



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# GUIDELINES FOR COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH SUPPORT PROGRAMS (CRSPs)



BIFAD Approved  
February 2005  
Draft



# GUIDELINES FOR COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH SUPPORT PROGRAMS (CRSPs)

BIFAD Approved  
February 2005  
Draft

On the cover:

A farmer examines pumpkin plants for insect damage in Gaidjhat village, Bangladesh.

Photo by E. A. "Short" Heinrichs, Program Director, IPM CRSP



## Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ACRONYMS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.0 THE CRSP APPROACH .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.0 THE USAID APPROACH.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.0 CRSP GOVERNANCE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT .....	6
4.2 POLICY FORMULATION AND OVERALL PROGRAM GUIDANCE .....	7
4.3 TECHNICAL OVERSIGHT.....	8
4.4 EVALUATION .....	8
4.5 REPRESENTATION OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS.....	8
<b>5.0 INSTITUTIONAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....</b>	<b>9</b>
5.1 USAID/WASHINGTON.....	9
5.2 USAID REGIONAL AND COUNTRY MISSIONS.....	10
5.3 BIFAD .....	10
5.4 SPARE .....	10
5.5 THE CRSP COUNCIL .....	11
5.6 MANAGEMENT ENTITY .....	11
5.7 PARTICIPATING US INSTITUTIONS .....	12
5.8 PARTNERS.....	13
5.9 PARTICIPATING HOST COUNTRY INSTITUTIONS.....	13
5.10 INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS .....	13
<b>6.0 PLANNING A CRSP .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7.0 IMPLEMENTING THE CRSP.....</b>	<b>14</b>
7.1 ASSISTANCE AGREEMENTS .....	14
7.1.1 <i>Subagreements with Participating US Institutions.....</i>	<i>15</i>
7.1.2 <i>Subagreements with Participating Host Country Institutions.....</i>	<i>15</i>
7.2 DEVELOPING AND MONITORING THE WORK PROGRAM.....	15
7.2.1 <i>Global and Annual Work Plans.....</i>	<i>15</i>
7.2.2 <i>Host-Country Institution Building and Training.....</i>	<i>15</i>
7.3 GRADUATE STUDENTS.....	15
7.4 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.....	16
7.4.1 <i>Performance Period.....</i>	<i>16</i>
7.4.2 <i>The Fiscal Responsibilities of the ME.....</i>	<i>16</i>
7.4.3 <i>Use of Funds.....</i>	<i>16</i>
7.4.4 <i>Policies on Cost Sharing.....</i>	<i>17</i>
7.5 REVIEWS AND EVALUATIONS.....	18
7.5.1 <i>Internal Evaluations of Research Quality and Progress.....</i>	<i>18</i>
7.5.2 <i>External Evaluations of Research Quality and Progress.....</i>	<i>18</i>
7.5.3 <i>External Evaluations of Administrative and Management Effectiveness.....</i>	<i>19</i>
7.5.4 <i>The Five-Year Extension Process.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<b>8.0 REBIDDING THE CRSP MANAGEMENT ENTITY.....</b>	<b>20</b>

<b>ANNEX 1: GLOSSARY.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: TITLE XII AMENDED.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: THE BIFAD CHARTER.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>ANNEX 4: THE SPARE CHARTER.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>ANNEX 5: THE CRSP COUNCIL BYLAWS.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>ANNEX 6: GUIDANCE ON INTERNAL CRSP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>ANNEX 7: A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CRSPS AND THE CRSP GUIDELINES.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>ANNEX 8: RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COGNIZANT TECHNICAL OFFICER IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF ASSISTANCE INSTRUMENTS.....</b>	<b>44</b>

## Executive Summary

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID)-supported research and development program in agriculture known as the Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP) was created in 1977 to engage the capacities of the US land grant and other eligible universities in addressing the needs of developing nations worldwide while also contributing to US food security and agricultural development. The US Congress made this possible with the passage of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975 under its Title XII. In October 2000, Title XII was reauthorized, enabling the continuation of long-term collaborative university research programs as one of several categories of US university research efforts helping “to achieve the mutual goals among nations of ensuring food security, human health, agricultural growth, trade expansion, and the wise and sustainable use of natural resources.”

These Guidelines have been prepared with joint consultation between US university partners and USAID to provide a framework for managing the CRSPs. They build on previous versions of such Guidelines and have been updated to reflect the changes in the Title XII legislation as amended in October 2000 as well as changes in USAID. Although only advisory, the Guidelines offer direction to both USAID staff and US and Host Country institutional partners involved in CRSPs about the preferred policies and procedures for implementing a CRSP program. The Guidelines are based on nearly thirty years of experience with CRSP management. Each CRSP is encouraged to draw on the Guidelines to address its own specialized circumstances, e.g., its partners, its degree of program maturity, and its priority world regions for research.

The Guidelines briefly describe both the CRSP approach and the current context for agricultural research and development within USAID. The roles and responsibilities of the many institutions involved in the CRSP program are outlined. Alternatives for establishing advisory and oversight bodies for the CRSP are described. A section on implementation of the CRSP outlines key provisions for administering the assistance agreements between USAID and US as well as Host Country institutions is included. This section addresses financial management, training, and required reviews and evaluations. Additional information on these topics as well as other background information is provided in the appendices.



Photo by E. A. "Short" Heinrichs  
Program Director, IPM CRSP

A farmer sells her produce at the farmer's market at Coimbatore, India. The IPM CRSP is providing Indian farmers with the technology they need to produce pesticide-free, high-quality vegetables.

## Acronyms

ADS	Automated Directive System
AMR	Administrative Management Review
AO	Agreement Officer
BIFAD	Board for International Food and Agriculture Development
BOD	Board of Directors
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CIB	Contract Information Bulletin
CRSP	Collaborative Research Support Program
CTO	Cognizant Technical Officer
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EEP	External Evaluation Committee
EGAT	Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade
HC	Host Country
IARC	International Agricultural Research Centers
JCARD	Joint Committee on Agriculture Research and Development
JRC	Joint Research Committee
LWA	Leader with Associate
ME	Management Entity
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OAA	Office of Acquisitions and Assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
PASA/RSSA	Participating Agency Service Agreement/Resources Support Service Agreement
PD	Program Director
PE	Planning Entity
P&P	Policy and Procedures
PI	Principal Investigator
RFA	Request for Application
SF	Standard Form
SOW	Scope of Work
SPARE	Strategic Partnership on Agricultural Research and Education
TC	Technical Committee
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USDOC	United States Department of Commerce
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency

## I.0 Introduction

The face of agriculture has changed dramatically in the last thirty years. The agricultural sector around the world continues to be a driving force in local and national economies, but producers' lives and livelihoods are increasingly shaped not simply by farm-level conditions, but also by national, regional, and international economic, social, environmental, and health factors. To thrive in these rapidly changing and increasingly complex environments, producers, processors, and entrepreneurs as well as agricultural researchers draw on expertise and products from many sources. A key contributor to improving agricultural productivity worldwide has been through USAID-supported research and development programs.

The Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP) was created in 1977 to engage the capacities of the US Land Grant and other eligible universities in addressing the needs of developing nations worldwide while also contributing to US food security and agricultural development. The US Congress made this possible with the passage of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975. Title XII of the Act originally authorized USAID to provide program support for long-term collaborative university research and coordinate with other Federal and State efforts to maximize the benefits of agricultural development in both the United States and in agriculturally developing nations. In October 2000, Title XII was reauthorized,<sup>1</sup> enabling the continuation of long-term collaborative university research programs as one of several categories of US university research efforts helping "to achieve the mutual goals among nations of ensuring food security, human health, agricultural growth, trade expansion, and the wise and sustainable use of natural resources."<sup>2</sup>

In recognition of the growing complexity of agricultural activities globally, the amended Title XII legislation broadened the definition of agriculture to include:

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

These Guidelines for managing the CRSPs, although only advisory,<sup>3</sup> offer direction to both USAID staff and US and Host Country institutional partners<sup>4</sup> involved in CRSPs about the preferred policies and procedures for implementing a CRSP program. The Guidelines are based on nearly thirty years of experience with CRSP management. Each CRSP is encouraged to draw on the Guidelines to address its own specialized circumstances, e.g., its partners, its degree of program maturity, and its priority world regions for research.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Title XII, Amended (2000), Section 296 (a). The text is provided in Annex 2.

<sup>2</sup>The creation and continuing implementation of research programs under these Guidelines must be in accordance with applicable US laws, regulations and policies. The 22 CFR 226 establishes uniform administrative requirements for Federal grants and agreements. USAID is also regulated by the Automated Directive System (ADS) Chapter 303 for "Grants and Cooperative Agreements to Non-government Organizations" (<http://www.USAID.gov/policy/ads/300/303.pdf>).

<sup>3</sup>The 2005 version of the CRSP Guidelines (which supersedes all others in 1977, 1979, 1985, and 1989) complies with the 2000 amended Title XII legislation, as well as changes in USAID policies and procedures. The Guidelines build on earlier versions collaboratively developed by the US university community, the CRSP institutions, the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD), and USAID. The Guidelines themselves are advisory although they sometimes refer to required provisions. Each CRSP entity is legally bound to the performance standards in its assistance agreement.

<sup>4</sup>Title XII amended (2000) defined "public and private partners" as entities that have cooperative or contractual agreements with universities, which may include formal or informal associations of universities, other education institutions, United States Government and State agencies, private voluntary organizations, nongovernmental organizations, firms operated for profit, non-profit organizations, multinational banks, and, as designated by the Administrator, any organization, institution, or Agency incorporated in other countries.

## 2.0 The CRSP Approach

When first established, the CRSPs represented a new way to plan and administer agricultural research in partnership with developing country individuals and institutions. US university capabilities in research, academic training, and outreach, organized in a coherent whole, continue to offer an approach not seen in other programs. They build on but do not duplicate existing programs of universities and United States (US) agencies and other organizations.<sup>5</sup> The CRSPs continue to be an innovative mechanism for strengthening collaboration between US universities, USAID, other Federal agencies,<sup>6</sup> International Agricultural Research Centers (IARCs), and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), industry groups, developing and transition country universities, and research and extension programs in developing and transition countries. The CRSPs have the dual goal of improving agriculture both in developing countries and the United States, and with US institutions,<sup>7</sup> international, and host country institutions contributing resources to the program (see Sections 5.7 -5.10).

The CRSP approach encourages organizational and management flexibility in prioritizing, selecting, and implementing its research activities from a broad array of possible topics. This flexibility makes it incumbent on each CRSP to develop and articulate a very clear set of goals, to establish appropriate benchmarks, and to achieve results. Each CRSP has the responsibility to restrict its research and outreach activities to those that can be adequately supported within its given budget.

Each CRSP develops a global plan to guide its interdisciplinary, collaborative research program. The global plan for research identifies the key problems and constraints for the CRSP topic. It is global in outlook and seeks to frame results so that they are applicable and transferable regionally and globally (worldwide). The global plan is developed for a five-year research cycle and applies to each CRSP as a whole, although individual activities may be constituted for a shorter time period. In developing the global plan, the ME, with its partners and PIs, seeks to address not only the critical research questions in its area of expertise, but also the larger development questions and priorities expressed through USAID relevant strategies and performance objectives.

The collaborative character of the research offered through the CRSPs is distinct from contract research, in that the US universities and their partners share with USAID both the cost of and a joint interest in the results of their endeavors. CRSPs also operate differently from IARCs. While sharing with CRSPs a research focus on selected commodities, plants, animals, and related areas that are suitable for application to developing countries, the IARCs have established research facilities ("centers") overseas and their training efforts are usually short-term. CRSPs and IARCs productively cooperate on related research and complement the comparative advantage of each, while avoiding duplication and competition.

The CRSPs are defined by a constellation of characteristics:

- They are coordinated, multi-disciplinary research programs that are collaboratively developed and cooperatively implemented, with shared responsibilities between US and host country institutions and scientists. CRSP goals are consistent with the goals of USAID to support economic growth and to reduce poverty through the generation of knowledge and technologies important to the development of agriculture and natural resources of developing and transition countries, while also contributing to the improvement of agriculture in the US.

---

<sup>5</sup> Section 297 (b) includes "the Department of Agriculture, State agricultural agencies, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Food and Drug Administration, other appropriate Federal agencies, and appropriate nongovernmental and business organizations."

<sup>6</sup> These might include Federal Agencies such as the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the United States Department of Commerce (USDOC), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and other domestic and international agencies.

<sup>7</sup> For the purpose of these Guidelines, a US university and its partners are defined in Section 296 (f) of Title XII, Amended (2000). Also see glossary in Annex I.

- They are long-term activities, funded through grants or cooperative agreements,<sup>8</sup> which, to the maximum extent possible, should “be carried out within the developing countries and transition countries comprising newly emerging democracies and new liberalized economies.”<sup>9</sup>
- They develop the human and institutional capability of research organizations in the countries where CRSP activities are located. The institutional relationships established between CRSPs and host country institutions are intended to be enduring and to transcend the life of the CRSP.
- They address human capacity development and, in addition to using research projects as a vehicle for this capacity development, they may accommodate training needs through graduate degree programs, research assistantships, and workshops.
- They employ a “program approach” in their research design and implementation, working collaboratively among several institutions in the US and overseas, drawing on the expertise of several disciplines to solve identified constraints to agricultural problems.
- They follow a “global plan” of research goals and strategies to reach them. Research proposals are selected in open competition according to their ability to address the identified constraints in the CRSP’s global plan. These plans are subject to approval by USAID and by BIFAD and its relevant subcommittees.
- They select research sites not only to achieve quality research results, but also according to criteria including the importance of the research to a specific country economy, the presence of adequate institutional research capacity in country, the interest and commitment of the host country government or institutions in the research program, the interest of the relevant USAID Bureau and/or country Mission, and the availability of sufficient resources to do the research.

### 3.0 The USAID Approach

The USAID agricultural strategy<sup>10</sup> marks out the strategic priorities that agricultural programming will address. It focuses on four strategic themes:

- Expanding global, regional, and domestic trade opportunities and improving the capacity of producers and rural industries to act on them;
- Improving the social, economic, and environmental sustainability of agriculture;
- Mobilizing science and technology and fostering a capacity for innovation; and
- Strengthening agricultural training and education, outreach, and adaptive research.

These strategic themes support the Millennium Development Goals of reducing poverty and hunger through agricultural development. The strategies build on the comparative advantages that the US offers in agribusiness and trade; community-based natural resource management and sustainable environmental protection; agricultural research and development; and training, education, and information and communication technologies.

The Automated Directive System (ADS)<sup>11</sup> that is the policy and procedures manual for USAID provides detailed guidance in its 200 and 300 series on applying these provisions to USAID-funded grants and cooperative agreements. For example, attention to gender and environmental soundness are both addressed in the agricultural strategy and in USAID’s ADS.<sup>12</sup> Consideration of gender is a required technical analysis in program design as well as in the monitoring

---

<sup>8</sup> CRSPs are funded either as grants or cooperative agreements. BIFAD voted in 2004 to solicit two CRSP proposals under the Leader/Associate (LWA) award, a particular form of grant or cooperative agreement that allows USAID Missions to make associate awards (see Contract Information Bulletin (CIB) 99-10 (May 1999)).

