

FOREWORD

9/11: LINKING NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

**By Dr. Montague W. Denment**  
**Director, Global Livestock CRSP**

One can not comment on our year's activities without discussing the implications of the events of September 11 for the country's international perspective especially with regard to development assistance. While Americans as a people have benefited almost unconsciously from the economics of globalization, we now have suffered quite deliberately from the globalization of terrorism. The country is now focused internationally as it has not been since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Let me state up front that in my discussion of these issues I am in no way attempting to justify or rationalize terrorist acts but wish to understand their causes as a means to make our world more secure and just. The first reactions and discussions that have permeated our lives over these months have been focused on direct action against Al Qaeda. However with time, more fundamental issues are being raised about the nature of US interactions with the developing world. Universities are seeing remarkable increases in enrollment in courses related to Islam and the Middle East. The press is scouring our institutions for scant capacity in expertise related to events of 9/11. In this short period Americans are beginning to realize how little they understand of that part of the world and how poorly connected we are to events in the region.

In the last decade as the world leader, the US has neglected its responsibility to uplift the poor. We have diminished or abandoned much of our positive foreign engagement that addresses

the global issues of the poor. Our foreign assistance budget is small (35th among nations as a proportion of GDP, less than France in absolute terms, less than 0.25% of our overall federal budget). Foreign assistance was supported politically in the past as a means of staving off the Soviet influence but with the breakup there has been little political will for foreign affairs. Our attention span for development has been short and fragmented in a process that is long-term and integrated. In effect we have practiced the politics of disengagement. Nowhere is this more obvious than in Afghanistan. We backed the "freedom fighters" in Afghanistan against the Soviets and supported the Mujahideen with military training and weapons. When the Russians left we pulled out our support and disengaged from the situation. Disengagement has had its costs. The situation in Afghanistan is in part a result of a lack of positive foreign engagement on our part. America was not there to present an alternative view of the world for Afghanistan that might have assisted them to develop a stable, economical viable society.

I know people whose views are similar to those who caused this horror although I think none of them would carry out such acts. I believe they started life as human beings just like all of us but their lives became so desperate and convoluted that they think that we are the evil in the world. They think this because of distortions of reality but they believe these distortions in part because they have so little contact with the truth and in part because there

is some truth even in the distortions.

In the Middle East, perhaps understandably, the US has gone through cycles of engagement, sometimes intense support of the peace process, and withdrawal over the seemingly endless violence and despair. Yet we have failed to exert true leadership in the Middle East. A plan for US long-term involvement, sufficiently focused, intense and balanced, has never emerged. In hindsight the resources now committed to war would likely have brought development and peace to the region yet the situation continues unresolved, fomenting violence that fuels the distortions of our national values in the eyes of the region's Muslims.

The Israelis have always taken the hard line in the cycle of violence, and the situation is now as bad as it has been in 20 years. Violence alone is not the answer. The French after the 1986 terrorist bombings in Paris rooted out the guilty (primarily disaffected Islamic youths from Algerian resident in France) but the government also recognized the causes of the frustrations for this population and reached out to their community with a comprehensive series of social and political programs. The result is that the terror disappeared.

The US continues to be active internationally, not in a sufficiently intense way with long term goals appropriate for development, but in a reactionary way where we feed the starving or provide disaster assistance (not figuring out how to improve food systems in the first place or prevent disasters made more intense by poverty, poor land use or faulty construction) or police local conflicts that could at least be dampened by our leadership to defuse situations before they become violent (Rwanda and Somalia are a classic example of lack of leadership responsibility).

The terrorists are truly fighting a war in their eyes and we need to understand the conditions that give them their cause and remove

them. I support intensive action to route out their networks and extinguish them individually. But at the same time we will never be safe from terrorism by only constructing shields, becoming less engaged and providing good counter intelligence. Moreover there are great prices to pay in personal freedom and the quality of life for America if we only have a defensive action.

America needs to attack the disease as well as the symptoms. We need to use our resources to create the foundations for broad based economic growth that nurtures stable democratic societies and eliminates terrorism as the only avenue for action to achieve a reasonable standard of living. We must engage so we not only change the conditions but we also understand the national political, social and economic landscape well enough to be effective partners. Part of the failure of our intelligence has been that we are not sufficiently engaged in these areas to know what is happening.

So I am arguing that we can not in this globalized world just put up walls and enact a military solution. Terrorism in NYC is globalization's dark side coming back to bite us. The US should go out not only to punish, but to engage and provide a means for the poor to achieve the visions of our world that we think should be the fundamental principles of a world order. Development assistance is a principal means to that end.

