

**Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH)
Planning and Management Committee (PMC) Meeting
IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria
March 24-25, 2017
Summary of Action Items**

Introduction

Members of the A4NH Planning and Management Committee (PMC) met with the Program Management Unit (PMU) for two days at IITA headquarters in Ibadan. The day prior to the meeting, IITA coordinated presentations and tours showcasing their research activities in A4NH. Copies of the presentations are saved [here](#). Members of A4NH's Independent Advisory Committee (IAC) attended the PMC meeting as observers. A list of participants can be found at the end of this summary. John McDermott, A4NH Director, chaired the meeting.

Meeting Objectives

- To assess and identify funding gaps in flagships for 2017-2018 and align them with potential funding opportunities being pursued by Managing Partners
- To discuss how A4NH can report annual progress to IAC and W2 donors
- To review the outcomes that were achieved (or not achieved) in Phase I and explore, in flagship teams, how we'll use MARLO in Phase II to document our progress and contributions towards flagship outcomes.
- To review the status of CGIAR Site Integration and A4NH plans for country coordination in each of the five A4NH focus countries
- To identify priorities and modalities for some integrative activities in 2017 and 2018 for A4NH overall and by flagship
- To identify priority collaboration issues and plans for 2017 and 2018

Action Items

This document summarizes the action items from the meeting by the general topics discussed.

SESSION 1: CURRENT FUNDING AND PLANS FOR RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

During Phase I of A4NH, most of our Window 1/Window 2 (W1/W2) funds came from W2 and it was a consistent amount of \$15.1 to \$17.7 million/year. Historically, there has been a relationship between the two windows, meaning that CRPs receiving more W2 were given less W1. Overall the CGIAR Fund (W1/W2) is very important but not a promising opportunity for growth. For sustainable growth of the program in new areas, coordinating larger W3/bilateral grants are most important. Around 75-85% of A4NH's overall budget comes from W3/bilateral grants, mostly from HarvestPlus, IFPRI-PHND, and IITA. In Phase I, there were only a few W3/bilateral grants shared between institutions. In Phase II, we want to see more cases where institutions work together on grant proposals to strengthen research areas in the flagships that are contributing to our stated outcomes. The purpose of the first session was to discuss how Flagship management teams and Managing Partners could improve their capacity to compete for grants that contribute to A4NH and how the PMC can support this through engagement with donors and greater cooperation across institutions.

Each flagship and each managing partner provided an update on resource mobilization efforts to the PMC. The presentations are available [here](#). Following the presentations, the PMC discussed the proposed research agendas and funding plans.

Action Items

- Each flagship will identify a flagship management team. This team will have regular meetings in which a discussion on resource mobilization, needs to be included. Given the important role of Managing Partners in fundraising, Managing Partners working in a flagship area need to be included. John will consult with the Flagship Leaders about who makes up this team.
- To ensure information sharing, Managing Partner representatives on the PMC will inform the Flagship Leader when a proposal relevant to that flagship is being prepared and/or has been submitted. For all proposals, but especially larger ones (more than \$1 million), Managing Partners are encouraged to notify the Flagship Leaders during the preparation stage.
- The PMU will prepare a template for the Flagship Leaders to track resource mobilization in their flagship. The Flagship Leaders will keep the list up-to-date and share with the PMU on a regular basis. This will allow the PMU to support the Flagship Leaders on their resource mobilization priorities and track the grant pipeline as part of overall CGIAR financial forecasting and reporting strategies. More details on this process will be shared at the next PMC virtual meeting on Thursday, May 4.

