

2017 National IPM Coordinating Committee Meeting
October 17-18, APLU Building, Washington, DC
Recorded by Patrick Beauzay, Incoming NIPMCC Chair

PowerPoint presentations given at this meeting can be viewed online at: <http://escop.info/nipmcc-presentations-october-2017/>

Tuesday, October 17

8:00 a.m. Meeting called to order – Doug Walsh

- **Introductions - Doug**
- **Recap of last year's meeting – Doug (PowerPoint presentation)**
 - 2016 State of IPM Report recap
 - Other activities recap

8:30 a.m. Reports from regional technical committees and IPM Centers

- **WERA report - Paul**
 - Emphasizes multi-state communication
 - Invasive species are a major issues
 - PSMPs
 - Active weather support networks among states (western weather work group)
 - Professional development programs (risk management, risk reduction)
- **NE IPM Center report (PowerPoint presentation given, not available online)**
 - Signature Programs – organic IPM, urban IPM, climate change & pests, next generation education, advanced production systems
 - Communications Team – *Insights* publication
 - Partnerships – grants program
 - Evaluation
- **NEERA report – Donna Ellis**
 - Group overview
 - Need to stay up to date with other regions
 - Funding challenges
- **NCERA report – Bob Wright**
 - Theme – ‘Adapting to Change’ – leadership changes
 - Networking and outcomes of networking– other state’s areas of emphasis
 - Update regional priorities
 - Invasive species
 - Pesticide resistance
 - Pollinator issues
 - Dicamba drift issues
 - Cooperation with IPM Centers, and outputs/outcomes of networking and cooperation, particularly how working groups can leverage funding, cooperation outside of the IPM Centers
- **NC IPM Center report – Lynnae Jess (PowerPoint presentation)**
 - Working groups – 16 right now
 - 2018 Pollinator Habitat Usage Survey – purposes and process, NIFA funding for iPiPE component, data collection requirements, participants

- Western IPM Center report – Amanda Crump
 - Engaging federal and national partners – using pesticide use data
 - Responding to Federal Register requests
 - PMSP process
 - Working closely with regional programs (IR4, SARE) – biopesticides
 - Developing survey on importance of communication programs in western region
- Southern IPM Center report – Joe LaForest
 - Annual report available – outcome/impact based
 - Enhancement grant program RFA open now (closes November 3rd)
 - Friends of IPM Program – nominate someone for their great work (closes Nov. 17th)
 - Check out IPM DATA website/database
 - Technology in southern region (has national supplement)
- SERA report – no report

Wild Cards – Doug Walsh (moved up from 11:00 a.m. time slot)

- Over the course of the meeting, jot down ideas on sticky notes and post on board
- Summarize and discuss periodically during course of meeting

9:30 a.m. NIFA Review – Herb Bolton (PowerPoint presentation)

- USDA will announce CPPM awards week of Oct. 23rd
- NIFA and strategic planning snapshot – NIFA leadership role, strategic plans aligned with Farm Bills
- NIFA is now beginning steps to revise Strategic Plan for next 5 years
- Upcoming NIFA Science Stakeholder Listening Sessions – national meeting venues, but input can be given online as well – check NIFA website
- NIFA current mission and vision – CPPM supports mission and vision
- NIFA Strategic Plan and Goals – Science, People, Process, Communication
- NIFA aligns Strategic Plan and RFAs with REE, USDA overarching plans and goals
- Farm Bill – current FB expires Sept. 30th 2018. House and Senate committees have held and continue to hold hearings
- Tactical Sciences – “Calls” (conversational meetings) to address challenges, vision on emerging threats to and protection of our national food enterprise. See slide for various programs that support Tactical Sciences. Point made about how these programs may be underfunded in the context of the enterprise we are trying to protect. Two invitation only meetings have been held to start the dialogue and gauge the interest of this diverse group of stakeholders. Two White Papers have been published.
- NIFA Communication – “Share Your Science” campaign, interest in manuscripts in high impact journals and other meaningful contributions, grantee blogs
- CPPM Program – Review, RFA focus areas, funding by year (20M in 2017, increase from 2016 put into EIP program)
- CPPM – NIFAs Expectation – ARDP (applied research, research-led and extension-led projects), EIP (should implement new IPM strategies or improve known strategies), RCP (coordinate and improve efficiency of IPM efforts, etc. – importance of Regional IPM Centers)

