

**Call Notes: ESCOP Science & Technology Committee Conference Call**  
**February 23, 2015 @ 3:30 pm**  
**215-446-3656, ACCESS CODE: 1442561**

**Participants:**

John Russin (Chair), Jeff Jacobsen, Harald Scherm, Cameron Faustman, Larry Curtis, Dave Thompson, Adel Shirmohammadi, Chris Hamilton (recorder)

**Call Summary and Next Steps:**

1. General agreement on most recommendations
2. Some discussion regarding going beyond recommendations:
  - a. Land-grants need to speak with a unified voice on support for capacity and competitive funds.
  - b. Action Item: Develop a faculty survey to ask within institutions/regions for specific reasons why NIFA grant applications have declined, so that we have a better sense of the problem and potential solutions.
  - c. Action Item: Engage with NPLs and others on ways to increase interagency collaborations (NIFA, NIH, NSF, etc.).
3. Jeff Jacobsen and Chris Hamilton will reach out to other S&T members for any additional feedback.
4. Develop an S&T committee position paper/communication/memo to send to ESCOP.
5. Next call Monday, March 23 from 4-5 ET. Same call-in number.

**Call Notes:**

1. John Russin reiterated S&T purpose from email. John provided a brief history of the committee, including the 2010 ESCOP Science and Tech Roadmap and the trifold.
2. Call charge: To discuss and develop a position paper/communication/memo on the NRC Report on AFRI and the NIFA response. Discussion of the four recommendations (knowing that recommendations 2-4 have subcomponents).

***RECOMMENDATION 1:*** *The United States should strengthen its public investment in competitive agricultural R&D to ensure that it continues its role of a global leader in the innovations and technologies that are needed to promote health and well-being and to feed growing worldwide populations sustainably.*

**S&T Comments:**

Yes, this is important and we support this recommendation. We saw an AFRI increase, but dollars are small, especially as compared to NIH and NSF. What is the cause? Lobbying issue? More work needed from our stakeholders?

NIFA agrees with this recommendation, but there's not much they can do.

APLU Sightlines Infrastructure inventory: Our facilities are in a state of disrepair and may be something that might get attention.

NIFA's support for competitive versus capacity funds? One issue is that we haven't spoken with one voice as Land-grants on the Hill.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** NIFA should simplify the AFRI program structure by realigning it to more clearly address its specific mission and mandates as defined in authorizing legislation.

**Recommendation 2-A:** To realign AFRI's portfolio with its legislative mandate, NIFA should renew its priority for fundamental research. That should include an emphasis on proposals that will generate fundamental knowledge to support novel technologies, provide platforms for extension and education, and educate the next generation of food and agricultural scientists.

**S&T Comments:**

Agree and support. Workforce issue needs to be addressed. Need support for training, States can't afford to fund it on our own.

Percent of success is too low, result of CAP grants siphoning funds or is there something else going on?

Foundational grants (investigator driven) more responsive as compared to grants that encompass the less than nimble Challenge Area grants.

There is a demonstrated need and the budget should be increased.

Important to reinforce the unique nature of NIFA with inquiry-driven research AND mission-driven research. This uniquely distinguishes the NIFA research mission from other federal agencies.

**Recommendation 2-B:** As part of its realignment, AFRI should be simplified by eliminating the Challenge-Area Program, and areas of research within the Foundational Program should be primarily investigator driven.

**S&T Comments:**

Those who get CAP grants support them; some things just can't be done without large amounts of money.

Other, smaller areas might go by the wayside for a while.

Sometimes a lot of money is too much.

Yes, this is moving in the right direction, further support basic/foundational research funding.

**Recommendation 2-C:** *AFRI should carefully examine the causes of the decline in the numbers of applicants, awardees, and trainees and adjust its grant programs to ensure that future generations of young scientists are not lost inadvertently from food and agriculture R&D because of funding policies.*

S&T Comments:

Agree with recommendations. More money needed

Need more information on reasons for fewer applications

Action Item: Develop a faculty survey –ask within institutions/regions why applications have declined (potential reasons below).

Low funding percentages (~13% average, is this worth the time given the size and duration of the awards?)

Should full indirects be allowed on subcontracts?

Need for preliminary data limits success, competition in general, has ARS eligibility influenced LGU success?

Panel review process and variability issues? Should NPLs play greater role? How can we help NIFA?

Difficulty and time consuming coordinating Extension, Research, and Education mission are projects. Even the integration of Research and Extension has larger transaction costs.

What kind of incentives and awards logistical support can be provided at the institutional level to prevent burnout? There are so many additional expectations on faculty, so perhaps this is causing the decline in applications. Maybe this is not a NIFA problem.

**Recommendation 2-D:** *AFRI should consider eliminating CAP grants as a grant category and committing more resources to other grant types.*

S&T Comments: (see above) Agree with recommendations.

In general, CAP project productivity not as great as single PI due to a number of factors.

The NRC Review evaluated 'early period' CAP grant performance and does not necessarily reflect the performance of the most recently awarded CAP grants. These recently awarded CAPs are now fully operational and are generating their own levels of outputs and outcomes.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** *AFRI should develop a strategic plan that identifies priorities for its overall program, goals for meeting them, and a framework for assessing the program's progress.*

**Recommendation 3-A:** *NIFA and USDA should lead interagency efforts to effectively coordinate and collaborate across agencies on food and agricultural research.*

S&T Comments:

Agree with this recommendation.

So many areas of overlap exist between USDA/NIFA supported research and NIH, NSF and DOE (for example). We need more efforts to partner and pool/crossover resources and break down walls. We need support from other agencies in language and action for doing collaborative work.

Obesity and Nutrition; Food, Energy and Water; and Pharmaceuticals are several areas of potential intersection. Discussion with NPLs and others to facilitate partnerships is recommended. Do we know how these federal agency partnerships develop?

**Recommendation 3-B:** *NIFA should form an AFRI Scientific Advisory Council that consists of members who represent the food and agricultural research, education, and extension professional communities.*

S&T Comments: Yes, strongly agree. We need Land-grant based advisory board that would have outspoken, good thinkers and individuals interested in a different future. The mechanisms to discuss issues with NIFA and the NAREEE Board, APLU sections and FFAR are not adequate.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:** *To enhance program accountability and management, AFRI should have a dedicated leader who manages the program on a daily basis.*

**Recommendation 4-A:** *NIFA should establish a clearer organizational structure and lines of authority for AFRI, including a designated director to lead, manage, and speak for its program, and NPLs dedicated to AFRI alone.*

**Recommendation 4-B:** NIFA should have a more consistent and predictable program portfolio and funding strategy to enable better planning by the food and agricultural research community.

**Recommendation 4-C:** NIFA should use a more robust information-management system that would provide a basis for AFRI policy and strategic planning. The system should allow detailed assessment and management of the food and agricultural competitive research funding pool.

