ESCOP Meeting
July 25-26, 2007
Loews Philadelphia Hotel
Philadelphia, PA

Minutes

Participants:

Jerry Arkin (Univ. of GA)
Susan Barefoot (Clemson Univ)
David J. Boethel (LA State Univ.)
Greg Bohach (Univ. of ID)
Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD)
Forrest Chumley (KS State Univ.)
Jim Clark (W. TX A&M)
LeRoy Daugherty (NM State Univ)
Steve Goodwin (Univ. Of MA)
H. Michael Harrington (ED-WAAESD)
Fred Hutchinson (CGA)

Arlen Leholm (ED-NCRA)
Mort Neufville (NASULGC)
Ralph Otto (CSREES)
Ronald Pardini (Univ. Of NV)
Alfred Parks (Prairie View A&M Univ.)
Daniel Rossi (ED-NERA)
Lee Sommers (CO State Univ.)
Dariusz Swietlik (ARS)
Alton Thompson (NC A&T State Univ.)
Eric Young (ED-SAAESD)

Assignments and Actions:

Agenda Item 1.0   Approval of the Agenda, Approval of February 27, 2007 ESCOP Minutes, Interim Actions of Chair

• Approved agenda
• Approved minutes of February 27, 2007 meeting

Agenda Item 4.0   Communications and Marketing Committee

• Approved that ESCOP move ahead with enabling the Communications and Marketing Subcommittee to send the RFA for development of a strategic marketing plan out for bid.

• Harrington and Thompson are to work together to develop a Zoomerang survey on the Ag on the Hill program.

Agenda Item 6.0   NRSP Review Committee

• Approved that the NRSP Review Committee recommendations be forwarded to the ESS in September for ESS approval.

Agenda Item 9.0   Developing a Strategic Operational Plan for ESCOP

• Approved development of both long and short-term plans. The short term plan is to be developed by the ESS meeting by the ED's. The long-term plan is proposed to include ECOP.

Agenda Item 11.0   Multistate Research Awards

- Present proposal as amended to ESS to create awards program. Amendments are: recognize regional nominees at ESS and winner at NASULGC meeting; expenses for regional winners to ESS and the national winner to be paid at 50% by ESCOP and 50% by the managing region.

Agenda Item 12.0 Partnership Working Group

- Eric Young and Mike Harrington will develop a white paper regarding the future of the Partnership Working Group.

Item 1.0 Approval of the Agenda, Approval of ESCOP Minutes for February 27, 2007, Interim Actions of the Chair
Presenter: Ron Pardini
Background:

A request was made to approve the agenda as circulated.

A request was made to approve the minutes of the February 27, 2007 meeting.

The following interim actions were taken:

1.   The ESCOP support of the International Plant Germplasm Treaty was reported to Peter Bretting (USDA/ARS)

2.   The deadline for submission of the assessments from the individual states was extended to August 15. A reminder is to be sent to the regional associations.

3.   The updated Communications and Marketing Plan was circulated to the PBD.

Action Requested: Approval of the agenda and February 27, 2007 minutes
Action Taken: Approved the agenda as circulated; approved the minutes of the February 27, 2007 Meeting.

Agricultural Research Service (ARS)

Report to

Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP)

July 25, 2007
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

1. Update on ARS Organization and Leadership (attached)
2. ARS Budgets (attached)
3. Joint ARS-CSREES-SAES Program Planning Activities (attached)
4. Profile of ARS Laboratories in Pennsylvania (attached)

Dariusz Swietlik

Associate Area Director, North Atlantic Area

USDA United States Department of Agriculture

ars Agricultural Research Service

600 East Mermaid Lane
Wyndmoor, PA 19038

215-233-6668 (voice)
215-233-6719 (fax)
Dariusz.Swietlik@ars.usda.gov

Administrator's Council
Agricultural Research Service

Caird E. Rexroad, Jr.
Associate Administrator
Research Programs

Edward B. Knipling
Administrator

Antoinette A. Betschart
Associate Administrator
Research Operations

Program Planning and Coordination
(National Program Staff)

Steven M. Kappes
Deputy Administrator,
Animal Production & Protection

Ghassem R. Asrar
Deputy Administrator,
Natural Resources & Sustainable
Agricultural Systems

Judith B. St. John
Deputy Administrator,
Crop Production & Protection

Joseph T. Spence
Deputy Administrator,
Nutrition, Food Safety & Quality

Pai-Yei Whung
Director,
Office of International Research Programs

Area and NAL Directors

Wilbert H. Blackburn
Director,
Northern Plains Area

Steven R. Shafer
Director,
Midwest Area

Edgar G. King, Jr.
Director,
Mid South Area

Dan R. Upchurch
Director,
Southern Plains Area

Darrell F. Cole
Director,
South Atlantic Area

Phyllis E. Johnson
Director,
Beltsville Area

Wilda H. Martinez
Director,
North Atlantic Area

Dwayne R. Buxton
Director,
Pacific West Area

Peter Young
Director,
National Agricultural Library

Program Support and Operations
(Headquarters)