## **THE GLOBAL LIVESTOCK CRSP**

### **AN OVERVIEW**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The Global Livestock CRSP (formerly known as the Small Ruminant CRSP) has expanded its research to address important topics in the international livestock development sector. The program, comprised of seven broad-based interdisciplinary projects, focuses on human nutrition, economic growth, environment and policy linked by a global theme of agriculture at risk in a changing environment. The projects involve researchers from 13 US universities, 3 international agricultural research centers and 74 foreign institutions. The program is active in three regions of the world: East Africa, Central Asia and Latin America.

#### **HISTORY**

Established in 1978 as the Small Ruminant CRSP, the Global Livestock CRSP is one of eight CRSP programs developed under Title XII of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975. The CRSP model, pioneered by the SR-CRSP, was built on the structural strengths of US land-grant universities and collaborative partnerships with international organizations. Four characteristics ensure the effectiveness of this model: 1) Collaboration with US land-grant universities; 2) International training; 3) Long-term scientific relationships; 4) Program cost-effectiveness.

#### **REENGINEERED**

In 1995, the CRSP began a major restructuring of the program in response to USAID's own reengineering efforts and the changing needs of the international development community. The process, a comprehensive planning and assessment procedure, was initiated with priority setting workshops in the three regions. As forums for client input, the workshops were intended to maximize the opportunity of regional professionals to present their views on the development issues confronting them. The problem models they developed established the scope for activities within the region. Assessment teams, selected in an initial competition, developed projects that addressed the top priorities within the regions. The problem model was the central component of the assessment process with each team charged with refining their problem model through in-field explorations. To ensure grass roots input, over 20 regional workshops involving 35 countries were conducted during the assessment period. The teams submitted final proposals for a competition to be

included in a proposal to USAID. The seven final projects are headed by University of California-Davis, University of California-Los Angeles, University of Wisconsin-Madison (2), Texas A&M University System, Utah State University, and Colorado State University. The process was designed to be problem driven and produced results oriented projects.

### **A GLOBAL PROGRAM**

The GL-CRSP global program builds effectively on complementarities between projects in different regions. Centered on a theme of managing risk in our unpredictable world, the program is developing the capacity to predict risk so it can be better managed, improving the tools to cope with risk, and contributing to the mediation of risk. The GL-CRSP has chosen to work in ecosystems and regions where human populations and natural resources are most vulnerable and in most cases, where biodiversity is most valuable. The model of risk management is most highly developed in our East African program where the four complementary projects cover prediction, adaptation and management of risk.

#### ***Predict the Future***

The project, *Early Warning System for Monitoring Nutrition and Livestock Health for Food Security of Humans in East Africa*, headed by Texas A&M University System (TAMUS), addresses risk by adapting already successful U.S. technologies to East Africa in order to increase the lead time on the forecast of drought and famine, and allow policy makers to visualize the impact of their interventions on food crises. The project combines predictive and spatial characterization technologies with the formation of a network of collection and measurement sites in East Africa. The data from these sites, in coordination with the Famine Early Warning System (FEWS) project, will allow 6-8 weeks of increased lead-time for drought forecasting.

#### ***Mitigating Coping and Adapting to Perturbations and Change***

The project, *Integrated Assessment of Pastoral -Wildlife Interactions in East Africa*, headed by Colorado State University (CSU), addresses the relationship between pastoralists and wildlife conservation in the context of the unpredictability of semi-arid environments. This project will adapt models already in use in U.S. national parks to assist policy makers at the national and local level to establish approaches that are compatible with both pastoral life and conservation of biodiversity. The project intends to identify, in an integrated manner, the tradeoffs of different management decisions on wildlife conservation, livestock production and pastoralist food security and health.

The project, *Improving Pastoral Risk Management on East African Rangelands*, headed by Utah State University (USU), uses four systems to cope with risk and destock livestock in semiarid ecosystems: resource tenure, closer links to markets, rural finance and public service delivery. These activities represent mechanisms to allow asset diversification, improved ability to interact with markets, increased investment in rural institutions and commerce, and better capacity to cope with

an unpredictable environment. The impact of these alternatives will likely reduce conflict, improve the economic conditions of pastoralist and their communities, provide higher productivity and stability to their livestock systems and greater protection for the biodiversity in their environments.