10:00 a.m. BREAK

10:15 a.m. EIP Program Review – Rubella Goswami (PowerPoint presentation)

- \$10.5M in awards given to states in 2017
- Review of EIP Priorities (primary and secondary) – pollinator health was a new priority in 2017
- Percent effort for each priority in submitted grant applications
- Panel review process – 3 technical reviewers, 1 evaluator. Ranked in 5 standard NIFA categories. Reviewers requested to provide comments and overall ranking, plus a ranking for each priority area. Evaluation strength in the proposals was an important and deciding ranking factor. Reviewers asked to provide detailed reviews and recommendations for improvement (if necessary).
- Panel Observations – Overall, quality is improving in some proposals. Some needed to clarify roles of collaborators. Research Demonstration – 20% maximum. Evaluation section needs more attention, including logic models, measurable outputs and outcomes, addition of performance targets improved the evaluation section of a number of proposals.
- Mini-grants? (I'm not clear on this)
- Pay to attention to language like “Successful applications should/will/must have ...”
- 53 awards made, all 50 states and 2 territories received awards, pollinator health priority well represented in proposals
- Panel Rankings and Fund Distribution: Outstanding (6, 97%), High (20, 84-94%), Medium (21, 63-70%), Low (6, 40-50%)
- Slide on Priority Areas by State (maps by priority area)
- Other Funding Opportunities for IPM programming (non-AFRI programs, AFRI foundational program esp. CARE program, educational programs such as ELI program)

10:45 a.m. Increased Relevance for IPM in IR-4 Priority Setting (Keith Dorschner, PowerPoint presentation)

- Example of indoxacarb use on strawberries
- Regional IPM Centers given an automatic ‘A’ priority at IR-4 Food Use Workshop (e.g. tebufenozide on grapes)

11:15 a.m. NIFA Report (Sonny Ramaswamy)

- Rationale for importance of work that we do – nutritional security, not just food security. How many people on prescriptions to manage metabolic disorders that could be managed or cured with proper nutrition, to say nothing of other chronic diseases caused by poor/improper nutrition? Global hunger has trended down, but is still a major problem (850M globally will go hungry today, 29,000 will die of hunger today). 16M households in US go to bed hungry tonight. Food deserts in urban areas like DC. ‘Perfect storm’ exacerbation driven by increasing human population (climate change, human conflict, mass migrations, globalization of trade, anti-intellectual left/right leagues and factions, and pest problems as a result of these factors).
- Speak to why what we do is important for producers, especially in light of above factors. Sustainability. Only 4M producers in US, 20M in food enterprise system but we all have to eat. Ability to profitably produce food. Accessibility to affordable, healthy food. Transformative discoveries and uses of new production and management technologies. Extension Service continues to deliver transformative education. Re-read the Morrill Act. As we project into the future of farming, how will IPM continue to address needs? Communication - we have to tell our stories well and reach our audiences!
- NIFAs role in food enterprise – channel transformative discoveries and education to address our food enterprise challenges. We spend \$150M per year on crop protection research and extension/education, but it’s not enough. Aspirations to increase capacity funding. Agricultural

Research Caucus – federal legislators. Talk to our representatives about what we do and why it's important. Return on investment from practicing IPM.

- Tactical Sciences – create synergies among different NIFA programs (IR-4, NPDN, etc.).

12:15 p.m. LUNCH – Resume at 1:30 p.m. EDT

1:30 p.m. National IPM Roadmap - National Priorities Setting Workshop (Sue, Doug, Amanda, PowerPoint presentation)

- Review of current IPM Roadmap
- David Epstein, OPMP – in terms of rewrite, what needs clarification, deletion, addition? Does the roadmap reflect changes in IPM need over time? This is a federal document (federal IPM CC), feds have final say as to what goes into it. New revision by mid-2018. Request from national PSEP folks for roadmap update, and since it's been 5 years since last revision let's take another look at it.
- Workshop – 12 questions, discussion, report out and turn in written comments which will be compiled and sent to the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee.

National IPM Roadmap – Breakout/Workshop Session

Group 1 – Steve Elliott

Q1 Pesticide exposure reduction, agricultural activity as a specific outcome, human health and nutrition as a specific outcome, restate what's in the roadmap as aspirational, rather than as negative consequences, include pollinator health/pollinator benefits

Q2 Make it two documents – one 'high level' philosophical, one with set of priorities

Q3 Weather variability – climate change is a variable, roadmap should be flexible. IPM is a framework that can accommodate new variables like climate change.