**Recommendation 4-D:** NIFA should develop the capability to regularly evaluate AFRI projects in terms of their outcomes, which would allow assessment of the economic and social impacts of the research that AFRI supports.

**Recommendation 4-E:** NIFA should establish standard operating procedures that provide greater opportunity for NPLs to contribute to final project-funding decisions.

**S&T Comments:**

Are these systems impeding NIFA operations?

There is a need to increase Congressional support for NIFA through a better and more thorough understanding of what the problems for the historical lack of increased federal financial commitment, for example, on par with NSF or NIH increases.

Use of Impact Statements to show importance of research in NIFA communications efforts extracted from Annual Reports and POW. Why not make better use of the [landgrantimpact.org](http://landgrantimpact.org) database?

Need to team up to help NIFA and disseminate information better, get big statement out there. Why should this be supported and why is it important are key questions that must be answered.

## ESCOP Science & Technology – CALL MINUTES

March 23, 2015 @ 4 pm ET

215-446-3656, ACCESS CODE: 1442561

### Committee Members:

<p><b>Chair:</b> John Russin (SAAESD)</p> <p><b>Delegates:</b> Larry Curtis (WAAESD) David Thompson (WAAESD) Joe Colletti (NCRA) Deb Hamernik (NCRA) Cameron Faustman (NERA) Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA) Nathan McKinney (SAAESD) Harald Scherm (SAAESD) Teferi Tsegaye (ARD) Marakis Alvarez (ARD)*</p> <p><b>Executive Vice-Chair</b> Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA)</p>	<p><b>Liaisons:</b> Terry Nelsen (ERS) Cliff Gabriel (OSTP) Adrianna Hewings (ARS) Frank Zalom (Pest Mgmt Subcom) Edwin Price (ICOP) Scott Loveridge (Social Sci Subcom) Bob Holland (NIFA) Muquarrab Qureshi (NIFA)</p> <p><b>*Chair elect</b></p>
--	---

**Participants:** David Thompson, Deb Hamernik, Adel Shirmohammadi, Nathan McKinney, Bob Holland, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton (recorder)

### Action Items:

1. Approve first addition to the 2/23/2015 notes; see details in topic 2.a. below.
2. Disapprove second addition to the 2/23/2015 notes; see details in topic 2.b. below.
3. Approval of 2/23/2014 minutes.
4. Disapprove conducting a survey on faculty survey on low rates of grant applications
5. ESCOP/S&T should evaluate the NAREEE board and provide suggestions on improvements to NIFA.
6. Approve scheduling a half day face to face meeting during the Fall ESS/AES/ARD Meeting and Workshop, 9/28-30, 2015 in Charlotte, NC
7. Next call Monday, April 27 from 4-5 ET at same call-in number.

### Call Notes:

1. **Roll call:** David Thompson, Deb Hamernik, Adel Shirmohammadi, Nathan McKinney, Bob Holland, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton (recorder)

## **2. Potential Additions to 2/23/2015 Minutes:**

- a. Joe Coletti (S&T member, but cannot join calls at this time due to scheduling conflict) suggested to Jeff via phone conversation, which in turn Jeff paraphrased on page 2, under Recommendation 2: Important to reinforce the unique nature of NIFA with inquiry-driven research AND mission-driven research. This uniquely distinguishes the NIFA research mission from other federal agencies.
- b. A second element was paraphrased on page 3, 2-D: The NRC Review evaluated 'early period' CAP grant performance and does not necessarily reflect the performance of the most recently awarded CAP grants. These recently awarded CAPs are now fully operational and are generating their own levels of outputs and outcomes.
  - i. Disapprove this addition: We need data to support this change to the notes/recommendations and we don't have the information to measure these yet. Their productivity still needs to be examined.
  - ii. Perhaps we should wait until they are over, since some have only had 5 years of activity so far.
  - iii. Conversation Summary: CAP grant performance/productivity should be evaluated across all CAPS awards (past and current) and, most importantly, after the entire award term is complete.
- c. Without the 2.b. addition, the 2/23/2015 minutes are approved.

## **3. Discussion Items on AFRI Review**

- a. Faculty Survey (*Recommendation 2C*)
  - i. Do we need a survey? Would it even be useful to ESCOP or NIFA? Comments:
    - 1. Perhaps we already know the reasons for low application rates (some programs have such narrow priorities, priorities change year to year, award rate is so low).
    - 2. Human subject issues would be involved for a true scientific survey triggering a IRB review. Develop questions, obtain formal approvals, etc.
    - 3. General impression, will vary from year to year, so many different reasons and interpretations may exist.
    - 4. Informal communications might be the most valuable for developing recommendations.
    - 5. Unclear if this information would even help NIFA in the end.
    - 6. We might learn something, but it's probably not worth the effort
    - 7. Overall: No, let's not do a formal survey.
  - ii. Comment: NIFA is adding new programs (Exploratory Research) and increasing funding amounts (CARE program, from \$150,000 to \$200,000 upper limit) to help increase the number of applications and the quality.
- b. Interagency Collaborations (*Recommendation 3A*)
  - i. We don't have a good sense on how NIFA leads on these collaborations and what can ESCOP do to assist with these efforts.
    - 1. These collaborations come in different formats, official mutual funding (i.e. robotics, plant seed stock genomics, etc.) with committed NIFA and other agency funds. \$25-28 million committed to interagency

programs, want to leverage 4-5x this amount, details are outlined in specific RFAs (watch for these on the NIFA website)

2. Other Interagency programs which are not as formal:
    - a. NIFA and Food and Nutrition Service, via regional nutrition centers
    - b. Food Safety with NSF and NIFA (IL Institute of Technology website) is a good program to review
    - c. NIFA Deputy Director Luis Tupas ([ltupas@nifa.usda.gov](mailto:ltupas@nifa.usda.gov)) is a good contact for NSF and water collaborations
  3. What input can ESCOP have on these collaborations?
    - a. Let NIFA know about important topics for interagency opportunities.
    - b. Communicate this information through NPLs and/or deputy directors.
    - c. Same for international research opportunities – NIFA cannot fund these, but can work through agencies that do have an international component.
  - c. Scientific Advisory Council (*Recommendation 3B*) – NIFA discussions are occurring at this time on this topic. One existing mechanism is for ESCOP to engage with the NAREEE board and offer suggestions. In addition, ESCOP could offer additional insight into this recommendation.
- 4. Face to Face S&T Meeting Discussion**
- a. Yes, a face to face would be good. Various options were discussed.
  - b. Fall ESS/AES/ARD Workshop in September 28-30, 2015, Charlotte, NC would be the best option.

Call adjourned at 5 pm ET.