The project, *Role of Animal Source Foods to Improve Diet Quality and Growth and Cognitive Development in East African Children*, headed by the University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA), targets mechanisms to cope with malnutrition of rural populations, particularly children. The project is definitively testing the link between animal source foods (ASF) and cognitive and physical development in children. Additional project work, after testing, will consider the effectiveness of different interventions in delivering ASF into the diets of children.

The Global Livestock CRSP is also active in Central Asia and Latin America. The Central Asia program addresses a rapidly changing and unstable political and economic environment, where little effort has been made, particularly in rural areas, to “cushion” the effects of transition to a market economy. The Latin America program faces sustainability issues, with a growing population, more firmly entrenched poverty, and a rapidly diminishing resource base.

In Latin America, the project *Community Planning for Sustainable Livestock-based Forested Ecosystems in Latin America*, headed by the University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW), deals with the impact of increasing human population on the conversion of forest and the management of integrated livestock systems that protect and use the biodiversity of these ecosystems. The importance of water emanating from the mountain forest is central to the project, which is organized at the watershed level. The project uses a strong community based involvement to address how to develop productive, profitable and environmentally sustainable food systems in marginal environments for livestock production.

The project, *Integrated Tools for Livestock Development and Rangeland Conservation, in Central Asia*, headed by the University of California-Davis (UCD), emphasizes both adaptation and mitigation. This project will have significant global and local impacts in four main areas: atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration, rangeland conservation, enhanced productivity and sustainability of livestock systems, and socio-economic aspects of livestock production.

### **PROGRAM GOAL**

The goal of the GL-CRSP is to increase food security and improve the quality of life of people in developing countries while bringing an international focus to the research, teaching and extension efforts of U.S. institutions. This goal is to be met through collaboration between U.S. land-grant institutions and national and regional institutions abroad that are active in livestock research and development.

### **STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES**

To achieve this goal, the following objectives have been identified:

- To strengthen the ability of institutions in developing countries to identify problems in livestock production and develop appropriate solutions.
- To increase employment and incomes among livestock producers and associated value-adding agribusinesses.
- To improve livestock production while monitoring the effects of production on the environment and exploring the integration of production systems with the rational use of natural resources, such as wildlife.
- To enhance the nutritional status of targeted populations through increased availability and utilization of animal source products.
- To provide support to decision-makers in developing policies that will promote livestock production, marketing, and processing of animal products; human nutrition and child physical and cognitive development; and natural resource conservation and management.
- To identify, study, and strengthen communication systems (including but not limited to extension) among livestock producers, businesses, researchers, and consumers.

### **RESOURCES**

Funds for the GL-CRSP are granted for a five-year period by the United States Agency for International Development. A minimum cost-sharing contribution of 25 percent from participating US institutions is required. The projects also receive substantial contributions from host country collaborators and leveraged funds.

## STRUCTURE

The Global Livestock CRSP is administered as a grant to the University of California, Davis, which, as the *Management Entity*, administers subgrants to participating US institutions and maintains fiscal responsibility.

The GL-CRSP *Program Director* is responsible for program development, coordinating activities of the projects across and within regions, and oversees the daily operations of the GL-CRSP.

The *Program Administrative Council* provides input on the overall program goals, recommends strategies for programmatic development and advises and concurs on the program budget.

The *Technical Committee* provides intellectual exchange and input on programmatic planning for the CRSP to the Program Director and the Program Administrative Council.

The *External Evaluation Panel* provides objective evaluations of the CRSP programmatic process.

## OVERSIGHT GROUPS

Global Bureau, United States Agency for International Development (USAID)  
Board for International Food and Agricultural Development and Economic Cooperation (BIFADEC)  
Strategic Partnership for Agricultural Research and Education (SPARE)

### PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Ahmed Sidahmed, IFAD (CHAIR)  
Bernard Engel, Purdue University  
Jerrold Dodd, Cameron University  
Penelope Nestel, Nutrition Consultant  
Jane Shey, Shey and Associates  
Michel Simeon, World Bank  
Ralph von Kaufmann, ILRI

### EXTERNAL EVALUATION PANEL

David Sammons, Purdue University (CHAIR)  
Nancy Conklin-Brittain, Harvard University

### USAID

Joyce Turk, Program Officer

### U.S. LEAD PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

Layne Coppock, Utah State University  
Jim Ellis, Colorado State University  
Jerry Stuth, Texas A&M University System  
Emilio A. Laca, University of California - Davis  
Timothy Moermond, University of Wisconsin -  
- Madison  
Charlotte G. Neumann, Univ. of California -  
Los Angeles  
David Thomas, University of Wisconsin -  
Madison