James H. Bradley
Deputy Administrator,
Administrative & Financial Management

Joseph S. Garbarino
Director,
Budget & Program Management Staff

Melinda L. McClanahan
Chief Information Officer

Jeff Hayes
Acting Director,
ARS Homeland Security

Sharon D. Drumm
Special Assistant to the Administrator
and Executive Secretary of the AC

Sandy Miller Hays
Director,
Information Staff

Donald L. McLellan
Director,
Office of Outreach, Diversity, and Equal Opportunity

Richard J. Brenner
Assistant Administrator,
Office of Technology Transfer

Karen Pearce
Senior Legislative Advisor,
Office of the Administrator

ARS Budgets

- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2007, ARS has been operating under the continuing resolution funded at the FY 2006 budget level of $1,128,943,000.   OMB has cleared ARS' program and funding plans for implementation of the prior year earmarks totaling $210,000,000.   Most of these earmarks were determined to support the Administration's priority initiatives and accountability requirements and therefore could be continued as is or after slight modification.   About 30 earmark projects totaling $35 million did not adequately meet the evaluation criteria. These projects are being terminated and the funds reallocated to new projects and research objectives that are relevant, merit-based, and have adequate programmatic control.

- The President's Budget Proposal for FY 2008 is shown below as increases and decreases to the FY 2007 Full Year Continuing Resolution.

Agricultural Research Service
Budget Estimates- Fiscal Year 2008

FY 2007 Full Year Continuing Resolution…………………………$1,128,943,000

Changes to FY 2008 Budget Estimate:

  INCREASES:

  FY 2008 Pay Cost Increases…………………………………… $19,978,000
  Priority Research Initiatives…………………………………… $84,546,000
                                                  Total $104,524,000

  DECREASES:

  Program Reductions (Prior Year Earmarks)………………….. ($211,950,000)

FY 2008 Budget Estimate……………………………………… $1,021,517,000

Net Reduction in FY 2008 ………………………………..   ($107,426,000)

Joint ARS- CSREES-SAES Program Planning Activities

USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS), USDA Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service (CSREES) and the State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES) are working effectively together toward solving important problems facing American agriculture. Below are three instructive examples of how ARS, CSREES, and SAES coordinate, at upper administrative and scientists levels, their respective programs that address common goals.

Bee Colony Collapse Disorder (CCD)

- CCD is a syndrome of honey bees that strikes colonies. The foragers leave the hive and never return. There is no satisfactory explanation for what is causing bee disappearance.
- In 2006, USDA-ARS, Penn State University, the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, and the University of Montana formed a Colony Collapse Disorder (CCD) Working Group which subsequently was expanded to include CSREES, APHIS, EPA, DoD, Florida Department of Agriculture, Arizona State University, North Carolina State University, University of Illinois, and Bee Alert Technology, Inc, Montana.
- In March 2007 a CCD Steering Committee was formed. The CCD Steering Committee oversaw development of an Action Plan, and the CCD Working Group coordinates research. The Action Plan (http://maarec.cas.psu.edu/ColonyCollapseDisorder.html):
  - Focuses on four areas: i) Survey; ii) Analysis; iii) Research; iv) Mitigation.
- Allocation of agency resources:
  - ARS: Base program 7.6 million at 4 Honey Bee Laboratories;
  - ARS: An Area-wide Project to demonstrate how to rear healthy colonies ($1 million per year for 5 years); refocus of ARS Bee Labs to CCD;
  - CSREES: A Multi-state Hatch Act Project to promote bee health.
  - ARS & CSREES: Sequencing of the bee genome with NIH.
  - Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS): Analysis of hive samples for pesticides;
  - APHIS: Trial of a bee health monitoring system in Montana and Florida.
  - Department of Defense (DoD): Use of a new particle size detector for pathogen searches.
- Formation of research teams of ARS and other federal and academic researchers with focus on identifying new pathogens and detecting pesticides associated with CCD, and determining the stress effects of migratory beekeeping on bees.
- Briefings and Testimony at the House and Senate.
- CCD Steering Committee consists of: Co-chairs Kevin Hackett (ARS), Rick Meyer (CSREES) and Mary Purcell-Miramontes (CSREES) and also includes Sid Abel (EPA), Charles Brown (APHIS), Doug Holy (NRCS), Bruce McPheron (Penn State Univ.), Sonny Ramaswamy (Purdue University), and Evan Skowronski (DoD).

The Action Plan and the interagency rapid response to CCD, together, serve as a model of cooperation between ARS, CSREES, Universities and other state and federal agencies.