<sup>9</sup> Title XII, Amended (2000), Section 297 (c).

<sup>10</sup> “Linking Producers to Markets” (July 2004).

<sup>11</sup> See the USAID website, [www.usaid.gov/policy/ads](http://www.usaid.gov/policy/ads), for more information.

<sup>12</sup> See ADS section 201.3.12.6. Section 303.5.5b states “USAID policy requires that gender issues be addressed as appropriate in all USAID-funded activities. The guidance in the ADS draws heavily on definitions and concepts developed by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and its Guidelines for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment in Development Co-operation (1998) [available at [www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org)].”

and evaluation of program results. Agreement on definitions of key concepts used in gender work is a fundamental starting point to provide clarity about the meaning and importance of gender for PIs in the CRSPs, making it easier to construct indicators that measure relative gender inequalities and that monitor gender integration in program design and implementation.

Two questions are asked by the USAID ADS that need to be addressed in a gender analysis: (1) how will gender relations affect the achievement of sustainable results; and (2) how will proposed results affect the relative status of men and women. Addressing these questions involves taking into account not only the different roles of men and women, but also the relationship and balance between them and the institutional structures that support them.

An environmental analysis (distinct from the federally required environmental review) is mandatory in the preparation of a country strategic plan. ADS 203.3.8.7 also states more generally that “environmental soundness is an important criterion for all Agency programs.” “Potential environmental impact of programs should be reviewed,” and in some situations it may also be necessary to identify ways to mitigate environmental problems arising in implementation.

## 4.0 CRSP Governance

These Guidelines seek to find a balance between establishing standard operating procedures and permitting the flexibility that CRSP institutions need for managing each research program in the context of different institutional policies and procedures. CRSPs are encouraged to address the governance functions listed below in a management structure that best meets the needs of the topic being investigated and the preferences of the partner institutions, while seeking to reduce both real and transaction costs of CRSP management. The overarching goal is to simplify governance, oversight, evaluation, and management functions so as to maximize resources devoted to core research and training activities. To protect the interests of all participants and to work effectively, the CRSPs must be transparently managed. Transparency is only achieved through full and open communication among partners and through the establishment of a governing system of checks and balances. Transparency about the policies and procedures of the CRSPs is also important for informing all interested parties, including potential participants, about program management.

There are five different functions to be addressed in CRSP governance:

- Managing the research program;
- Setting policies and dealing with policy issues;
- Ensuring technical oversight of the research program;
- Evaluating research proposals and research progress; and,
- Protecting the interests of participating institutions.

Review of CRSP operations has shown that a number of interactive governing, guidance, and evaluation bodies are needed to assure accountability and to achieve these functions of program management, policy setting, technical oversight, evaluation of research quality, and representation of the participating institutions. Several different organizational structures can achieve these functions equally effectively. Each CRSP, in accordance with this guidance on governance, will establish appropriate bodies to carry out these functions, and drafts and ratifies the necessary charters and by-laws detailing specific duties and responsibilities. These documents form part of each CRSP’s “Policies and Procedures” (P&P) manual (see Annex 6).

### 4.1 Program Management

The functions of program management are typically carried out by a Management Entity (ME). The Management Entity (ME) administers the assistance agreement from USAID, houses the administrative support staff of the CRSP, and manages the overall research program. The ME must be a legally recognized institution, usually a US university or an administrative unit within a university. Institutions eligible to receive a federal grant are eligible to serve as a ME. No authority permits a federal Agency to serve as a CRSP ME, although it can participate under the same conditions as other eligible institutions and receive USAID funds directly or through a US university. The specific responsibilities of the ME are elaborated in Section 5.6. USAID’s management review and evaluation procedures are designed to ensure that the ME can achieve the CRSP goals as outlined in its global research plan and within the budget contained in the assistance agreement document.

The CRSP Director (also called a Program Director (PD)) is appointed by the ME subject to USAID approval.<sup>13</sup> To direct a CRSP program effectively and efficiently the PD needs excellent research credentials and exceptional management capability and experience. Most programs also have a full or part-time Deputy or Assistant Director. Additional supporting staff members are appointed by the ME and together with the PD form the CRSP management team.

## 4.2 Policy Formulation and Overall Program Guidance

To assist the Management Entity, CRSPs have established different types of advisory bodies. Operating procedures and policies for these boards, with guidance on selection of members,<sup>14</sup> their terms of service, and their responsibilities are documented in the group's bylaws and are also included in each CRSP's P&P manual.

Most commonly, the policy-setting or program advisory body has been constituted as a Board of Directors (BOD) of between seven to ten people. This type of Board normally sets CRSP policies, approves the program budget allocations, reviews evaluation reports, and advises the ME on other program issues.

One possible organizational structure establishes a BOD that consists primarily of institutional representatives from some or all of the CRSP partners. The ME invites these participating institutions (including international and host country institutions) to appoint a representative to the board. The institution hosting the ME has a permanent member on the Board. Board members are selected by their institutions on the basis of their responsibilities and their relevant expertise to represent not only their respective institutions but also the larger interests of the CRSP. Non-institutional members are usually identified by the ME and approved by the BOD.



Photo by the Bean/Cowpea CRSP

A Bean/Cowpea CRSP scientist works with a Fulani farmer in Niger.

Another organizational structure draws its members from a broader array of institutions such as the World Bank, IARCs, NGOs, professional organizations, host countries research organizations, or other groups with knowledge and experience of the topics addressed by the CRSP. Representatives may also be drawn from an eligible US University, preferably from a university that is not participating in the CRSP. This type of board acts as the main advisory body to the ME and helps to set budgets and choose areas of scientific focus as well as specific projects. In at least one case, this structure also fulfills the role of technical oversight that is more commonly addressed by group drawn from among the Principal Investigators (PIs) (see below Section 4.3). Members for this second type of board are usually selected from names submitted by the PIs, institutional partners, and other interested people or groups.

The CRSP Director serves as an ex-officio member in these groups. In those CRSPs that are grants, the USAID representative is also an ex-officio member in these groups. As one of the elements of USAID's "substantial involvement" in CRSPs administered as cooperative agreements, USAID participates as a member in the senior permanent decision-making body of a CRSP with a voice and vote, but does not have authority to veto.<sup>15</sup> USAID participates in all regular and extraordinary sessions of that body to exercise this role.

These advisory board deliberations are to be carried out in a transparent, open, and participatory manner. These advisory groups record their positions on the issues and their votes in the minutes of its meetings. Without a written record of its intent, these groups cannot easily review whether or not the ME has later carried out its wishes or reversed them. While the ME is the final authority on decisions about program assignments, budget allocations and authorizations, it is advised, in a spirit of collaboration to consider carefully the advice and guidance of these advisory groups. Justification will be required for any departure from the advisory group's recommendations. The departure will be recorded in minutes of meetings and reported in writing back to the advisory group by the ME.

<sup>13</sup> Approval of the CRSP Director is one of the elements of USAID's "substantial involvement" in CRSPs that are administered as cooperative agreements.

<sup>14</sup> The P&P manual may also include CRSP guidance on conflicts of interest, when appropriate.

<sup>15</sup> This sentence reflects language agreed to by USAID and university representatives in 2004.

### **4.3 Technical Oversight**

Each CRSP requires technical oversight. Most CRSPs establish a technical advisory group to provide recommendations about which research project or project component will or will not be supported, to assess budgets and project goals, and to determine whether or not projects are achieving the goals that have been set. In some cases, the technical oversight groups make these decisions directly; in other cases they are only advisory to the ME.

These functions have frequently been provided by a Technical Committee (TC) consisting primarily (though not exclusively) of principal scientists or Principal Investigators (PIs)<sup>16</sup> actively engaged in the work of the CRSP. They are sometimes elected by other participating scientists. In other cases, the program advisory body described in Section 4.2 also fulfills the functions of technical oversight by drawing on technical specialists who are not CRSP scientists but who offer subject expertise based on their work with commodity boards or research institutions. The technical oversight committee membership broadly reflects the range of disciplines and regional interests of the CRSP and includes host country scientists. The exact number and composition of each committee, along with the term of membership and the election process, is decided by the ME in consultation the CRSP scientists and documented in the committee's bylaws, approved by the policy-setting board, and recorded in the P&P manual. The CRSP Director and USAID CTO usually serve as ex-officio members of the technical oversight committee.<sup>17</sup>

The technical oversight committee meets annually, either in face-to-face meetings and/or by phone, mail, fax, e-mail, or web-based conferencing. Minutes are circulated among all of the CRSPs participating scientists. The TC formally reports its findings in writing to the ME, which normally shares them with the policy-setting board, for further consideration and action.

Some CRSPs have also adopted a system of regional or in-country advisory committees, consisting of representatives from donors (both bilateral and multilateral) and the host governments, USAID Country Mission representatives, and CRSP researchers. These committees perform a variety of functions, including advance review and endorsement of research and travel plans and/or training programs for host country personnel. The committees also discuss new technology being generated, means of spreading this technology, and means of coordinating other donor activities with the CRSP.

The technical advisory committee must be impartial and function in the best interests of the CRSP and its developing country partners. The roles and responsibilities of the TC must be carefully developed and documented for all CRSP participants.

### **4.4 Evaluation**

The CRSP programs need to be regularly reviewed by independent experts from appropriate technical disciplinary backgrounds, experience, and regional knowledge to ensure excellence in program content and achievements as well as to ensure that technical proposals and project performance is evaluated knowledgeably and without bias. USAID approves the selection of members for the evaluation in consultation with the appropriate subcommittees of BIFAD. The evaluation team reports to the ME and to the participating institutions and copies of their reports are forwarded to USAID and BIFAD (and its relevant subcommittees) (see Section 7.5.2).

### **4.5 Representation of Participating Institutions**

Representation of the interests of US universities and other major cost-sharing and beneficiary institutional participants will be made through an appropriate provision in one of the governing structures described above. In the past, CRSPs have provided for this representation on the Board of Directors through rotating terms or, less frequently, through an administrative council or communications network of institutional representatives. Each CRSP will establish a process for communicating with higher administrative managerial points of contact for each participating institution so that, if those institutions have concerns, there is an existing mechanism for communicating and addressing them.

---

<sup>16</sup> Who is a PI? The definition of a Principal Investigator varies across universities and across CRSP programs. Most CRSPs identify the PI as the lead scientist in charge of a specific CRSP activity or set of activities, including both US and host country scientists within this designation. Others use the term only for the US-based PIs. Sometimes the university hosting the ME has designated an "administrative PI" for the CRSP as a whole. It is important for each CRSP to decide on its own criteria for membership on the TC and to be consistent in its use of titles, even though these criteria may vary from one CRSP to another.

<sup>17</sup> If the technical oversight committee is the "permanent decision-making body" of the CRSP, then the USAID representative has a vote on that committee.

## 5.0 Institutional Roles and Responsibilities

### 5.1 USAID/Washington

CRSPs are funded and managed through the USAID/Washington central management unit dealing with research on economic growth, agriculture, and the environment. USAID monitors and backstops the operations of the CRSPs, and reviews their programs, projects, and budgets. USAID periodically identifies priority areas for its agricultural research programming, minimally every five years. It will confirm topics of continued importance and establish a list of promising topics for investigation should funds become available. USAID may choose to develop the list internally, to work in conjunction with BIFAD and its subcommittees, to involve the university community, and/or to hire consultants to assist with the process.

USAID is also responsible for issuing solicitations, and accepting and evaluating proposals for the renewal and/or new awards to CRSP MEs. When the research topic is agreed by USAID and BIFAD to be of continued importance to fulfilling the goals of Title XII, USAID will rebid the CRSP ME in a competitive process every ten years. USAID may also initiate a change in the ME for cause during the term of the award if it is determined that either the ME has failed to comply with the terms and conditions of the award. Such a decision could be based on the recommendation of the BIFAD, Strategic Partnership on Agricultural Research and Education (SPARE), or other advisory bodies from evidence documented in an Administrative Management Review (AMR), an External Evaluation Panel (EEP) report, or an audit. USAID has the authority to determine that the program is not in the national interest of the US or violates an applicable law.<sup>18</sup>

USAID is responsible for allocating funds to each CRSP in a timely manner, in accordance with the initiation date of the CRSP's assistance agreement and in time for each of the participating institutions to fulfill their financial obligations. Yearly fund allocation is made before the annual anniversary date. When possible, as new agreements are signed, compromises between the work cycles of the research programs (often based on academic and agricultural calendars) and the annual Congressional Budget cycle are negotiated.

The USAID management units responsible for the CRSP portfolio regularly and fully communicate with other parts of the Agency (such as other central offices, Regional Bureaus, and Regional and Country Missions) about CRSP activities, the applicability of CRSP research results to field problems, as well as difficulties encountered by CRSPs and possible solutions.

USAID's Office of Acquisitions and Assistance (OAA) assigns a CTO to manage each CRSP. CTOs communicate among themselves and with their supervisors through regular meetings and electronic networks about the relevant USAID regulations governing CRSPs to ensure uniformity in the interpretation and application of the rules across the CRSP community. The CTO provides assistance to the ME in obtaining clarifications of, and necessary waivers to, policies and procedures, and provides appropriate documentation to the USAID Agreement Officer in the Office of Acquisitions and Assistance. While CTOs provide information about CRSP research to other units and facilitate the addition of new or supplementary research components from other units, they must avoid the appearance of conflicts of interest. Additional responsibilities of the CTO are detailed in Annex 8, as identified in USAID's "Guidebook for Managers and Cognizant Technical Officers on Acquisition and Assistance."<sup>19</sup>

USAID has two additional responsibilities defining the limit of its "substantial involvement" in the operation of the CRSPs administered as cooperative agreements:

- First, USAID approves the designated Key Personnel of the CRSP, i.e., the CRSP Director;
- Second, USAID (usually the CTO) participates with a voice and vote but without veto power in the senior permanent decision-making body of the CRSP.<sup>20</sup>

As noted elsewhere, for all CRSPs, USAID approves the selection of members of the evaluation panel, thereby validating their appropriate professional qualifications and lack of potential conflicts of interest.

---

<sup>18</sup> See Title 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter II, Part 226.60-62.

<sup>19</sup> "Guidebook for Managers and Cognizant Technical Officers on Acquisition and Assistance" (1998), Washington, D.C.: USAID. Chapter IX, "Administration of Assistance Instruments" (Section B: pages 63-66). (<http://www.USAID.gov/policy/ads/600/refindx6.htm#G> [3026s1.pdf])

<sup>20</sup> This section reflects language that was agreed to by USAID staff and US university representatives.

