PD-ABJ-254

FUNDING GUIDELINES FOR THE

SMALL RUMINANT CRSP

Working Paper
prepared by the Management Entity

FUNDING GUIDELINES FOR THE SMALL RUMINANT CRSP

From its inception, the SR-CRSP has consistently debated the issue of funding subprojects in an appropriate and equitable fashion. With the continuation of the CRSP reassured, the trimming of the CRSP to fewer sub-grants, and the substantial increase in the level of funding that seems likely (probably as much as 25% increase for six years), it is appropriate to review the basis and guidelines for future funding.

This paper is divided into three parts:

- Historical perspective
- Current situation
- Future prospects

Historical Perspectives

When the University of California agreed to undertake the role of Management Entity (ME), the sub-projects, principal investigators for those projects, and the level of funding for each of the subcontracts had been firmly established by RTI. This was accomplished long before the selection of a program director or the staffing of the ME, and was entrenched to such a degree that for the first year of the CRSP, these funding levels were actually embodied in the language of Grant USAID/DSAN/XII-G-0049. The appropriate amounts were duly allocated by UCD to sub-contractors. During the first year of CRSP, the ME set about trying to understand what had motivated the particular levels chosen. A visit to RTI was made to discuss the issue with the original authors of the CRSP. This, together with a process of deduction, revealed that a crude rationalisation, taking into account the discipline, US work, and the number of overseas sites, had generated in RTI a provisional formula. Depicted in Table 1, this became known as "Formula Funding." Surprisingly, with one or two notable exceptions, Formula Funding was accepted by the Technical Committee and the Board as a sound basis for funding CRSP activities and little questions or acrimony from its use has occurred. It led to the subgrants being issued in the amounts shown in Table 2.

With experience, the formula has been modified, the major landmark changes being:

1. Objection by USAID/BIFAD to the use of the word "formula" for which the word "guideline" has been substituted and will be used from now on.

2. Request by the Animal Health component that the guidelines be changed from $150,000 base for US + one overseas site and $50,000 for additional sites, to $175,000 base + $50,000. This was approved.

3. Request by Production Systems component that the guidelines be changed from $115,000 base for US plus one overseas site and $25,000 for additional sites to $150,000 base + $50,000. This was approved.

4. Request by the Sociology, Economic and Systems Analysis components that guidelines be changed from $115,000 base for US plus one overseas site and $25,000 for additional sites, to $150,000 base plus $25,000. This was approved.

5. The establishment from life of project funds of special allocations by the Board to the Management Entity for specific use. These have included:

   Site Development funds
   Contingency funds
   Funds for Morocco
   Funds for Prolific Sheep Proposal
   Funds for Overseas exchanges

6. Allocation of Administrative costs into the ME rather than the subgrant budgets. These include:

   Search for overseas site costs
   Audit accountability
   Board costs
   Technical Committee costs

External Evaluation Panel costs
Overseas counterpart costs
Management Entity budget

7. Redistribution of funds for additional responsibilities. When it became apparent that some projects would fail in meeting their objectives and would be terminated, other projects were asked to assume the overseas responsibilities of terminated projects. They were provided with additional funds to do so, according to the following guidelines:

   -- Health, Biological or Range sub-projects taking on a second component or additional site to receive $75,000 first year, $50,000 second year, and third year to be determined.
   -- Socio-economic, Systems sub-projects taking on a second component or an additional site to receive $50,000 first year, $25,000 second year, and third year yet to be determined.

The impact of these accumulated changes can be seen in Table 3, which represents the approved funding guidelines for the 5th year budget and provides funding as seen in Table 4. This may be compared to Table 2, which was the approved 1st year budget.

Current Status

The current status of funding guidelines is shown in Table 4. (The only exception to this has been in the first takeover that became necessary in the CRSP when Winrock filled an emergency in Kenya with respect to the Forages component. It received $100,000 and $75,000 in the first and second years of takeover, as opposed to the prescribed $75,000 and $50,000 respectively, but will likely fall into line next year.) Unless the CRSP Committees decide to alter the basis of funding, guidelines shown in Table 3 stand as the directive to Management Entity.

