

## State of IPM Report – 2017

Developed by the National IPM Coordinating Committee at its October 17 & 18 Meeting

**Background:** The National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) formalizes the relationship between the IPM extended community among regional committees and centers and state programs to provide direct input to the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) Science and Technology Committee as well as to the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP). The NIPMCC's charge is to: make recommendations to ESCOP and ECOP on programs, policies, reports, and other matters that affect pest management implementation; make recommendations on budget matters relating to pest management; assist in development of reports and strategic plans on pest management issues; and pursue activities that facilitate coordination and collaboration nationally among and between IPM research and extension at the Land Grant universities, and between the Land Grants and Federal agencies involved in IPM.

The Committee convened on October 17, 2017 with a recap of the prior year's efforts that included a survey of NIPMCC participants. A key priority among the NIPMCC membership was the need for stable and prolonged funding for Extension and research IPM activities. Additional priorities included determining how current IPM programs could expand into "New IPM Programs" through the adoption of new technology and communication systems. Emphasis was placed on a "One Voice" paradigm that would speak cohesively on behalf of the IPM community and its stakeholders. Attention was directed towards building and improving partnerships among IPM practitioners and programs locally, regionally, and nationally. Regional IPM Centers were recognized for the coordination they provide for local programs. Trepidation was expressed regarding the "ageing out" of current IPM practitioners and the need to train the next generation of IPM practitioners was prioritized.

Overall the NIPMCC's priorities derived from 2016 were:

- Improve national capacity to support Extension IPM programs in all states and territories to deliver the technologies of the "New IPM" to users and practitioners
- Improve funding for IPM research to develop the technologies of the "New IPM"
- Develop a mechanism for aggregating a set of National IPM Priorities, thereby empowering the National IPM Program to communicate with "One Voice" to stakeholders and policy makers
- Improve partnerships and linkages with IPM groups
- Develop an improved process for aggregating reports and developing national IPM messaging (success stories)
- Improve definition of the roles of IPM Centers – aligned with NIPMCC priorities
- Empower programs to effectively impact all U.S. stakeholders – respect, consider and appreciate cultural, language and learning diversity
- Enhance awareness and engagement of students and youth in STEM and agricultural

education – to promote development of the next generation of IPM practitioners and scientists

- Effectively engage in educating the public about food (Ag Literacy) to counter misinformation with science-based reports using media appropriate for mass audiences

The meeting included brief presentations from the regional IPM Coordinating Committees and Regional IPM Centers. Common themes that resounded throughout these reports included concerns regarding stable funding, invasive species, pesticide resistance, and pollinator controversy and how these factors contribute to instability in local and regional IPM programs.

Reports were provided by NIFA leadership regarding how NIFA will be engaging stakeholders to better fulfill their needs and priorities as well providing a review of the 2017 Extension Implementation proposal competition. EIP proposals were funded at some level in all 50 states and 2 territories.

A report was provided by the Interregional Research Project #4 (IR-4) that detailed how the program would be placing a greater emphasis on a systems approach to pesticide registration on specialty crops and that IPM would play a significant role in IR-4's priority setting moving into the future.

The morning of October 17 concluded with a presentation from and discussion with outgoing NIFA Director Sonny Ramaswamy. Dr. Ramaswamy emphasized NIFA's role in providing nutritional security for the nation moving forward. Sustainability in food production and IPM's role as a critical component in the tactical science of future food production was discussed.

The NIPMCC reconvened at 1:30 PM on October 17 with a workshop on setting National IPM Priorities. This included a review of the National IPM Roadmap by NIPMCC membership and the view of the IPM roadmap from a federal perspective presented by David Epstein from the USDA Office of Pesticide Programs. Breakout groups were formed and tasked with addressing specific questions. After sufficient time the NIPMCC gathered as a whole and drew the conclusions detailed below.

#### **Summary of input from National IPM workshop breakout session:**

- The IPM Roadmap should be written in an inspirational spirit with overarching, philosophical goals and with focus areas that encompass and are translatable to all areas/iterations of IPM.
- Within this common vision of IPM, the IPM Roadmap should clearly emphasize measureable goals within narrower focus areas that document and demonstrate the impacts/outcomes of IPM adoption. Impacts/outcomes should relate to short, mid and long-term changes.