National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee (NPGCC)

- The National Plant Germplasm System (NPGS) is a network of more then twenty gene banks, distributed throughout the U. S., which has responsibility for the conservation and utilization of the Nation's plant genetic resources. The NPGS is funded through a partnership of State and Federal resources, real and in-kind.
- A new National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee (NPGCC) was formed in 2005 following a special ESCOP task force study and joint agreement with CSREES and ARS. It's goals are to facilitate the coordination of ARS, CSREES and SAES planning and assessment mechanisms for NPGS policy, organization, operations and support; promote awareness and understanding of the NPGS across ARS, CSREES, and SAES and more broadly to the scientific community; and serve as a vehicle for improving communications and discussions about issues impacting the NPGS with ARS, SAES, and CSREES.
- The current members of the NPGCC are L. Sommers (Colorado State-SAES), Chair; E. Young (Executive Director, Southern Region); K. Grafton (North Dakota State- SAES), G. Arkin (University of Georgia-SAES), A. M. Thro (CSREES), E. Kaleikau (CSREES), B. S. Benepal (CSREES), P. Bretting (ARS-National Program Staff), D. Buxton (ARS-Pacific West Area), and C. Gardner (ARS – Ames).
- NPGCC members made a joint presentation on the NPGS to the 2006 Experiment Station Section/State Agricultural Experiment Station/Agricultural Research Directors Workshop on September 24-27, 2006. That presentation, plus testimonials from key Directors about the NPGS's value, increased the NPGS's visibility to this important group. In May 2007, the NPGCC recommended to the National Research Support Project Review Committee to restore off-the-top funds designated for NRSP-5 (the Prosser, WA virus-free pome and stone fruit project) and NRSP-6 (the potato genebank project at Sturgeon Bay, WI) to their FY 06 levels to sustain these valuable efforts.
- The NPGCC confers frequently by e-mail, quarterly by teleconference, and meets face-to-face at least once a year. Its next meeting is scheduled for June 2008 in Fort Collins, Colorado.

The USDA Animal Genomics Blueprint

- A blueprint for future research, education and extension efforts in agriculture animal genomics has been developed by a task force of ARS, CSREES and SAES scientists and administrators. It is to be released to academia, federal, and industry partners and stakeholders in the next few weeks.
- The Blueprint is built on strong inputs from stakeholders. In 2006, the ARS and CSREES conducted a joint stakeholder workshop where the input from federal, university and private sector scientists, producers and representatives of animal commodity groups and animal industries was obtained.

- Designed as a pyramid, **the Blueprint** has **Science to Practice** at the top that is supported by fundamental and mission oriented research in **Discovery Science** and is based on a solid foundation of **Infrastructure.** **Science to Practice** is concerned with delivering important genome-based technologies to animal producers. **Discovery Science** is concerned with filling critical gaps in our understanding of gene structure and function in animals and **Infrastructure** is concerned with genomics tools, databases, genetic resources and education and training for students, scientists and the public.
- The task force was co-chaired by Ronnie D. Green (ARS) and Muquarrab A. Qureshi (CSREES) and consists of 11 other members: Peter C. Buerfing (CSREES), Noelle E. Cockett (Utah State University), Steven Kappes (ARS), Anna C. Palmisano (CSRESS), Gary A. Rohreer (ARS), James Womack (Texas A&M University), Hans H. Cheng (ARS), Deb Hamernick (CSREES), Mark A. Mirando (CSREES), Daniel L. Pomp (University of North Carolina), and Curt Van Tassell (ARS).

Profiles of ARS Laboratories in Pennsylvania

- Pennsylvania is the home for **the Eastern Regional Research Center (ERRC)** located in Wyndmoor (Philadelphia suburb). Shu-I Tu, Acting Center Director. The seven research units of ERRC consist of:
  - **Food Safety Intervention Technologies Unit.** Howard Q. Zhang, Research Leader. Primary objectives are to develop new processes and new biological, chemical and non-thermal physical technologies for the decontamination of meat, poultry, fresh and fresh-cut fruits, vegetables, sprouts and juices.
  - **Fats, Oils and Animal Coproducts Unit.** William Marmer, Research Leader. The main goal of this unit is to foster the utilization of domestic fats and oils, hides, wool, and other animal coproducts by application of chemistry and biotechnology and add value to these materials, establish new uses for them and overcome environmental impediments to domestic processing. Among the products investigated from fats and oils are biodisel fuel and lubricant additives.
  - **Microbial Food Safety Research Unit.** John Luchansky, Research Leader. This unit's research program addresses strategies and technologies to: 1) prevent bacterial pathogens from entering the food chain; 2) development rapid detection methods; 3) development of risk assessment strategies and mathematical models to predict the growth, survival and death of pathogens; and 4) the effect of food environments on pathogen survival and virulence. Research is conducted principally at ERRC, but poultry and aquaculture research are conducted at Work Sites located at University of Maryland Eastern Shore in Prince Anne, Maryland and Delaware State University in Dover, Delaware, respectively.
  - **Dairy Processing and Products Research Unit.** Peggy M. Tomasula, Research Leader. This unit's main goal is to solve critical problems in milk utilization and create and utilize new concepts and advances in dairy

science and technologies to expand markets for milk, dairy foods and milk-based food ingredients. Examples of research approaches include: genetic modification of food processing microorganisms to produce foods with improve flavor and texture; casein and whey modifications for improved thermoplastic extrusion into high-value products; prediction of milk protein structure-function relationships by computer-assisted modeling and others.