SESSION 2: PLANNING, MONITORING, AND REPORTING IN PHASE II

The PMU shared a new reporting template it developed to share progress updates with the IAC on an annual basis. The template was designed to provide background information on the A4NH portfolio that the IAC has requested and was organized to show progress along A4NH's impact pathways. Much of the information in this report could be generated from the new planning and reporting platform, MARLO, reducing the reporting burden for flagship leaders. The PMC and IAC, felt the draft contained too much information and they thought limiting the report to a 2-page narrative, with visuals, per flagship on progress since last year would be more useful. The IAC said they were most interested in reading about what has been learned – contextual evidence related to the plausibility of the theory of change – and the unexpected frustrations or pleasant surprises from the past year's research. If the report was tailored to donors, the general attitude was that a shorter format – narrative plus visuals – focused on A4NH's influence would be more effective. The PMU took note of more detailed comments on the template and will incorporate this feedback into a revised version that will be shared later this year. More time was spent on Session 1, so we skipped the presentation, discussion, and group work on outcomes.

Action Items

- The reporting template will be simplified and revised per feedback provided by the IAC. The PMU will circulate the template before the IAC meets for its annual meeting.

SESSION 3: INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS

The PMU is preparing a new TeamSpace, or internal platform, for A4NH to use in Phase II. The key improvements will be ease of access for non-CGIAR users and improved functionality because it will be housed on the cloud and not on the IFPRI server. There was a brief discussion about other resources the PMC would like to find on such a space and other functions it could serve.

Action Items

- Initially, TeamSpace will provide (a) a document repository for the PMU, PMC, flagship teams, and country coordination teams, (b) a calendar of key internal events, and (c) contact lists for members of A4NH. It will be made available to A4NH members by end of April 2017.

SESSION 4: UPDATES AND PLANS FOR COUNTRY COORDINATION

The CGIAR Site Integration Strategy is an appeal to the CGIAR Centers to work together in partner countries. In advance of the Phase II CRP proposals, 20 priority countries were identified for initial planning. One CGIAR Center has been selected as coordinator for each country. They are expected to develop the site integration strategy and then to ensure that the Centers are coordinating to respond to the needs of the countries. Six of the 20 countries are designated as high priority for starting the process. Three are in Africa and are led by A4NH Managing Partners: Ethiopia (ILRI), Nigeria (IITA), and Tanzania (IITA). The other three are Bangladesh, Nicaragua, and Vietnam.

A4NH has designated five focus countries as part of its own Country Coordination and Engagement, places where we have several flagships working and where we have Managing Partners who were already leading or playing an important role in CGIAR Site Integration. The A4NH focus countries are: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria, and Vietnam. There are W1/W2 funds allocated to support the recruitment of a person who can support members of the country team with analysis or other research tasks and to cover operational costs to support the country coordination team and leader. Contracts will be signed with each Managing Partner responsible for a country team for this specific allocation and a work plan will be developed. The purpose of this session was primarily for information sharing, so the FP Leaders and Managing Partner representatives could understand and engage in country coordination efforts. The presentations can be found [here](#).

Kwesi Atta-Krah briefed the PMC on CGIAR Site Integration process overall, with some examples on how this is working for IITA in Nigeria. Site integration has been incorporated into IITA's institutional strategy for 2012-2020 and they have changed their management structure somewhat to accommodate this new priority to align better with relevant CRPs, Centers, and other parties. IITA is thinking beyond the CGIAR SLOs to country strategic goals. One exercise IITA is in the process of completing is looking at their major projects and estimating their contribution to five Nigerian Zero Hunger Initiative Targets (linked to SDG2) - hunger, malnutrition, agricultural productivity, sustainable food production, and genetic diversity – identifying the Nigerian states where the work is being carried out, and eventually, reaching some agreement on indicators. Kwesi's presentation describes this in more detail.

