

**NRSP Review Committee
Annual Meeting
May 28, 2014
Denver, CO
NOTES**

Participants:

Bret Hess
H. Michael Harrington
Don Latham
Eric Young
Tim Phipps
Doug Buhler
Clarence Watson
Shirley Hymon-Parker

NRSP_TEMP004, “Enabling Pesticide Registrations or Speciality Crops and Minor Uses”:

Bret Hess gave a brief summary of the project’s goals, objectives, and recent accomplishments/impacts. Bret Hess reported that the Western Directors support the project, believe it has an important mission, and were glad it has expanded. Doug Buhler acknowledged his biases regarding this program (AA, MSU is hosting institution, specialty crops are important in Michigan) and reported that there is strong support for the program in the North Central region. Tim Phipps reported that there is strong support from the Northeast Region for this program because of its industry support and meaningful impacts. Clarence Watson reported that specialty crops are extremely important in the southern region and the project has strong support. Shirley Hymon-Parker reported that the 1890s are pleased with the degree of leveraging and the project has strong support from this region as well. Mike Harrington reported on a meeting he’d had with IR-4 leadership regarding maintenance budgets. He is concerned that the existing budget request is not fully justified.

>>Why do all NRSP dollars go to support salaries?

>>Unanimous approval of a recommendation to approve the proposal and budget with a request that the program more fully explain/justify the maintenance funding level requested.

NRSP_TEMP6, “US Potato Genebank”:

Bret Hess gave a brief summary of the goals and objectives of this project and their recent accomplishments and impacts. He also summarized the budget and peer reviewer comments, noting that peer reviewers expressed strong support for the project. Bret Hess reported that the Western Region supports this project. Doug Buhler reported that the North Central region discussed alternative models of funding for this effort—should the region or perhaps specific states benefiting from the program provide support? The region has strong support for the project, but recognizes that there has been increasing funding uncertainty. The Southern Region is currently supportive of the project, but support falls strongly along commodity lines. There was also some discussion about why USDA has taken over the cotton genebank and not

this one. It was noted that the potato lobby might be approached about taking this up in D.C. to try to get additional federal support (only \$150,000 more). In addition, it was suggested that institutions in key states could also split the cost of maintenance support. Tim Phipps reported that the Northeast region recognizes that this is a unique case, but would like to see NRSP-funding phased out. It was also discussed that a combination of federal and institutional funding could actually result in a funding increase. Mike Harrington suggested that the program could better report program impacts—that reporting how much material was distributed is more of an activity. Mike also suggested that the committee needs to do a better job of justifying the maintenance level of funding being requested; he would like to see greater exploration of a “fee for service” model. Other RC members reported that there are myriad reasons why a fee-for-service model is unworkable for this system. Shirley Hyman-Parker reported support for an industry-federal-state funding model.

>>Last paragraph in Justification and Statement of Issues may be out of place. Please correct if necessary.

>>Approval of recommendation to approve proposal and budget with the requirement that the committee look at alternative funding models (e.g., increase ARS budget; look for support from key institutions) and report back to the NRSP-RC at the mid-term review on progress toward the goal of eliminating or significantly reducing NRSP funding at the end of this cycle.

NRSP_TEMP007, “A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs”:

Bret Hess provided an overview of the goals, objectives, budget (esp. leveraged funding, and recent accomplishments and impacts). Bret Hess reported that the Western Region supports the project. There was some discussion in that region about minor uses for major species. There was discussion about alternative funding models for this program. The Southern Region also supports the project and wants it to succeed. Support was weak in the Northeast region. In the North Central region, it was suggested that eliminating support might be the kick needed to force some action; other RC members supported this notion. Shirley Hyman-Parker reported that the 1890s have reservations about supporting it, given the history and background shared today. Most members felt that they didn’t demonstrate “new” money, as required, but instead only did a better job of reporting existing funds (sheets suggest new funding; explanations don’t). There was additional concern that there simply isn’t sufficient funding to make this program effective (only 1 approval anticipated in next 5 years; nothing close to the order or the size of the IR-4 program). There is also concern that stakeholder involvement is insufficient.

Later in the meeting: Discussion of how to potentially get the BAA to take up this issue. The Budget and Advocacy Committee Chair charged the ESCOP and ECOP Budget and Legislative Committees to develop a process for bringing new initiatives to the table. A report is due at the July

The anticipated process would take at least 2 years for development writing and vetting. This is needed because of the lead time on NIFA or other federal agency budget planning. Part of what is needed now is to determine who the industry and congressional champions for this work might be. Might need to create an entirely new project—hard to ask someone to fund what

hasn't worked so far (but hasn't worked because they don't have funding—rather a “chicken and egg” problem).

>>USDA CSREES should be replaced with NIFA throughout, where appropriate.

>>Recommended to reject the proposal and budget (7 in favor; 1 opposed). If the recommendation is accepted by the vote of ESS then NRSP7 would still receive a terminal year of funding at the FY15-level in FY16.

>> Alternative recommendation in case this recommendation is overturned by directors: approve existing 5-year proposal and budget with report-back on alternative funding model at mid-term.

>>Recommend that the committee provide letters of support from industry.

>>Concern about “coordinated” peer review.