- o **Crop Conversion Science & Engineering Research Unit.** Kevin Hicks, Research Leader. Enzymatic, chemical, physical, fermentation and other environmentally sustainable processes are developed to convert surplus crops into value-added functional food ingredients, industrial gums, biodegradable materials, renewable fuels and health-promoting nutraceuticals. The Unit has the Agency's only process engineering unit with facilities and expertise to do pilot plant research involving basic theoretical investigations, process development, scale-up simulations and economic feasibility studies.
- o **Microbial Biophysics & Residue Chemistry Research Unit.** Shu-I Tu, Research Leader. The unit develops advanced techniques for the detection of pathogenic bacteria and chemical residue in food. It also conducts research on soil fungi to enhance mineral nutrient uptake by crops.
- o **Core Technologies Unit.** Shu-I Tu, Research Leader. The Unit provides ERRC research scientists accessibility to modern research instrumentation, sophisticated data processing methodologies and contemporary electronic research information resources. It includes Research Data Systems, Scientific Information Resources, Microscopic Imaging, Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy and Nucleic Acid Facility technologies.

- **Pasture Systems & Watershed Management Research Unit.** Ray Bryant, Research Leader. Located on Penn State University Campus in University Park, the unit conducts research aimed at: 1) developing technologies for improving forage use in integrated cropping and grazing systems that reduce off-farm inputs of feed, fuel and chemicals; 2) quantify the effects of land management on water quality and quantity; and 3) integrate animal and plant production and resource management components into prototype systems for testing.

- **North Atlantic Area Office** located in the ERRC in Wyndmoor. Wilda H. Martinez, Area Director. The North Atlantic Area consists of 12 states: Connecticut, Delaware, Main, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont and West Virginia. The Area Office provides line management and oversight for research programs of 12 research locations/centers and 6 worksites, consisting of 21 Research Management Units and operating under an annual combined budget of over $100 million.

Item 3.0: Budget and Legislative Committee Report
Presenter: LeRoy Daugherty/H. Michael Harrington
Background:

The ESS federal budget priorities for FY 2010 will be developed and discussed at the ESS annual meeting this September. The ESS FY09 priorities to this point are as follows.

1) Maintain capacity for research through base funds (Hatch, Evans-Allen, McIntire-Stennis, Animal Disease).

2) Increase the National Research Initiative (NRI) with special emphasis on integrated program areas.

ESS FY 09 Subject Matter Priorities for Federal Funding (all agencies)

Broad Category	Rank	Issue
Biobased Economy	1	Bioconversion and biofuels Feedstocks Development and utilization of bioproducts Economics and policy Land-Use Issues and policy Water quality and quantity Energy security
Food, Nutrition and Health	2	Food Safety Obesity/Consumer Behavior Innovative plant and animal technologies and systems Functional Foods/Nutraceuticals
Environment	3	Water quality and quantity Invasive species Rural communities and land use issues Global climate change Sustainable agriculture systems Agricultural mechanization
Food and Agro Security	4	Rapid Detection of Threat Agents Risk Assessment Facility and Personnel Security

Biobased Economy: Increase our knowledge of bioconversion of plant and animal feedstocks to bioenergy and bioproducts including plant and microbial genomics, bioprocessing systems, and biomass production.. Enhance understanding of the long term sustainability of bioconversion systems including economics, land use policies, water availability, and energy security.

Food, Nutrition and Health: Develop the knowledge base on the etiology of food safety. Develop an understanding of the role of diet and consumer behavior on human health including obesity. Develop innovative plant and animal production technologies and systems. Enhance the ability to identify foods with physiological activity and apply new, innovative technology to improve food systems.

Environment: Provide a framework for understanding and addressing issues of water quality and quantity and invasive species. Develop a better understanding of rural community vitality including land use. Contribute to issues of global climate change. Develop sustainable agriculture systems including agricultural mechanization.

Food and Agro Security: Develop the knowledge base for (1) rapid detection of threat agents and disaster preparedness and recovery efforts, (2) risk assessment, and (3) facility and personnel security. Provide for facilities as stated in section 1485 of the 2002 Farm Bill that authorizes up to $10M per year awarded to each experiment station on a competitive basis with required matching funds (77 units (SAES and ARD) at $10M each amounts to $250M per year for three years).

Action Requested: For information

Item 4.0: ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee
Presenter: Jerry Arkin/Arlen Leholm
Background:

ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee Report
The "Marketing the SAES" white paper is a result of work by the ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee. In February of 2007, this committee was asked by ESCOP and some members of the AHS group to develop compelling reasons why our nation's State Agricultural Experiment Stations need a marketing strategy. Included in this brief, is a list of frequently asked questions and answers concerning the proposed marketing strategy.

