



External Advisory Panel Monday (EAP) 19<sup>th</sup> June 2017  
Board Room, Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies, Easter Bush

**Present:**

Mizeck Chagunda (Chair)	Prof. Funso Soniayi (Skype)	Ciara Vance (CV)
Prof. Andy Peters (AP)	Andy Catley (AC)	Louise Donnison (LD)
Dr Tim Robinson (TR)	Prof. James Smith (Observer)	Alan Duncan (AD)
Dr Wendy Harrison (WH)	(11.00-1300)	Antonia Robb (AR; Secretary)
Dr Lois Muraguri (LM)	Prof. Geoff Simm (GS)	
Prof. Jonathan Rushton (JR)	Darren Watt (DW)	
Dr Michael Pearce (MP)	Karen Smyth (KS)	

**Apologies:**

**Introduction to SEB & EAP**

- Professor David Argyle welcomed the members of the committee to the school
- Committee members introduced themselves and gave an overview of their background and expertise.
- Prof. Andy Peters gave a presentation on the high level background to SEBI and the role of the EAP:

<https://datasync.ed.ac.uk/index.php/s/Nzi4rBChFOH4Tda>

**Key points from the initial discussion:**

- SEBI could be seen partly as a co-ordinating group bringing other organisations together.
- The EAP was envisaged to guide, support and raise the profile of the SEBI team.
- There was discussion about how the role of SEBI related to FAOSTAT. TR was now back at FAO and would connect SEBI to the relevant people at FAOSTAT.
- How would SEBI identify data sources – a starting point would be to look at other BMGF projects and meta data. Understand key issues with ownership of data, management and archiving.
- It would be necessary to identify target audiences in the decision making process, including industry who are often the decision makers rather than government.
- JR emphasised the need to understand the different classes of livestock system, structure of the sector etc., when considering technology uptake.
- GS- Suggested SEBI connected with Agrimetrics. Initial contact already made.
- Noted that SEBI is planning to undertake a demand study assessing the data needs of stakeholders in Ethiopia and Tanzania. This would be discussed further at the CoP meeting on 20-22 June 2017.

**MC opened discussion on paper 4 – Terms of Reference (ToR) for the EAP**

<https://datasync.ed.ac.uk/index.php/s/X7cJt3kXtzZMggB>

- EAP not being asked for formal endorsement but SEBI might occasionally seek their support in negotiations with stakeholders.
- EAP to act as a expert peer review for SEBI.
- Modus Operandi:
  - 6 monthly meetings.
  - EAP will be invited to comment and have input on specific tasks.
  - Provide support needed to keep projects on track.
  - Review project progress and performance at each meeting.



SEBI project details - outline the Program objectives, status quo, successes, challenges, progress

- Prof Andy Peters gave a presentation on SEBI Program 1  
<https://datasync.ed.ac.uk/index.php/s/15CjNVenaVgaXof>

MC opened for discussion around SEBI Program 1

- Discussion around mortality and different classes of cattle are the same e.g. breed, gender, age. For example 50% mortality of male calves is not a big issue in the dairy sector.
- There are different priorities on production in different countries, age differences and gender differences. Needs to be specific – such as,
  - Or looking at economic impact then the potential (rationale) for intervention.
  - Projects are not hypothesis driven at the moment but interventions would need to be e.g. vaccination program to reduce economic impact of CBPP.
- ICAR have developed methodology over the last 30 years in animal breeding this is available to help harmonise data from different countries to allow genetic evaluations. This may be helpful for the objectives of the SEBI program. SG and MC have a PhD student currently looking at data in this area.
- Need clarity on targets, also possibly re-ordering programs 2, 3 and 1 to allow for more logical linkage between the programs.
  - AP -This was looked at previously, however it could be reviewed again in future.
- Questions were raised as to how we define 'new technology'. Is it a vaccine or policy level change? Could 'new technology' be a different management system? In some circumstances novel technology may not be required. Existing available interventions could be as effective.
- Agreed need to ensure we factor in conditions such as drought to mortality levels. This is the biggest livestock killer.

