

# Welcome and Introductions

Doug Walsh, Chair 2017

# Report from the 2016 meeting and 2016 State of IPM Report

Doug Walsh, Chair 2017

# 2016 Meeting (Charles Allen, Chair)

Day 1, October 18, 2016

- Reports:
  - NIFA, EPA, NRCS, Food Security, School IPM, Organic IPM, SCRI, SARE, Organics
  - Marty Draper Perspective (swan song)
- IPM World Café Workshop – A First Step to Create Ideas to Inform Future Initiatives
- What are the BIG ideas for a NEW IPM?
  - You have a ‘clean’ white board with the full authority and financial support to create a NEW IPM. What are 3 key concepts to evolve the current paradigm?
  - Local, state and regional IPM needs exist. How would you go about identifying and linking these needs to national priorities?
  - How would you programmatically address underserved populations or program areas?
  - How would you create the next generation of IPM professionals?
  - Consider the food production needs to feed the world population by 2050. How can LGUs best support the IPM needs of the global community?

# 2016 Meeting (Charles Allen, Chair)

Day 2, October 19, 2016

- Reports:
  - Federal Advocacy and Success Stories
  - Grand Challenges Across Professional Societies and Industry
- Organizational Structure Primer for the NIPMCC, ESCOP/ECOP & APLU
- Workshop on Communication and Accountability
  - How should local, state, regional and national needs assessments be determined?
  - What is the best way to coordinate IPM on a national basis?
  - What is the system infrastructure needed to best develop and deliver IPM?
  - How can we better capture and package IPM stories?
  - How should state impacts be communicated at the national level?
  - Excluding time and funding, what are the barriers to effective communication and accountability?

# Product from the 2016

## State of IPM Report - 2016

*Developed by the National IPM Coordinating Committee at its October 18-19, 2016 Meeting*

- Synthesized the results of a survey of meeting participants on the *State of Programs and Perceptions on Sustainability*

Summary - All Survey Participant Responses (n=30)

	<b>Federal</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>End-User</b>	<b>Pest Mgt Industry</b>
<b>Primary funding source for respondent's IPM program</b>	62%	28%	6%	3%
	<b>Increased</b>	<b>Decreased</b>	<b>Same</b>	
<b>IPM Program Funding</b>	48%	30%	22%	
<b>Percentage Change</b>	28%	26%		
	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>		
<b>Sustainability of IPM Programs - current funding and funding model</b>	52%	48%		

# Main Points

- Most programs were federally funded.
- Most had seen increased funding during the last 10 years. The average increase in funding reported among programs were similar.
- About half the respondents thought programs were sustainable with current funding and the current funding model.
- University extension and research respondents were more pessimistic about the sustainability of funding than were IPM Center respondents.
- Responses from programs in which states were the primary funding source were generally more optimistic about program sustainability.
- Funding levels have declined in some IPM programs over the last 10 years.
- Generally, programs are coping by diversifying sources of funding, but many programs have lost IPM extension/research capacity.

# Key IPM-related Issues of National IPM Coordinating Committee Attendees

- Participants in the 2016 NIPMCC Meeting provided input for this section of the State of IPM Report in two sessions;
  - Ideas Informing the Future – the New IPM
  - IPM Communication and Accountability.
- IPM Program Funding
  - By far, the most common issue described by attendees was the need for federal funding for Extension IPM Programs at a minimum, base-level in all U.S. states and territories.

# Key IPM-related Issues of National IPM Coordinating Committee Attendees

- Stakeholders and Priorities

- Identified that stakeholder involvement is important to Extension IPM
  - IPM program priorities are often locally-driven, but should be aggregated to at the state, region and national level.
  - A list of IPM priorities
- 
- Identified that stakeholder involvement is important to Extension IPM
  - IPM program priorities are often locally-driven, but should be aggregated to at the state, region and national level.