training and technology has become globalized, for example, the grafting technology going from Bangladesh to Honduras. How one site has affected or influenced another site in the transfer of technology.

Importance of International Meetings?

A question came up about the importance of the annual meeting of the International Plant Protection Society in Scotland (and international meetings in general)—how important is that to this program? Answer: not that important. A program leader noted however, that if he doesn't get anything out of the CRSP, there's less incentive to get good people to participate. In other words, supporting an international trip to present a paper now and then might be a good thing. Hedlund responded that "if you put in 14 trips to Scotland, then explain why."

Vaughan reminded everyone to take a copy of the POPs manual, the template for initial environmental examinations, USAID's rules, and the book *Globalizing IPM*. Then he reminded everyone that in the last year and a half USAID developed a branding strategy, and that we're required to use the USAID logo on anything we purchase. The ME had some labels printed up, and Vaughan encouraged the PIs to take some.

Suggested Journals for Publication?

Maredia asked if the ME had any suggestions about what journals they should try to get published in. Although it depends on the nature of the article, some suggestions were: *Crop Protection*; and *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, from the Netherlands.

Question: is there any allowance for translations? We want to do proceedings in Russian and English. Miller said she used her supply money for that. Norton noted that there isn't any general fund for that.

7. Issue of Gender in Projects

Importance of Working on Gender Throughout Project, Not Just at End

Christie reported on her work with gender, as follows: "I just did a summary, wrapping up the previous stage, **which Larry is to send to you**. I just want to stress that it's common for projects to report on gender at the end; you can't report on gender at the end if you didn't do the work. Sex-disaggregated data doesn't tell the whole story. There has to be some thinking about the gender material that comes up through your work. I know that with budget cuts that does take

time. You may not see it as relevant, but the evidence shows that if you ignore gender, it affects your project. For example, some of our studies show that women control the budget. I'm called program director, but I don't have a budget. You can't look for gender to report if you haven't been doing gender stuff; the numbers aren't enough."

She continued by saying that it's important to plan on it (gender work) from the beginning. "Stress this to the institutions, get them to incorporate it as part of their thinking. The basic thing is to figure out what do women do? You can't assume. It starts with trying to figure out what are the gender components. Access to information is one of the biggest problems that comes up with gender. Women need to have access to info that is under their control. Some problems you might encounter with a survey, for example: women won't report themselves as being farmers even though they are."

Institutionalization of Gender Awareness by Host Countries

Alwang noted that this (work on gender) has to do with institutionalization. "Some of the principles have been adopted by the host country. One of the big impacts of the project has been the revision of people's attitudes about the role of gender. There has been so much done up to this point. I wouldn't ignore that. But we do probably need to do a better job of publicizing. There has been a progressive increase in people's understanding of the role of gender."

8. Issue of Travel; Re-allocation of Funds

There was a request for feedback after the Program Leaders turn in their workplans. Also, it was asked, "If we wait until September to do the travel matrix, will that be too late?"

Hedlund responded that he wants a partial travel plan that includes everything in October, November. He added that he can take it (a travel plan) any time before September 15th.

Norton encouraged those who are traveling in October or November to send in a partial travel plan by June 15th.

There was some discussion of the allocation of money and why, if cuts are allocated evenly, increases aren't allocated evenly. It was suggested that people in the country have the chance to reallocate as well.

It was noted that another difficulty with managing the projects is that various research foundations are extremely bureaucratic. Systems are slow in reporting. "I've got collaborators who wouldn't understand a deadline if it hit them over the head."

More Discussion of Budget Reduction

There was some discussion of the budget reduction. Vaughan explained that "the 10% doesn't get taken from you, it's just that your allocation the next year will be smaller. Whatever you manage to eke out of the \$1.3 M—you'll still be working with the budget you planned to be working with."

As an example, if after September 30th, you've still got \$100,000 you haven't spent, and your budget for Year 3 is \$300,000, your budget will be reduced by \$100,000.

Mark: After Sept. 30th, I've got \$100,000 I haven't spent. My budget for Yr 3 is \$300,000. My budget is going to be reduced by \$100,000. ?

Unrelatedly, Mullins mentioned a new online journal, completely electronic, published by Scientific Journals International. The cost of subscription is \$200/year. It has several categories, come from outside the United States. It may be reached at:

<http://www.scientificjournals.org>

At 11:40, the EEP returns to the room, and at 11:45, the full meeting re-convenes.