**ESCOP Science & Technology****April 27, 2015 @ 4 pm ET****215-446-3656, ACCESS CODE: 1442561****Committee Members:**

<b>Chair:</b> John Russin (SAAESD)  <b>Delegates:</b> Larry Curtis (WAAESD) David Thompson (WAAESD) Joe Colletti (NCRA) Deb Hamernik (NCRA) Cameron Faustman (NERA) Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA) Nathan McKinney (SAAESD) Harald Scherm (SAAESD) Teferi Tsegaye (ARD) Marakis Alvarez (ARD)*  <b>Executive Vice-Chair</b> Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA)	<b>Liaisons:</b> Terry Nelsen (ERS) Cliff Gabriel (OSTP) Adrianna Hewings (ARS) Frank Zalom (Pest Mgmt Subcom) Edwin Price (ICOP) Scott Loveridge (Social Sci Subcom) Bob Holland (NIFA) Muquarrab Qureshi (NIFA)  <b>*Chair elect</b>
--	--

**Action Items**

1. March 23, 2015 call notes approved. Chris Hamilton will upload these to the ESCOP website.
2. Today's call agenda approved.
3. Committee agrees that the AFRI Summary Notes document looks good and summarizes the committee's approach well.
4. Committee finalized their commitment to meet face to face on October 1. They are awaiting specifics from Jeff/John, but Chris Hamilton told them to plan for a morning meeting (8-12 noon) when making travel arrangements.
5. Next call will be at 4 pm ET on Monday, June 1.

**Call Notes**

Note: Neither John Russin nor Jeff Jacobsen was able to join the call, due to a last minute emergency. Due to the short notice and with John's approval, Chris Hamilton ran a brief call, covering the major agenda items.

1. Roll Call: Bob Holland, Deb Hamernik, Scott Loveridge, Cameron Faustman, Nathan McKinney, Teferi Tsegaye, Marakis Alvarez, Larry Curtis, Adel Shirmohammadi, Chris Hamilton
2. Review Minutes and Approve (3/23/2015 Call): Approved
3. Approve Agenda: Approved
4. Finalize AFRI Review Approach and Content (Attachment AFRI Summary Notes): Everyone agreed they look good and summarize the committee's position well.
5. Finalize the commitment to a face-to-face at the ESS/SAES/ARD meeting on October 1:
  - a. Yes, committee is looking forward to meeting at this time and awaits final confirmation on arrangements from Jeff Jacobsen and John Russin.
  - b. Chris Hamilton told the committee to plan on a morning session, perhaps between 8am and 12 noon, when making travel arrangements.
6. TOPIC – Open Access to Publications and Data (April 27, June 1 and maybe June 22): Topic was tabled until next call on June 1, 2015.
  - a. Attachment USDA Public Access Implementation Plan (Wotecki webinar)
  - b. Website hyperlink to USDA and other federal agency plans (<http://tinyurl.com/q95gqhj>)
7. TOPIC – Multistate Research Award Selection (June 1)
  - a. Chris Hamilton described the deadlines for regional submissions and will send a rating/rankings sheet with nomination materials.
  - b. Committee members should review the materials and rank submissions in advance of June 1 call.
8. TOPIC - National Guidelines for Multistate Research Award (June 1): We will approve the 2016 National Guidelines during the June 1 call.
9. Other TOPICS: Next call will be at 4 pm ET on Monday, June 1.

Call adjourned.

## ESCOP Science & Technology

June 1, 2015 @ 4 pm ET

215-446-3656, ACCESS CODE: 1442561

### Committee Members:

<p><b>Chair:</b> John Russin (SAAESD)</p> <p><b>Delegates:</b> Larry Curtis (WAAESD) David Thompson (WAAESD) Joe Colletti (NCRA) Deb Hamernik (NCRA) Cameron Faustman (NERA) Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA) Nathan McKinney (SAAESD) Harald Scherm (SAAESD) Teferi Tsegaye (ARD) Marikis Alvarez (ARD)*</p> <p><b>Executive Vice-Chair</b> Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA)</p>	<p><b>Liaisons:</b> Terry Nelsen (ERS) Cliff Gabriel (OSTP) Adrianna Hewings (ARS) Frank Zalom (Pest Mgmt Subcom) Edwin Price (ICOP) Scott Loveridge (Social Sci Subcom) Parag Chitnis (NIFA) Denise Eblen (NIFA)</p> <p><b>*Chair elect</b></p>
--	--

### Action Items

1. April 27, 2015 call notes were approved. Chris Hamilton has uploaded them to the ESCOP website.
2. NC140 was confirmed as the committee's recommended national winner of the 2015 ESS Excellence in Multistate Research Award and Chris Hamilton/Jeff Jacobsen will send this recommendation on to the ESCOP Executive Committee for final approval.
3. The committee decided to limit supporting appendices for nominations submitted at the national level (to the S&T committee) to only the single page listing of participating institutions. Regional nomination packets may include additional materials. This change will be reflected in the final version of the S&T's 2016 Multistate Research Award Announcement.
4. Next Call: Monday, June 22 at 4 pm ET. Jeff Jacobsen will forward on to the committee materials related to open access to data and publications to facilitate discussion.
5. Our October 1, 8 am to 12 noon face-to-face meeting in Charlotte, NC was confirmed. Please plan your travel to include this additional session.

### Call Notes

1. Roll Call: Deb Hamernik, Cameron Faustman, Marikis Alvarez, Larry Curtis, Adel Shirmohammadi, David Thompson, Harald Scherm, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton (recorder)

2. Review Minutes and Approve (4/27/2015 Call): Approved
3. 2015 Multistate Research Award Winner Discussion: The Committee discussed the results of the 2015 multistate award ranking (included below). All were in agreement of the rankings and comments listed in the summary sheet. Chris/Jeff will forward NC140 on to the ESCOP Executive Committee for final approval as the national winner. The ranking sheet will be included so that EDs can share the S&T committee's comments on with their regional winners.
4. Revised 2016 Multistate Award Announcement:
  - a. The Committee discussed the updated 2016 Excellence in Multistate Research Award Announcement and provided a few minor edits to the text.
  - b. Discussion ensued on whether the same projects can be submitted multiple times. The Committee agreed that this decision should reside with individual regions.
  - c. Further discussion centered on nomination page limits and whether letters of support and other supporting appendix materials should be included. By consensus, the Committee decided that supporting materials can be included at the regional level, but when regional winners are submitted to the national S&T committee, they should adhere to a firm 3-page limit, plus one additional page listing participating institutions.
  - d. Jeff will revise the 2016 Award Announcement to reflect these updates.
5. Next Steps for the ESCOP S&T (for June 22 call and beyond): Our June 22 call will center around NIFA's new policy on open access to data and publications. Jeff Jacobsen will forward on to the committee materials related to open access to data and publications to facilitate discussion, as well as try to include Bill Hoffman in the discussion.
6. Our October 1, 2015, face-to-face meeting in Charlotte, NC is confirmed and we have a room. Please plan your travel so that you can attend this meeting. We'll meet from 8 am to 12 noon.