## 5.2 USAID Regional and Country Missions

The involvement and participation of USAID Regional and Country Missions can be very important to the success of CRSPs. Missions are encouraged to engage in dialogue with USAID/W and the CRSP MEs, facilitated by the CRSP CTO, regarding any CRSP activities anticipated or operating in their countries or regions. Though not required, it is often in the Mission's interest to facilitate CRSP efforts, including providing resources, financial and otherwise, and/or where feasible, facilitating custom clearances and logistics support.

Formal agreements must be negotiated for CRSP activities within each country. These agreements are usually in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). These are usually enabling documents. Specific activities and commitments are then provided in either additional MOUs or subagreements between the HC and US partner institutions. These agreements specify the conditions, responsibilities, and resource commitments of the collaborating parties; changes to the agreements need to be ratified by both US and overseas institutional administrative representatives. The USAID Mission has the option of being involved in the development of the CRSP program as relevant to their own programs, and in the agreement with the host country government or its institutions. The Mission will receive a copy of the final agreement and be given the opportunity to be a cosigner if it so desires. Involving the Mission and discussing plans with Mission personnel, including the Mission Director, ensures that the intended activities complement and do not conflict with any of the Mission's activities.

Some missions have directly supported CRSP activities. USAID Missions are authorized to issue grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts using established authority delegated to them. Where a USAID Mission is interested in obtaining a CRSP's expertise and involvement in that country/region, it may negotiate actions and activities consistent with the CRSP's type of assistance agreement (grant or cooperative agreement). Under the LWA, these linkages are facilitated by the CRSP CTO. The USAID Mission with the help of the CRSP CTO negotiates with the ME the type, amount, and method of support that the Mission wishes to provide for that CRSP in the country. Sometimes the original award needs to be amended to enable the new activity. Under the Leader/Associate (LWA) assistance agreement,<sup>21</sup> Missions can make an associate award to carry out the mission's desired program.

## 5.3 BIFAD

The Board on International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) was established under the 1975 amendments of the Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to advise USAID on, among other issues, a range of Title XII programs and programming issues including oversight of CRSPs and the relationships of CRSPs and IARCs (see Annex 3). It helps to insure that high quality advice and input is made available to USAID and to the CRSPs from the university community, and when necessary, establishes subcommittees and/or working groups to review specific CRSP activities and/or the recommendations of evaluation teams. BIFAD is responsible for reviewing reports from its subcommittees and/or working groups, and forwarding its recommendations to the Administrator of USAID.

BIFAD through its appropriate subcommittees may be consulted on specific CRSP procedures, including:

- Selection of members of the external review committees;
- Whether to extend a CRSP from five to ten years;
- Whether to initiate a new CRSP topic; and
- Whether to terminate or redirect a CRSP topic.

## 5.4 SPARE

The Strategic Partnership for Agricultural Research and Education (SPARE) is a subcommittee of BIFAD. Its members include staff from USAID and from the university community and their partners. The mandate of SPARE is to respond to requests from BIFAD to discuss and/or analyze issues on topics relating to agriculture,<sup>22</sup> to engage its partners in

---

<sup>21</sup> See Contract Information Bulletin 99-10, "Leader/Associate Assistance Instruments," which states: "...Missions, or other offices, may fund Associate grants under the Leader grant. Each Associate grant shall contain a separate activity description that fits within the broader program description of the Leader grant, as well as separate budget and reporting requirements, but will otherwise be considered to be covered by the terms and conditions of the Leader grant."

<sup>22</sup> As defined in Title XII amended, see page 2 and glossary (Annex 1)

discussion and/or analysis of the issues, and to provide, as appropriate, clear recommendations for action on those issues to BIFAD (see Annex 4).

## 5.5 The CRSP Council

The CRSP Council was formed in 1989 to provide guidance to both USAID and the CRSPs on CRSP matters, such as their technical and development problems and program direction and priorities. The Council helps facilitate communication among the CRSPs and to oversee inter-CRSP programs. Its Steering Committee, composed primarily of the CRSP Program Directors, provides a single entity with which USAID and other donors can interact. The regular business of the Council is carried out by its Steering Committee, through conference calls and emails, as well as annual meetings. USAID appoints its representatives to be ex-officio, non-voting members of the Council (see Annex 5).

## 5.6 Management Entity

The Management Entity (ME) bears the responsibility for fulfilling all the management functions defined in the grant or cooperative agreement in accordance with Federal Regulations governing assistance agreements.<sup>23</sup>

The key responsibilities normally defined for the ME are listed below and detailed in specified sections of these Guidelines:

1. To coordinate and involve CRSP partners in developing and maintaining an integrated and multi-disciplinary five-year global research plan and an overall training plan, with defined regional strategies and addressing the major technical and socio-economic constraints of the research topic (Section 2.0);
2. To represent the CRSP in specific official contacts within the United States and abroad, and in dealing with USAID, BIFAD, and its relevant subcommittees;
3. To work in a transparent and collaborative manner with USAID along with US, international, and host country partners to develop the CRSP research programs both in the US and in host countries, allocating resources for research among disciplines and among the partners, maintaining balance between US and overseas research activities that achieves the CRSP goals in a cost-effective manner. This includes coordinating with the partners in the preparation, management, and evaluation of annual budgets and work plans for research and training (see Section 7.4.2). The ME also encourages its Pls to work collaboratively with USAID field missions in developing the CRSP research program. The ME has the responsibility for negotiating the MOU with the host governments and its institutions, in cooperation with representatives of the participating US institutions;
4. To organize the ME staff to manage and support such necessary administrative functions as: developing and keeping current Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) and appropriate sub-awards with partner institutions; serving as secretariat for the CRSPs' governing bodies, taking minutes and providing summaries as appropriate; communicating regularly about the CRSP to partners in the US and host countries (research deans, department heads, directors of international programs and of experiment stations, and others, as appropriate), facilitating links between CRSP activities and others implementing related research and outreach;
5. To ensure that relevant results and technical data on the mandated research focus is made available to USAID and partners, and is reported to document achievements so that program results can be accurately measured; and to collect and maintain data on indicators reported to USAID.
6. To administer both the fiscal and programmatic aspects of the program under the guidance of the CRSP governing bodies, including the preparation and submission of annual and other reports to USAID/Washington in a timely manner as required in the assistance agreement.



Photo by E. A. "Short" Heinrichs  
Program Director, IPM CRSP

A scientist and farmers examine an eggplant plant in Gaidjhat Village in Jessore, Bangladesh. The IPM CRSP is working to provide village farmers with eggplant grafting technology. This technology enables farmers to increase crop yields 2 to 3 times and has already resulted in a 300% increase in local income.

<sup>23</sup> See also footnote 2.

7. To prepare and maintain a "Policies and Procedures" (P&P) manual for the CRSP which identifies the CRSP structure and describes the functions of its component groups, as well as providing detailed guidance on the implementation of its programs (including systems for monitoring travel, for regular reporting to USAID, and for dissemination of research results) (see Section 4 and Annex 6);
8. To submit to USAID, based on recommendations of its scientists and governing bodies, names for the External Evaluation Panel (EEP) and to organize its work schedule and site visits (see Sections 4.4 and 7.5.2);
9. To oversee the addition of core institutions or of new program components through open competitive solicitations from eligible institutions;
10. To arrange for meetings among US and host country CRSP researchers, administrators of partners, and, when possible, USAID staff, on a financially feasible schedule.

## 5.7 Participating US Institutions

Those institutions that participate in the CRSP under a formal sub-agreement with the Management Entity that receives the USAID assistance agreement are defined as "participating institutions."<sup>24</sup> Participating US institutions are responsible for fulfilling the roles identified for them in the global research plan and for carrying out all of the CRSP activities stipulated in their sub-agreements. Ordinarily, they:

1. Work collaboratively and transparently with the ME to finalize the global research plan and to update these plans, in a timely manner, with the submission of their annual work plans and budgets, to report annually on their progress, and to publish their research results.
2. Budget their USAID Federal funds responsibly, and in keeping with the standard policies of their institutions,<sup>25</sup> showing a minimum twenty-five percent contribution in non-Federal resources (in kind or in cash) of the total subaward amount minus exclusions (see Section 7.4.4).<sup>26</sup> The participating institutions also comply with audit requirements and can be audited by US Government audit agencies upon request of the USAID.
3. Designate an institutional representative (e.g., a lead PI, a Dean, or a Director of International Agriculture Programs) to act as a link between the CRSP and the institution, monitoring not only the approval of plans and budgets and changes in them, but also the overall relationship between the institution and the CRSP (see also Section 4.5).
4. Maintain a collaborative relationship and a commitment to supporting research at its own and the host country institutions during the period of the sub-agreement as their contribution to the multidisciplinary team effort, and establish, in cooperation with the ME, a scientific network linking the US and host countries engaged in the research program. The US institutions are expected to maintain an appropriate balance between research overseas and research in the United States. The US institutions are also encouraged to maintain open communications with USAID field missions and seek to engage their support for CRSP research and outreach.<sup>27</sup>
5. Assist the ME in developing and implementing a training plan (including both degree and short-term training) for candidates from the host countries to help fill the needs of institutional development programs in those countries.
6. Provide input for annual reports that the ME submits to USAID. Annual reporting may include, but not be limited to, e.g., research results, success stories, activity data base, reviews of national activities, degrees received by CRSP-funded students, participants in short-term trainings (disaggregated by sex), papers published and honors/ awards received by CRSP PIs, scientists, and trainees, etc.

---

<sup>24</sup> Including US universities and their partners, as well as Federal agencies (see fns. 4, 6, and 7) and Title XII (2000) (as amended).

<sup>25</sup> If there is a conflict between the participating institution's policies and those in the subaward, then those in the subaward are the binding ones.

<sup>26</sup> The 25% cost-share requirement also applies to research activities funded at the ME institution.

<sup>27</sup> Title XII legislation mandates that most of the research will be done overseas where possible; USAID has tended to accept a 50-50 or 60-40 ratio of US expenditures for research in the United States versus research expenditures overseas. Cost of training host country researchers in the United States is classified as an overseas expenditure.

## 5.8 Partners

Title XII (as amended) has broadened the definition of the institutions that can partner with US universities in its programs:

...the term 'public and private partners of universities' includes entities that have cooperative or contractual agreements with universities, which may include formal or informal associations of universities, other education institutions, United States Government and State agencies, private voluntary organizations, nongovernmental organizations, firms operated for profit, non-profit organizations, multinational banks, and, as designated by the Administrator, any organization, institution, or Agency incorporated in other countries.

Some Federal Agency partners are uniquely suitable for providing technical assistance. Working with these Federal Agency partners and using their facilities and resources should not compete with private enterprise nor interfere unduly with domestic programs. In addition, USAID cannot augment the appropriations of the federal Agency unless it is for work not regularly budgeted by such Agency. Finally, a federal Agency may participate in a CRSP as an institution and receive federal funds from a participating university through a subaward or contract, so long as the primary university character of the research program is not changed, and so long as the participation is also subject to the enabling legislation of the particular federal Agency. Funds that are passed to other federal agencies through a subaward are exempt from the cost-sharing requirements. However, if a participating federal Agency's activities are covered by specific appropriations under its own legislation, it must be determined administratively that the expenditures from the USAID award for such purposes are required for effective implementation.

## 5.9 Participating Host Country Institutions

The responsibilities of the host country institutions are similar to those of the US institutions (see Section 5.7). As part of the collaborative research process, the host country institutions benefit from their relationship with the CRSP while also sharing the responsibilities for developing work plans and budgets, prudent fiscal management of research funds, and timely reporting on topics and data requested by the PI or the ME on the research or outreach activities, staff achievements, or other topics. Given the importance of training and institutional capacity building, the host country institution has a key role to play in identifying appropriate topics and candidates for both degree programs and short-term education.

In addition, host country institutions are expected to work collaboratively and transparently with the regional research leaders and/or project PIs and provide to them as needed information about local resources and/or procedures that can facilitate the achievement of results and logistical support when appropriate and feasible. Their specific responsibilities and commitments are detailed in the MOU between the CRSP and the HC institution (see below). Host country institutions may also designate an institutional representative other than the research scientist to liaise between the CRSP and the institution (see also Section 4.5).

## 5.10 International and Regional Scientific Institutions

The CRSPs are expected to create and maintain networks of scientists jointly with international and regional scientific institutions in the countries in which they work. CRSPs link to other CRSPs operating in the same host country or region when their research topics intersect and they have the resources to establish connections.

CRSPs are also encouraged to work with the IARCs, since their interests and goals overlap, and both receive substantial support from USAID. The ME may develop cooperative and collaborative relations with IARCs. Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) between CRSPs and IARCs formalize those relationships and promote understanding and coordination. Joint projects may be feasible, but require a joint program proposal outlining the functions of each institution in the project and the amount of funding for each. The goal is to achieve complementarities and to maximize the comparative advantages of each party.

There may be cases in which a CRSP may need to access resources in a developed country other than the United States. This need should comply with USAID source-origin regulations. This can be done on a scientific and cooperative basis for mutual purposes.

## 6.0 Planning a CRSP

A new CRSP activity on a new topic might emerge in several ways. New topics may be suggested either in joint consultation between BIFAD and USAID, through an unsolicited proposal, or from USAID in response to new development needs. Where there is a need for more information to determine the suitability of the CRSP mode, BIFAD and USAID may choose to have exploratory studies conducted to ascertain the global dimensions of the topic and/or the degree of university expertise and interest. An exploratory study is funded by USAID, subject to funding availability. It is a short-term effort (between 3-6 months) and of relatively modest cost. It may involve targeted studies, a state-of-the-art review, professional conferences or workshops, small feasibility studies, and a canvass by BIFAD (or its relevant subcommittee) of host country and US university attitudes. Coordination with US missions and regional bureaus may be appropriate, in addition to consultations with US and HC universities to determine their level of interest and resources. The group conducting the study submits its report to USAID, who shares the report with BIFAD and its subcommittees for a decision on establishing a new CRSP.

When a topic is determined to be appropriate for the CRSP mode, USAID may choose to move forward either with an additional planning activity or by directly issuing a request for application (RFA). If USAID decides to fund an additional planning activity, it selects a Planning Entity (PE), in consultation with BIFAD and its relevant subcommittees, who also monitor and advise in the planning process. The PE may be a single institution, a consortium of universities, an organization, a federal agency, a foundation, or private firm with appropriate competencies. The mode of funding, contract or grant, of the planning activity would be determined by the type of relationship desired by USAID with the PE.<sup>28</sup>

Whether the PE is to be awarded as a grant or cooperative agreement, a public announcement of the intent to select the planning entity (PE) is made, listing the selection criteria and Scope of Work (SOW), and inviting applications. A meeting is held for all interested parties to provide additional information on Title XII, on the CRSP concept, on objectives of the program being considered, and the planning required. In the past, each interested institution was asked to submit an expression of interest and statement of capability that was reviewed by meeting participants and from which a list of candidates was developed. At USAID's request, BIFAD (and/or its relevant subcommittee) evaluated the candidate institutions for the PE as well as the list of institutions interested in participating in the CRSP and made a recommendation to USAID. BIFAD also made its recommendations regarding the capabilities of the institution interested in participating in the CRSP. USAID will make the final selection of the PE.