Marketing the SAES

Despite the vital work and exciting discoveries at the State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES), we believe there is insufficient visibility for sustenance of our programs, let alone the growth which the nation needs. We seem to suffer not just from a shortage of fiscal resources but also from a lack of a recognized identity. Too few in Washington D.C. and elsewhere know of us, our mission, and the substance of our research efforts. To remedy this situation, the ESCOP, Communication and Marketing, Committee recommends a marketing (educational) campaign aimed at key federal officials who make the funding decisions upon which our collective destinies depend.

How do we build upon existing efforts to get better recognition of SAES and turn that into strategic support for our programs? The ESCOP, Communication and Marketing, Committee believes that earlier and repeated use of the media to educate and attract major sponsors for our programs is the best way to go forward. We have to build support in home districts and states of our congressional champions and convert that locally-based support into explanations of and publicity for the national SAES system.

Challenge
Over the past fifteen years (F.Y. 1992 to F.Y. 2006), Hatch program funds have been steadily eroded by inflation. As measured in constant 2000 (inflation adjusted) dollars, Hatch funding was $192 million in F.Y. 1992 and $153 million in F.Y. 2006. During this same time period (and again measured in constant 2000 dollars), appropriations for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) increased from $8.6 billion in F.Y. 1992 to $24.0 billion in F.Y. 2006 and funding for the National Science Foundation (NSF) increased from $2.2 billion in F.Y. 1992 to $3.6 billion in F.Y. 2006.

Why have NIH and NSF thrived while funding for the SAES system has withered?

• NIH and NSF have a strong cadre of congressional supporters who understand the agencies' missions, support their goals, and champion their causes.

CSREES and the SAES institutions do not have legislative champions who are ready, willing, and/or able to provide the sustained leadership necessary for significant SAES funding growth.

Recommended Solution
The land-grant system (including the Experiment Station Section) has a strong and effective lobbying effort in place. We believe that this existing effort needs to be complemented by a narrowly-focused

education campaign aimed at no more than 20-30 members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. We need these members to understand:

- What we do in their state or district.
- What we do for the nation and the greater global community.
- How federal SAES funds leverage state, local, and private funds.
- Why increased SAES funding – both through the formulas and competitive methods – is so important.

The ESCOP Communication and Marketing Committee recommends that the Experiment Station Section retain a nationally recognized marketing firm to help us establish a brand identity and educate federal decision-makers.

Who, What, Why, Where and When of a State Agricultural Experiment Station Marketing Strategy

Why do State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES) need a marketing strategy?

- The SAESs lack identity, are difficult to describe, and have not achieved the financial and political support levels necessary to take full advantage of their problem-solving and economic development capacity. The SAESs, a $2 billion per year enterprise, do virtually no marketing at present.
- The land-grant system's current lobbying approach has worked well, but is not designed to educate key federal decision-makers at a level more than needed to support the lobby effort.

What will the SAESs achieve with a marketing effort?

- It will link state and local-based research impacts to dynamic, integrated and competitive food, agriculture, human systems, forestry, and environment research institutions.
- Also, a successful marketing effort will allow for a more educated base to support increased, sustainable funding (which must include both competitive and formula/capacity-building resources).

Who is the key audience for the SAES marketing strategy and where should the SAESs first focus resources to obtain the most impact?

- In the next few years, ESCOP should focus the primary marketing message on key members of the House and Senate and House Agriculture and Appropriations Committees and their relevant subcommittees. The SAESs might also focus on leaders in OMB, OSTP, and USDA.
- By initially focusing on key Members of Congress (in their local districts) we would limit the targets and link a national marketing campaign by utilizing experiment station communication expertise already in place to provide access to the local media and other outlets. This would be the most strategic and cost effective approach to marketing the SAESs.

Should a SAES marketing strategy include teaching and extension functions?

- A skilled marketing firm will help the SAESs determine how best to craft marketing messages for maximum impact. Clearly, teaching and extension functions need marketing assistance too; an integrated approach would better represent the system's breath and depth.
- The advantage for marketing the SAESs includes its ability to develop multistate research teams and rapid responses to national issues.

- No matter the mission involved, a successful marketing effort must remain focused, simple, economical, and directed at those individuals who affect system budgets.

Doesn't our advocacy firm already perform the marketing function as part of its lobbying contract with the SAESs through NASULGC?

- No the existing advocacy firm, hired to lobby Congress on behalf of the Colleges of Agriculture, Extension, the SAESs, etc. does not have the marketing function in its contract. However, the marketing strategy must coordinate closely with the lobbying effort – a strong marketing effort would complement and strengthen the system's effectiveness.

What attributes and experiences must a marketing firm possess if selected to develop and implement a SAES marketing strategy? Where would the firm deliver the messages?

- The firm must have demonstrated congressional marketing success and it must understand how to influence our key target audience.