Alfred Dixon briefed the PMC on activities happening within the **Nigerian government**. The Nigerian government's agricultural agenda divides the country into 14 staple crop processing zones and they have developed projects around these zones to develop agricultural productive, strengthen infrastructure, and entice the private sector. Using a loan from the Nigerian government (via World Bank and African Development Bank), IITA will collaborate with the Nigerian government on a food *and* nutrition security initiative with other CGIAR Centers (AfricaRice and ICRISAT) on developing value chains for three staple crops— cassava, rice, and sorghum, in three economic development corridors. In terms of the government's relationship to the Zero Hunger Initiative, they are focusing on five states as pilots in 2017 and then in 2018 another 18 states will be added. Kwesi is leading the initiative and using IITA as the coordination center and the secretariat. They will be doing an assessment and monitoring of the pilots to make sure the milestones/targets are being met. These provide focal states where CGIAR can work. In some cases, these are the states where other agencies are focused, e.g. WFP. Lastly, TAAT

(supported by the African Development Bank) plans to cover almost 35 countries in Africa and Nigeria is very important. It is expected to start in June 2017.

Victor Manyong briefed the PMC on Site Integration progress in **Tanzania**. In 2015-16, CGIAR Centers started by mapping the CGIAR activities ongoing in the country; almost all the Centers are working in Tanzania plus 7 CRPs. There is a lot of private sector and INGO and NGO activity. They reviewed the national plans and then developed the Site Integration Strategy. Priority areas were selected from that plan. Joint resource mobilization is happening – IITA is developing a proposal with ILRI, which will likely be included in A4NH. WorldFish is relocating from Zambia to Tanzania to support Site Integration. Victor noted that some of the challenges have been waning enthusiasm and funding. Site Integration was the only CGIAR strategy for Phase II put into place without any earmarked funding.

Relatedly, the World Bank asked CGIAR to do some analysis on investment and the Tanzanian government, as part of their process of developing a new country strategy. Several CGIAR centers to be part of the process. Tanzania is also putting in a place a semi-autonomous agricultural research institute called TARI, or the Tanzania Agricultural Research Institute.

Busie Maziya-Dixon briefed the PMC on A4NH Country Coordination progress in **Nigeria**. The team has met and identified six activities to start with in 2017, including a nutrition advocacy group that engages with an existing initiative in Nigeria to bring together and engage with civil society, NGOs, and other researchers. Using the A4NH funds, they are in the process of recruiting a research associate. The PMC discussed one challenge in Nigeria. Donor attention will be focused on the northeast areas – an area identified at risk for famine – and this will draw resources away from CGIAR priorities. Borno state is one state where there are overlapping interests. Nigeria is also a focus country for FP1. Inge requested that the A4NH country coordination team help researchers when they are planning to conduct research in the country and to help facilitate ethical approvals. Several flagships noted interests in working more with the private sector in Nigeria. For example, Adewale mentioned that HarvestPlus has monthly discussions with private sector partners in Nigeria on how to build investment in biofortified crops. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has selected Nigeria as one of their priority countries. BMGF is funding a project in West Africa – Nigeria and Burkina Faso are the current countries selected – that’s based on a project they are funding in India called POSHAN. The projects are based on the idea that there’s a lot of evidence on nutrition interventions and investments, but it’s not reaching decisionmakers in ways that makes it easy for them to use. These projects are part of FP4 and Jef noted that based on Kwesi’s presentation, there are clearly some potential collaborations.

Action Item

- Add an ILRI representative to the Nigeria team. Delia suggested Tunde Adegoke Amole.

Namukolo Covic briefed the PMC on progress in **Ethiopia**. The recruitment process for the Research Associate has begun and they expect to have that person on board before the end of April. Some of the Ethiopia country coordination began before the team was established, so some of what Namukolo presented on the 2017 work plan is quite far along. During the Site Integration process, A4NH was given the role as nutrition consultant in Ethiopia because of concerns that Centers cannot fulfil the expectations on nutrition. There will be an annual meeting with policy stakeholders, CGIAR Centers/CRPs, and other development partners to align everyone to national priorities and goals. Another side of filling this niche is capacity building, which will be led by Namukolo through the activities mapped to the third cluster in FP4 known as 3C. This involves other work and processes linked to the African Union, ReSAKKS, and CAADP. Namukolo finds herself on call; CGIAR Centers call her and ask her