Call adjourned.

## 2015 ESS Excellence in Multistate Research Award

Please rank each nomination from 1-4, with 1 being the best, based on the award criteria below. Include your supporting comments in the appropriate column.

*All nominated projects shall be evaluated using the same criteria including, in descending order of importance, the Project's: accomplishments indicated by outputs, outcomes and impacts; added-value and synergistic advantages from the Project's interdependency; degree of institutional participation (SAES and others); extent of multi-disciplinary activity; amount of integrated activities (multi-functional); and evidence of additional leveraged funding to further the Project goals.*

### COMMITTEE SUMMARY

Project No.	Project Title	Average Rating (Rank)	Overview
NC140	Improving Economic and Environmental Sustainability in Tree-Fruit Production Through Changes in Rootstock Use	1.2 (1)	<p><b>Accomplishments, outcomes, impacts:</b> Clear, strong environmental, educational, economic impacts and metrics, support letters</p> <p><b>Added value/synergistic advantages from interdependency:</b> strong articulation of added value, accomplishments and deliverables could be clearer, interdependency is mostly limited to horticulturists</p> <p><b>Institutional participation:</b> Large/diverse, universities, federal, industry, Extension, international</p> <p><b>Multidisciplinary activity:</b> Broad</p> <p><b>Leveraged funding:</b> Good</p>
NE1201	Mycobacterial Diseases of Animals	3.2 (3)	<p><b>Accomplishments, outcomes, impacts:</b> Good potential impacts in the future, but</p>

			<p>currently not well defined.  Young project, good example of a multistate project coming together quickly to address an issue, repository significant, support letters</p> <p><b>Added value/synergistic advantages from interdependency:</b> Some, but generally not well defined</p> <p><b>Institutional participation:</b> Strong state, federal, industry, and international linkages, but limited participation with Extension and the public</p> <p><b>Multidisciplinary activity:</b> Not well defined</p> <p><b>Leveraged funding:</b> Unclear</p>
S1049	Integrated Management of Pecan Arthropod Pests in the Southern U.S.	2.1 (2)	<p><b>Accomplishments, outcomes, impacts:</b> Strong economic, professional/training impacts, publications, could use more recent impacts, good data on outputs, ipmPIPE, long-standing</p> <p><b>Added value/synergistic advantages from interdependency:</b> Good, mostly entomologists</p> <p><b>Institutional participation:</b> Good/modest, good connection with Extension, excellent educational component/student training</p> <p><b>Multidisciplinary activity:</b> Unclear/mostly entomologists</p> <p><b>Leveraged funding:</b> Excellent/good/modest</p>

W3122	Beneficial and Adverse Effects of Natural, Bioactive Dietary Chemicals on Human Health and Food Safety	3.5 (4)	<p><b>Accomplishments, outcomes, impacts:</b> Modest impacts/outcomes, ID of beneficial and harmful compounds, strong basic research focus, excellent publication record</p> <p><b>Added value/synergistic advantages from interdependency:</b> Unclear</p> <p><b>Institutional participation:</b> Modest, international linkages, reviewers expressed concern over failure of committee to reach out to soy processors and find mutually beneficial solutions</p> <p><b>Multidisciplinary activity:</b> Little to no Extension/outreach connection</p> <p><b>Leveraged funding:</b> Good/excellent</p>
-------	--	---------	---

**ESCOP Science & Technology****Call Notes: June 22, 2015 @ 4 pm ET****215-446-3656, ACCESS CODE: 1442561****Committee Members:**

<b>Chair:</b> John Russin (SAAESD)  <b>Delegates:</b> Larry Curtis (WAAESD) David Thompson (WAAESD) Joe Colletti (NCRA) Deb Hamernik (NCRA) Cameron Faustman (NERA) Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA) Nathan McKinney (SAAESD) Harald Scherm (SAAESD) Teferi Tsegaye (ARD) Marikis Alvarez (ARD)*  <b>Executive Vice-Chair</b> Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA)	<b>Liaisons:</b> Terry Nelsen (ERS) Cliff Gabriel (OSTP) Adrianna Hewings (ARS) Frank Zalom (Pest Mgmt Subcom) Edwin Price (ICOP) Scott Loveridge (Social Sci Subcom) Parag Chitnis (NIFA) Denise Eblen (NIFA)  <b>*Chair elect</b>
--	---

**Action Items**

1. The June 1, 2015 call notes were approved and Chris Hamilton uploaded them to the ESCOP website.
2. Please mark your calendars for our next call: Monday, August 24, at 4 pm ET (same numbers as above).
3. Jeff/Chris will look over today's call notes and synthesize a focused agenda for August 24.
4. Plan to attend our October 1, 2015 face-to-face meeting from 8 am to 12 noon at the Ballantyne Hotel, Charlotte, NC.

**Call Notes**

1. Roll Call: Larry Curtis, David Thompson, Joe Coletti, Deb Hamernik, Adel Shirmohammadi, Harald Scherm, Marikis Alvarez, Parag Chitnis, Denise Eblen, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton (recorder)



2. Review Minutes and Approve (6/1/2015 Call): Approved

3. Open Access Data Introductory Discussion:

Parag Chitnis of NIFA gave a brief introduction into the open access to federally funded data and scholarly publications resulting from the OSTP and OMB mandates, indicating that NSF and NIH have had the practice in place for a number of years, requiring two-page data management plans be submitted with all grant applications. USDA-NIFA's will mirror NSF and NIH with the two-page data management plan (DMP) requirement. NIFA has already instituted this policy through a pilot program with select competitive 2015 RFAs as a way to elicit stakeholder feedback. FY2016 RFAs will all include the two-page data management plan requirement for all competitive RFAs. The direct cost of publications and data management can be included into the grant budget. Specific standards of data management will be left up to the policies or best practices of the given research communities/professional societies, since definitions of 'raw data' through data needed to replicate the research are dependent on the given field.

Below is a summary of the S&T Committee's comments, questions, and call discussion:

Q: Will NIFA increase allowable requests on grants to cover the costs of data management above the stated grant maximum amounts? A: It will depend upon the authorizations and appropriations of the budget in question. Some programs are more flexible than others; however, no new money has been allocated for this new requirement.

Concurrently, there has been a proliferation of open access journals, resulting in page charges being reinstituted to researchers desiring to publish in these types of journals. This is a change from the past practices, whereby library subscription fees and faculty memberships to professional societies, in general, used to cover publication costs. Often, these charges result after the grant has already ended. Are there best practices for dealing with this? Perhaps include an item in the budget for publication costs?