### MANAGEMENT ENTITY

Montague W. Demment, Director  
James Scott, Assistant Director  
Susan L. Johnson, Program Coordinator  
Yolanda Reina-Guerra, Bookkeeper

**COLLABORATING INSTITUTIONS**

**CENTRAL ASIA**

**Kazakstan**

Barayev Research Institute of Grain Farming  
Center for Sheep Selection and Genetics  
(CSSG)

Institute of Feed and Pasture  
Institute of Ecology and Sustainable  
Development  
Institute of Economics  
Kazakh Scientific Research Technological  
Institute of Sheep Breeding  
Ministry of Science - Academy of Science RK  
(MS ASRK)  
National Federation of Private Farmers of  
Kazakstan  
Research Technological Institute of Sheep  
Breeding

**Uzbekistan**

Academy of Science  
Karakul Sheep Research Institute  
Samarkand State University  
Uzbek Livestock Research Institute  
Uzbek Research Institute of Market Reforms  
Uzbek Sericulture Research Insititute

**Turkmenistan**

Academy of Sciences  
National Institute of Deserts, Flora and Fauna

**Kyrgyzstan**

Kyrgyz Research Institute of Animal  
Husbandry

**EAST AFRICA**

African Wildlife Foundation  
Crisis Mitigation Office - ASARECA  
FARM Africa

**Ethiopia**

Adami Tulu Agricultural Research Center  
Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization  
(EARO)  
Holetta Research Center  
Livestock Policy Analysis Program (LPAP)  
Mekelle University  
Oromia Agricultural Development Bureau  
Oromia Cooperative Promotion Bureau  
Norwegian Church Aid (NCA)  
Save the Children USA  
Southern Rangelands Development Unit  
(SORDU)  
USAID Mission to Ethiopia  
Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Action  
(VOCA)

**Tanzania**

Livestock Production Research Institute  
(LPRI)  
Ministry of Water and Livestock Development  
Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority  
Selian Agricultural Research Institute,  
Tanzania  
Sokoine University, Tanzania  
Tanzania National Parks (TANAPA)  
Tanzania Wildlife Reserach Institute  
(TAWIRI)  
University Collgege of Lands and  
Architechtural Studies (UCLAS)  
University of Dar es Salaam

**Kenya**

African Conservation Centre (ACC)  
Arid Lands Resource Management Project  
(ALRMP)  
ATGRCA (Amboseli Tsavo Group Ranch  
Conservation Association)  
Drought Monitoring Centre  
Egerton University  
Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI)  
Kenya Department of Resources, Surveys &  
Remote Sensing  
Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)  
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural  
Development  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Ministry of Education  
Ministry of Health  
Mpala Research Centre  
National Dryland Farming Research Center  
National Range Research Center  
Regional Centre for Mapping and Resources  
for Development (RCMRD)  
Semi Arid Rural Development Programme  
(SARDEP)  
University of Nairobi

**Uganda**

Makerere University  
Namulonge Agricultural and Animal Research  
Institute  
Serere Animal and Agricultural Research  
Institute

**LATIN AMERICA**

Servicios Agro-Informaticos de Apoyo a la  
Planificacion para el Uso y Manejo de los  
Recursos Naturales (AGROSIG), Bolivia  
Centro de Datos para la Conservacion  
(CDC), Ecuador  
Centro Interdisciplinario de Estudios  
Comunitarios (CIEC), Bolivia  
Centro de Estudios Regionales para el  
Desarrollo de Tarija (CER-DET), Bolivia  
Fundacion Antisana (FUNAN), Ecuador  
Heifer Project International, Ecuador  
Instituto Manantlan de Ecologia y de la  
Conservacion de la Biodiversidad  
(IMECBIO), CUCSUR, Universidad de  
Guadalajara, Mexico  
Comunidad de Estudios JAINA, Bolivia  
Terranueva, Ecuador

**INTERNATIONAL**

Food and Agricultural Organization (Italy)  
International Center for Agricultural Research  
in Dry Areas (ICARDA)  
International Livestock Research Institute  
(ILRI)

**United States**

Colorado State University  
Cornell University  
South Dakota State University  
Texas A&M University  
University of California, Davis  
University of California, Los Angeles  
University of Colorado  
University of Kentucky  
University of Wisconsin - Madison  
United States Department of Agriculture  
(USDA), ARS  
Utah State University  
Yale University