for talking points when they are attending meetings with nutrition elements. This is happening *ad hoc*. Being responsive to other CRPs and Centers has been quite an undertaking and she's looking forward to having a Research Associate. FP1 had its first country consultation workshop in February 2016 and a follow-up workshop only a few weeks ago. The landscape analysis is in very strong draft form. One challenge for FP1 in Ethiopia has been that Bioversity is the focal point, but they do not have any staff presence (working on nutrition and health) in-country any longer and WUR does not have any permanent presence in-country although they are working with several PhD students. As a solution, Bioversity is using some W1/W2 resources to support a researcher from an Ethiopian university and there's an intention that the country coordination Research Associate will complement the Research Associate that supports this Ethiopian researcher working for Bioversity. Ethiopia is more of an expansion country for HarvestPlus, working primarily on breeding vitamin A maize; they have one staff member in-country working with AU and ReSAKKS. For FP3, they have a national scoping study to look at value chains and the interventions that have worked this year. There is also interest in looking at alternatives to traditionally processed dairy products (fermented milk and better) to improve food safety and quality and incorporating nutrition elements into ILRI's food safety work, in collaboration with Inge. There has been a lot of FP4 work in Ethiopia, but FP4 is still in the process of refining what it will do in Phase II. One new element they would like to see is results being used to influence curriculum development in academic institutions to address nutrition capacity gaps.

The PMC discussed expectations as a very real risk in all the focus countries, but particularly in Ethiopia where A4NH country coordination is further along. A4NH/CGIAR plans are well aligned to the national goals. We have raised expectations for what we can do. Government institutions are responding, but we need to be clearer about what we are offering (also see below in the discussion of integrative actions).

Stef de Haan briefed the PMC on progress in **Vietnam**. The team is hiring a Research Analyst. Interviews will start next week so that the person can be on board by mid-April. The country team has selected three sites, including an urban-rural transect, where the idea is to apply common metrics. The Data Platform in Vietnam will measure food system transitions. The biggest challenge the team has faced so far is coherent portfolio development and coordination, which is a common challenge for multidisciplinary research. One way they are overcoming these challenges is to approach key partners – in specific sectors, or institutes, or platforms – as a CGIAR team. They are also sharing students, which allows for co-mentoring and exposure to multidisciplinary tools and methods and approaches. Stef noted that *foods systems* is becoming more and more a crowded space and it's challenging for A4NH to explain to national partners what we mean by food systems and what it entails. There are a lot of promising opportunities, including last month the team participated in an event with the World Bank and Dutch government on food security. Stef raised three issues for PMC to consider: comparability across A4NH focus countries; need to translate materials into the local language, particularly because we are talking about new concepts; and identifying a few donors for strategic and coordinated fundraising. The PMC discussed how the Vietnam context provides some interesting research issues that would allow FP3 and FP5 to work together to measure food safety and human health impacts of shifting trends in pork production. Enrico mentioned that Bioversity will be strengthening its collaboration with the Hanoi Medical Research Center through their Drivers of Food Choice grant. FP4 is planning to do a Stories of Change in Vietnam, which will be led by IFPRI with CIAT. The links between A4NH and FISH and CCAFS are not well developed in Vietnam, but common study sites could be one way to engage them in collaborative projects.

John briefed the PMC on progress in **India** and **Bangladesh**. Country coordination has not progressed much in India beyond identification of team members. There are a lot of CGIAR Centers in India,

concentrated mostly in Hyderabad and New Delhi. In Bangladesh, there are fewer CGIAR Centers but the ones that are there are very active. Maya noted that CIAT does not have much work in Bangladesh even though they were included in John's list. Delia added that ILRI is working in several locations in India on milk safety at minimal funding levels and ILRI is rebuilding their relationship with ICAR.