Preliminary Data management options:

- Should NIFA create and fund its own, centralized data repository? It's an issue of cost. Funding for this would come out of existing research funds; NIFA does not currently have the funds to cover such a program. NIFA has discussed the option of creating competitive grant programs to explore open access alternatives with publications and data. NIFA and ESCOP would need to work together to encourage Congress to increase funding for such a program.
- Can (should) local university libraries or research offices take on this task? Possibly, although perhaps different locations would have different specialties. University libraries are well-equipped to handle publications, but can they handle the much more complex facet of open access with data?

- Discussion ensued on alternative models with a single university or consortium of institutions securing funds to host digital data. Regional centers might be an alternative to every institution having to do their own across disciplines and funding agencies. Some discussion reflected upon the issue across all 1862s and 1890s. Again, ESCOP and NIFA would need to work together to petition Congress for new funding to support such a program.
- Other?

How do we address the long-term, post-grant, costs of data management? How can we build these costs into grants? Are there other ways universities are funding these? What is the cost of implementing this across all institutions?

Ultimately, we need more money to meet the requirements of this unfunded mandate. Where would these funds come from? Petition Congress to increase NIFA funding? Request increases to Capacity funds? Should we be looking elsewhere besides federal grants to fund data management?

How do we address researchers who conduct their research with a variety of funding sources, including federal, state, commodity, foundation, etc.? At what threshold of funding are the data and publications considered applicable to this mandate through us of federally funded research? Currently, there is no formal NIFA policy on this.

Should the S&T committee reach out to our research communities/societies and collect information and feedback on their current and future activities associated with open access to publications and data? The tri-societies (SSSA/CSSA/ASA) and entomology groups are already involved; this is also an opportunity to reach out to animal science groups. Yes, perhaps this can be a role of this group. We may need this information or some representative samples from these sources to be able to estimate the actual costs of publications and data management and the human, physical and financial resources needed.

NIFA is happy to receive feedback at any time on this data policy. They consider this a gradual approach (and have published a three-year implementation plan) and would like to incorporate stakeholder feedback to ensure that this is not an unnecessary burden without benefit.

Path forward from this call: Jeff and Chris will discuss the call notes and work to synthesize a focused agenda for our next call. This discussion will likely carry forward over a few calls and the October 1 meeting. This Committee would then make a formal policy recommendation to ESCOP, which would then be directed to NIFA, hopefully by this fall/early winter. Parag indicated NIFA is happy to receive feedback at any time and that a timeframe of this fall would great.

Call adjourned at 4:59 pm ET.

**ESCOP Science & Technology****Call MINUTES: August 24, 2015 @ 4 pm ET****215-446-3656, ACCESS CODE: 1442561****Committee Members:**

<b>Chair:</b> John Russin (SAAESD)  <b>Delegates:</b> Larry Curtis (WAAESD) David Thompson (WAAESD) Joe Colletti (NCRA) Deb Hamernik (NCRA) Cameron Faustman (NERA) Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA) Nathan McKinney (SAAESD) Harald Scherm (SAAESD) Teferi Tsegaye (ARD) Marikis Alvarez (ARD)*  <b>Executive Vice-Chair</b> Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA ED) Chris Hamilton (NCRA AD; Recorder)	<b>Liaisons:</b> Terry Nelsen (ERS) Cliff Gabriel (OSTP) Adrianna Hewings (ARS) Frank Zalom (Pest Mgmt Subcom) Edwin Price (ICOP) Scott Loveridge (Social Sci Subcom) Parag Chitnis (NIFA) Denise Eblen (NIFA)  <b>*Chair elect</b>
---	---

**Action Items:**

1. Chris will contact those not on this call (Deb, Adel, Teferi, Marikis) to confirm their attendance at the October 1 face-to-face meeting of the S&T for a final head count for breakfast.
2. Call notes from June 22, 2015 were approved.
3. Today's call agenda was approved.
4. Jeff will write up a summary of the data access discussions to present as a report to ESCOP.

**Minutes:**

1. Participants: Larry Curtis, David Thompson, Joe Colletti, Cameron Faustman, Nathan McKinney, Harald Scherm, Parag Chitnis, Denise Eblen, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton
2. Review and Approve Call Notes (6/22/2015) - Approved
3. Adopt the Agenda - Approved
4. Discussion Topic – Open Access to Publications and Data (across 1862 and 1890 Institutions)
  - a. General Discussion
    - i. Federal Funds (Competitive, Capacity, 'Supported Wholly or In Part' with federal/regional/state/foundations/etc.) Parag mentioned that there is a requirement to create and include data management plans (DMPs) in a number of AFRI programs in the current cycle. From his prior job with NSF, it generally

was the case that the 'cost' was 20-25% of the budget, clearly dependent upon the nature of the proposed work.

1. This threshold is currently undetermined in emerging Federal policy.
2. Flexible model would be most useful.
3. Committee suggests a "wait and see" mindset.
- ii. By LGU Institutions, VPR, Libraries, Computer Science, AES directors
  1. How does this play out at the state level?
    - a. Many are deferring to the Vice President of Research (VPR) office, who would be talking to other VPRs; University-wise efforts in data management exist, organized by VPR, driven right now by NSF and NIH requirements
    - b. AES offices may wish to take the lead as it relates to capacity funds
    - c. Everyone is still working to figure this out, including at the Federal level
    - d. There is an effort to integrate with the SE Research Association for a Southern regional data repository; the initial focus is on NSF data right now. Some efforts to regionalize exist, but still a work in progress.
- iii. National Agricultural Data Network (NADN) Proposed NRSP (For information only):
  1. There is a new, emerging NRSP pre-proposal on its way to the ESCOP NRSP-RC focusing on the data management of the large crop and livestock CAPs and certain large, traditional NIFA grants
  2. Proposes using NRSP funding mechanism for longer, higher use of this data (analytics, meta-analysis, modeling)
- b. Publications (Centralized, Decentralized, Hybrid)
  - i. Approved manuscript or journal article (post embargo period) and/or other publications
  - ii. By Professional Societies, LGU Institution, National Ag Library, LGU Libraries, Private Sector

Q: If this is a federal mandate, what true role do these professional societies have, other than to make recommendations?

    - a. For societies that have an associated publication, they would need to know how soon to give public access. Immediate access would collapse their membership fee business model.
    - b. Some societies may archive supplementary data for articles, others do not. Meta data, expense issues, etc.
- c. Data (Centralized, Decentralized, Hybrid)
  - i. Metadata, Refined data and support data for figures
  - ii. Linked to publications
  - iii. Long-term stewardship – concerns with cost, data decay, etc.
- d. Financial
  - i. Sustainable resources
  - ii. Cost estimates –
    1. None available yet at the federal level, applicants can include the cost of data management in their grants. From his prior job with NSF, it

generally was the case that the 'cost' was 20-25% of the budget, clearly dependent upon the nature of the proposed work.