- The firm must be able to deliver marketing messages to the key members in their home districts and to the most important media markets that influence those members but be able to tie local outcomes to a national SAES system.

How do you hold a marketing firm accountable for performance?

- ESCOP would identify and carefully monitor outcome measures and objectives stated in the marketing firm's contract for progress toward the strategy's objectives and goals.

- ESCOP will develop a marketing outcome report and present it to the system annually. Additionally, ESCOP will conduct a comprehensive review after three years.

Who will hold the marketing firm to its milestones and outcomes as stated in the contract?

- ESCOP charged the Communication and Marketing Committee with developing a strategic marketing plan and thus accepts this responsibility.

How will SAES marketing efforts complement other attempts to gain new resources?

- It will enhance our chances for success with efforts such as CREATE-21 and NIFA.

- It will enhance and be coordinated with the existing lobbying effort.

- It will cooperate with other parts of the NASULGC system where appropriate.

How will ESCOP fund this marketing effort?

- ESCOP initially provided the Communication and Marketing Committee $10,000 to develop a marketing firm proposal.

- ESCOP must fund and implement successful marketing efforts over the long run.

- ESCOP needs some off-the-top funding to sustain at least the initial phases of this marketing effort.

- ESCOP and its member institutions could strategically redirect funds currently spent on fragmented efforts whose impacts are, at best, unknown to fund and sustain much of the proposed marketing effort.

- At some point, ESCOP could ask SAES stakeholders to contribute to the effort's funding.

• A coordinated marketing effort from ECOP and ACOP may also benefit the strategy.

When should the marketing effort begin?

Ideally, in order to influence the next annual budget/appropriations cycle, the effort should begin no later than October 1, 2007. A marketing firm should be selected as soon as possible.

Action Requested: None. This has been sent to the AHS and Policy Board for information.
Action Taken: Approved that ESCOP move ahead with enabling the Communications and Marketing Subcommittee to send the RFA for development of a strategic marketing plan out for bid.

Item 5.0   Science and Technology Committee
Presenter: Dan Rossi for Steve Pueppke
Background Information:

The ESCOP Science and Technology Committee met via a conference call on June 7, 2007. The Social Science Subcommittee remains very active and is focusing collaboration around the following key issues: the human aspects and impacts of the bioeconomy; immigration and rural communities; the intersections of food and health; and specification of the rural development NRI RFP. Pat Dick was elected chair and Cornelia Flora will serve as the representative to the Science and Technology Committee.

The NRI priority input process was completed and forwarded to the NRI leadership. We are waiting to determine what impact the input will have on the RFP's. We may need to re-evaluate the process in future meetings and decide whether to re-engage the system.

The Science Roadmap update was well received. It may be necessary to revisit and update the Roadmap every 4 to 5 years. There is discussion of the development of an operational strategic plan for ESCOP. The Committee is prepared to participate in this process.

The Committee discussed the issue of a maximum percentage for NRI integrated awards. There was a feeling that the awards should be driven by program needs and the quality of the proposals received, and that all outstanding integrated proposals should qualify. As the maximum percentage is currently legislated, it was suggested that ESCOP should request a revision of the legislation removing the maximum. The committee looked at some background information on how other funding agencies define and handle integration. It was felt that it would be helpful to invite representative from NSF and NIH and Anna Palmisano to our next meeting.

The committee started to review its charge to determine whether it is still relevant. As the participation in the conference call was somewhat limited at that time, it was decided the committee will reconvene to revise and update the charge.

Dr. Pueppke has served as chair of the committee for three years and suggested that it may be time to appoint another chair. Nominations are being requested.

The Committee may meet at the ESS Meeting on September 17. If not, a conference call will be scheduled after the meeting.

Action Requested: For Information

Item 6.0   NRSP Review Committee
Presenter: Lee Sommers and Mike Harrington
Background Information:

The NRSP Review Committee met on June 6, 2007 in Kansas City. Committee members present were Lee Sommers (CO), chair and W rep; Marshall Martin (IN), NC rep; Bill Vinson (WV), NE rep; Craig Nessler (VA), S rep; Al Parks (Prairie View A&M), ARD rep; Larry Miller, CSREES rep; Eric Young, S Executive Director; Mike Harrington, W Executive Director and; Don Latham (IA), stakeholder rep.

Following discussion of the NRSP budget proposals submitted to the Committee, the following recommendations will be presented to the Experiment Station Section at the annual meeting.

Budget Requests
NRSP-1. Research Planning Using the Current Research Information System (CRIS). The amount requested for FY08 was $337,574. It was noted that the FY08 budget reflects the obligation of the SAES to fund 25% of the cost of CRIS as well as an increase in funding since the SAES now funds 75% of the cost of NIMSS through the CRIS budget. Motion by Martin to accept budget request. Second by Parks. Motion passed.