Experience has revealed that the present guidelines, while providing a logical and understandable basis for fair allocation of funds, do create some

problems. Given the imperfections in human nature, this is not too surprising! (Had RTI designed us, they might have left "original sin" out of our nature and thereby removed most of the fun of working with such a heterogenous group of PIs). The main problems have been:

-- The loss of flexibility in funding. Some PIs would have preferred less money early on and more later, or vice versa, but apprehension or distrust led to everyone taking their piece of the cake each year. Consequently,

-- Large carryover of funds from year to year was experienced by some PIs and deficits by others, who proceeded to implement their projects rapidly.

-- The guidelines tended to provide reward for working in many sites, while at the same time guaranteeing that the more sites taken on, the less attention will be paid to each one individually.

-- The early guidelines assumed a large difference in the costs of various kinds of science (range research vs. sociology, for example), but in fact, "internationalisation" of research tends to diminish such differences. (It costs as much to fly, house, feed a sociologist overseas as a range man, etc.) However, these difficulties have largely been removed by modifications of the guidelines as the CRSP proceeded. (Retrospective redress for earlier injustices has been requested but stubbornly resisted by the ME!)

These and other pressures now felt, such as the need to place high priority upon training, the presence of expatriates overseas, and the need to truly integrate research work has led to several suggestions for modification of the entire basis for subproject funding in the SR-CRSP. With this in mind, the ME undertook two exercises.

1. Dr. Bill Weir, when newly appointed to the CRSP, without prior knowledge of CRSP, and bringing the experience of a longstanding Department Chair and Associate Dean, was asked to look into alternative proposals. This he did.

2. In a memorandum to all PIs and Board members in July 1982, Dr Weir's paper was distributed, and all were asked to respond to his suggestions or come up with completely new ones. The response has been almost non-existent.

Future Prospects

There are three clear alternatives open for discussion:

- Continuation of funding guidelines as set out in Table 4.

- Development of a completely new scheme as yet unproposed by PIs, BIR, or the ME.

- Proceed with a factoral approach to funding similar to that proposed by Dr. Weir. The following paragraphs are a refinement of such an approach which is also linked to a re-definition of sub-projects in the host countries.

6

Proposal for Revision of SR-CRSP Funding Guidelines and Sub-Projects

The present proposal combines two new features:

- redefinition of sub-projects
- revision of the funding base to a factoral approach.

Adoption of this concept would radically change the operation of the SR-CRSP in several major ways, and most notably:

-- Large block sub-grants would no longer be guaranteed.
-- Funding would be based on actual rather than anticipated implementation of program plans.
-- The emphasis on organisation, structure, and management would shift radically to country programs.
-- Fundable components would be restricted and defined within more circumscribed categories.

DEFINITION AND ASSUMPTIONS

The Principal Investigators and Participating Institutions

All the assumptions about who is a principal investigator and what their responsibilities are will be continued. However, it will be assumed that there are now 14 PIs in 10 institutions.

Institution	Discipline	Investigator
California	Breeding	Bradford
California	Health	Olander
Colorado	Health	DeMartini
Missouri	Sociology	Nolan
Montana	Breeding	Blackwell
North Carolina	Nutrition	Johnson
Texas A&M	Breeding	Shelton
Texas A&M	Systems	Cartwright

Texas Tech	Range	Bryant
Utah State	Range	Malechek
Utah State	Physiology	Foote
Washington	Health	McGuire
Winrock	Economics	DeBoer
Winrock	Management	Fitzhugh

Workplans and Budgets

Each PI will be expected to submit two separate workplans as a minimum consisting of:

-- a comprehensive workplan and budget for US work
-- a comprehensive workplan and budget for ONE overseas site.

Some PIs will be requested so submit additional workplans and budgets for additional overseas sites. This request will come from the Management Entity, following approval by TC and Board.

All the requests will be made on standard forms provided by the ME, which for both the US and overseas sites will allow funds to be allocated in the following categories up to the specified maxima and minima.