2. Issues of data management costs after the grant ends are a concern: How much? How long? Security? Etc.
3. Every federal agency is expected to have a plan and they are currently researching these concerns on cost and structure of data storage.

e. Training

f. Other

i. How has Science and Technology Committee functioned in the past? Reflections for future work?

1. Science Roadmap 2010 was the largest recent issue. ESCOP S&T worked with a similar ECOP committee on this, identifying priority issues for the system. Perhaps the data access issue is something the committee could focus on in a similar way?
2. Also worked to make loss of "Earmarks" less painful (about 12 years ago?)
3. Future topic? Perhaps "How can we grow NIFA budget"

ii. Comments on face-to-face meeting agenda

1. NIFA webinars on Centers of Excellence are occurring in the next few weeks, so Parag Chitnis will be able to provide more information on this topic. In addition, he will provides some comments on the Commodity Board provision and implementation from the Farm Bill.
2. *Added 8/27: This is the first of two webinars for anyone interested in providing feedback on NIFA's implementation of the Center of Excellence (COE) provision from the 2014 Farm Bill. The webinar is Aug. 27 at 1 p.m. (EDT). The second webinar is scheduled for September 3 at 1 p.m. (EDT). For webinar access and call-in information, visit <http://nifa.usda.gov/centers-excellence>.*
3. AFRI Review #2, what is this? Bob Holland referred to this recently, but we are not sure if it's available yet. More information to come. Parag will check with Bob. *Added 8/27: Bob referred to the update about the progress of actions to implement the NRC recommendations about AFRI. It will be posted on the NIFA website soon. The next update about the progress will be posted in January 2016.*
4. There are many items on the 10/1 agenda, we'll have to be careful to time them appropriately to be able to have meaningful discussions on each.
5. If an S&T member cannot attend the 10/1 meeting, feel free to have an associate attend in your place, as you see fit.

Call adjourned at 3:59 pm CT

**ESCOP Science & Technology**  
**Face-to-Face Meeting MINUTES**

Thursday, October 1, 2015 8 am to 12 noon  
The Ballantyne Hotel and Lodge, Charlotte, NC  
Meeting room: York

**Committee Members:**

<p><b>Chair:</b> Marikis Alvarez (ARD)</p> <p><b>Delegates:</b> Larry Curtis (WAAESD) David Thompson (WAAESD) Joe Colletti (NCRA) Deb Hamernik (NCRA) Cameron Faustman (NERA) Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA) Nathan McKinney (SAAESD) Harald Scherm (SAAESD) John Yang (ARD) Ed Buckner (ARD) Chair Elect ? (WAAESD)</p> <p><b>Executive Vice-Chair</b> Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA ED) Chris Hamilton (NCRA AD; Recorder)</p>	<p><b>Liaisons:</b> Terry Nelsen (ERS) Cliff Gabriel (OSTP) Adrianna Hewings (ARS) Frank Zalom (Pest Mgmt Subcom) Edwin Price (ICOP) Scott Loveridge (Social Sci Subcom) Parag Chitnis (NIFA) Denise Eblen (NIFA)</p> <p><b>*Chair elect</b></p>
---	--

**Agenda (use Ctrl+Click in Word to access hyperlinks below):**

1. [ESS S&T Guidelines and Approaches](#) (below)
2. [Riley Foundation Report](#) (Unified Message)
3. [AGree Report](#) (Research & Innovation: Strengthening Agricultural Research)
4. [NRC Report](#) (Animal Science related)
5. NIFA ([Centers of Excellence](#), [Commodity Boards](#))
6. Other Federal Agencies, Foundations and Related Entities Reports????
7. TOPICS
  - a. Signature Programs (e.g. breeding)
  - b. Water Security and related issues
  - c. Listening Sessions
  - d. Development of Crosscutting programs (Biomedical, Vet, Eng)
  - e. Budget Initiatives
  - f. Other

**Participants:** Cameron Faustman, Parag Chitnis (NIFA), Bob Holland (NIFA), Marikis Alvarez, Deb Hamernik, John Yang, Ed Buckner, Nathan McKinney, Adel Shirmohammadi, Jeanette Thurston (NIFA; jthurston@nifa.usda.gov), Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton

**Action Items:**

1. Keep monthly S&T calls on the third Monday of each month at 4 pm ET. Chris will send a reminder email with dates and call-in details.
2. Chris will work with Bob Holland and Parag Chitnis on an updated list of federal reps to the ESCOP S&T.
3. Committee approved the below S&T Guidelines and Approaches.
4. Jeff Jacobsen will verify with Wendy Wintersteen that the group is forming a working group and if so, let her know that ESCOP would like to be involved.
5. Jeff will create a document summarizing discussion points on the AGree Report for S&T review, and the data management and access concerns, to possibly take forward to ESCOP.

**Meeting Minutes:**

1. Roll Call and introductions
2. [ESS S&T Guidelines and Approaches](#) (below)
  - a. OSTP member needs to be updated. Cliff Gabriel is no longer at OSTP. **Action: Chris will work with Bob Holland and Parag Chitnis on an updated list of federal reps.**
  - b. **Action: Keep monthly S&T calls on the third Monday of each month at 4 pm ET. Chris will send a reminder email with dates and call-in details.**
  - c. Discussion occurred regarding how S&T fits into ESS/ESCOP:
    - i. Committee makes recommendations to ESCOP, which then charges others with the activity. For instance, S&T might recommend the creation of a multistate committee, working group and then ESCOP would charge an ED/director to begin the process.
    - ii. We might also recommend a political or programmatic stance on an issue or policy.
    - iii. We should also consider serving a proactive role in generating ideas on the next set of initiatives, rather than just being reactive as the committee historically has been.
  - d. **Action: Committee approved the below S&T Guidelines and Approaches.**
3. [Riley Foundation Report](#) (Unified Message): Discussion ensued regarding whether we are actually speaking with a unified voice to both Congress and the private sector through Cornerstone and APLU and how we differentiate ourselves from what NIH and NSF do.
  - a. Perhaps more industry support would also help.
  - b. Consider all interagency funding opportunity RFAs. These are huge opportunities, above and beyond what AFRI might offer. Perhaps S&T could help disseminate this information, with help from NIFA.
  - c. **Action: Jeff Jacobsen will verify with Wendy Wintersteen that the group is forming a working group and ESCOP would like to be involved (if they aren't already).**
4. [AGree Report](#) (Research & Innovation: Strengthening Agricultural Research) Discussion:
  - a. S&T generally agrees with the report, perhaps not so much regarding increased Congressional oversight through more hearings

