Agenda Item 9.2: ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee/BAC Agenda Brief

Presenters: Steve Slack and Mike Harrington

Background:

The committee holds regular monthly conference calls that are well attended. The current B&L Committee membership is shown below.

Chair: Steve Slack (NCRA) **Delegates:** William (Bill) Brown (SAAESD) Jeff Jacobsen* (WAAESD) Ernie Minton (NCRA) Karen Plaut (NCRA) Orlando McMeans (ARD) Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD) Bob Shulstad (SAAESD) Tim Phipps (NERA) Thomas Burr (NERA) Bret Hess (WAAESD) **Executive Vice-Chair** Mike Harrington (WAAESD)	**NIFA Liaison** Paula Geiger (NIFA) **Representatives** Caird Rexroad (ARS) Glen Hoffsis (APLU Vet Med) Eddie Gouge (APLU) Ian Maw (APLU) Dina Chacon-Reitzel (CARET) Cheryl Achterberg (APLU - B of Hum Sci) Jim Richards (Cornerstone) Hunt Shipman (Cornerstone) *Chair elect

Crop Protection:
The Committee reviewed and approved the July 2012 working paper from the Crop Protection Working Group (WG). The working paper describes a single that was also submitted to the BAC. The WG, which consists of more than 30 members representing all parts of the crop protection community and stakeholder, continues to refine with working paper with completion by the November. The document will come back to the B&L Committee as well as the BAC for further action.

An essential element of this effort is that all programs are included within a new crop protection/IPM program a single budget line. This could be accomplished with full authority and functional intent of the legislation such that the several programs highlighted above will maintain form and function. However, consolidation into a single budget line (within NIFA) should only be done in such a way to enhance the

coordination among essential elements described in the working paper (e.g., IR-4, Regional IPM and EIPM). Such consolidation ***SHOULD NOT*** be interpreted as justification for overall budget reductions.

The concept of functional equivalency (described below) is critical to the success of this effort. It is important to protect program integrity, including maintaining current eligibility for accessing the funding. Without functional equivalency many currently successful programs will only be asked to do more with less when in fact need for these programs has never been greater.

Guiding Principles:
The following principles were developed and endorsed by the ESCOP and ECOP Budget and Advocacy Committees, and provide the foundation from which the Working Group on IPM has developed its rationale for this report.

- Protect/maintain the funding for E- IPM, Regional IPM Centers, and IR-4 programs of the Land Grant Universities This includes local capacity as well as competitive support for important programs and projects;
- Consolidate budget lines where it makes sense, doing no harm;
- Maintain intent (functionally equivalent) of programs (e.g., integrated activities regardless of where the budget resides within the USDA/NIFA Budget);
- Expand our ability to integrate research, education, and Extension functions of the nation's Land Grant Universities in local and multistate problem solving;
- Ensure regional multistate collaboration focused on sharing and cooperating among Land Grant Universities and NIFA;
- Acceptable to those directly affected and supported by the COPs, BAC and PBD; and
- Acceptable to appropriators.

The BAC submitted a motion to PBD stated that BAC supported inclusion of all IPM working group elements including IR-4 and recommended to PBD that a directed discussion be held with IR-4 and appropriate representatives from AHS related to inclusion in a comprehensive IPM program and a combined budget initiative.

Review of Roadmap Priorities:
This Committee supports all 7 challenges and the top two priorities from each of the seven challenge areas. However, it was suggested that focus be on the top 2 from each of the 7 challenge areas. For example, there are also some that are overarching, cross-cutting issues, such as climate, water and IPM. There may also be regional priority differences as well.

The Science and Technology Committee is developing a short 4-5 page synthesis document. Three overarching themes have emerged: "human health and well-being" as a function of "food safety and security", "socioeconomics and the bioeconomy", and "ecosystems and the environment". The committee agreed with the Science and Technology Committee on to better sharpen the focus of the Roadmap more manageable segments. This input will be provided to NIFA through a formal letter to Sonny Ramaswamy and others from the B&L, S&T Committees and ESCOP. However, every opportunity to provide more detailed input will be taken to provide advice to federal agencies on targeted investments.

2014 Priorities: The committee reaffirmed a continuing commitment as top priorities: Hatch, Evans Allen, McIntire-Stennis and other formula based capacity programs which should remain at least level if not increase. In addition the committee supports continuation of the mandatory grants programs and significant increases in AFRI.

Action Requested: For information