USAID, in consultation with BIFAD (and its relevant subcommittees) manages the planning contract or grant so that a wide range of stakeholders are given an opportunity to present their views, that prospective institutions are objectively evaluated, that organizational conflicts of interest are avoided,<sup>29</sup> and that the process is in compliance with all appropriate Federal Regulations (see also section 8.0).

## 7.0 Implementing the CRSP

### 7.1 Assistance Agreements

The assistance agreement (grant or cooperative agreement) is between USAID and the ME institution. It is the official legal mechanism through which USAID supports a CRSP and it may not be contravened in any manner by any of the parties short of an official agreement modification acceptable to the signatories. As noted above, USAID assistance agreements include standard US Government provisions.

---

<sup>28</sup> Different types of funding instruments imply different institutional and oversight arrangements. In the case of a Federal Agency, USAID may use a Participating Agency Service Agreement/Resources Support Service Agreement (PASA/RSSA). If a contract is used, the entity will be selected and the contract executed in accordance with the requirements of federal law and regulations governing procurement of services by Government agencies. If USAID chooses to use a grant or cooperative agreement, it will develop a scope of work for planning the CRSP and the criteria for selection of an institution to serve as the PE will be jointly developed by USAID and BIFAD (and its appropriate subcommittees).

<sup>29</sup> Normally, the PE will have the option of later serving as a participating institution in the research program, if it meets Title XII criteria and is qualified and safeguards against "organizational conflicts of interest" have been met. There may be exceptions where the PE may be excluded from participation in the CRSP by a prior decision made by USAID on BIFAD's recommendations. The planning grant or contract shall specify whether the PE is to be excluded or permitted to participate in the CRSP.

### **7.1.1 Subagreements with Participating US Institutions**

The ME negotiates subawards with participating US institutions to define, authorize, and fund the work to be done under the CRSP. The subawards shall incorporate, by reference or otherwise, the substance of the assistance agreement, and a copy of the master agreement with the ME is made available to the subawardee institution.<sup>30</sup> Subawards are modified as needed to update work plans, budgets, and conditions.

### **7.1.2 Subagreements with Participating Host Country Institutions**

Two types of agreements are needed: an MOU with the Host Country and the subagreement that specifically addresses the work to be carried out under the CRSP. Agreements with a participating Host Country (HC) institution is made either with the participating US institution that is the home institution for the PI or with the ME institution. It specifies the relationship of the host country institutions to the CRSP and defines their involvement with various institutions within the host government. It also states requirements for annual work plans and budgets. The subagreement specifies the organization or institution of the host government with which the CRSP will work. The detailed work plan, work sites, the training program, travel, and other activities, are described in the annual and longer term work plan, and may be a separate annex. Host country institutions must be prepared to account, maintain records, and be subject to audits in accordance to applicable USAID policies as specified in the subaward. It is also important that the subaward specifies the host country institutions' commitments of logistic support (such as transport, custom clearance procedures, and import privileges), facilities (including housing and office space), and personnel.

## **7.2 Developing and Monitoring the Work Program**

### **7.2.1 Global and Annual Work Plans**

In response to the initial Request for Application (RFA), the CRSP proposal outlines a five-year global research vision. After the award is made, this global research vision is collaboratively developed in greater detail into a plan with the CRSP partners. The initial five-year plan is adjusted and carried forward in annual workplans.

Each participating institution prepares an annual research work plan and budget according to the performance period identified. Many CRSPs issue RFAs requesting proposals for three-year activities; others use a five-year time frame. The US and host country institutions collaboratively prepare each annual plan of work and budget.

### **7.2.2 Host-Country Institution Building and Training**

In addition to its research goals, the CRSP has the goal to strengthen the research capacity of host countries so that host country partner institutions can increasingly carry out independent research and lead research in their region. CRSPs provide assistance to improve host country research institutions capabilities in research management, including record keeping, and fiscal management issues. Training includes both degree training, especially graduate training at participating US and host country or regional institutions, as well as short-term training provided through workshops, seminars, and other media. Each CRSP develops a training plan detailing the training needs of the HCs and how those needs can be met.

USAID policy on training<sup>31</sup> identifies an annual target of fifty percent women in new trainee third-country and US enrollments. Although this policy does not apply to in-country training, all CRSPs should work towards achieving these targets.

## **7.3 Graduate Students**

US and HC graduate students may be employed on CRSP projects at US or overseas sites as research assistants to achieve CRSP goals. Their employment can follow conventional practices of US universities under the Hatch Act system, and US institutional Guidelines on compensation should apply as long as the employment and the compensation are not in conflict with the USAID assistance agreement. US students benefit from expanded learning opportunities about global agricultural research, strengthening their capacity to carry out research and teaching activities, for solving problems in food production, processing, markets, and consumption in developing and transition countries.

---

<sup>30</sup> This may exclude proprietary or confidential budgetary information.

<sup>31</sup> See ADS 253.3.8 "Training for Development."

Assignment of graduate students as research assistants overseas is subject to host country approval. Such assignments must be closely supervised by senior US and HC scientists, including some on-site direction, especially during the initial period of the assignment. Graduate student assignments could include thesis research on a CRSP project when this fits into the CRSP and host country goals and objectives. Often graduate students are selected based on a specific project needs. This should be balanced with the overall training needs of the HC in which the CRSP is working. It is the responsibility of the ME to be sure that the training plan reflects these needs and that such training is conducted.

While graduate students can contribute to CRSP research under proper supervision, developing countries and USAID expects that the ME will strongly encourage the Principal Investigators to carry out CRSP activities in developing and transition countries to maximize the benefit to host country students and professionals.

## **7.4 Financial Management**

### **7.4.1 Performance Period**

The assistance agreement specifies the initial performance period for each CRSP, typically for five years, with the ability to extend up to ten years.<sup>32</sup>

### **7.4.2 The Fiscal Responsibilities of the ME**

The ME institution is responsible for the successful implementation of the program and is accountable to USAID for the use of federal funds under the award. Each participating institution manages its approved CRSP budget in accordance with the award agreement and standard provisions. Carryover of funds from one year to the next is permitted at the institutional level. The ME considers any unmet responsibilities and the workload of the institution for the year ahead. Also, the ME is allowed to include in its budget those sums that are to be expended for purchase of commodities and services for application to use at overseas sites. USAID has accepted that a 50:50 or 60:40 ratio of US to Host Country expenditures for research meets the Title XII expectations under 297(c).<sup>33</sup>

The following points address the fiscal responsibilities of the ME:

1. Expenditures are subject to federal audit in accordance with applicable regulations including Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133.
2. The ME must respond to USAID with such financial reports as deemed necessary within USAID regulations and required in the award documents to support USAID's monitoring of the CRSP, including quarterly reports to USAID on accruals for the previous quarter due five days after the end of the quarter.
3. The recipients of all research contracts, grants and cooperative agreements must comply with Agency patent invention disclosure and patent reporting requirements, as required by the Bayh-Dole Act (codified in 37 CFR 401), and included in USAID's standard provisions.

### **7.4.3 Use of Funds**

CRSP funds from both university and USAID sources may be used for approved CRSP activities, subject to the standard provisions of the assistance agreement, such as:

1. The planning, organizational, and implementation costs of US-based and overseas research programs that directly and significantly contribute to the solution of developing country problems.
2. Overseas research activities of US institutional employees, including graduate students, working on approved collaborative research programs;

---

<sup>32</sup> In a Leader/Associate award: "...the Leader grant will normally be for five years and may be extended to ten years through non-competitive waiver under the provisions of ADS 303.5.5dl (see CIB 99-10). Associate grants may be issued until the Leader grant expires. The Leader grant may provide for the Associate grants to extend for up to five years. With a non-competitive waiver Associate grants may extend for a total of ten years, but in no event may they extend for more than five years past the expiration of the Leader grant. Also, in no case may a grant extend more than five years into the future at any given time."

<sup>33</sup> To the maximum extent practicable, activities under this section shall: (1) be directly related to the food and agricultural needs of developing countries; (2) focus primarily on the needs of agricultural producers, rural families, processors, traders, consumers, and natural resources managers; (3) be adapted to local circumstances; and (4) be carried out within the developing countries and transition countries comprising newly emerging democracies and newly liberalized economies; (5) emphasize the improvement of local systems for delivering the best available knowledge to the small farmers of such countries.

3. Research arrangements between management entities and eligible universities and collaborating developing country institutions or individuals, and for conducting research on developing country agricultural situations to test validity, relevance and applicability of findings, baseline and end of project data;
4. Supporting developing country and US graduate students;
5. The development and operation of research information exchange systems including conferences, data storage and retrieval systems, publications, materials exchanges, professional exchange arrangements and any other arrangements necessary to the execution of problem-solving activities;
6. Special CRSP activities in joint projects with international agricultural research centers, NGOs, and the private sector;
7. Indirect costs based on negotiated rates established by the cognizant federal Agency; and,
8. Such other functions as are essential to the effective conduct of approved collaborative research programs.

Experience suggests that 20% of the CRSP annual budget is a reasonable target for covering the ME's operating costs.

#### **7.4.4 Policies on Cost Sharing<sup>34</sup>**

Because the pursuit of CRSP research goals is intended to benefit both US universities in improving US agricultural and economic development as well as USAID efforts to achieve development results from its provision of foreign assistance, each CRSP is required to match, with non-federal resources (in cash or in kind), twenty-five percent of the federal funds provided by USAID, subject to six specific exclusions. With this mutuality of interest, each university should plan its participation in the CRSP to fit its domestic goals as well as those of USAID.

The ME is also authorized to subgrant to non-Title XII institutions to obtain expertise desirable for the CRSP and these institutions are also permitted to participate in the governance of the CRSP. They cannot be required to match with non-Federal funds as a condition of their involvement, but if they are unable to do so, the CRSP organization must provide their share.

The following costs are excluded from the matching requirement:

1. Cost to operate the ME;
2. Funds committed under the terms of a formal CRSP host country sub-agreement, including funds for facilities, host country personnel services, and equipment and commodity purchases by a participating US institution for use by a host country entity or by the US institution in a host country. Funds for these costs may be held apart in reserve by the participating US institution until expended directly to a vendor for the goods and services described. Also, the funds may be passed to the host country for its purchases and use in accordance with the agreement;
3. Costs for training of participants as defined in ADS 253. Provisions for such training normally would be made in the formal sub-agreement;
4. Hospital and medical costs of US personnel of the CRSP while serving overseas.<sup>35</sup>
5. Funds that are transferred through a subaward to another Federal agency; and
6. Typically, funds used to support costs of conferences held specifically to disseminate CRSP research findings to USAID and other US government employees. Travel and conference costs of CRSP participants that are funded by the CRSP are not exempt, nor does the exemption apply to annual or biannual PI meetings that may be attended by some USAID (or USDA, etc.) staff.

All USAID-financed costs borne by USAID that are associated with the performance of employees of participating US institutions, working in the United States and in the developing countries on both short and long-term assignments, where federally funded under the CRSP, are program costs of the CRSP and must be matched.

---

<sup>34</sup> USAID policies on cost sharing are given in ADS 303.5.10 and ADS 216 and 22 CFR 226.23 (see also Annex 6).

<sup>35</sup> Participating institutions should carry their own medical insurance for their personnel and participants need to be insured in accordance with applicable provisions.

Costs of any of the items listed in 22 CFR 226.23 may be considered for matching contributions. The twenty-five percent non-federal financial participation is a general guideline that would apply to most CRSPs; each CRSP shall be bound by the amount indicated in its assistance agreement. Exceptions may be made in specific cases where this might be unrealistic or inappropriate after consideration jointly by BIFAD and USAID, if the element of collaboration is substantial and apparent. Within a CRSP, it is not necessary that the federal cost of every institution or cost of every single activity or project within an institution be matched, as long as the aggregate of all the federal costs of projects and activities within the overall CRSP meet the twenty-five percent requirement. A participating federal Agency is not required to match USAID funds.

## **7.5 Reviews and Evaluations**

There are two types of assessments that are required of the CRSPs. The first evaluates the quality and progress of the research; the second reviews the administrative and management effectiveness of the CRSP. While related, these two assessment processes are distinct; they have different purposes, audiences, schedules, sources of support, and rely on different types of evaluators.

A critical responsibility of the Management Entity with the policy setting or program advisory body is to ensure that the CRSP has well-defined goals that address high priority issues, and that it sets clear outcomes and benchmarks. The number of activities implemented by the CRSP should be within the limits of the budget. The policy setting or program advisory body bears responsibility for ensuring that the evaluation and review reports are accurate and properly used and that their recommendations implemented.

### **7.5.1 Internal Evaluations of Research Quality and Progress**

The ME of each CRSP together with its various advisory bodies set up a process for carrying out annual internal reviews, in consultation with the appropriate subcommittee of BIFAD, usually in conjunction with the preparation of the annual report and/or the development of the annual work plan.

### **7.5.2 External Evaluations of Research Quality and Progress**

External evaluations carried out by independent experts offer a critical and impartial view about the quality and progress of the research programs. They provide evidence for objective decision-making about program components and can help to address difficult institutional issues or biases. To carry out these evaluations, each CRSP sets up an external review process, often by a group called the External Evaluation Panel (EEP). The EEP is responsible for evaluating the status, funding, progress, plans, and prospects of the CRSP research program, presenting its findings, and making recommendations. The funding for the EEP is drawn from the regular allocation from USAID to the CRSP.

The SOW for the evaluation is developed by the ME in consultation with the CRSP's advisory bodies, BIFAD and/or its appropriate committees, and USAID. Each external evaluation, as needed, will typically:

- Assess whether the research program of a CRSP is well-balanced, whether the different activities are progressing adequately, and whether they are relevant and helping to achieve the larger program goals;
- Identify inadequate performances;
- Gauge effective balance between research and training for development of institutional research capability;
- Assess the balance of domestic versus overseas research in terms of effectiveness of solving constraints in developing countries;
- Evaluate the performance and the productivity of each institution on each project;
- Assess the appropriateness of projected resource allocations; and,
- Evaluate the dissemination of research results, and the effectiveness of utilization (a measure of the appropriateness of the research).

Members of the evaluation teams should be senior scientists recognized by their peers and selected for their in-depth knowledge of a research discipline relevant to the CRSP and experience in research and/or research administration. Candidates are nominated by the ME, in consultation with the TC, professional societies, and other sources and are subject to approval by USAID. Specific criteria for selection of the team, number of positions, terms of service, and other details should be developed and documented in the CRSP Policies and Procedures manual (see Annex 8).