Group 2 – Joe LaForest

Q1 What industry are we talking about when stating 'industry stakeholders', provides a common vision of IPM to rally around, broad goals, make sure 'industry' knows about the IPM Roadmap

Q2 Genetic modifications – already covered under human health, new technologies;

Q3 Pesticide safety education – who all are players in this issue (EPA, OSHA, CDC, poison control centers, etc.)? Will this influence how this is written in the IPM Roadmap? Is there an issue of (mis)interpretation/use of current human health/worker protection language in the Roadmap? People reading the roadmap must see the importance of IPM in PSEP!

Group 3 – Jean-Jacques Dubois

Q1 Is the document written by IPM enthusiasts for IPM enthusiasts? Make useable by people like congressional liaisons, professional societies (ESA, etc.), make it attractive and engaging; make it easier to translate/adapt roadmap into different situations; make roadmap emotionally engaging

Q2 Role of social media in Roadmap? Roadmap (as it is) is not a roadmap at all. Maybe easier to communicate if there are measurable goals in the Roadmap, in addition to large philosophical goals

Q3 Pollinator protection in IPM and Roadmap – should it be a general principle, or a specific priority with specific goals

Group 4 – Charles Allen

Q1 Function and value of Roadmap, should aspire to be a broad, overarching inspirational/aspiring document; have a diagram or graphic that represents the roadmap; areas could be beefed up, esp. worker protection, human health outcomes; evaluation professionals need to use the Roadmap as well, more work and emphasis on outcomes and how that can feed back into Roadmap evolution;

Q2 Define IPM network – who are players and partners? NIPMCC used to have more federal partners attending the meeting. Works for CPPM programs, but what about programs outside of NIFA?

Can the Roadmap help us with funding operation from outside agencies? Discussion on social network analysis, where analyses can be incorporated

Q3 IPM in urban, parks vector control – IPM framework should be overarching enough to cover iterations of IPM in these areas. These areas fit in the Roadmap. Parks are moving towards protection of ecological services. Bedbugs are a targeted pest with chemicals, but exclusion and non-chemical treatments are also used. School IPM. Infographic to communicate the IPM Roadmap. Vector control doesn't have much emphasis in the road map. Should we use "community IPM" or "urban IPM"?

3:00 p.m. BREAK

3:15 p.m. WILD CARDS #1

- Post-it notes on board being read by Doug (I walked back in late after break)
- Discussion on indirect costs
- How does NIFA get input from other (pertinent) federal agencies?

3:30 p.m. How to be Successful with Success Stories – Steve Elliott and Regional IPM Center evaluators, communication specialists (PowerPoint presentation and activity)

Evaluators

- Common IPM Measures - NIFA would like to collect common indicators for CPPM (EIP, ARDP, RCP). IPM is not solely funded by CPPM.
- Logic Models used to capture/drive common indicators. Long-term impacts are captured.
- Towards Common Measures
- Success Stories – gathering materials: you will need numbers, anecdotes (breathe life into story)
- Numbers – use active writing, keep it short and to the point! Meaningful numbers: there was a problem, we responded, the problem was solved. This is just the three parts of a logic model, and we should already have this!
- Plan Ahead – know what stories you will tell before you start. Set up a recording system for everything you do – inputs, outputs, outcomes. Again, refer to your logic model. Document the problem. Make your life easy – create simple recording forms. Collecting numbers – surveys, interviews, public statistics.
- Surveys – best if respondents are in person or if you can contact by phone. Plan ahead – what are you trying to measure? What data do you collect?

Writers

- Laurie - Identify audience, tailor your story to that audience. How do you want your audience to feel after reading your story? What do you want them to do? Media, stakeholders, policy makers, etc. A press release might not be the same as a success story. Based on facts, science, proof.
- Rosemary - nuts and bolts of writing a story. Use your evaluation results to write your story. Introduction – tell the audience what you want them to know. Body – problem you addressed, what you did to solve the problem, technology used. Conclusion – impacts, links, etc. Keep it short, sweet and to the point. Not too much detail, talk about results. Stick to active vs. passive.
- Steve – get on the road, see what's going on out there, visit with people on farms. This can make a big difference in your understanding, and translates into better stories.
- Public doesn't care who funded a project, just that it makes a difference.
- Even failures can make good stories if something was learned.
- Written, videos, photo essay can all communicate stories.
- Andy Clark (SARE writer) – book on cover crops. SARE will use their grants database to make outputs. SARE uses farmers to help tell stories to other farmers. Promoting stories. Print

material, thumb drives. SARE has a PR person to promote and market their materials. Check out the SARE website!