SESSION 5: FULFILLING A4NH'S INTEGRATIVE ROLE

The Phase II proposal lays out some general areas and activities relative to A4NH's role as an 'integrative CRP' on nutrition and health for CGIAR. In the first years of Phase II (at least 2017-18), the W1/W2 funds have been earmarked for the Managing Partners, which is limited to five CGIAR Centers and 2 non-CGIAR institutions. Part of the discussion focused on how to engage the other CGIAR Centers, currently considered Strategic Partners, in nutrition and health, particularly since nutrition work in other flagships (outside A4NH) was largely not funded. CGIAR also never set explicit expectations for the 'integrative CRPs' so A4NH is in the process of defining this for ourselves. This session was primarily used for brainstorming.

Within CGIAR, the implicit expectation is that A4NH can help the commodity CRPs to adopt nutrition-sensitive approaches. Some of this comes from a recognition that CGIAR Centers/CRPs do not have capacity to work on nutrition. At the same time, there is also some resistance to work on nutrition or report on progress, particularly when there's no internal capacity. There are tensions. The first, how nutrition sensitive can their approach be if it tends to be focused on a single commodity? The second, how do we address concerns that promoting diverse diets compromises any one commodity?

One suggestion was to think about the 'integrative' possibilities in three ways – **framing** (e.g., introducing and/or advocating common terminology), **managing** (e.g., like some of the activities Namukolo described she is doing in Ethiopia), and **reporting** (e.g., telling the agriculture, nutrition, and health success stories). Framing and reporting could be done cost-efficiently, but managing could quickly become costly in terms of finances, time, and other resources. Plus, it could start to look like A4NH is doing work on behalf of other partners. Another important consideration is how A4NH will assess our impact in any of these areas.

There was consensus that A4NH should avoid the managing task. **Framing** is more of where A4NH should focus. "Integrative" framing efforts could include ensuring that consumption and diet quality issues contribute to CGIAR country coordination efforts in prioritizing actions with national partners. It could also look to leverage technologies or approaches from CGIAR Centers that could have broader food system applications (for example zinc fertilizers for multiple crops). This could then progress to providing advice and writing joint proposals where researchers add a nutrition/health/food system element as part of the larger framework developed. Hopefully such an approach will help us more strategically manage our integrative role. For example, Namukolo is regularly asked to provide 'talking points' on nutrition from other CGIAR partners in Ethiopia. In another example, the CGIAR Site Integration Plan for Ethiopia states that CGIAR will hold a series of seminars on nutrition as part of efforts to creating a more enabling conversation about nutrition within CGIAR.) John suggested that we start such integrative framing in the FP1 focus countries (four of the five A4NH focus countries) and provide a first layer of evidence on how staple crops are being consumed, how they are processed, what's added, and how nutritious is the final product. These should be part of FP1's focus country deliverables in 2017-18. A second part of the framing could be to influence the CGIAR Site Integration logic by emphasizing the message that we need to start by looking more at demand and consumption, rather than on the supply side. How will we know if it has any impact? We'll assess the influence of this evidence on research agendas in other Centers/CRPs.

Some participants thought we could do more on a combination of **framing** and **reporting** by influencing CGIAR to ask all CRPs to report against nutrition-related indicators and/or sensitization activities. More broadly, A4NH needs to be precise about what we mean by *nutrition sensitive* and what are clear nutrition objectives. One suggestion was for A4NH to conduct a structured analysis to identify the barriers to increasing nutrition-sensitivity in CGIAR. Some thought that donors would expect more from A4NH; they expect A4NH to be actively involved in the AFS-CRPs to help increase the nutrition-sensitivity of their work. John suggested we focus initially on framing in the four FP1 focus countries and through the CGIAR Site Integration processes. In his conversations with donors, he will explain the limitations A4NH faces and explain where we see our comparative advantage in CGIAR given our resources (financial, time, and personnel).

Action Items

- Recognizing the need to manage expectations, all Flagship Leaders and team members should focus any cross-CRP activities in the realm of *framing*, as discussed today, without any obligation to assist with activities that may fall under *managing*, as discussed today. Flagship leaders/members can be knowledge brokers and recommend other resource persons or resources. The biggest emphasis on framing will be in FP1 and to a lesser extent FP4. Within the integrative nutrition and health framing – we should plan for specific joint projects that could involve any flagship.
- Invite representatives from AFS-CRPs to A4NH country consultation workshops.
- As John receives more clarity from CGIAR and/or other CRPs about their expectations, he will share it with the PMC.

