

**NRSP-Review Committee Meeting Notes
June 3-4
Washington, DC**

Attending:

Craig Nessler (SAAESD)	Michael Vayda (NERA)
Alfred Parks (ARD)	Tom Bewick (CSREES)
Ralph Cavalieri (WAAESD)	Dan Rossi (NERA)
James Wade (APLU)	Don Latham (Stakeholder (CARET))
Marshall Martin (NCRA)	Eric Young (SAAESD)

1. NRSP-1 Recommendation
 - Approve budget FY10 of \$346,829
 - Renewal proposal next year needs to address future relationship with REEPORT

2. NRSP-3 Recommendations
 - Approve renewal proposal for '09 – '14
 - Improve communication of future directors with AES directors
 - Approve FY10 budget of \$50,000

3. NRSP-4 Recommendation
 - Approve FY10 budget of \$481,182

4. NRSP-6 Recommendation
 - Approve FY10 budget of \$150,000

5. NRSP-7 Recommendation
 - Approve proposal for '09 – '14, with caveat that MRF funding will be reduced each year by whatever special grant is appropriated for this project up to \$325,000, contingent on edited proposal with additional information on the following three questions sent to NRSP Review Committee by August 1.
 - What is the process for selecting which drugs are tested through NRSP-7?
 - How many drugs are on the waiting list and what is the projected progress over the next 5 years?
 - Is the industry support for this activity only \$16,800 as indicated in the budget tables? If not, please provide more information on industry support.
 - Approve FY'10 budget of \$325,000, with caveat that MRF funding will be reduced whatever special grant amount is appropriated for this project in FY'10 up to \$325,000. This recommendation is also contingent on the edited proposal.

6. NRSP-8 Recommendation
 - Approve FY'10 budget of \$500,000
 - Next year's budget request must include justification for each species' budget and why the funding is divided equally among species.

7. New NRSP Review Process

- Guidelines section VI A. “New NRSP Development”
 - First sentence change “encouraged” to “required” and add “no later than September 1” to end of that sentence.
- Develop peer review form that must be used in peer reviews and add to Guidelines.
- Change Appendices A1 and A2 under “January 15” section by replacing “Executive Directors” with “NRSP Review Committee Chair”.

8. NRSP_temp 201

- Discussion
 - Public breeders and other specialty crops improvement programs need help navigating the regulatory process
 - Project is huge, difficult to determine what decision process will be used to target specific crops
 - Proposal seems to have strong advocacy slant toward government and industry trying to convince public what’s best
 - Public consumers of specialty crops should be primary the stakeholder to help create a market demand for transgenic varieties which would motivate industry to fund regulatory compliance
 - Project needs more involvement of consumers and consumer advocates and refocus on public good
 - The loss of anticipated benefits from transgenic varieties may be more due to lack of public acceptance rather than regulatory requirements
 - One main problem with proposal is the very elaborate structure and organization involved
 - If there is a true need for this type of assistance, private sector would likely provide this service.
 - Need more preliminary work on public need and acceptance of crops being proposed for release
 - NRSP-4 exists because minor crop production industry demanded it, but there does not seem to be a similar demand for this from specialty crop producers
 - In principle this idea has merit but the proposal needs to be refined
 - Activity is appropriate as a NRSP
 - Proposed structure to facilitate regulation process is too elaborate and inefficient
 - Should work with regulatory community to make the process less cumbersome
- Recommendation
 - Defer proposal to be revised and resubmitted to address the following concerns. The four regional Administrative Advisors should be appointed and involved in the revision.
 - Involvement of specialty crops consumers and consumer advocates in the project.
 - Assessment of public need and acceptance of transgenic specialty crops.
 - Structure and organization should be simplified, if possible, to make the activity more efficient.

9. NRSP_temp161 Recommendation

- Approve proposal for '09 – '14 contingent on a revised proposal answering the following questions being received by NRSP Review Committee no later than August 1, otherwise it will be deferred to next year.
 - Why did NRC stop providing this service? Did they determine it was not needed or used by the industry, or did it become a low budget priority for NRC, or some other reason?
 - What role does ARS have in the proposed activity?
 - Why is the budget split equally between the different activity areas. What is the justification for this? What is basic budget for each coordinator and technical group, ie. salaries/wages, travel, supplies, etc?
 - Why is aquaculture and other minor species (small ruminants, horses, etc.) not included?