NRSP-3. National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP). The budget proposal of $61,000 for FY08 was consistent with the prior recommendations of the Committee to implement a phased reduction in funding. Motion by Latham to accept budget request. Second by Nessler. Motion passed.

NRSP-4. National Agricultural Program to Clear Pest Control Agents for Minor Uses. The amount requested for FY08 was $481,182. This request is consistent with prior recommendations of the Committee. Motion by Martin to accept budget request. Second by Parks. Motion passed.

NRSP-5. Develop and Distribute Deciduous Fruit Tree Clones Free of Viruses and Virus-like Agents. The amount requested for FY08 was $145,919. This request restores funding for the project to the level existing in FY06. The Committee supports this level of funding based on input from the National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee as well as feedback from each of the regional associations. Motion by Martin to accept budget request. Second by Nessler. Motion passed.

NRSP-6. Inter-Regional Potato Introduction Project. The amount requested for FY08 was $110,000. This project is an essential component of the National Plant Germplasm system and the funding request is consistent with maintaining ongoing support from the SAES for the project. Motion by Nessler to accept budget request. Second by Latham. Motion passed.

NRSP-7. Minor Use Animal Drugs. The amount requested for FY08 was $542,700. This project has not requested funds in past fiscal years because the funding has been provided via a special grant originating in the USDA budget. Due to the uncertain status of special grants in the USDA budget, the project submitted a request for off-the-top funding to the Committee. The Committee concluded that funding via the President's budget request for USDA was likely. Motion by Latham to reject the budget request. Second by Nessler. Motion passed.

NRSP-8. National Animal Genome Program. The amount requested for FY08 was $400,000. This request is consistent with prior recommendations of the Committee. Motion by Latham to accept budget request. Second by Parks. Motion passed.

NRSP Project Reviews
Based on the NRSP guidelines, each project should conduct an external review if a proposal for renewal will be submitted. In FY08, NRSP-3, NRSP-5, and NRSP-8 will be in their 5th year and should conduct an external review if renewal is contemplated. The Administrative Advisers for these projects should coordinate the review process with the CSREES NPL assigned to the project. The NRSP Review Committee will utilize the external review documentation to assess the need for ongoing off-the-top funding.

NRSP Guidelines
The Committee reviewed the guidelines and is proposing the following changes for consideration by the ESS.
  1. Change from 2/3 vote to simple majority for overturning recommendation
  2. Change of term for regional association committee members
The Committee also noted the change in leadership within ECOP. The chair will contact ECOP about their preference for membership on the Committee.

It was also noted that the current guidelines do not contain a section detailing the process for their revision. A proposed process will be submitted to the ESS.

Committee Membership
We are recommending that the terms increase from 3 to 4 years to facilitate rotation of Committee leadership among the ESS regions. The S and NE need to have the terms of their reps extended for 1 year to synchronize terms. We also encourage similar terms for all members. If a member of the Committee resigns/retires, the regional association is asked to appoint a rep to complete the term in order to maintain the staggering of reps from the four regions.

The current guidelines specify that the chair will rotate between the regions in a specific order. Our discussions concluded that the guidelines should not specify the rotation, rather the committee should internally adopt an appropriate structure for sharing leadership responsibilities.

Representative	Individual	Final FY for Term and Notes
W	Sommers(chair in FY07)	2007 – new rep for '08; 4 year term
NC	Martin	2008 – new rep for '09; 4 year term
S	Nessler (chair in FY08)	2009 – extend 1 year; new rep for '10
NE	Vinson (chair in FY09)	2010- extend 1 year; new rep '11
ARD	Parks	ARD option and appoints
CSREES	Miller (retiring July 2007)	R. Otto will appoint replacement
ECOP	Wade	ESCOP appoints with ECOP input
Exec Director	Harrington & Young	ESCOP option
Stakeholder	Latham	ESCOP option

Committee Discussion
The committee discussed several items of interest to activities of the ESS.
- Specialty crops – A critical component of many specialty crop research and extension programs is the incorporation of new species and evaluation on alternative crops. The National Plant Germplasm System plays a major role in providing the germplasm used by plant breeders in developing new and alternative crops. The NPGCC should consider how to contribute to the emerging efforts in the Farm Bill on specialty crops.
- National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee – There will be likely be an ongoing discussion about the most appropriate mechanism for funding NRSP projects contributing to the National Plant Germplasm System. The NPGCC is encouraged to further evaluate alternative funding approaches for the ESS components of the system.
- New NRSP projects – The Committee did not receive any suggestions or formal proposals for new projects.

Action Requested: Final Association recommendations on NRSP budgets
Action Taken: Approved that the NRSP Review Committee recommendations be forwarded to the ESS in September for ESS approval.

THE EXPERIMENT STATION SECTION

GUIDELINES FOR NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS (NRSPs)

ADOPTED December 13, 2002
REVISED September 27, 2004
REVISED September XX. 2007

Table of Contents

I. MISSION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS

The activity of an NRSP focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research.