## Review Schedule

The ME – in consultation with its own advisory groups and collaborating institutions as well as BIFAD (or its relevant committee) and the evaluation team – will develop an appropriate work schedule for the external reviews. Some CRSPs utilize their external evaluation teams for varying levels of review at different points in the five-year performance period, depending upon whether they have research activities operating on three or five-year cycles. An in-depth evaluation of each research activity (often, but not always, with site visits to host country locations) is expected at least once, depending on the needs and maturity of the research program. The external review should also evaluate the CRSP program as a coherent whole, and assess its ability and continued relevance for achieving USAID's broader development goals.

## Outcome of the Research Quality Review

The ME should make full use of the EEP and its recommendations. The EEP recommendations serve as the basis for bringing about changes in both the specific activities of a single CRSP and/or the composition and direction of the larger collaborative research program as a whole, since it addresses not only the value of the individual CRSP program, but also how well it continues to address USAID's broader development goals. If the CRSP governing bodies or its ME disagrees with a recommendation, the ME submits the rationale and justification for such disagreement to USAID. Copies of these documents (both the review and the response) are made available to BIFAD and its relevant committees, the Administrative Management Review Team, and USAID for their roles in reviewing the CRSP for either the five-year extension.

### 7.5.3 External Evaluations of Administrative and Management Effectiveness

USAID prepares the SOW for the administrative management review, outlining issues and problems to be covered, drawing on USAID's knowledge of the CRSP and the results of its inquiries to mission and bureaus with which the CRSP has worked. The purpose of the review is to give feedback to the Agency on how well the Management Entity is operating and carrying out the agenda set forth in the CRSP proposal, in accordance with the Guidelines. The review is conducted by a team of specialists hired by USAID. USAID's Administrative Management Review also draws on any



Photo by Roger Harris

Aquaculture CRSP research is helping to better understand the biology and farming potential of the Colossoma, a fish indigenous to the Peruvian Amazon.

EEP reviews that have been conducted. USAID pays the costs associated with the AMR directly; they are not drawn from the CRSP budget.

### 7.5.4 The Five-Year Extension Process

Each CRSP is established as a five-year grant or cooperative agreement with an opportunity for a five-year extension. To provide adequate time for the CRSP to prepare new research proposals for a five-year extension, sometime at the end of the third or the start of the fourth year of the first five-year agreement, USAID and BIFAD needs to make a determination whether the research topic addressed by the CRSP continues to be relevant to fulfilling the goals of Title

XII, and whether the specific CRSP is managing that task

appropriately. When USAID in consultation with BIFAD (and/or its appropriate subcommittees) decides that a new competition for the CRSP ME is needed, USAID will draft a Request for Application (RFA) and post it publicly through the Federal Government website for new solicitations ([www.fedgrant.gov](http://www.fedgrant.gov)). The USAID Office of Acquisition and Assistance handles the scheduling and detail of the process, which often includes a prospective applicants conference in Washington to receive information about the solicitation and a period of question and answers prior to the submission date. An evaluation panel is convened to evaluate the applications and make a decision.

If the CRSP research area is agreed by USAID and BIFAD to be of continued importance, then USAID prepares a review schedule in consultation with the ME of each CRSP.

These reviews consist of a technical review by the EEP, an Administrative Management Review (AMR) by USAID, both described above. The ME prepares for USAID's review by compiling appropriate reports on progress and documents on issues to be addressed and will make any EEP reports available. The ME submits issues and problems on behalf of the program to the USAID CTO.

USAID's report on its administrative management review is submitted to the ME, which uses the recommendations to adjust the program and its proposal to be submitted to USAID for a five-year extension of the award.

The five-year extension proposal typically includes the following types of documents:

1. An Executive Summary for the total program, including progress on removing defined constraints, a brief statement on each subaward, including progress by each one and proposed activities overall and for each subaward.
2. A five-year program vision ("global vision");
3. Subaward activities including general progress on objectives for prior activities and a more detailed statement on the most recent four years along with a plan of action for projected activities.
4. Success stories, linkages established, and specific activities in developing countries. Documenting quantitative and qualitative benefits to US agriculture, as well as to developing countries, are of particular interest to USAID and BIFAD.
5. Management Entity activities including management procedures employed and activities not adequately described in subaward reports. Responses to EEP recommendations should be shown.
6. Summary Budgets on SF 424 - actual or projected yearly budgets from inception through the year of proposed extension, with a five-year forward horizon, shall be submitted for each subaward, for the ME and for any other sub-grants and subcontracts not otherwise covered. These shall be presented according to categories listed on SF 424. USAID grant document contributions, participating institutions contributions, developing country contributions shall be shown in separate columns. The USAID Agreement Officer and CTO can provide advice on SF 424.
7. A summary report is prepared and presented by the ME, covering all the recommendations made by the EEP during the three previous years, the actions and decisions made, and justification of the ME's failure to take action, or its decision to take contrary actions.

This proposal will be reviewed by USAID and BIFAD (or its appropriate subcommittees) at the end of the fourth year or start of the fifth year of the award to make adjustments to the technical program and address management issues as appropriate, and to make administrative decisions regarding the amount of funding for the CRSP.

## 8.0 Rebidding the CRSP Management Entity

The CRSP Management Entity (ME) will be rebid at the end of each ten-year authorization. The rebid will be for the ME only, based on its management capability. The rebid will not include the projected research program.

USAID, BIFAD, and the university community agree that:

- A new Request for Application (RFA) for a CRSP ME will be released during the academic year at least one year prior to the termination of existing CRSP programs. The RFA would allow at least two months of time to prepare proposals for submission.
- The RFA evaluation criteria will include past performance reports on the administration of similar research programs for the proposed ME. Criteria will address the proposed institution's strength of management capacity, technical capacity on the CRSP topic; ability to articulate a vision for research on the CRSP theme; ability to provide a clear plan to implement that vision, including a description of the mechanisms that will insure the program draws on the best technical competence available; ability to provide a plan to leverage additional resources from Mission buy-ins and other sources, including the private sector; and the ability to demonstrate how to award, in a fully open and competitive process, both bridge funds, if required, and planning grants and sub-awards.
- The RFA will neither require nor prohibit the proposed ME institution from listing partners in its proposal, nor will the inclusion of partners necessarily increase the strength of the proposal, since the subsequent research program award will, as described above, be a fully open and competitive process.

## Annex I: Glossary

### Administrative or Institutional Council

A group of university administrators, consisting of a representative from each US institution participating in a CRSP; sometimes called “Board of Institutional Representatives.” Each member represents the interests of their institution as well as the CRSP as a whole.

### Agreement Officer

A person with authority to enter into, administer, terminate and/or close out assistance agreements. The term “Agreement Officer” includes persons warranted as “Grants Officer.”

### Assistance Agreement

A grant or cooperative agreement that documents the USAID obligations to the CRSP ME.

### BIFAD

Board for International Food and Agricultural Development.

### Bilateral Programs

Assistance programs involving arrangements between a single developing country and a single donor country.

### Board of Directors (or Program Advisory Council, etc.)

An advisory body selected to assist, advise, and make policy recommendations to the ME in the execution of a CRSP. Members reflect the interests of the CRSP as a whole.

### CGIAR

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

### Collaborating Institutions

Institutions that form a partnership arrangement with a lead participating US institution to collaborate on a specific research project.

### CRSP

Collaborative Research Support Program

### CRSP Council

Administrative body consisting of the Program Directors and Chairs of the Boards of Directors and Technical Committees from each active CRSP.

### CTO

Cognizant Technical Officer. A USAID or other employee designated by the Agreement Officer to oversee a CRSP on behalf of USAID.

### EEP

External Evaluation Panel. Senior scientists not involved in the CRSP and selected for their ability to evaluate the scientific progress and relevance of a CRSP program.

### EGAT

A Pillar Bureau of USAID addressing Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade.

### Exploratory Study

A study undertaken to define the feasibility of conducting a CRSP, or to provide supplementary information needed for definition of approach, scope, and interests of US institutions in participating in a CRSP.

### Five-Year Review

A formal review by USAID of a CRSP with joint participation of BIFAD, which takes place in the first five years of a ten-year grant or cooperative agreement to determine whether to extend a CRSP program for an additional five years.

### Global Plan

The overall plan of a CRSP for research on problems and constraints, global in nature, whose results are applicable and transferable regionally and globally (worldwide).

### Global Vision

A provisional outline or draft framework for the Global Plan that may be developed by the ME in preparation for a new proposal. The expectation is that it could be revised and refined in consultation with partner institutions after award.

### Grant Proposal

The formal document submitted by an ME to USAID, proposing a CRSP for receiving a grant outlining the manner of implementation of the program, and showing the budgetary requirements.

### Host Country

A developing or transition country in which a CRSP has formal activities.

### IARCs

International Agricultural Research Centers, including those in the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research program.

### Institutional Development

Improvement in the capability of institutions in developing countries to conduct developmental programs for agriculture and other sectors, or for implementing educational/training, research, health and other public programs. Improvements may include physical facilities, equipment, furnishings, transportation, and/or organization, but refers primarily to development and training of professional cadre.

### JCARD

Joint Committee on Agricultural Research and Development

### LWA

Leader/Associate award

### Matching Requirement

That sum of resources, financial or in-kind, which participating US institutions must collectively contribute to a CRSP program as defined in the grant document.

### ME

Management Entity of a CRSP

### Mission

A formally organized USAID unit in a developing country led by a Mission Director or a Country Representative.

### MOU

Memorandum of Understanding.

### NGO

Non-Governmental Organization.



Photo by the INTSORMIL CRSP

Sorghum, first domesticated thousands of years ago in what is now Ethiopia, has been improved by selecting plants for many different characteristics. INTSORMIL plant breeders select for yield, digestibility and taste of the grain, and resistance of the plant to insects, fungi, viruses, bacteria and drought. The bags on some of the plants in the image above are to control pollination of plants involved in breeding trials.

### **Non-Presence Country**

A developing country in which USAID has no physical presence.

### **Participating Institutions or Partners**

Those institutions that participate in the CRSP under a formal subagreement with the Management Entity that receives the USAID grant.

### **Pass-through Funding**

Funds transferred from a CRSP entity to a cooperating developing country entity for purposes of supporting in-country activities of the CRSP.

### **PE**

Planning Entity.

### **Peer Panel**

A small group of experts selected to assist with some aspect of planning or implementing a CRSP, sometimes used to help identify the most appropriate participating institutional members for participating in a CRSP.

### **PI**

Principal Investigators. Scientists in charge of the research for a defined segment or a scientific discipline of a CRSP.

### **SPARE**

Strategic Partnership for Agriculture Research and Education.

### **Subgrant Agreement**

A document representing a sub-agreement made between the ME and a participating institution under authority of the grant agreement by the ME with USAID.

### **TC**

Technical Committee. A group of scientists selected to help guide the scientific aspects of the research program of a CRSP.

### **Title XII**

The Title XII Amendment to the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975 as passed by the United States Congress and subsequently amended in 2000.

### **USAID**

United States Agency for International Development.

### **USAID/W**

Washington headquarters of the United States Agency for International Development.

### **USDA**

United States Department of Agriculture.

### **USDOC**

United States Department of Commerce.

### **USEPA**

United States Environmental Protection Agency.

## Annex 2: Title XII Amended<sup>36</sup>

### Summary

On October 27, 2000 President Clinton signed the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Improvement Act of 2000, P.L. 106-373. This act is the first major amendment to Title XII, Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, since the Title's passage in December 1975 as part of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-161).

Among the numerous additions to the Title, the amended Title XII broadens the goals of the Title to include "ensuring food security, human health, agricultural growth, trade expansion, and the wise and sustainable use of natural resources"; broadens the US land-grant university community to include its public and private partners; calls for "a coordinated program to increase world food and fiber production, agricultural trade, and responsible management of natural resources" through a global network of US universities, international agricultural research centers, and other international research entities as well as the facilitation of participation by the broader US university community in programs of multilateral banks and agencies which receive United States funds; and "generally engage the United States university community more extensively in the agricultural research, trade and development initiatives undertaken outside the United States." The amended Title also adds Native American land-grant colleges to its definition of universities eligible and provides definitions for 'public and private partners of universities,' 'agriculture,' and 'agriculturists.'

**Definition of Public and Private Partners of Universities.** As used in this title, the term 'public and private partners of universities' includes entities that have cooperative or contractual agreements with universities, which may include university beneficiary groups, other education institutions, United States Government and State agencies, private voluntary organizations, nongovernmental organizations, firms operated for profit, non-profit organizations, multinational banks, and, as designated by the Administrator, any organization, institution, or Agency incorporated in other countries.

**Definition of Agriculture.** As used in this title, the term 'agriculture' includes the science and practice of activities related to food, feed, and fiber production, processing, marketing, distribution, utilization, and trade, and also includes family and consumer sciences, nutrition, food science and engineering, agricultural economics and other social sciences, forestry, wildlife, fisheries, aquaculture, floriculture, veterinary medicine, and other environmental and natural resources sciences.

**Definition of Agriculturists.** As used in this title, the term 'agriculturists' includes farmers, herders, and livestock producers, individuals who fish and others employed in cultivating and harvesting food resources from salt and fresh waters, individuals who cultivate trees and shrubs and harvest nontimber forest products, as well as the processors, managers, teachers, extension specialists, researchers, policy makers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed, and fiber system and its relationships to natural resources.

---

<sup>36</sup> Taken from version prepared by Susan J. Thompson, Office of Agriculture, Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade, USAID. Development, U.S. Agency for International Development, January 2001.

*Title XII Amendment, Final Act*

TITLE XII Amendment: Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Improvement Act of 2000

P.L. 106-373

Signed by President 10/27/00

**GENERAL PROVISIONS.**

**(a) Declaration of Policy – Sec. 296(a)** The Congress declares that, in order to achieve the mutual goals among nations of ensuring food security, human health, agricultural growth, trade expansion, and the wise and sustainable use of natural resources, the United States should mobilize the capacities of the United States land-grant universities, other eligible universities, and public and private partners of universities in the United States and other countries, consistent with sections 103 and 103A of this Act, for: (1) global research on problems affecting food, agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; (2) improved human capacity and institutional resource development for the global application of agricultural and related environmental sciences; (3) agricultural development and trade research and extension services in the United States and other countries to support the entry of rural industries into world markets; and (4) providing for the application of agricultural sciences to solving food, health, nutrition, rural income, and environmental problems, especially such problems in low-income, food deficit countries.