1. Salaries and Benefits

PI Allowance (Maximum 0.25 FTE)		$_____
Co-PI in US (maximum of 2 at 0.50 FTE)		$_____
Co-PI Overseas (minimum of 1.0 FTE)		$_____
Technician in US (Maximum 1.0 FTE)		$_____
Technicians Overseas (no limit)		$_____
Residents Overseas (no limit)		
Salary	$_____	
Housing	$_____	
Travel	$_____	
Schooling	$_____	
Subtotal:		$_____

Training:		
Students in US	$_____	
Students Overseas	$_____	
Professional Visits	$_____	
Subtotal:		$_____
2. International Travel		
PI (Maximum 2 trips/site/year)	$_____	
Co-PI (maximum 1 trip/site/year)	$_____	
Subtotal:		$_____
3. Domestic Travel		
In US	$_____	
In-country (overseas)	$_____	
Other public transport	$_____	
Subtotal:		$_____
4. Supplies and Expenses		$_____
5. Equipment		$_____
6. Other		$_____
7. Indirect Costs		$_____
TOTAL		$_____

It is proposed that by exerting maxima and minima in certain categories, which clearly need more study and refinements, the subgrants can remain relatively smaller than at present, with more held back in contingency funds to address special needs or build the best programs in special ways. This would undoubtedly allow for closer collaboration between subprojects and allow the CRSP to develop into a truly collaborative, and well integrated research program.

Critically important features of the overseas workplans and budgets will be the inclusion of:

- -- an overseas resident expatriate scientist or justification if not needed
- -- a training component for overseas scientists
- -- clearly defined and pre-specified travel requirements
- -- clearly defined statement on integration with other components of CRSP in-country

Overseas Sites and Disciplines

If we were to adopt this procedure, the current design of the SR-CRSP would be as depicted in Table 5. While there is no particular advantage to condensing "disciplines" into smaller categories for any particular reason, especially if they are truly different, some simplification could occur if the following took place:

- -- Combine forages, nutrition, and management into Nutrition and Feed Production
- -- Combine sociology and economics into Socio-Economics
- -- Combine systems analysis and farming systems into Systems

Table 5 depicts the structure of the SR-CRSP that is presently in place. Table 6 depicts what the CRSP might look like if such a re-definition were implemented. Currently, we have 30 projects in 10 disciplines in 5 countries. In Table 6, we show 25 projects in 7 disciplines in 5 countries, and it clearly implies dropping certain projects.

The Level of Funding and Carryover Funds

The level of funding would be determined by implementation of workplans. Activities not implemented would not generate carryover because funds could simply not be committed until work is actually implemented. Uncommitted funds would remain in the life of project funds and be allocable to those programs that were proceeding apace. It is likely that the contingency pool of funds would be higher under the revised proposal.

Board members and PIs are encouraged to work through existing 1982/83 workplans as they would apply to the new proposal, calculate where gains and losses to their program would occur, and respond in any way you see fit to the ME, prior to the Joint Meeting of the TC and BIR Executives.

TABLE 1

GUIDELINE FUNDING IN SECOND YEAR OF SR-CRSP
1979/80

		US + 1 Overseas Site	Additional Overseas Site
I	ECOLOGICAL		
	Range Research	$200,000	$50,000
II	BIOLOGICAL		
	Health	150,000	50,000
	Breeding	150,000	50,000
	Nutrition	150,000	50,000
	Physiology	150,000	50,000
III	SOCIO-ECONOMIC SYSTEMS		
	Economics	115,000	25,000
	Sociology	115,000	25,000
	Management	115,000	25,000
	Production Systems	115,000	25,000
	Systems Analysis	115,000	25,000

TABLE 2

BOARD APPROVED BUDGET
1978/79

	Institution	Discipline	Required	
1.	California	Breeding	206,786	
2.	California	Health	196,145	
3.	Cal Poly	Reproduction	60,000	
4.	Colorado	Health	150,000	
5.	Missouri	Sociology	174,992	
6.	Montana	Breeding	200,000	
7.	North Carolina	Nutrition	109,435	
8.	Ohio State	Forages	166,016	
9.	Texas A&M	Breeding	160,000	
10.	Texas A&M	Systems	184,000	
11.	Texas Tech	Range	200,000	
12.	Tuskegee	Management	100,000	
13.	Utah State	Range	196,081	
14.	Utah State	Reproduction	99,800	
15.	Washington	Health	200,000	
16.	Winrock	Economics	175,000	
17.	Winrock	Farm Systems	100,000	
				2,678,255
Special Board Authorizations				
18.	Site Development Fund		200,000	
				200,000
19.	CRSP Committees, Boards, Panels		140,573	
				140,573
20.	Management Entity		227,854	
				227,854
	TOTAL			$3,246,682