- b. Data access discussion: No one really knows what their institutions will do yet and how this will pan out; we are all learning as we go. NIFA has no policy yet and will be having stakeholder sessions soon. NIFA has published their 3-year Implementation Plan. Parag and Jeanette are the NIFA contacts for data access policy.
  - c. Discussion also ensued regarding the newly proposed data NRSP for crops and livestock (National Ag Data Network, NADN). Is it too soon to propose an NRSP on this topic; would it be better to wait and see? Again, Janette and Parag are the contacts for NIFA comments on this NRSP. **Action: Jeff will check with Eric Young regarding how to best handle a NIFA peer review of this developing NRSP.**
  - d. We recommend taking these concerns back to our regions and making associated recommendations to the NRSP-RC before they formalize their recommendations to ESCOP.
  - e. **Action: Jeff will create a document summarizing discussion points on the AGree Report for S&T review, including data management and access concerns, to possibly take forward to ESCOP.**
- 5. [NRC Report](#) (Animal Science related) Discussion: Included discussion of how capacity funds are handled differently across institutions, should these funds be part of the data management plan requirement, and possible increased reporting burdens with data management plans.
- 6. NIFA Commodity Board (Parag Chitinis presented) Discussion:
  - a. “The 2014 Farm Bill allows eligible national and state commodity boards to propose topics for research that they are willing to equally co-fund with NIFA.” There will be 2016 RFAs and the quality of proposals will determine funding. See <http://nifa.usda.gov/commodity-boards> for eligibility.
  - b. NIFA will give an update on how funds are handled and more details on program management at a future meeting (regional spring meetings?), after the RFAs come out.
- 7. NIFA [Centers of Excellence](#) (Parag Chitnis presented) Discussion:
  - a. Entities qualified as Centers of Excellence have funding priority over others when all else is equal.
  - b. Eligibility application is included as part of the proposal.
  - c. This designation is included in the award communication, if entity meets the criteria.
  - d. Designation tied only to individual award, does not carry over. Entities must apply for designation with each proposal.
  - e. NIFA is currently collecting data on how this policy impacts smaller institutions, junior scientists, etc. for minimum intended negative impact.
- 8. Closing comments: Marikis and Jeff thanked everyone for attending, with special consideration to Parag, Jeanette, and Bob for attending and participating with the S&T. Send any other topics of interest to Jeff/Chris for future discussion.

Meeting Adjourned at 10:33 am ET.



**Experiment Station Section  
Science and Technology Committee  
Operating Guidelines  
August 19, 2015**

**Purpose**

The ESCOP Science and Technology (S&T) Committee is charged with promoting and enhancing science and technology in the Land-grant university system. The committee will assist ESCOP to identify future directions and anticipate and respond to research needs and opportunities for funding. The committee will assist in linking science and technology programs to multistate and national research initiatives. The committee will recommend how ESCOP will respond to reports, recommendations, and planning documents from the national science community. This committee will provide guidance to ESCOP strategic planning and priority setting.

**Membership**

- Chair from one of the five SAES/ARD regions
- Two representatives from each of the five SAES/ARD regions
  - Incoming Chair
- One ED (non-voting) to serve as executive Vice-Chair and to assist the Chair
- Non-voting representatives from the following organizations:
  - NIFA
  - ARS
  - ERS
  - Chair of the Social Science Subcommittee
  - ESCOP Co-Chair of the Pest Management Strategies Subcommittee
  - Other organizations including OSTP, other COPS and other federal agencies as appropriate (i.e., NASA, EPA, DOE)

Members serve four year terms and may be reappointed indefinitely. The term of Chair, Incoming Chair and Past Chair are for two years each.

**Organization and Function**

The S&T may meet in person once a year associated with the Fall ESS Meeting and Workshop or as the need arises. Other in-person meetings can be scheduled by the Chair as necessary. The S&T will meet by teleconference monthly to quarterly for S&T work plan updates, coordination, issue or problem solving, selecting the ESS National Excellence in Multistate Research Award winner and associated business. Meeting agendas and support materials will be provided, after consultation with the Chair, to the S&T Committee in advance of the teleconference or in-person meetings. Minutes will be taken from each teleconference, approved at the next S&T meeting and posted on the ESCOP website.

Annually, during late May and early June, the S&T will receive and evaluate the regional nominations for the ESS National Excellence in Multistate Research Award. The S&T Committee will individually rank the nominees and a summary will be provided to the Chair for teleconference discussions to select the top Multistate project. This recommendation is provided to ESCOP for their evaluation and ratification. The S&T will announce the winner to ESS membership and APLU before the end of June.

It is expected that programmatic and policy decisions are to be made by consensus. If necessary, formal decisions are to be determined by simple majority of a quorum of S&T members.

The S&T may create ad hoc work groups to assist with special tasks or problem solving, as needs are addressed by ESCOP. The work groups will be responsible to the S&T.

### **Officers**

The Chair of the S&T will be a member of one of the five SAES/ARD regions. The Chair serves for two years. The position will rotate among the sections in same order as the ESCOP Chair (NC, S, ARD, W, NE).

The incoming Chair will discharge the duties of the Chair, such as presiding over meetings when the Chair is not available and guide the work of the S&T. The Regional Office may also facilitate the meetings as the need arises.

### **Quorum**

For purposes of doing business, a quorum shall consist of a simple majority of the duly constituted members at any officially called meeting for which written notice is sent in advance of the meeting. A simple majority of the quorum resolves all issues.

### **Parliamentary Authority**

The emphasis in all S&T meetings shall be on orderly process to achieve an objective decision by those present and voting. Should there be a parliamentary challenge, it shall be answered by referring to the most current edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

### **Amendments**

These operating guidelines may be amended at any business meeting of the S&T provided the proposed amendment has been sent to all members in advance of the meeting, and the question is passed by a simple majority of a quorum of the voting members present at that meeting.