SESSION 6: COLLABORATION WITH ROME-BASED AGENCIES

In 2013, James Garrett was seconded to the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) from IFPRI. His task was to strengthen nutrition in IFAD and the links between A4NH and IFAD, plus the other Rome-based UN agencies, the World Food Program (WFP) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). James provided a summary to the PMC on what was accomplished. In mid-2016, Bioversity began hosting James. As part of Phase II, one of Bioversity's contributions as a Managing Partner is strengthening collaboration with the Rome-based agencies. James serves as the CGIAR representative on the UN System Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN) and the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Nutrition. James' role is not to coordinate or replace efforts of individuals or Centers working with the Rome-based agencies. Rather, he emphasizes in his interactions that A4NH can be a conduit for CGIAR engagement. James provided a thorough overview of the nutrition research aspects of each Rome-based agency in his presentation. During the session, he collected feedback from the PMC on what demands they had relative to the Rome-based agencies and ideas on communication efforts that James could facilitate.

Bioversity was recently awarded a grant from IFAD. The intention is that the grant would be used across A4NH. In the first phase, they will trace out the theory of change on how information for nutrition-sensitive operations in the Rome-based agencies is accessed and used. Then, they'll map the needs to the A4NH knowledge pool as well as other sources around agriculture and nutrition. Next, they will work with communications specialists to shape the information so it can be delivered in the ways that are useful to operational teams at the Rome-based agencies. Some of this addresses a comment on an evaluation that the IFAD research was not very related to the IFAD projects. Thus, A4NH research needs translation elements to make research helpful for operations. There's some money in the grant to do process and impact evaluation. Once that stage is reached, this will be discussed with the PMC.

Action Items

- Managing Partners are encouraged to share information on their involvement with the Rome-based agencies with James. If Managing Partners have ideas for specific countries, please share them with James and he will direct you to the right person in IFAD who can facilitate grants, for example.
- For IFAD, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between IFAD and A4NH (formally, IFPRI) has been drafted and will be reviewed by the IFAD Board at their meeting in September. Our expectation is that if the MoU contains some specific areas of work, joint objectives, and potential sources of funding, and IFAD and A4NH carry on with regular consultations, it will be a strong partnership. It could lead to opportunities beyond IFAD grants to A4NH-affiliated projects, such as A4NH members providing expertise to IFAD projects, using IFAD projects as platforms for A4NH outputs (e.g., technologies), and/or joint fundraising.
- In response to a question about A4NH's involvement with CFS and the Scaling up Nutrition (SUN) Movement, John clarified that A4NH's role in SUN has been more technical and the key conduit has historically been Stuart Gillespie. James shared his impression that member states are paying more attention to CFS and looking to the high panel of experts. Opportunities for A4NH were not explicit, but some options could be A4NH-proposed side events at CFS and information packaged as policy guidance for the member states.

Any Other Business

Suggested dates for the face-to-face meeting of the PMC and the IAC were the **week of October 30**. The meeting will be held at IFPRI headquarters in Washington, D.C.

A4NH's 2016 Annual Report to the System Management Office will be submitted on April 17. A draft will be circulated on April 3 for comments. John plans to submit the report to DFID, upon their request, with a cover note on how W1/W2 funds were used in 2016. DFID and A4NH have similar interests. The Global Panel on Agriculture and Food Systems for Nutrition was scheduled to be transferred from the UK to Brazil last year, but Brazil was not prepared to lead it so DFID has continued. DFID has strong interests in food systems, diets, nutrition, and strengthening links to country-level efforts, particularly in Africa.

The African Development Bank will be holding their annual meetings in India, May 22-27, around the theme of Transforming Agriculture for Wealth Creation in Africa. John will consult with others to explore options for discussions between A4NH members/affiliates at the meetings.