The Congress so declares because it finds—

(A) that the establishment, endowment, and continuing support of land-grant universities in the United States by Federal, State, and county governments has led to agricultural progress with and through the private sector in this country and to understanding processes of economic development;

(B) that land-grant and other universities in the United States have demonstrated over many years their ability to cooperate with international agencies, educational and research institutions in other countries, the private sector, and nongovernmental organizations worldwide, in expanding global agricultural production, processing, business and trade, to the benefit of aid recipient countries and of the United States;

(C) that, in a world of growing populations with rising expectations, increased food production and improved distribution, storage, and marketing in the developing countries is necessary not only to prevent hunger and ensure human health and child survival, but to build the basis for economic growth and trade, and the social security in which democracy and a market economy can thrive, and moreover, that the greatest potential for increasing world food supplies and incomes to purchase food is in the developing countries where the gap between food need and food supply is the greatest and current incomes are lowest;

(D) that increasing and making more secure the supply of food is of greatest benefit to the poorest majority in the developing world;

(E) with expanding global markets and increasing imports into many countries, including the United States, that food safety and quality, as well as secure supply, have emerged as mutual concerns of all countries;

(F) that research, teaching, and extension activities, and appropriate institutional and policy development therefore are prime factors in improving agricultural production, food distribution, processing, storage, and marketing abroad (as well as in the United States);

(G) moreover, that agricultural research abroad has in the past and will continue in the future to provide benefits for agriculture and the broader economy of the United States and that increasing the availability of food of higher nutritional quality is of benefit to all;

(H) that there is a need to responsibly manage the world's agricultural and natural resources for sustained productivity, health and resilience to climate variability; and

(I) that universities and public and private partners of universities need a dependable source of funding in order to increase the impact of their own investments and those of their State governments and constituencies, in order to continue and expand their efforts to advance agricultural development in cooperating countries, to translate development into economic growth and trade for the United States and cooperating countries, and to prepare future teachers, researchers, extension specialists, entrepreneurs, managers, and decisionmakers for the world economy.

**(b) Additional Declarations of Policy – Sec. 296(b)** Accordingly, the Congress declares that, in order to prevent famine and establish freedom from hunger, the following components must be brought together in a coordinated program to increase world food and fiber production, agricultural trade, and responsible management of natural resources, including—

(1) continued efforts by the international agricultural research centers and other international research entities to provide a global network, including United States universities, for international scientific collaboration on crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, farming resources, and food systems of worldwide importance;

(2) contract research and the implementation of collaborative research support programs and other research collaboration led by United States universities, and involving research systems in other countries focused on crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, farming resources, and food systems, with benefits to the United States and partner countries;

(3) broadly disseminating the benefits of global agricultural research and development including increased benefits for United States agriculturally related industries through establishment of development and trade information and service centers, for rural as well as urban communities, through extension, cooperatively with, and supportive of, existing public and private trade and development related organizations;

(4) facilitation of participation by universities and public and private partners of universities in programs of multilateral banks and agencies which receive United States funds;

(5) expanding learning opportunities about global agriculture for students, teachers, community leaders, entrepreneurs, and the general public through international internships and exchanges, graduate assistantships, faculty positions, and other means of education and extension through long-term recurring Federal funds matched by State funds; and

(6) competitive grants through universities to United States agriculturists and public and private partners of universities from other countries for research, institution and policy development, extension, training, and other programs for global agricultural development, trade, and responsible management of natural resources.

**(c) Sense of Congress Section—296(c)** The United States should --

(1) effectively involve the United States land-grant and other eligible universities more extensively in each of the program components described in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (b);

(2) provide mechanisms for the universities and public and private partners of universities to participate and advise in the planning, development, implementation, and administration of each component,

(3) assist such universities and public and private partners of universities in cooperative joint efforts with --

(A) agricultural institutions in developing nations;

(B) regional and international agricultural research centers;

(C) multilateral banks and agencies receiving United States funds;

(D) development agencies of other countries; and

(E) United States Government foreign assistance and economic cooperation programs; and

(4) generally engage the United States university community more extensively in the agricultural research, trade, and development initiatives undertaken outside the United States, with the objectives of strengthening its capacity to carry out research, teaching, and extension activities for solving problems in food production, processing, marketing, and consumption in agriculturally developing nations, and for transforming progress in global agricultural research and development into economic growth, trade, and trade benefits for aid recipient countries and United States communities and industries, and for the wise use of natural resources; and

(5) ensure that all federally funded support to universities and public and private partners of universities relating to the goals of this title is periodically reviewed for its performance.

**(d) Definition of Universities—Section 296(d)** As used in this title, the term 'universities' means those colleges or universities in each State, territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, benefits under the Act of July 2, 1862 (known as the First Morrill Act) or the Act of August 30, 1890 (known as the Second Morrill Act), which are commonly known as 'land-grant' universities; institutions now designated or which may hereafter be designated as sea-grant colleges under the Act of October 15, 1966 (known as the National Sea Grant College and Program Act), which are commonly known as sea-grant colleges; Native American land-grant colleges as authorized under the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note); and other United States colleges and universities which --

(1) have demonstrable capacity in teaching, research, and extension (including outreach) activities in the agricultural sciences; and

(2) can contribute effectively to the attainment of the objectives of this title.

**(e) Definition of Administrator—Section 296(e)** As used in this title, the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

**(f) Definition of Public and Private Partners of Universities** As used in this title, the term 'public and private partners of universities' includes entities that have cooperative or contractual agreements with universities, which may include formal or informal associations of universities, other education institutions, United States Government and State agencies, private

voluntary organizations, nongovernmental organizations, firms operated for profit, non-profit organizations, multinational banks, and, as designated by the Administrator, any organization, institution, or Agency incorporated in other countries.

**(g) Definition of Agriculture** As used in this title, the term 'agriculture' includes the science and practice of activity related to food, feed, and fiber production, processing, marketing, distribution, utilization, and trade, and also includes family and consumer sciences, nutrition, food science and engineering, agricultural economics and other social sciences, forestry, wildlife, fisheries, aquaculture, floriculture, veterinary medicine, and other environmental and natural resources sciences.

**(h) Definition of Agriculturists** As used in this title, the term 'agriculturists' includes farmers, herders, and livestock producers, individuals who fish and others employed in cultivating and harvesting food resources from salt and fresh waters, individuals who cultivate trees and shrubs and harvest nontimber forest products, as well as the processors, managers, teachers, extension specialists, researchers, policy makers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed, and fiber system and its relationships to natural resources.

#### **Sec. 297 GENERAL AUTHORITY.**

**(a) Authorization of Assistance—Section 297(a)** To carry out the purposes of this title, the President is authorized to provide assistance on such terms and conditions as he shall determine --

(1) to implement program components through United States universities as authorized by paragraphs (2) through (5) of this subsection;

(2) to build and strengthen the institutional capacity and human resource skills of agriculturally developing countries so that these countries may participate more fully in the international agricultural problem-solving effort and to introduce and adapt new solutions to local circumstances;

(3) to provide long-term program support for United States university global agricultural and related environmental collaborative research and learning opportunities for students, teachers, extension specialists, researchers, and the general public;

(4) to involve United States universities more fully in the international network of agricultural science, including the international agricultural research centers, the activities of international organizations such as the United Nations Development Program and the Food and Agriculture Organization, multilateral banks, the institutions of agriculturally developing nations, and United States and foreign nongovernmental organizations supporting extension and other productivity-enhancing programs; and

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

**(b) Requirements—Section 297(b)** Programs under this title shall be carried out so as to—

(1) utilize and strengthen the capabilities of United States universities with public and private partners of universities in--  
(A) developing capacity in the cooperating nation for classroom teaching in agriculture, plant and animal sciences, human nutrition, and vocational and domestic arts and other relevant fields appropriate to local needs;

(B) agricultural research to be conducted in the cooperating nations, at international agricultural research centers, or in the United States;

(C) the planning, initiation, and development of extension services through which information concerning agriculture, environment, and related subjects will be made available directly to agriculturists in the agriculturally developing nations by means of education and demonstration; or

(D) the exchange of educators, scientists and students for the purpose of assisting in successful development in the cooperating nations;

(2) take into account the value to United States agriculture of such programs, integrating to the extent practicable the programs and financing authorized under this title with those supported by other Federal or State resources including resources of the private sector so as to maximize the contribution to the development of agriculture in the United States and in agriculturally developing nations; and

(3) whenever practicable, build on existing programs and institutions including those of the universities, the Department of Agriculture, State agricultural agencies, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Food and Drug Administration, other appropriate Federal agencies, and appropriate nongovernmental and business organizations.

**(c) Further Requirements—Section 297(c)** To the maximum extent practicable, activities under this section shall—

(1) be directly related to the food and agricultural needs of developing countries;

(2) focus primarily on the needs of agricultural producers, rural families, processors, traders, consumers, and natural

resources managers;

(3) be adapted to local circumstances; and

(4) be carried out within the developing countries and transition countries comprising newly emerging democracies and newly liberalized economies;

(5) emphasize the improvement of local systems for delivering the best available knowledge to the small farmers of such countries.

**(d)** The President shall exercise his authority under this section through the Administrator.

**(e) Special Programs** The Administrator shall establish and carry out special programs under this title as part of ongoing programs for child survival, democratization, development of free enterprise, environmental and natural resource management, and other related programs.

**Section 298 BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT.—(a)**

**Establishment—Section 298(a)** To assist in the administration of the programs authorized by this title, the President shall establish a permanent Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Board") consisting of seven members, not less than four to be selected from the universities. Terms of members shall be set by the President at the time of appointment. Members of the Board shall be entitled to such reimbursement for expenses incurred in the performance of their duties (including per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from their homes or regular place of business) as the President deems appropriate on a case-by-case basis.

**(b) General Areas of Responsibility of the Board—Section 298(a)** The Board's general areas of responsibility shall include, participating in the planning, development, and implementation of, initiating recommendations for, and monitoring, the activities described in section 297 of this title.

**(c) Duties of the Board—Section 298(c)** The Board's duties shall include, but not necessarily be limited to—

(1) participating in the formulation of basic policy, procedures, and criteria for project proposal review, selection, and monitoring;

(2) developing and keeping current a roster of universities—

(A) interested in exploring their potential for collaborative relationships with agricultural institutions, and with scientists working on significant programs designed to improve agricultural production, trade, and natural resource management in developing countries, and with private organizations seeking to increase agricultural production and trade, natural resources management, and household food security in developing and transition countries;

(B) having capacity in the agricultural, environmental, and related social sciences,

(C) able to maintain an appropriate balance of teaching, research, and extension functions,

(D) having capacity, experience, and commitment with respect to international agricultural efforts, and

(E) able to contribute to solving the problems addressed by this title;

(3) recommending which developing nations could benefit from programs carried out under this title, and identifying those nations which have an interest in establishing or developing agricultural institutions which engage in teaching, research, or extension activities.

(4) reviewing and evaluating memorandums of understanding or other documents that detail the terms and conditions between the Administrator and universities and their partners participating in programs under this title;

(5) reviewing and evaluating agreements and activities authorized by this title and undertaken by universities and public and private partners of universities to assure compliance with the proposes of this title;

(6) recommending to the Administrator the apportionment of funds under section 297 of this title;

(7) assessing the impact of programs carried out under this title in solving agricultural problems and natural resource issues in the developing nations, assuring efficiency in use of Federal resources, including in accordance with the Governmental Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-62; 107 Stat. 285), and the amendments made by that Act;

(8) developing information exchanges and consulting regularly with nongovernmental organizations, consumer groups, producers, agribusinesses and associations, agricultural cooperatives and commodity groups, State departments of agriculture, State agricultural research and extension agencies, and academic institutions;

(9) investigating and resolving issues concerning implementation of this title as requested by universities; and

(10) advising the Administrator on any and all issues as requested.

**(d) Subordinate Units—Section 298(d)** The President may authorized the Board to create such subordinate units as may

be necessary for the performance of its duties, including but not limited to the following:

(1) a Joint Policy Committee to participate in the design and development of the collaborative activities described in section 297; and

(2) a Joint Operations Committee which shall assist in and advise on the mechanisms and processes for implementation of activities described in section 297.

(e) In addition to any other functions assigned to and agreed to by the Board, the Board shall be consulted in the preparation of the annual report required by section 300 of this title and on other agricultural development activities related to programs under this title.

**Sec. 299 AUTHORIZATION—(a)** The President is authorized to use any of the funds hereafter made available under section 103 of this Act to carry out the purposes of this title. Funds made available for such purposes may be used without regard to the provisions of sections 110(b) and 211(d) of this Act.

(b) Foreign currencies owned by the United States and determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be excess to the needs of the United States shall be used to the maximum extent possible in lieu of dollars in carrying out the provisions of this title.

(c) Assistance authorized under this title shall be in addition to any allotments or grants that may be made under other authorizations.

(d) Universities may accept and expend funds from other sources, public and private, in order to carry out the purposes of this title. All such funds, both prospective and in hand, shall be periodically disclosed to the Administrator as he shall the regulations require, but not less often than in an annual report.

**Sec. 300 ANNUAL REPORT.** The President shall transmit to the Congress, not later than September 1 of each year, a report detailing the activities carried out pursuant to this title during the preceding fiscal year and containing a projection of programs and activities to be conducted during the subsequent five fiscal years. Each report shall contain a summary of the activities of the Board established pursuant to section 298 of this title and may include the separate views of the Board with respect to any aspect of the programs conducted or proposed to be conducted under this title.

## Annex 3: The BIFAD Charter

### Article I. Board's official designation:

Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (henceforth referred to as the "Board").

### Article II. Board's objectives and scope of activity:

The primary mission of the Board is to advise and assist the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) with regard to programs and activities relating to agriculture and food security as set forth in Title XII of Chapter 2 of Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act 1961, as amended.

### Article III. Board membership and appointments:

The Board shall consist of seven members appointed by the President, not less than a majority of whom shall be selected from the universities as defined by Section 296(d) of Title XII. Terms of the members shall be established by the President at the time of appointment, as provided by Section 298(a) of Title XII.

### Article IV. Period of time necessary for the Board to carry out its purpose:

Indefinite; Section 298 of Title XII provides for a permanent Board.

### Article V. Agency and official to whom the Board reports:

The Board shall report to the Administrator of USAID, and (as provided in Section 300 of Title XII) to the Congress.

### Article VI. Agency responsible for providing necessary support for the Board:

USAID.

### Article VII. Description of duties for which the Board is responsible:

In discharging its duties, the Board will:

- A. consult with, provide information to, and furnish advice to the Administrator of USAID on all aspects of programs included under Title XII and on such other matters as directed by the Administrator.
- B. provide universities with information on USAID programs and activities that may be of interest to the university community.
- C. participate (on a selective basis) in the development and implementation of USAID policies that affect programs and projects in which US universities are or could be involved.

### Article VIII. Subordinate units:

The Board is authorized to create such subordinate units as may be necessary for the performance of its duties and the discharge of its responsibilities.

USAID provides support services to the Board's subordinate units, subject to availability.

### Article IX. Estimated cost of the Board

Work Years	Dollars	Staff Total
1.0	\$250,000	1.0

### Article X. Estimated number and frequency of meetings:

The Board will meet at least twice a year.

### Article XI. Records Availability:

The records, reports, minutes, agenda or other documentation of the Board shall be made available in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, and other applicable laws and regulations.

**Article XII. Charter amendment:**

The Board may amend the Charter as necessary, consistent with applicable laws and regulations with the approval of the Administrator of USAID.