Discussion on writing

- How do audience groups WANT to receive our information? Survey the audience!
- What kind of information do they want?
- LISTEN to what they want!

4:30 p.m. COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING

- Open nominations from the floor (there were none)
- Slate of candidates supplied by committee (Charles Allen, Patrick Beauzay, Ed Rajotte). Ballot form provided by Charles. Two candidates presented : – Dr. Ann Hazelrigg (Univ. Vermont), Dr. Rakesh Chandran (WVU)
- Voting by all present at meeting. Ballots prepared by Charles Allen.
- Ballots tallied by Charles Allen and Patrick Beauzay
- Dr. Ann Hazelrigg elected as chair-elect.

5:00 p.m. ADJOURN for the day

Wednesday, October 18

8:00 a.m. IPM Institute – Tom Green (PowerPoint presentation)

- Role of IPM Institute
- Stop School Pests (stopschoolpests.org)
- Webinar on 10/25 on Pesticide Risk Tool (pesticiderisk.org). Webinar will be recorded
- IPM Symposium week of 3/18 in Baltimore
- Food Narrative Project (handout at meeting, also posted online) – IPM Voice, RedTomato, FrameWorks Institute

8:15 a.m. Enhance One Voice Communication (Charles Allen with help from Danesha, Matt)

- White board – Discussion: How do we improve/advocate our One Voice to policy makers?
- Amanda – visits to Capitol Hill
- Steve – audience, message, purpose. Know these first to be effective. What do we want to tell and why?
- Paul – seminars on groups that work with legislators. Federal and state legislative processes, regulatory processes – how do we effect change through these processes?
- Pat – grass roots advocacy by farmers themselves. We need to effectively do our Extension jobs
- Frank – can we aggregate our national IPM message through our LGUs?
- Jeff – Extension Service and Experiment Station at the national level. We make recommendations to ECOP and ESCOP and on up through the system. We (NIPMCC) are the ones who have inform ECOP/ESCOP as that is one of our functions.
- Chris – make use of the listening sessions (NIFA). But what is our message?
- Doug, Amanda, Charles, Jeff – we need a position? statement(s) ready to go to give to legislators, policy makers. Make it dynamic, flexible for different groups? National IPM Communicator idea –
- Subcommittee on messaging (Danesha [co-chair?], Amanda, Steve)
- Educating Congress
- How we raise ideas to communicate to Congress

These topics and more were recorded on flip chart sheets and posted on the venue wall behind the stage. After the discussion, meeting participants were asked to place colored dots (5 per person) next to each of 5 topics they felt were the most important. Topics with the most dots were recorded by Charles. We will summarize this as a separate document for the group via Basecamp

9:45 a.m. BREAK

10:00 a.m. IPM Centers Discussion – center directors (PowerPoint presentation by Lynnae Jess speaking for Sue and the other center directors)

- Review of funding sources for centers
- Leadership, personnel
- Center grant programs
- Leveraging funds
- Signature programs
- Special projects
- How centers address and contribute to National IPM Priorities (these are listed on Meeting Agenda)

10:30 a.m. Breakout for Centers Open Discussion (feedback)

- Strengths, aspirations, what do states value most? Evaluation resources, working groups, information exchange, PMSPs (west),
- Capturing impacts, networking, information exchange stats that the centers play a part in

11:30 a.m. Wild Card Topics Discussion

- Discussion on using existing mechanisms to get the word out, such as landgrant.org Impact Statement Database - contact your extension director or AES director to upload impact statements
- Dicamba drift
- How can we engage social scientists in our IPM communication efforts? and maybe economists?
- How do we evaluate the success of our communication strategy?
- Should the IPM Roadmap be presented to the public as a multimedia graphic?

Wild card sticky notes were collected by Patrick Beauzay who will concatenate them into one document for Basecamp.

11:50 a.m. Meeting Summary

- Next year's meeting time?
- Make sure no conflict with World Food Prize – week before or week after? Jeff and I can work on this.
- 2018 NIPMCC National Meeting will be held on October 23-24 at the APLU Building.
- 2018 IPM Centers Meeting will be held October 24-25 at the APLU Building.

12:00 p.m. ADJOURN