List of Participants

Planning and Management Committee

*Designates virtual participation

**Designates delegate for Flagship Leader and/or Managing Partner representative

Flagship 1: Inge BROUWER

Associate Professor, Food and Nutrition Security
Division of Human Nutrition
Wageningen University
Email: inge.brouwer@wur.nl

Flagship 2: Adewale OPARINDE**

Research Fellow
HarvestPlus
IFPRI-Washington, DC Office
Email: a.oparinde@cgiar.org

Flagship 3: Delia GRACE

Program Manager
Food Safety and Zoonoses
International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
Email: d.grace@cgiar.org

Flagship 4: Namukolo COVIC**

Research Coordinator
IFPRI-Addis Ababa, Ethiopia Office
Email: n.covic@cgiar.org

Flagship 5: Eric FÈVRE*

Professor of Veterinary Infectious Diseases
Institute of Infection and Global Health
University of Liverpool and joint appointee at the
International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
Email: Eric.Fevre@liverpool.ac.uk

A4NH Director: John MCDERMOTT

Director
Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH)
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: j.mcdermott@cgiar.org

Bioversity International: Enrico BACCIONI**

Initiative Manager
Bioversity International
Email: e.baccioni@cgiar.org

CIAT: Maya RAJASKHARAN

Head of Program Coordination
International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)
Email: r.rajaskharan@cgiar.org

IFPRI: Jef LEROY**

Senior Research Fellow
IFPRI-Washington, DC Office
Email: j.leroy@cgiar.org

IITA: Victor MANYONG

Director for Eastern Africa and Leader of the Social
Science Research Group
IITA Regional Hub for Eastern Africa
Email: v.manyong@cgiar.org

ILRI: Iain WRIGHT

Deputy Director General for Research
International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
Email: i.wright@cgiar.org

LSHTM: Jeff WAAGE*

Former Director (retired)
London International Development Centre (LIDC)
Consultant, London School of Hygiene and Tropical
Medicine (LSHTM)
Email: jeff.waage@lshtm.ac.uk

Jo LINES*

Reader of Malaria Control and Vector Biology
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM)
Email: Jo.Lines@lshtm.ac.uk

WUR: Ruerd RUBEN

Research Coordinator of Food Security, Value Chains and
Impact Analysis
Wageningen University and Research
Email: ruerd.ruben@wur.nl

Independent Advisory Committee

Prof Mahendra DEV

Director
Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research
Email: profmahendra@igidr.ac.in

Mary NYAMONGO

Executive Director and Co-Founder
African Institute for Health and Development
Email: mnyamongo@ahdint.org

Emmy B. SIMMONS

Former Assistant Administrator
USAID
Email: emmybsimmons@aol.com

Prof Joyce KINABO

Professor of Human Nutrition
Sokoine University of Agric.
Email: joyce_kinabo@yahoo.com

Robert PAARLBERG

Professor of Political Science
Wellesley College
Email: rpaarlbe@wellesley.edu

Resource Persons

Silvia ALONSO ALVAREZ

Scientist Epidemiologist
International Livestock Research Institute
Email: s.alonso@cgiar.org

Stefan DE HAAN*

Regional Program Management Officer, Vietnam
International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)
Email: s.dehaan@cgiar.org

James GARRETT

Senior Research Fellow
Bioversity International
Email: J.Garrett@cgiar.org

Kwesi ATTA-KRAH

Director, Systems and Site Integration
International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
Email: k.atta-krah@cgiar.org

Alfred DIXON

Director of the Development and Delivery Office
International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
Email: a.dixon@cgiar.org

Busie MAZIYA-DIXON

Food and Nutrition Scientist
International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
Email: b.maziya-dixon@cgiar.org

Program Management Unit

Tigist DEFABACHEW

Contract & Grants Administrator/Sr. Admin. Coordinator
Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH)
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: t.defabachew@cgiar.org

Amanda WYATT

Program Manager
Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH)
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: a.wyatt@cgiar.org