>>Mike, Bret and Frank Galey to draft some talking points to share with group for regional discussions this summer.

NRSP_TEMP009, “National Animal Nutrition Project”:

Bret Hess gave an overview of this project's goals and objectives, budget, and recent accomplishments and impacts. Bret Hess also summarized the peer reviews. Bret Hess reported that the Western Region had a discussion about the inclusion of equines—this decision was stakeholder-driven. The Western Region supports the proposal and expanded budget/scope. The Northeast region also supports the project and had the same question regarding equines. Mike Harrington expressed concern that the project hasn't yet achieved existing goals, but wants to take on more. There was some discussion about the gap analysis. NRSP9 is willing to support a research project that looks at this. There was also concern that outreach/communication could be better—they have done a good job communicating within professional societies and are waiting on a significant report. There was some discussion of the budget and university funding. Salaries, etc. are not true leveraging. However, industry support of this project is strong (~\$15M cash). The committee would like to see LGU support vs. non-LGU support. The committee would also like to see impact beyond website views. Western Region was also concerned that regional representation was lacking. Committee might also consider bringing junior or less well established members to ensure long-term sustainability. There was some discussion of expansion and when might that stop. There are a series of nutrient requirements that are required for a set of animals—this would help to limit expansion. Work is somewhat cyclical. There was also acknowledgement that this is a brand-new project that needs a little time to capitalize on momentum and build more. There were also questions on the budget—salaries and website maintenance, especially. Right now there are 4 animal types (dairy, beef, poultry, swine). Animal types are addressed on a 10-year cycle. Industry will contribute when a study is requested. MRF funding allows for the infrastructure and support for these studies. While it may not seem like they've accomplished everything they set out to do in the first 5 years, this is largely because they need to amass stakeholder contributions prior to beginning a study.

>>Recommend providing an economic analysis of impact during the mid-term review.

>>Recommend improving outreach/communication plans and implementation

>>Approved recommendation to approve proposal and budget.

The Future of NRSPs

Should NRSPs be infinitely supported? How can they transition away from NRSP funding?

NE and NC regions wonder if the role of the NRSP program should be explored. They also ask what differentiates programs like IR-4 that seemingly go on forever, or others, like NRSP10, that have a built-in sunset clause. There was discussion of this 5-6 years ago amongst the Executive Directors: Continuation of an NRSP at a base funding level depends on 3 things: 1) do the directors still want to participate; 2) Is the research still being done; and 3) allows LGUs and NIFA to continue to contribute. Several existing projects (e.g., NRSP3) fit into this category. While some NRSPs get into doing research, they are really supposed to provide support to research—they are not intended to research, per say (depends largely on how “research” gets defined). There are also indirect benefits of these projects—grants received, etc. that would be hard to report.

Discussed regional models for project “start-up.” Examples ranged from regional start-up funding pools to grants training workshops.

There was some discussion of the role of the RC in recommending new NRSPs—most members felt that the best projects come from the bottom-up.

Mike Harrington noted that many NRSPs are not reporting meetings and posting annual reports in NIMSS. Sarah Lupis will send a reminder to all NRSP AAs that they are responsible for authorizing at least one meeting per year in NIMSS (okay to authorize multiple meetings) and attaching an annual report to that meeting and to extract a few impacts for the National Impact Database.

Discussed re-doing the NRSP proposal form in NIMSS.

>>Recommended keep the same structure and just get rid of character limits in each section (since there are so few NRSPs).

Coordination of Review

Seems like there is no continuity to how reviews are conducted. Eric Young recounted his experience with a review and renewal of NRSP8. In this example, the NIFA rep took a leadership role in coordinating the peer reviewers. Doug Buhler also recounted his experience with a review and renewal of NRSP3. Really the Lead AA and NIFA Rep should drive the process with the NIFA Rep leading the peer review process. Agreed that there should be some common process, including leadership roles, and material provided to peer reviewers. The EDs office (for the Lead AA’s region) should support the Lead AA in this process. The committee agreed that there should be a step where the peer reviewers have a conference call or in-person meeting with the NIFA rep; NIFA rep to lead that call/meeting and provide the summary of the peer review to the Lead AA. Peer reviewers should be identified by the NRSP Committee and cannot receive any funds directly from the NRSP and cannot be directly involved in current activities. The NRSP’s Lead AA will consult with the NIFA rep to select reviewer then the NIFA rep will contact potential peer reviewers to ensure that they are willing and able to conduct the review.

- >> Change guidelines on page 14. Add additional, detailed steps to Appendix A2.
- >> Update ESCOP website to include recent minutes and updated version of the guidelines.

Electronic voting:

Idea supported. Suggested that we include QR codes.

Funding Total:

\$1,914,682.00 MRF for NRSPs. Well below the authorized 1% of Hatch.

Next Steps:

- NRSP-RC Review Forms due to Sarah or in NIMSS by Thursday, June 4th
- Review these Minutes and return any corrections to Sarah Lupis (sarah.lupis@colostate.edu) also by Thursday, June 4th.
- Sarah Lupis and Bret Hess to communicate NRSP-RC recommendations to AAs and regional associations via regional EDs offices.
- Mike Harrington, Bret Hess and Frank Galey to draft and circulate talking point regarding NRSP7 before July.