- Ciara Vance gave a presentation on SEBI Program 2  
<https://datasync.ed.ac.uk/index.php/s/Rgbr6eDhOU4Dvli>

MC opened for discussion around SEBI Program 2

- Sub-Contract with Tableau.
  - Used as a visualisation platform
  - Easy to use and view
  - SEBI has 20 licences which can be distributed to partners e.g. GALVmed
- Important to identify the specific audience and what type of data we will have.
  - BMGF driven. Data will be applicable to policy makers & government
- Potential to gain access to commercial farm level data that could provide useful information on fertility, mortality, milk production e.g. Reading Group (VEERU).
- Consideration needs to be given to the type of data captured and for what purpose:
  - In economic terms, it would be production rather than productivity.
  - Output per animal – usually per female
- Breeding companies should also be encouraged to share data. Some companies might adopt strategies that are unsustainable and not good for welfare.
- Noted that milk recording agencies would have good records of dairy cattle production.



- Prof Andy Peters gave a presentation on SEBI Program 3  
<https://datasync.ed.ac.uk/index.php/s/yjNth1HnUK3Q8Ms>

#### MC opened discussion around SEBI Program 3

- Define a technology
  - Anything that can increase productivity
  - Can be high tech or low tech e.g. vaccines, diagnostics, feed, management
  - BMGF may be geared towards hi tech and vaccines, would they fund low tech solutions?
  - Mobile telephony usage to deliver education/management advice.
- Benefit of collecting value chain data was discussed and understanding the data from farm to end consumer.
- Main parameter is productivity rather than mortality, leading to improvements in the income of small holder farmers
- Link with initiatives on the ground such as The African Chicken Genetics Gains Program and African Dairy Genetic Gains using mobile phones and linking to commercial company in Kenya (e.g. E Cow). These potentially feed data straight back to famers.

MC opened for discussion on direction of the programs, key challenges, solutions and developments. Where will EAP members contribute? Key points as follows:

- Scope for P2 is good but direction still to be identified, should take direction from data coming from Programs 1 & 3 by processing their outputs.
- Tanzania is very well defined and on track at University of Glasgow.
- Need to utilise outputs from Livegaps to help define Programs 1 & 3.
- Program 2 could also look towards market research rather than data exchange.
- Productivity data are of fundamental importance.

#### SEBI growth and development

The EAP team split into 2 groups to discuss the following:

What is the USP of SEBI? What niche to we occupy relative to other global initiatives?

- Part of University of Edinburgh, network and advisory. In a strong position to draw on a wide area of expertise.
- Links interventions to evidence, makes data available for secondary analysis.
- Weaknesses and challenges include the short time frame of 3 years.

From what you have heard about P1, P2 and P3 what adjustments would you advise?

- More specific and focussed, better linkage between 3 programs. Focus data collection on existing projects and on the outcomes of LIVEGAPS.

What Ideas do we have around sustainability of SEBI, LD4D and the data platform?

- 1 stop shop, additional funding could be sought from BBSRC.
- Could we go to Microsoft to request data storage?
- Data structure and analytics add value.
- CoP adds value, encourage private sector support.
- Volunteer positions.
- Show benefits to human wellbeing.
- Exploit links with other human health programs.
- Government engagement.



**MC: Discussion, wrap up, points to carry to Day 2**

- SEBI started as a new concept and now has a home.
- Not just a project – actively displaying links with other initiatives.
- Industry and governments are seeing the relevance.
- Moving in the right direction.
- Timescales of what has been achieved to date are encouraging.

**External Advisory Panel Monday (EAP) 20<sup>th</sup> June 2017  
St Leonard's Hall, Pollock Halls Campus**

**MC gave a re-cap from day 1:**

- Members of the EAP were unsure about the term of 'Retail Grant Maker' and there was much discussion around this topic. EAP offered the alternative term "Brokering House" reflecting the role of SEBI as an identifier of needs and technologies. It is noted that the term Retail Grant Maker came from BMGF and this may or may not be negotiable.
- Focus of BMGF is to help smallholder farmers – discussion around what this means, the sociological consequences of this and if the way of life for small holder farmers is sustainable.
- SEBI will not be working directly with smallholder farmers but with industry and policy makers.
- It was important to improve the clarity of understanding of the meaning of 'Technology' in reference to Program 3.

**Role of SEBI EAP**

**MC Opened the discussion about the role of the SEBI Expert Advisory Panel, looking again at paper 4: <https://datasync.ed.ac.uk/index.php/s/X7cJt3kXtzZMggB>**

- SEBI looking for support and expert opinion from the EAP members.
- Size of group is ideal and skills of members have been matched to 3 SEBI programs.
- SEBI is hoping to have "assertive" advice from the panel.
- SEBI currently provides regular updates to BMGF and could copy this to the EAP.
- EAP to meet 6 monthly (1 face to face, 1 teleconference).
- EAP to help raise SEBI profile.
- The use of Social Media was being reviewed with a view to implementation in the near future.
- SEBI will welcome ongoing feedback from EAP members.