XIX. Final Joint Meeting

EEP Finishes Report June 15th

De Datta opened the final, joint session by noting that by June 15th, the EEP will finish their report. The recommendation will come from the EEP, not the TC. The EEP is evaluating each project not only for pipeline amounts, but also for new projects. Implications are that reallocated funds are to be based strictly on the EEP's recommendations. At issue is how much will be cut. The reallocation will take place in September.

Most Important Objective: Save the IPM CRSP

He continued by noting that the first objective of this review is a scientific evaluation that will go before the Board for final approval. The most important objective is: to save the IPM CRSP. This report can be used to get a mid-course correction.

Issue of Site Visits—When, Where

The issue of site visits was discussed. Jacobsen said they will most likely be in random order. Traxler will visit Latin American/Caribbean—Ecuador; then the second trip will be to Guatemala and Honduras sometime this summer. Gapasin will visit SE Asia and Bangladesh in August. She will also visit the Philippines. In June, she'll visit South Africa to review the parthenium project.

Nishimoto will go to Uganda and Ethiopia in mid-September. Jacobsen will go to West Africa—Senegal and Mali—Aug. 10th-14th. And possibly Eastern Europe sometime in June. Gapasin will try to attend Sally's diagnostic.

The importance of stakeholder comments to the report was noted.

Rajotte noted that it's important to conduct a site visit when the crops there are actually in the ground. It's important to consider the seasonality of crops.

Jacobsen noted: "We've got two deadlines: by June 15, we need to have paper review; then we have more in-depth mid-term review by December 7th." That they will try to focus for the SPARE meeting, and really put the IPM CRSP in a good light for that.

What the EEP Wants From Program Leaders

Jacobsen said the EEP would like to have from the Program Leaders:

- info on your efforts to get support from Missions
- has the IPM CRSP funding been used to leverage other funds? E.g. Gates Foundation.
- How is the U.S. benefiting from the IPM CRSP? E.g. with the finding of the Yellow Leaf Curl Virus in California.
- For the in-depth report, impact indicators. If each of you can provide impact indicators for health and nutrition, environment, biodiversity, social and gender issues, economic growth enterprise, poverty reduction, income.
- We'd like you to tell us what would happen if there was no IPM CRSP? Who would supply that info? Chemical companies?
- Institutionalization of IPM in these regions, countries. The graduates and collaborators in Phase I, and Phase II—what are they doing now? Have we really institutionalized something in-country?

Then he noted that each of the members of the EEP will take primary writing responsibilities for each area. First draft:

Nishimoto - East Africa, Central Asia, Weed project

Gapasin - SE Asia, South Asia, Diagnostics

Traxler - LA/Caribbean, Impact assessment

Jacobsen - West Africa, the two virus projects, the IT project

Please submit these inputs by October 1, 2007. "We'll send out a letter detailing this."

Gapasin added, to clarify, that they want two documents: 1st document: technical report. Then for the regional programs, they'll be looking at a group of countries and the tech transfer programs in countries. In the in-depth analysis, they will develop key indicators. "We will be looking at an assessment of how these programs in complementarity achieve objectives."

Jacobsen noted that, "Conceptually, we're looking at global programs and seeing how they support regional programs."

De Datta mentioned the idea of transformational diplomacy again and said that once you read the definition, you see this IS what we do, so we can play this up.

Finally, De Datta thanked everyone for coming. He said that we have two objectives: to do well in the current IPM CRSP project, and secondly: to look at how we move forward and save IPM CRSP in the coming five years and beyond. "We will be seeking your help and counsel. Again, thank you all for your contributions. My objective is to see that all of you succeed."

Hedlund made some additional final comments, as follows: "I've already forewarned you about a significant budget cut. I didn't attend Larry's session on IEE; I want to emphasize that they *are* important. If you are bringing in GMOs or exotic species of biological control organisms, they must be justified, and must be followed by an environmental assessment. This is because there have been many examples of beneficial organisms that later became pests. This is a requirement

of the cooperative agreement. Failure to do that is grounds to terminate the project. I second Christie's comments regarding gender—include gender at the beginning of your work. It's important that this be included. If you have to spend some money to include it, do it—this will be money well-spent. I want to thank you all for coming. I was impressed with the 15-minute reports. I try to send something to the assistant administrator every week about the successes of IPM CRSP. I appreciate your help on it. The more help you can give, the more I'll appreciate it. Tell me about your successes. Tell me about upcoming events. These are newsworthy. Major workshops, etc. This way, people are constantly reminded that this CRSP is out there. I thank everyone again for coming; and thank the ME for organizing the meeting.”

Norton added, “From the TC's perspective, I would like to thank everyone at OIRED, EEP, and TC.”

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 pm.