- The IPM Roadmap should include a succinct public value statement.
- The IPM Roadmap should include an infographic that illustrates the goals of the IPM Roadmap, similar to the infographic found the 2017 NIFA CPPM Competitive Grants Program RFA.
- The role of IPM in Pesticide Safety Education Programs (PSEPs), in human health outside the PSEP arena, and in environmental health should be clearly stated.
- The role of IPM in human nutrition should be clearly stated. Food diversity is an increasing problem, especially in industrialized nations.
- The IPM Roadmap should be accessible to an audience much broader than traditional IPM practitioners, including legislators, federal agency partners, private industry partners, professional societies, commodity group representatives, etc. Do we need to increase our communication/information exchange capacity?
- The IPM Roadmap should reflect current IPM challenges, for example pesticide resistance and climate change.
- Pollinator health/protection/conservation should be a specific focus area.
- Should conservation of natural enemies also be a specific focus area, or can this be included with pollinators into one focus area?
- Should we use 'Urban' or 'Community' IPM? As currently written, this focus area is 'residential and public areas' which covers a lot of ground.

After a break the NIPMCC then turned its attention to the topic of "How to be Successful with Success Stories". This discussion was led by evaluators and communication specialists from the regional IPM Centers. Evaluators stressed the need for common measures as indicators of IPM success. Documentation and hard numbers as well as strategic planning are critical in communicating a success story. Writers from the regional centers emphasized that we are in a multi-media world and that videos, photos, and social media can also serve well in delivering success stories. Success stories need to be relevant for the target audience; interactive surveys of stakeholders will provide the basis of how and why they want to receive information regarding IPM success stories.

The afternoon concluded with NIPMCC business in which Dr. Ann Hazelrigg from the University of Vermont was elected to serve as Chair-elect of the NIPMCC in 2018 and Chair in 2019.

The NIPMCC reconvened the morning of October 18 with a discussion led by the IPM Institute. The initial discussion included an explanation of the role of the IPM Institute and solicitation of participation in the 9<sup>th</sup> International IPM Symposium in March of 2018. The discussion was then directed towards the Food Narrative Project's efforts Toward a More Informed Conversation About Food and Farming. This project seeks to improve the agricultural literacy of much of the general public. The concept of polarized simplicity regarding food was discussed, particularly the perception that agricultural production is oversimplified in terms of good versus bad. While we have far more technology and science involved in food production than ever before, the

public in general is unaware of where or how their food is produced. IPM “One Voice” seeks to remedy this and improve the public’s understanding of farming practices and food production.

The NIPMCC then moved into a workshop on Enhanced One Voice Communication. This workshop focused the NIPMCC efforts on how can we improve and advocate as One Voice to policy makers. Topics covered included direct visits with legislative staff. An emphasis should be placed on increased knowledge of the audience. We as IPM practitioners have the ability to conduct grassroots advocacy and we should learn how to better exploit this precious resource. Toward this end, the NIPMCC needs to develop of a short and concise position statement. The NIPMCC concluded that the creation of a National IPM Communicator housed with either NIFA or a regional IPM Center was an idea that should receive further consideration, although the logistics could prove difficult given current circumstances.

Late morning on the 24<sup>th</sup> the leadership and staff of the regional IPM Centers were given the opportunity to discuss their respective programs’ opportunities and challenges. This included leadership challenges in a soft money funded program. There has been substantial turnover in center directors at several of the regional IPM Centers. The centers have proven adept at leveraging funds, managing various small grant programs, initiating special projects, and developing and conducting signature programs. The centers have proved to be adept at capturing impacts, promoting networking, and facilitating information exchange.

The NIPMCC meeting wrapped up with a discussion of “Wild Card Topics.” This process was initiated to provide an opportunity to discuss topics not included on the NIPMCC meeting agenda. Discussions were initiated on using existing mechanisms to get the word out. This included impact statements uploaded to [landgrant.org](http://landgrant.org). Further discussion included ways to better engage social scientists and economists and to improve evaluation of IPM programmatic communication strategies. Some consideration was given towards presenting the IPM roadmap to the public in a graphic format.

The dates of October 24 and 25, 2018 were selected for the 2018 meeting again with the location being the APLU Building in Washington, DC.