**ESCOP Science & Technology  
Call Notes: November 30, 2015**

**Committee Members:**

<p><b>Chair:</b> Marikis Alvarez (ARD)</p> <p><b>Delegates:</b> Larry Curtis (WAAESD) David Thompson (WAAESD) Joe Colletti (NCRA) Deb Hamernik (NCRA) Cameron Faustman (NERA) Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA) Nathan McKinney (SAAESD) Harald Scherm (SAAESD) John Yang (ARD) Ed Buckner (ARD) Chair Elect ? (WAAESD)</p> <p><b>Executive Vice-Chair</b> Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA ED) Chris Hamilton (NCRA AD; Recorder)</p>	<p><b>Liaisons:</b> Terry Nelsen (ERS) TBD (OSTP) TBD (ARS) Charles Allen (Pest Mgmt Subcom) Edwin Price (ICOP) Mark Skidmore (Social Sci Subcom) Parag Chitnis (NIFA) Denise Eblen (NIFA)</p> <p><b>*Chair elect</b></p>
---	---

**Participants:** Marikis Alvarez, David Thompson, Joe Colletti, Deb Hamernik, Cameron Faustman, Adel Shirmohammadi, Harald Scherm, Parag Chitnis, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton (recorder)

**Action Items:**

1. Parag Chitnis continues to work on updating federal agency liaisons to S&T.
2. Jeff Jacobsen will contact Chavonda Jacobs-Young for the name of the ARS liaison to S&T (done).
3. Jeff will edit AGree Report S&T Review document (done, [see below](#)) and share with ESCOP leadership.
4. Please continue to review the APLU antibiotic resistance document for our January call. Jeff will work to have Chase Crawford join the call, as well (done).
5. Deb Hamernik will send federal register link on OSTP request for ag research innovations to S&T. See: <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/11/05/2015-28289/identifying-sources-of-agricultural-innovation?et rid=49286515&et cid=90026>

**Call Notes**

1. Roll Call (see participants, above)
2. Minutes (review and approve) - Approved
3. Agenda (review and adopt) - Approved
4. S&T Liaisons Update (Parag Chitnis)
  - a. Parag is connecting with OSTP to identify a liaison for S&T.
  - b. OSTP priorities invite-only listening session happening on 12/1.

- c. NIFA data management plan webinars are on-going; the next one will be 12/4.
  - d. Vacant liaison slots on S&T: Still TBD due to turnover, but Parag Chitnis is working on this still and Jeff Jacobsen will contact Chavonda Jacobs-Young directly for the ARS liaison.
- 5. Actions Update (Jacobsen)
  - a. S&T Guidelines and Approaches – The S&T Guidelines and Approaches document approved during the 10/1/2015 meeting has been uploaded to the S&T page on the ESCOP website: <http://escop.ncsu.edu/ViewCommittees.cfm?comid=5>
  - b. Riley Foundation Status
    - i. Upcoming listening sessions with professional societies are occurring to refine the message
    - ii. Looking for AES involvement with key stakeholder groups to promote unified message. AES reps should specifically ask, “What can we do to help?”
    - iii. S&T in agreement with Riley Foundation Report
  - c. AGree Report Review (attached, ALL discussion)
    - i. Suggested edits: Second sentence: define “their”, who are “they”; Add website to review document
    - ii. This is a clear and concise review; Jeff will share with ESCOP leadership.
- 6. Addressing Antibiotic Resistance (attached, ALL discussion)
  - a. Reactions to report: Possible increase in funding for alternatives to antibiotics, how to define success/metrics.
  - b. Opportunities for ESCOP: Identifying source or process for funding
  - c. Jeff will work to get Chase Crawford on next S&T call for further discussion. Perhaps discuss defining success/metrics with him.
  - d. We will continue to discuss this report during our next S&T call.
  - e. New multistate committee NCD230 on antibiotic resistance formed recently.
- 7. S&T Delegates ‘Watch List Reports’ (ALL)
  - a. Topic ideas should be sent to Jeff. These will become the focus of S&T reviews to be submitted to ESCOP for information/action.
- 6. OSTP request for input on innovations in ag and research priorities, due 12/4. Deb Hamernik will send federal register link to S&T. See: <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/11/05/2015-28289/identifying-sources-of-agricultural-innovation?et rid=49286515&et cid=90026>
- 8. Other
  - a. APLU Meeting Highlights (attendees)
    - i. 1994 institutions notified APLU that they will no longer be members of APLU
    - ii. Discussion regarding increasing the number of land-grant institutions
    - iii. International APLU members, Mexico and Canada, present
    - iv. Sightlines LGU infrastructure survey presentation
    - v. Communications and Marketing and the importance of presenting a unified message
    - vi. From ESCOP: Peer review of NRSPs and revisions of review guidelines, as related to proposed new National Agricultural Research Data NRSP proposal
  - b. National IPM Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) (Jacobsen) - Going forward, Jeff will work with NIPMCC and SSSc to provide updates to S&T and secure liaisons.
  - c. Social Sciences Subcommittee (SSSc) (Jacobsen) (see 8.b.)

Call adjourned at 4:49 pm ET.

## **AGree Report: Research and Innovation: Strengthening Agricultural Research**

The ESCOP S&T Committee reviewed, discussed and approved (11/30/2015) the following points from the June 2015 Report. In general, we support the Report's narrative supporting current and future interests in substantially growing the agriculture and natural resources research infrastructure through a variety of mechanisms. AGree's core members and advisors are represented by current and past public and federal officials whom are listed in the Report (page 14). We provide specific reaction and comments below to the vision and elements of the Report. Lastly, if there are no comments on the AGree recommendations we are neutral.

1. U.S. research priorities are continually evaluated and refined at the federal and state levels through vast stakeholder engagement, visioning by faculty and professional societies and in ESCOP with the Science Roadmap. This ongoing realignment and action-agenda supports change, efficiency, and the dynamic nature of agricultural research that is both fundamental, transdisciplinary, systems-based addressing current and future challenges.
2. New financial resources are urgently needed to meet the demands. In addition, we fully support a growing partnership with other federal agencies to support (and grow) agricultural research with NIFA. This was a key element of the NRC Review of the AFRI program which S&T fully supported an expansion of multiple agency strategic focus on relevant research.
3. We do support increased interactions with Congress through established mechanisms as a means to understand the critical issues being addressed by research in the food and agriculture challenge arena by LGU ESS/ARD. We question the need for additional Congressional oversight.
4. S&T recognizes the federal mandate and, more importantly, the scientific value of access to publications and data to enhance and scientific advancements from all sources of funding. We encourage a go slow approach as the federal agencies are working on multiple fronts to meet the mandate and LGUs are studying and implementing processes and practices. This will help to ensure that limited resources at the State and Federal level are used effectively and efficiently.
5. Rich stakeholder engagement occurs within the States on a regular and consistent basis. There may be some value in discussions that capture this input and aggregate it to a regional and national agenda, where appropriate.
6. Leveraging State and Federal resources with multiple stakeholders is a common and accepted practice. Very few issues are entirely the domain of the public or private sector.
7. New resources should be secured for both capacity and competitive funding mechanisms. AFRI programs have, unfortunately, been significantly below authorized levels for many years. The U.S. should strive to restore our global leadership in agricultural and natural resources research.
8. AGree's Implementation Plan should provide additional venues to discuss and refine the U.S. infrastructure associated with NIFA, other federal agencies and LGUs. We welcome these actions and believe that ESS/ARD should be fully engaged in these efforts.

Report: [http://www.foodandagpolicy.org/sites/default/files/AGree\\_RII\\_2015\\_0.pdf](http://www.foodandagpolicy.org/sites/default/files/AGree_RII_2015_0.pdf)