

Executive Summary

[New] Pest Management Program – National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA)

Based upon recommendations from

The Board on Agriculture Assembly (BAA) of the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU)

In 2012, the BAA formed a national Working Group on Pest Management (“Working Group”)¹ to develop recommendation to strengthen the nation’s responses to crop production challenges and the threats of disease, insect pests and weeds. The Working Group’s recommendations focus on improving support for the agricultural, as well as the urban sector, through the identification of several core programs, called “Essential Elements” within a new Pest Management Program. The recommendations also address better collaboration and streamlining of a number of important, but currently standalone, NIFA budget lines.

Essential Elements of a New Pest Management Program

A number of critically important Pest Management programs supported by USDA are administered by the nation’s Land Grant Colleges and Universities (LGUs). These programs involve direct assistance to producers and urban clientele (in ways that are effective and efficient) and are backed by strong support from farmers and many other stakeholders. The Working Group identifies these as “Essential Elements” (see page two).

Funding Needs

Over the past five years, several pest management funding lines at NIFA have been eliminated, and/or combined. Within just the last two years, some \$2.6M has been redirected for (FY 2012 vs. FY 2013-proposed), and two important programs, Crops at Risk (\$1.4M) and the Risk Avoidance and Mitigation program (\$4.4M), have been eliminated. In addition, congressionally targeted special grant funds to address plant diseases and pest management (approximately \$23M) have been eliminated. The Working Group calls attention to the need to recapture the nearly \$34M in reductions and redirections. This support is critical to our ability to respond to pest management problems at the local, regional and national levels.

Essential Elements*	Estimated 2013 Funding (\$1,000s)	Estimated Future Funding Needs (\$1,000s)
Extension – IPM (E-IPM)	\$9,918	\$9,918
Regional IPM Centers (base support for four centers)	\$4,000	\$4,000
Integrated Pest Management Pest Information Platform for Extension (IPM-PIPE)	\$115	\$150
Competitive Grants Programs		
Regional IPM Centers (RIPM-targeted grants on pest control tactics)	\$2,362	\$2,362
Extension Integrated Pest Management (EIPM) Decision Support System	\$153	\$153
Pest Management Alternatives Program (PMAP)	\$1,402	\$1,402
Crops at Risk (CAR)	0	\$1,400
Risk Avoidance and Mitigation Program (RAMP)	0	\$4,400
Community IPM		NEW/TBD
Next Generation of Crop Protection Scientists		NEW/TBD
Total	\$17,950	\$23,785

* Not in priority order. Not represented here are the funds for the IR-4 program totaling \$11,913,000.

¹ The National Pest Management Working Group was composed of more than 40 professionals representing land-grant universities, industry, stakeholder groups, ARS, and NIFA.

Essential Elements of a New Pest Management Program

- **Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program (E-IPM)** works directly with agricultural producers, urban clientele, and other pest managers, providing education about sound pest management practices. The E-IPM program is centered on locally-adapted, problem-solving, and is critical to fully integrating scientific expertise with outreach that engages stakeholders about Integrated Pest Management (IPM). (This ensures that the work of the other Essential Elements actually reach pest managers resulting in economic, social and environmental benefits.)
- **Regional IPM Centers** maintain critical linkages to local stakeholders through the IPM programs of participating states and territories. These centers fund research and extension activities and broker information about IPM research, education and extension priorities for regions, commodities, and other environments where IPM is needed.
- **The ipmPIPE** is a monitoring network and early-warning system developed by the LGUs, USDA, and private groups to alert farmers to the presence of pest problems of area-wide importance. The ipmPIPE program includes surveillance and monitoring networks, a web-based information management system with criteria for deciding when to apply pesticides, predictive modeling, and outreach directly to producers (often through the E-IPM network of state coordinators).
- **A Competitive Grant Program** is an important component for strategically focusing the following essential elements of the New Pest Management Program. The Working Group recommends that recently lost funding in a number of NIFA pest management programs (e.g., CAR, RAMP, RIPM and PMAP) be recaptured and restructured into a new single competitive grant effort with shared responsibility for administering by both NIFA and the network of Regional IPM Centers. In addition, the Working Group also noted significant funding has been lost since 2010 by discontinuing many pest-management related special grants. If recovered, these funds could be redirected within a new overall approach to competitive grant management.
- **Community IPM** is a new initiative proposed by the Working Group to help manage pests in schools, homes, yards, office buildings, workplaces, etc. Community IPM encompasses an extremely wide range of environments, including places where people live, work, learn, play, directly benefiting nearly all US citizens.
- **Developing future and next generation of scientists while expanding the capacity for science-based decision making by pest management professionals** is critical to meeting challenges we face today and those for which we must prepare. The Working Group recommends that the new program include a commitment to undergraduate internships, graduate student opportunities, and curriculum development.

Enhancing Coordination and Improving Efficiency

Each Essential Element serves an important niche within the national pest management portfolio of programs and supporting services for producers. However, it is also important to directly and clearly enhance coordination and efficiency through role clarification, shared leadership, and accountability at national, regional and state levels. The Working Group further recommends:

- A Pest Management Coordinating Council appointed by the BAA's Extension Committee on Operations and Policy (ECOP) and Experiment State Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) to provide "shared leadership and decision-making" in national level decisions with NIFA. Such collaboration should include program priorities and funding, and coordination among the Essential Elements of the new Pest Management Program.
- A National IPM Coordinator should be named within USDA (the REE Under Secretary's office) to provide department-wide leadership, coordination, and management for federally-funded pest management efforts.