

NRSP RC Zoom Meeting 9/4/18, 1:00pm

In attendance: Fred Servello, Valerie Giddings, Mark McGuire, Keith Owens, Jeff Jacobsen, Don Latham, Ron Brown, Rick Rhodes, Dave Leibovitz

Absent: Doug Buhler

- 1.) Approval of the notes from May 22, 2018
 - a. Change requested: Don Latham has been on the NRSP RC since 2003.
 - b. **A motion to approve the notes was introduced by Rick Rhodes, seconded by Mark McGuire and approved unanimously.**

- 2.) Approval of the agenda
 - a. **Approved by acclamation**

- 3.) Discussion of NRSP8 renewal
 - a. Comments by the NRSP RC responses from NRSP8 to questions posed by the NRSP-RC
 - Funding supports salary for bioinformatics personnel and is an important element of the project.
 - Justification for carry-forward was weakly stated.
 - The project team has initiated consideration for transition off of off-the-top funding. The technical team suggested transitioning to multistate research projects dedicated to single species.
 - NRSP8 website offers a robust toolbox of bioinformatics resources – a worthy research support tool.
 - Funding for graduate student travel and speakers – is that research support or research? OTT funding should support activities/efforts that aren't supported at the local station or college level (graduate students are most frequently supported locally).
 - This is a 5-year renewal. Are we proposing that NRSP8 come up with an alternative funding/business plan over the next 5 years or sooner? NRSP8's transition plan: at the end of the next 5 years, there should be a clear proposal to shift away from NRSP funding. The NRSP should be firm and ask for the alternative funding plan at the next mid-term review to encourage more productive discussions on future strategies for national research support well in advance of the end of the approved project.
 - b. Frame recommendations for presentation to ESS
 - **A motion was introduced by Rick Rhodes: The NRSP RC recommends approval of the NRSP8 proposal at the proposed funding level of \$500,000 per year for the next five years. The NRSP-RC also recommends during the midterm review of NRSP8, that NRSP8 describe the plan to transition from off-the-top funding. The NRSP RC recommends not allowing carry-forward for NRSP8. The motion was seconded by Mark McGuire and unanimously approved.**

- 4.) Discussion of NRSP4 midterm review
 - a. Comments by the NRSP RC responses from NRSP4 to the NRSP RC review

- The NRSP RC notes that NRSP4 is making progress on the mission and implementation of the project.
- Actions taken by NRSP4
 - NRSP4 is following through on suggestions made by the NRSP-RC during the May 22, 2018 meeting.
 - NRSP4/IR4 undertook an independent review in 2016 (report was circulated to the committee by Doug Buhler.)
 - Jerry Baron (IR-4) has reached out to each 1862 research regional association to identify time at their annual spring meetings to visit on NRSP4. The regional associations have unanimously welcomed Jerry Baron's participation. There is uncertainty about NRSP4/IR4 within ARS and within Rutgers; Jerry needs face time and feedback with Directors to discuss needs of NRSP4/IR-4.
- b. Frame recommendations for presentation to ESS (informational)
 - The NRSP RC supports the actions taken by NRSP4 and, as a result of a satisfactory review, recommends to ESS continuation of funding at its proposed budget. Directors (1862) should expect to have an agenda item on NRSP4/IR4 at their spring meetings.

5.) Discussion of NRSP6 midterm review

- a. Comments by the NRSP RC responses from NRSP6 to the NRSP-RC review
 - The NRSP RC notes that NRSP6 is making progress on the mission and implementation of the project. However, a long-standing request for satisfactory progress on identification of an alternative business model remains unfilled.
 - The NRSP RC sought alternative business models from the NRSP6 team. Bill Barker (AA) suggested that NRSP6 consider seeking funding from private industry and/or USDA-ARS. The project could also consider shifting AES support from the NRSP model to an individual station support model.
 - NRSP6 has heard the message – an alternative business plan needs to be identified.
 - John Bamberg sought guidance from NRSP-RC chair Fred Servello. John provided the NRSP-RC with a basic plan for developing an alternative model. His planning process included: forming a small engaged team, planning a budget goal, and consulting the NRSP-RC on the acceptability of the new budget. The plan implied that the NRSP-RC would negotiate an alternative business model and budget with the NRSP6 team.
 - Jeff Jacobsen also spoke with John Bamberg, who deferred the development of alternative business plans. By the NRSP Guidelines, NRSP6 should be developing plans for transitioning from OTT funding. As the NRSP Guidelines note, "NRSPs should expect a finite period of off-the-top funding."
- b. Frame recommendations for presentation to ESS (informational)
 - The NRSP-RC recommends to ESS, as a result of a satisfactory review of the project mission and productivity, continuation of funding of NRSP6 at its

proposed budget. However, the NRSP-RC continues to solicit NRSP6 for a transition plan that identifies alternative sources of funding and the reduction or elimination of OTT funds. The NRSP-RC will ask NRSP6 to deliver such a plan, 6 months after the ESS meeting (April 1, 2019.) The business plan development will be conducted by the leadership team of the NRSP6.

6.) Discussion of NRSP9 midterm review

- a. Comments by the NRSP RC responses from NRSP9 to the NRSP RC review
- b. The NRSP-RC notes that NRSP9 is making progress on the mission and implementation of the project.
 - The NRSP RC sought greater clarity on the outputs of NRSP9.
 - On behalf of NRSP9, Merlin Lindemann shared a list of publications which is posted on the revised National Animal Nutrition Program (NANP) website. The website has also been revised: broken links have been removed, multiple “under construction” labels have been removed, and supporting materials have been added and updated.
 - The NANP team has worked extensively with the National Academies on nutrient requirements for different animals.
 - Metrics for reporting NRSP leverage are inconsistent. For midterm reviews and renewals, the NRSP should be clear how leveraged resources were measured and reported.
- c. Frame recommendations for presentation to ESS (informational)
 - The NRSP RC recommends to ESS, as a result of a satisfactory review of the project, continuation of funding for NRSP9 at its proposed budget. The NRSP-RC will solicit NRSP9 for a transition plan that identifies alternative sources of funding and the reduction or elimination of OTT funding.

7.) Identify NRSP RC face-to-face meeting date in 2019

- a. Typically held in late May or early June. A NRSP-RC member suggested late May. A fly-in meeting in Providence, RI is acceptable with the committee.

8.) Follow-up items from May 22, 2018 meeting

- a. Revision of NRSP review forms and NRSP Guidelines
 - The subcommittee of Rick Rhodes, Jeff Jacobsen, and Doug Buhler is examining the review forms and guidelines.
- b. An NRSP-RC teleconference may be held mid-Winter 2018-19 to discuss the reviews and guidelines.

9.) Adjourn

- a. **The meeting adjourned at 2:00pm EDT.**