**SEBI Finance**

**Prof. Andy Peters gave a presentation on SEBI Finance:**

**<https://datasync.ed.ac.uk/index.php/s/BhFofjkvxIRfEtp>**

**Discussion around SEBI Finance:**

- SEBI funded to approximately £5.5 million for 3 years.
- Recognised that the 'interventions' part e.g. Program 3 is underfunded – there is an understanding that more funding will flow subject to satisfactory delivery and demonstrated investment opportunities.
- There is some flexibility to move funds between projects (within 10%).
- A 6-9 month no cost extension had been agreed in principle with BMGF.
- Budget underspent due to time lag in getting started.



Josef Geoola gave a presentation on SEBI Legal:

<https://datasync.ed.ac.uk/index.php/s/sYA5SeweqL4Fe3P>

Discussion around SEBI Legal:

- SEBI Governed by Scottish Law.
- Funds sit with the University of Edinburgh and are considered to be public funding.
- There was considerable discussion about the meaning of Global Access and it was noted that the policy was open to revision as the SEBI program unfolds.
- BMGF would offer its access to legal resource as necessary.

Karen Smyth gave an overview summary of the 2 days' discussions

- We have discussed Programs 1, 2 & 3. P1 & P3 appear relatively straightforward thus far but P2 presents lots of questions.
  - Too ambitious with data platform.
  - Specify our audience?
  - Who wants the information?
  - What will it be used for?
  - Focus on specific countries.
  - Put Program 1 data into Program 2.
  - Better integration of P1, 2 & 3.
  - BMGF have a major interest in technological solutions.
  - Is the intention to sustain the practice of smallholder farming or just help make it more efficient?
- Output from P1 and LIVEGAPS should lead the technology focus as far as possible.

Stan Wood joined the meeting and gave an overview of his thoughts for the Panel:

- 3 separate pieces of work were put into the single SEBI grant.
- No need to over-engineer connections between 3 programs.
- The main purpose is evidence gathering and modelling.
- Livestock sector is poorly served compared with the crop sector.
- CoP is a virtual community that needs management – SEBI is to have this overview.
- Country focus is a good idea – there should be more focus on engagement at country level.

Discussion around SW overview:

- Practitioners should have access to data.
- Information needs to be discoverable.
- SEBI should have a Development not Research focus.
- In addition to the Geographic Focus could we have a thematic focus?
- Within 18 months we would like to see community coming together with grantees collaborating and this will be the key to success of the project
- EAP feel there is a need to integrate P1, 2 & 3 and that the scope is there.
- Suggest meeting of BMGF grantees.
- BMGF has a tremendous belief in animal health and vaccines.



Prof. Andy Peters summed up the discussions:

Suggested that SEBI is broadly moving in the right direction. Two days of meeting with CoP to follow. Still unsure about integration of the 3 programs – we will likely try to integrate them all using data from LIVEGAPS 1 & 2. Thanks for the enthusiastic input from EAP.

Karen Smyth gave a presentation on SEBI Communications Plan

<https://datasync.ed.ac.uk/index.php/s/Z5xA4tSIQXuHlxI>

#### Discussion around SEBI Communications

- LM offered support to the SEBI team on communication

MC Summed up the session from the past 2 days:

It has been a very first useful session with a good panel with a wide area of expertise. Honoured to be chairman and looking forward to the long term impact of SEBI – Thanks given to all.

AP Summed up the session from past 2 days

Thanks was given to all for willing participation at the meeting. SEBI is a small team and new to the sector so it will take some time to have impact. Thank you to MC for agreeing to be Chairman. SEBI appears to be progressing in the right direction but with lots of work to do and lots to still understand. Noted that the SEBI concepts were new to the EAP and this session had largely been about the team informing the EAP. It is to be expected that more specific actions would come out of future meetings. Now looking forward to 2 days of CoP meetings.

Next meeting – approx. 6 months to be arranged via Doodle poll. It is suggested that those living close by might attend in person and others would probably join by Skype.

#### Actions arising from the EAP meeting:

1. TR to connect SEBI to FAOSTAT
2. SEBI hold discussions with BMGF over plans for livestock grantee meeting
3. SEBI follow up with LM regarding advice around SEBI communications
4. SEBI to set and communicate date of next EAP meeting
5. SEBI to circulate Results Tracker to EAP
6. SEBI to send quarterly update report to EAP

Group Photograph:

<https://datasync.ed.ac.uk/index.php/s/Xj3gg1duzeoDOBS>