**Article XIII. Date filed:**

---

Andrew Natsios  
Administrator

Date: Sept. 23, 2004

## Annex 4: The SPARE Charter

[Approved by BIFAD on October 13, 2004; awaiting approval from USAID]

### Revised Charter

#### STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION (SPARE)

##### Preamble

The Board For International Food And Agricultural Development (“BIFAD”), established under Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as amended) to advise the United States Agency for International Development (“USAID” or the “Agency”) under the Title XII program, will be better able to do its work if it can draw upon strategic and operational analyses on critical issues identified by the Board. In particular, there is need for identifying, conceptualizing approaches to, and monitoring long term research and development priorities as well as the implementation of ongoing collaborative work undertaken under the broadened goals of the recent Title XII amendment, the Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Improvement Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-373).

In support of USAID Automated Directives System Chapter 216, BIFAD and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (“NASULGC”), an initiative is needed to strengthen the NASULGC partnership with USAID, bring in new partner-members as appropriate for the implementation of Title XII, and permit more effective deliberations in BIFAD. Membership of this strengthened partnership will include staff from USAID, the university community, and public and private partners of the Agency/University Community.

##### Article I. Partnership's Official Designation

The partnership is designated the Strategic Partnership for Agricultural Research and Education (“spare” or “The Partnership”). SPARE is a sub-committee of BIFAD and functions in partnership with NASULGC's Board on Agriculture Assembly (“BOAA”). It responds to requests of BIFAD, and reports its deliberations and recommendations to BIFAD and the BOAA. Only BIFAD will convey, as it deems appropriate, recommendations of SPARE to the Agency for review and action.

##### Article II. Objectives and Scope of Activities

The prime objectives of SPARE are (1) to mobilize all partners in discussion and/or analysis of issues put to it by the BIFAD within SPARE's area of responsibility; and (2) to provide clear recommendations for action to BIFAD as appropriate. Preliminary results of SPARE deliberations may, therefore, also be shared with NASULGC, USAID, private sector, and BIFAD as appropriate, to assure full discussion and review, prior to their presentation to BIFAD. The scope of the Partnership's activities include food security, agricultural modernization, nutrition, rural development, natural resources, food systems, agribusiness, agricultural trade, intellectual property rights, agricultural sustainability, and related sub-sectors of the Agency's agricultural portfolio.

BIFAD will provide guidance and direction to the SPARE, soliciting ideas for SPARE activities from USAID, NASULGC, and the private sector as appropriate. At BIFAD's direction, for example, SPARE may review ongoing Agency activities in the agricultural, natural resources, nutrition, food systems and related sectors, and provide reports on those reviews. Similarly, BIFAD may request SPARE to organize broader consultations on other donors' activities and approaches or to undertake a specific study of one subject.

##### Article III. Duties and Functions

The duties and functions of SPARE include:

- A. Defining emerging priority issues in the Partnership's areas of purview for BIFAD consideration and possible follow-on Agency and university action.
- B. Monitoring the performance of Agency agriculture science and technology activities under the Partnership's purview and reporting the results of these reviews to BIFAD.
- C. Making recommendations to BIFAD on funding levels based on past performance and Agency priorities.
- D. Providing information to BIFAD and NASULGC's BOAA on the objectives and results of the university-USAID partnership.

- E. Appointing ad hoc task forces to study and make recommendations to SPARE on specific issues under the Partnership's purview; the results of studies conducted by such task forces shall be discussed by SPARE and, as appropriate, recommendations shall be forwarded to BIFAD for consideration and action in accordance with standard procedures stated in this Charter.

In all cases, the duties and functions of SPARE shall be limited to responding to requests of BIFAD and reporting deliberations and recommendations to BIFAD and the BOAA in accordance with Articles I and VII. BIFAD may, at its discretion, make additional requests of SPARE as deemed necessary.

#### **Article IV. Organization and Operation**

SPARE members will select a chair and a vice chair (from among the eight appointed members of SPARE) each for a three year term. These selections shall be subject to confirmation by the Chair of BIFAD. It is anticipated that the chair will generally be from the university community and the vice chair from among general SPARE membership. A SPARE Executive Committee will be established consisting of the SPARE chair, the vice chair, the chair(s) of all ongoing task force(s), and, ex-officio, the SPARE Secretariat.

The responsibility of the Executive Committee is to:

- Set Agendas for SPARE meetings
- Work with BIFAD/BOAA leadership to identify priority issues for SPARE's consideration
- Interact with stakeholders to identify concerns and issues for SPARE's consideration
- Communicate with the BIFAD and the BOAA on SPARE deliberations.

The quorum for SPARE requires 5 members.

The Agency will pay the costs of its own members and BIFAD will pay the costs of all other members associated with attending meetings (i.e., travel, per diem, etc.). For the Agency, and subject to the availability of funds for this purpose, the total annual estimated cost of SPARE is .2 staff work-year for the SPARE Secretariat and \$25,000 for support of the expenses of Agency members to participate in SPARE meetings. Mutual agreement between BIFAD and the Agency for International Development will be reached in determining annual budget support levels needed by SPARE.

The location for meetings will be decided by the chair of SPARE in consultation with the Executive Committee. It will be advantageous to hold periodic meetings outside of Washington, D.C. with the hosting institution bearing meeting costs (other than those costs described immediately above). An Agency staff member will function as the Secretariat for SPARE. The agendas for SPARE meetings will be publicly available 10 business days prior to the meeting date and minutes for each SPARE meeting broadly disseminated within one month of each meeting to all constituent groups.

#### **Article V. Membership**

SPARE will consist of eight members: four chosen from the universities, three chosen from the Agency, and one chosen from university private sector partners.

As for the members chosen from the universities, the Chair of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly will recommend two candidates for each of three seats from the Land Grant System. The Chair of BIFAD will select and appoint one member from the two names for each such seat and will also select and appoint one member from the university community outside the Land Grant System.

As for the members chosen from the Agency, the Administrator of the Agency will recommend and appoint three members.

As for the member chosen from university private partners, the Chair of BIFAD will recommend and appoint a member.

The term of membership will be for three years. A second three-year term is permissible. Terms will be staggered so that only one-third expire in any one year. Members are serving in a representative capacity and, therefore, are not subject to conflict of interest and financial disclosure statutes and regulations.

The Chair of BIFAD and the Chair of BOAA will each appoint an observer from among their membership. The observers will attend the meetings of SPARE and will keep the members of BIFAD and the BOAA apprised of SPARE activities.

**Article VI. Period of Operation**

Indefinite

**Article VII. To Whom the Partnership Reports**

SPARE reports its deliberations and recommendations to the BIFAD and the Board on Agriculture Assembly of NASULGC through the International Agriculture Section of the Board. Each of these organizations will provide an opportunity for a SPARE report at their regularly scheduled meetings. A member of the SPARE Executive Committee will be tasked to provide the report. Actionable items will be taken forward to the Agency at the discretion of BIFAD.

**Article VIII. Subordinate Units**

The Partnership is authorized to create such subordinate ad hoc units as may be necessary for the performance of its duties and the discharge of its responsibilities. These units (Task Forces) will be for specific functions and will expire after specific time periods. Membership of subordinate units can be made up of SPARE or non-SPARE experts chosen to provide the capabilities needed to fulfill the assignments given to the unit. A SPARE member will chair all such units.

**Article IX. Estimated Frequency of Meetings**

SPARE will meet quarterly, with additional meetings at the discretion of the SPARE Chair, or the Chair of BIFAD.

**Article X. Charter Amendments**

The Charter of the Partnership may be amended after review by BIFAD and with the approval of the Administrator of USAID. The Chair of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly shall be consulted in the review process.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Approved

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Disapproved

Annex 5: The CRSP Council Bylaws

## Annex 6: Guidance on Internal CRSP Policies and Procedures

Each CRSP Management Entity (ME), in consultation with its partners and researchers, should develop a Policy and Procedures (P&P) manual. This manual will provide a detailed description of the policies and of the procedures the CRSP will follow in carrying out its various activities. The drafting of the manual can draw on those already published by other CRSPs, many of which are available on individual CRSP websites. The suggestions in this appendix are modeled after some of the existing P&P manuals, and include as well recommendations drawn from Administrative Management Reviews (AMR).<sup>37</sup>

### Rationale

Since CRSPs involve many participating institutions, both in the US and in other countries, these partners need a common reference they can access for information about how to carry out their activities. The P&P manual provides that common base. It gives participants the information they need to fulfill their obligations as members of the CRSP. It also provides the framework for transparency in CRSP management. Through the policies and procedures documented in the manual, all of the participating and nonparticipating institutions and scientists have an opportunity to see the principles by which decisions are made and activities implemented. As described below (see suggested table of contents), the manual will include information about the selection and structure of a CRSP's advisory groups, their bylaws, as well as copies of useful forms and detailed guidance for developing workplans, budgets, reporting, and travel.

The P&P manual of each CRSP should be available both in hard copy and posted on the CRSP's website for easy access by CRSP participants and others. The P&P manual should be reviewed and updated at least once per year or whenever changes are instituted.

### Contents

The following section offers suggestions for the content of a P&P manual. These are suggestions only, as each CRSP will have specific needs and purposes to achieve in its P&P manual, and there will likely be substantial differences between the P&P manuals of different CRSPs. The topics mentioned and the order in which they are presented are illustrative, as the final format and contents will be determined at the discretion of the CRSP's Management Office.

The title page might contain the name of the CRSP, title of the document (policy and procedures manual), the date of last revision, and contact information, including the name of the CRSP director, the CRSP website and physical addresses, as well as phone and email information for the management office.

---

<sup>37</sup> The findings and summaries of AMRs conducted from 2000-2003 may be found in a report prepared for USAID by Raymond J. Miller and Deborah S. Rubin, "Effective Management for Collaborative Research Support Programs: Issues and Opportunities" (November 2003), [USDA/ARS PO 43-K06-3-0669].

## Illustrative Table of Contents

1. Acronyms
2. Background
3. Program Introduction
4. Program Management
  - A. Organizational Structure
    - i. Management Entity
    - ii. Management Office
      - iii. Cognizant Technical Officer
  - B. Advisory Boards or committees
    - i. Board of Directors
      - ii. Technical Committee (TC)
      - iii. External Evaluation
4. List of Projects and Principal Investigators
5. Policies and Operating Procedures
  - A. Project Design and Implementation
    - i. Structure of Projects
    - ii. Memoranda of Understanding
    - iii. Subgrants
    - iv. Creating new projects
    - v. Adding, deleting or substituting a US or HC Institution
    - vi. Change of Principal Investigator
      - B. Work Plans
        - i. Work plan development, cycle and budget
        - ii. Work plan change
        - iii. Reporting
          - iv. Internet and web usage for project and program
  - C. Funding Cycle
  - D. Budgets
  - E. Accounting and Reporting
  - F. Equipment Acquisitions and Inventory
  - F. Travel
  - G. Participant Training
- Appendices

## A. Background

This section might include a brief discussion of the CRSPs in general, as exemplified in the following two paragraphs:

The Title XII amendments in 1975 to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 were intended to strengthen the capacity of US Land Grant and other eligible universities in agriculture, by providing long term support to solve food problems of developing countries and to develop their agricultural systems. Title XII authorized program support to collaborative university research that built a foundation for developing USAID-funded programs that included the Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP), a joint USAID/US university program, and funding for international research entities (such as the Collaborative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) system).<sup>38</sup> Neither the 1975 legislation nor the 2000 amendment actually identify or name the CRSP or the CGIAR as a specific program. As a result of the 1975 amendment USAID created BIFAD and working with BIFAD developed and implemented the CRSP program. Currently there are nine CRSPs operating; Global Livestock, Bean/Cowpea, INTSORMIL (Sorghum/Millet), Peanuts, BASIS (Economics and Policy), Pond Dynamics/Aquaculture, IPM (Integrated Pest Management), Soil Management, and SANREM (Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resources).

CRSPs are collaborative agricultural and natural resource research programs between US universities and institutions and universities and institutions in developing countries. There is a lead US university, a Management Entity, and several collaborating US universities and institutions that in turn collaborate with similar institutions in developing countries. There will usually be several institutions in two or more USAID regions of the world. Most of the CRSP assistance agreements are for five year time periods that can be extended or renewed for another five years.

## B. Program Introduction

This section might include an introduction to the specific CRSP. This could include information on the origin of the CRSP, its status, objectives, strategy, contract number, and the purpose and authority of the P&P manual. Some of the CRSPs have half a page of introduction and some have two or more pages.

## C. Program Management

Since many people are unfamiliar with CRSPs and their collaborative management it is important that this section describe in enough detail and in a clear way how CRSPs are managed and what role the role and responsibility of each entity is.

---

<sup>38</sup> Title XII was reauthorized in 2000 with broadened definitions of agriculture and areas of operation, and a renewed commitment to supporting long term programs in the creation of new knowledge and the solution of agricultural development problems at home and abroad.

## ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

### Management Entity

This section might include a brief statement of the ME's legal status and a brief description of its responsibilities.

### Management Office

This section describes the role, responsibility, and function of the MO and the Program Director (PD). A brief discussion of the PD's activities might be given. In this section and other sections, where appropriate, sections of the CRSP Guidelines could be referenced.

### Cognizant Technical Officer

USAID will have a Cognizant Technical Officer assigned to each CRSP. This section might explain the role and function of the CTO.

### Advisory Boards or Committees

Since each CRSP has a number of US universities and HC institutions as collaborators, and since these are multi-year programs working in various parts of the world with different cultures and issues it is critical that each CRSP have a well functioning, transparent and impartial advisory system that is clearly defined for all parties. The CRSP guidelines suggest various advisory bodies. Each CRSP should develop the system that is most appropriate for its situation and as a result there should be and will be differences amongst the CRSPs. But the advisory system should be developed to provide the program with well thought out, impartial advice that should be provided in a clear, transparent way. The CRSP in turn is responsible for reporting the advice it receives to all members of the CRSP and other interested bodies. The MO must also report what its resultant action will be and have been. If those actions differ from the advice received they must be justified to the CRSP board. Guidance on potential conflicts of interests may be included as well.

### Policy and Program Guidance

Each CRSP may have a Policy and Program Guidance board that provides advice on the operation and function of that CRSP. The composition of the board may vary depending on the function and role it is to fill. The name of this advisory group may also differ depending on its role. This group should be composed of impartial members who are familiar with aspects of the CRSP, the countries it works in (or might in the future), the technical and socioeconomic problems of developing countries, or other aspects important to the functioning of that CRSP. The board is to operate under a set of bylaws that are developed to fulfill its role. These should include the size of the board, terms of office, how members are selected and appointed, their role, how vacancies are filled, meeting frequencies, payment of expenses and honoraria if appropriate, how the chair and vice chair are selected and terms of office, size of a quorum, how various meeting types (e.g., conference calls and video conferencing) are used, and other appropriate information.

A copy of the bylaws should be included as an appendix.