10

TABLE 3

GUIDELINE FUNDING IN FIFTH YEAR OF SR-CRSP
1983[1]

		US + 1 Overseas Site	Additional Overseas Site
I	ECOLOGICAL		
	Range	$200,000	$50,000
II	BIOLOGICAL		
	Health	150,000	50,000
	Nutrition	150,000	50,000
	Breeding	150,000	50,000
	Physiology	150,000	50,000
III	SOCIO-ECONOMIC SYSTEMS		
	Economics	150,000	25,000
	Sociology	150,000	25,000
	Production Systems	150,000	25,000
	Systems Analysis	150,000	25,000

Additional Site or Component Takeover in I and II above:

Year 1	$70,000
Year 2	$50,000

Additional Site or Component Takeover in III above:

Year 1	$50,000
Year 2	$25,000

[1] Approximately 10% inflation factor was added to all these values.

TABLE 4

BOARD APPROVED BUDGET

YEAR 5 - 1982/83

Institution	Discipline	Required	
1. California	Breeding	220,000	
2. California	Health	190,000	
3. Cal Poly	Reproduction	.....	transfer to Utah State
4. Colorado	Health	190,000	
5. Missouri	Sociology	220,000	+ $55,000 for Morocco
6. Montana	Breeding	165,000	
7. North Carolina	Nutrition	220,000	+ $75,000 for Morocco
8. Ohio State	Forages	.....	transfer to Texas Tech
9. Texas A&M	Breeding	165,000	+ $75,000 for second component
10. Texas A&M	Systems	165,000	+ $75,000 for second component
11. Texas Tech	Range	220,000	+ $75,000 for second component
12. Tuskegee	Management	.....	transfer to Texas A&M
13. Utah State	Range	220,000	+ $75,000 for Morocco
14. Utah State	Reproduction	220,000	
15. Washington	Health	190,000	
16. Winrock	Economics	220,000	
17. Winrock	Farm Systems	165,000	+ 75,000 for second component
			3,275,000 in subgrants
Special Board Authorizations			
18. Exchanges between LDCs		100,000	
19. Prolific Sheep Program Devel.		100,000	
20. General Contingency Fund		240,187	
			200,000 Board Authorisations
21. CRSP Committees, Boards, Panels		180,000	
			180,000 (EEP, TC, BIR, OC'S, Audit
22. Management Entity		255,000	
			255,000 (ME office at UC Davis)
GRAND TOTAL			$4,150,187

14

TABLE 5

PRESENT STRUCTURE OF SR-CRSP

	BRAZIL	PERU	KENYA	MOROCCO	INDONESIA
Breeding	TAMU	MSU	TAMU	UCD	UCD
Sociology	UOM	UOM	UOM	UOM	UOM
Nutrition	NCSU	--	--	NCSU	NCSU
Economics	WI	WI	WI	--	WI
Health	UCD	CSU	WSU	--	--
Range	USU	TTU	--	USU	--
Reproduction	USU	USU	--	--	--
Systems	--	--	TAMU	--	--
Management	TAMU	--	--	--	--
Forages	--	TTU	WI	--	--
Farming Systems	--	--	WI	--	--

30 projects in 10 disciplines

Possible options:

1. Combine forages, nutrition, management into NUTRITION AND FEED PRODUCTION
2. Combine Sociology and Economics into SOCIO-ECONOMICS
3. Combine Systems Analysis and Farming Systems into SYSTEMS RESEARCH

TABLE 6

PROSPECTIVE STRUCTURE OF SR-CRSP

	BRAZIL	PERU	KENYA	MOROCCO	INDONESIA
Breeding	TAMU*	MSU°	TAMU*	UCD*	UCD*
Socio-Economics	WI*	UOM*	UOM*	UOM°	WI*
Nutrition	NCSU*	--	WI†	NCSU*	NCSU*
Health	UCD*	CSU*	WSU*	--	--
Range	USU*	TTU*	--	USU*	--
Reproduction	USU*	USU*	--	--	--
Systems	--	--	TAMU*/WI	--	--

° 0 resident expatriates
* 1 resident expatriate
† 2 resident expatriates