### Technical Oversight Committee

Each CRSP should have some system for providing a technical overview of the program. This would include what the issues are in the developing countries and which of those the CRSP should address, which projects to approve, what each project's status is each year, its accomplishments and if they are in line with the objectives and resources, how well the project is being conducted and how well it is using the funds. If the technical function is to be filled by the governing body that role should be included in its bylaws. If there is a separate technical committee then it should have a set of bylaws that would include membership, terms of office, how selected and appointed, role and operation procedures, meeting frequency, how expenses are paid, reporting procedures and other appropriate matters. It is also important that the TC operates in an unbiased way and that the good of the program is the driving force rather than the individual project. The bylaws should be included as an appendix.

### External Evaluation

With any technical program it is important to conduct a periodic outside expert evaluation. Since the CRSPs are usually operating under five year agreements, the guidelines recommend an in-depth review, usually in the third program year and a paper review in the fifth year. The P&P manual should outline how the evaluation panel is selected and appointed, how its charge is developed, reporting procedures, project inputs, how expenses are to be paid and other pertinent information.

## **Projects**

The CRSP may want to have a list or statement about the various projects in the program and identify the Principal Investigator and his or her contact information.

### **Structure of Projects**

Each CRSP is to have a Global Plan that it follows in project design, implementation and operation. This Global plan should be outlined and a copy appended. Since the MO is responsible for the overall program the actual research is carried out through projects conducted by scientists at the ME university or other US universities and institutions in collaboration with HC scientists and institutions. How these are structured and carried out should be described in this section. For example the individual PIs may be responsible for project and country coordination, or there may be subject matter coordinators or country or regional coordinators. This should be described and how the operation conducted be explained.

### **Memoranda of Understanding**

There are to be Memoranda of Understanding between the CRSP and each of the HC that the CRSP is working in. These are to be developed by the CRSP and then individual projects use those MOU as the enabling documents. There may be additional MOUs between the US universities and the HC institutions and between the ME and the US universities. Whether or not there are additional MOUs will depend on the country, and the individual university, or institutional requirements. An example MOU between the CRSP and a HC and a possible institutional MOU should be included in the appendices.

### **Subgrants**

The ME usually spends the project funds through the implementing US institutions by issuing subgrants to each lead institution. The subgrants will normally identify the conditions of the subcontract and identify any conditions in the USAID agreement that the subcontractor has to abide by, such as matching funds, reporting etc. The subgrant is an agreement between the ME and the implementing institution not between the PD and the PI. The PD and PI are the implementing principals. Usually a copy of the master agreement between the ME and USAID are provided with the subgrant. Most subgrants are for the operating budget year and funds are usually dispersed to the subgrantee once per year. The subgrant procedure may vary by ME. What the procedure is and who is responsible for the various steps should be identified.

### **Developing New Projects**

Different CRSPs operate on varying lengths of project years. Some use a three and others a five-year cycle. At the end of that period some CRSPs will advertise a project competition and some will not, therefore the process for how new projects are initiated needs to be described. Clear explanations about this process are an important component of transparency. Copies of the required forms should be included in an appendix.

### **Adding, Deleting or Substituting A US or HC Institution**

It is hoped, but it is not always the case, that project completion and evaluation will lead to an orderly and clear change or addition of institutions. This section of the manual should explain what conditions might required a change, what the criteria are for instituting a change, and how these changes are made. If the procedures are different for US and HC Institutions, those differences need to be identified.

### **Change of Principal Investigator**

When a PI from either a US or HC institution ends her/his role with a CRSP project, there should be an explanation of the process of how a new PI is selected and is approved to be a participant in the CRSP. There should also be an explanation of what process is to be used if a PI moves to another institution and requests to move the CRSP project to that new institution.

## **WORK PLANS**

### **Work Plan Development, Cycle, and Budget**

Each CRSP will have its own work plan cycle and requirements. This section identifies work plan requirements, cycle dates and duration, the form or format to be used (if there are forms, a copy should be appended), what budget

information is required and when, who reviews the material and what process is used, who submits the material and to whom, and any other pertinent information.

### **Work Plan Changes**

If for some reason the work plan needs to be changed during a work plan cycle, the procedure for change approval should be provided along with what any justification that might be required.

### **Reporting**

An important part of any project is the reporting of results and progress. This section includes a description of reporting requirements, when reports are due and to whom, what format or forms are to be used (if forms are to be used, a copy should be appended), who is responsible of report submission, what work and time period is to be reported, etc.

### **Internet and Web Usage for Projects and Program**

The use of both the internet and web sites is still relatively new for project and program reporting, report preparation, project updates, etc. This is particularly true for some parts of the world that might still have limited internet access. Some of the CRSPs have used the internet to reduce travel and increase timeliness. This section might include a brief description of how these means of communication are to be used.

## **FUNDING CYCLE**

Each CRSP will have a specific funding cycle depending on when the agreement between USAID and the ME is signed and the conditions specified in the agreement. This section might include the beginning and ending date of the program and any specific information the participants should know about funding that are included in the agreement. This section also includes information of the process the ME will use in allocating funds to subgranting institutions and what those subgranting institutions responsibilities are. For example when and how the ME will notify the subgrants of when USAID has approved funding for the subsequent year and how and when new subgrants will be executed.

### **Budgets**

What information is needed in the budgets to be submitted for funding, what budget lines are to be used and how much detail is required (such as number of trips and to where is needed), is only the immediate years budget needed, to whom is it submitted, do matching funds needed to be identified and in what amount, etc.

### **Accounting and Reporting**

This section might include how often the subgrantee can submit payment requests and how often they must submit requisitions, who are they submitted to, what detail is required, are these requirements the same for expenses incurred by US and HC institutions and if not what are the differences, what format is to be used, are there special reporting requirements due to HC participation (such as the funds spent in the US on behalf of the HC or funds spent in the HC), do matching funds need to be shown, etc.

### **Equipment Acquisitions and Inventory**

USAID has some requirements for major equipment purchases these should be stated, when are major acquisitions requests to be made and how, what is the approval process, how are deviations approved, what are the purchase amounts that need USAID approval, are there other equipment purchases that need the CRSP program approval, if so what are they and the process to be followed, what equipment can be included in yearly budgets, etc.

### **Travel**

Each CRSP program and its projects require both domestic and international travel. There are often specific types of approval needed for the travel depending on the country, purpose, and who will be traveling. For example, for some travel USAID approval or notification may be required; in some cases the PD needs to provide approval, and in others only the PI authorizes the travel. The various requirements need to be identified along with the time requirements including what reports are required. If travel approval forms are required copies should be appended.

### **Participant Training**

Each CRSP is to have a Training Plan; a copy of the plan should be appended to the P&P manual. This section might include the types of training to be conducted under the CRSP, what approval, if any, is needed, how trainees for each

type of training are to be selected and by whom, how the different types of trainees are to be paid, if they are, are individual projects to pay for training or is this a MO responsibility, how are project specific training needs versus CRSP program needs to be identified and met, etc.

### **Appendices**

This section includes copies of any committee bylaws and any forms that are to be used. The following is a possible list of such inclusions: advisory body bylaws, work plan forma, work plan change outline, international travel request form, equipment purchase form, travel report form, report form, etc.

## Annex 7: A Brief History of the CRSPs and the CRSP Guidelines

The CRSPs were made possible through passage of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975. Section 297(a) of the Title XII of that act authorized the President to “provide program support for long-term collaborative university research on food production and distribution, storage, marketing, and consumption.” It did not, however, anywhere explicitly name the CRSPs as a unique program. Planning for the CRSPs began in 1977 and the first CRSP (Small Ruminant CRSP) was initiated in 1978.

The CRSP Guidelines are advisory only and have no legal standing. They reflect proven patterns of management and operation, but ultimately, the operating regulations for each CRSP is governed by its assistance documents.

The Guidelines were first developed in 1977 and amended at various times:

- In 1977, by the (former) Joint Research Committee (JRC) (October 11)
- In 1979, by the JRC (October 10) to “clarify the role of USDA and the 25 percent matching requirement, and to accommodate the General Counsel’s concern regarding the process of selecting participants.”
- In 1984, by the Joint Committee on Agriculture Research and Development (JCARD) (October 11), and were adopted by USAID in October 1985.
- In 1989 (October 30/November 2), concerning changes to the CRSP ME, for adding, deleting, and substituting institutions, and to permit extensions of CRSPs (after the initial grant period) of up to five years, under certain conditions

In August 2000, a sub-committee of BIFAD completing a complete overhaul of the CRSP guidelines, but these were not been formally approved by USAID’s legal office.

In 2004, an updated version of the guidelines was contracted to address changes stemming from the reauthorization of the Title XII legislation in 2000 as well as changes in the organizational structure and agricultural strategy in USAID.

### Compendium of USAID CRSP Programs<sup>39</sup>

CRSP	Management Entity	Date Initiated	Authorized Until
<b>IPM</b>	Virginia Tech	2004	Sept 2009
<b>SANREM</b>	Virginia Tech	2004	Sept 2009
<b>Global Livestock</b>	University of California, Davis	1998	Sept 2008
<b>Soil Management</b>	University of Hawaii, Manoa	1997	Sept 2007
<b>BASIS</b>	University of Wisconsin	1996	Sept 2006
<i>IPM</i>	<i>Virginia Tech</i>	<i>1993</i>	<i>Dec 2006<sup>40</sup></i>
<i>SANREM</i>	<i>University of Georgia</i>	<i>1992</i>	<i>Mar 2005</i>
<i>Fisheries Stock Assessment</i>	<i>University of Maryland</i>	<i>1985</i>	<i>June 1994</i>
<b>Aquaculture<sup>41</sup></b>	Oregon State University	1982	July 2006
<i>Nutrition</i>	<i>Purdue University</i>	<i>1982</i>	<i>1991</i>
<b>Peanut</b>	University of Georgia	1982	July 2006
<i>Soil Management</i>	<i>North Carolina State University</i>	<i>1981</i>	<i>1996</i>
<b>Bean/Cowpea</b>	Michigan State University	1980	Sept 2007
<b>INTSORMIL</b>	University of Nebraska	1979	June 2006
<i>Small Ruminants</i>	<i>University of California, Davis</i>	<i>1978</i>	<i>Sept 1998</i>

<sup>39</sup> Current CRSPs are in bold; closed CRSPs are in italics.

<sup>40</sup> A no-cost extension was granted to allow for the completion of training until 2006.

<sup>41</sup> Until September 1, 2004, this CRSP was called the Pond Dynamics/Aquaculture CRSP.

## Annex 8: Responsibilities of the Cognizant Technical Officer in the Administration of Assistance Instruments<sup>42</sup>

1. The Cognizant Technical Officer is responsible for ensuring that USAID exercises prudent management over assistance funds by:
2. Preparing competitive announcements or writing a justification for an exception to competition in accordance with this Chapter;
3. Conducting the process of technical selection of recipients, including performing a past performance review and conducting a cost realism analysis;
4. Determining if the applicant's Program Description is responsive to a published USAID competitive notice or is otherwise in keeping with established USAID Strategic Objectives;
5. Recommending the expected level of cost-sharing in accordance with specific program requirement and 303.5.10;
6. Processing all necessary internal USAID authorization papers to request that the Agreement Officer consider awarding a grant or cooperative agreement to a selected applicant;
7. Assisting the Agreement Officer in determining the potential recipient's level of technical and managerial competence;
8. Monitoring and evaluating the recipient and the recipient's performance during the award in order to facilitate the attainment of program objectives by:
  - Maintaining contact including site visits and liaison with the recipient;
  - Reviewing and analyzing all performance and financial reports;
  - Assuring compliance with the terms and conditions of the award;
  - Carrying out all responsibilities as delegated by the Agreement Officer in the Schedule of the award or noted under the "Substantial Involvement" section of Cooperative Agreements; promptly notifying the Agreement Officer of any developments which could have a significant impact on the award;
  - Preparing internal documents to support amendments to the award;
9. Evaluating the recipient's program effectiveness at the end of the program and submitting a final report to the Agreement Officer.

### ADMINISTRATION OF AWARDS

Award administration encompasses all dealings between USAID officials and the recipient from the time the award is made until the end of USAID support. The specific nature and extent of administration will vary from award to award in the normal exercise of Federal stewardship responsibilities. It can range from reviewing and analyzing performance reports, performing site visits to a more technically developed substantial involvement by USAID under a cooperative agreement.

Oversight of Assistance award is shared between the Cognizant Technical Officer and the Agreement Officer. While there is a clear division of responsibility the functions are closely related and cannot be performed in isolation from each other.

Awards to US organizations shall be subject to 22 CFR 226 and the Standard Provisions for US Nongovernmental Grantees; awards to non-US organizations shall be subject to the Mandatory and Optional Standard Provisions for Non-US organizations (See ADS 303).

---

<sup>42</sup> Excerpted from the "Guidebook for Managers and Cognizant Technical Officers on Acquisition and Assistance" (1998), Washington, D.C.: USAID. Chapter IX, "Administration of Assistance Instruments" (Section B: pages 63-66). (<http://www.USAID.gov/policy/ads/600/refindx6.htm#G3026s1.pdf>)

Agreement Officers shall serve as the mandatory control point of record for all official communication that would constitute an amendment to the award. Agreement Officers shall receive copies of all performance and financial status reports, as appropriate. Cognizant Technical Officers shall be responsible for reviewing all performance and financial reports for adequacy and responsiveness and shall request the Agreement Officer take necessary action where reports are not received, are determined to be inadequate, or a problem is apparent. It is essential that the Cognizant Technical Officer and Agreement Officer work as a team in order to effectively administer assistance instruments.

The Cognizant Technical Officer should maintain close contact with the Agreement Officer to keep that Officer up-to-date on recipient performance and submit copies of status reports as required by the Mission Director or Bureau DAA to the Agreement Officer.

The Agreement Officer (AO) shall provide for the continuing oversight of the financial management aspects of the award through reviews of reports, correspondence, site visits or other appropriate means. When deemed necessary the AO shall request or arrange for special audits.

Post-award orientation with the Recipient and Technical Officer is encouraged to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the USAID officials who will administer the award. If specific authority is being delegated to the Technical Officer, it shall be so stated in the Schedule of the Award.

Site visits are an important part of effective award management. Joint site visits by the Agreement Officer and the Technical Officer are encouraged, since they can often be more effective review of the project. As soon as possible after each visit a brief report should be prepared highlighting the findings. A copy of each report shall be placed in the official award file.



Photo by Bean/Cowpea CRSP

Cowpea breeders in Burkina Faso

The Cognizant Technical Officer is responsible for preparing internal USAID documentation to the satisfaction of the Agreement Officer to support amendments to the award.

The Agreement Officer shall determine that the award does not contain administrative approvals which are in conflict with the stated regulations and policies. The Agreement Officer shall be responsible for all award suspension and termination actions.



This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.



U.S. Agency for International Development  
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20523  
Tel: (202) 712-0000  
Fax: (202) 216-3524  
[www.usaid.gov](http://www.usaid.gov)