II. GENERAL

National Research Support Projects are created to conduct activities that enable other important research efforts. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies.

All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. All projects must pass scientific scrutiny as well as be an issue that has national significance. Where appropriate, linkages to similar international activities are encouraged.

Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and meet one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP. General consideration will be given to assuring that the portfolio of NRSP projects has sufficient diversity so as to make best use of limited funds.

NRSP are initiated by use of Hatch funds drawn from the total federal allocation prior to the formula distribution to state agricultural experiment stations (SAESs). This funding process is called "off-the-top" and in total represents about 1% of the federal formula funds to SAES.

The National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS) is the official repository for NRSP project information. NIMSS is a web application for management of the Multistate Research Activities in a paperless environment. It is an information technology tool that facilitates the submission of proposals, reports and reviews online. NIMSS also serves as the central repository of records pertaining to multistate research projects and activities since September 2003. Information can be accessed anywhere, anytime at www.nimss.umd.edu.

Refer to Appendix B for more information on "Criteria for Establishing or Renewing an NRSP."

III. ORGANIZATION: NRSP REVIEW COMMITTEE
A. General

Since the dissolution of the Committee of Nine, there has been no single SAES entity with the general oversight responsibility for National Research Support Projects. An NRSP Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the committee) with broad oversight responsibility for the NRSP portfolio has been established and charged with providing general oversight, consistency in review and approval processes, and a national perspective relative to research support needs. The committee does not have the responsibility to micromanage individual projects.

While playing a gatekeeper function for the SAES system, it is also important that the committee's role is clearly advisory to the system. It makes recommendations to the Experiment Station Section (ESS) concerning existing and new projects. A key component of their role is to oversee implementation of sunset clauses whereby an NRSP reduces or eliminates its dependence on off-the-top funding. The committee brings its recommendations to the annual ESS meeting, currently held in September. It reports on the final project proposals and projected budgets, as well as their final recommendation. The SAES Directors vote (one vote per institution contributing off-the-top funding) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A simple majority vote is required to overturn the NRSP Review Committee recommendation.

One of the specific charges to the committee is to use the national priorities and needs as a basis for the review and evaluation of existing and new NRSP projects. It is responsible for assuring that the NRSP portfolio is monitored and is responsive to needs. The committee will identify specific areas of research support needs or at least utilize input from an established ESCOP mechanism such as the Planning Committee because of their focus on emerging issues and needs. The committee has the authority to proactively identify research support needs. The committee has access to resources available to seed the creation of new NRSPs responsive to emerging needs.

The committee is directly responsible for the annual review of progress and budget for existing NRSPs. It has the authority to ensure that the criteria contained in these guidelines are satisfactorily met by NRSPs.

Relative to the evaluation of revised and new projects, the committee oversees review by peer and merit panels. It develops criteria for the reviews, selects reviewers, assists in establishing protocols for review, and prepares the specific charge to the panels. Utilizing the results of the reviews and the committee's understanding of national research support needs, the committee makes recommendations concerning revised and proposed projects to the ESS.

A final role for the committee is one of broad advocacy for the NRSP system.
It insures the documentation of system and individual project impacts. It serves as the point entity for marketing the system and bringing it to national level prominence.

B. The NRSP Review Committee shall consist of:

1. One representative from each of the four SAES regions (1862 experiment stations) who is a current or past member of an MRC, and one from the ARD region (1890 research directors), appointed by the regional association chair. Each unit represented on the NRSP Review Committee will also designate an alternate to insure representation.   For the geographical regional associations, a logical alternate would be the regional MRC chair.

2. One representative from Extension appointed by the ESCOP Chair following the recommendation of the ECOP Chair.

3. One representative from CSREES, preferably a National Program leader, recommended by the CSREES Administrator and appointed by the ESCOP Chair.

4. One stakeholder representative, possibly a CARET representative, appointed by the ESCOP Chair.

5. Two regional executive directors appointed by the ESCOP Chair. One of the executive directors should be from the same region as the chair of the committee and will serve as the Executive Vice Chair, administratively supporting the committee. These two appointed executive directors will be voting members of the Committee. The other three regional executive directors (both SAES and/or ARD) not assigned to the Committee may attend meetings as ex officio, non-voting members.

6. Officers will include a chair and chair-elect chosen by the committee from the representatives' four SAES regions. The position of chair will rotate among the four geographical regions NC, W, S, and NE.

C. NRSP Review Committee Operations
1. Term of appointment to the committee will be three years. Terms of the four SAES regions' representatives will be staggered so as to provide continuity to deliberations.

2. The committee will meet face-to-face once per year prior to the September ESS meeting. Other business of the committee will be conducted electronically through conference calls and e-mails. All expenses will be borne by member's respective institutions except for the stakeholder representative. Travel funds for the stakeholder representative will be provided by ESS/ESCOP.

3. The committee will coordinate peer reviews of new and revised NRSP proposals and associated five-year budgets.

4. The committee and CSREES jointly arrange for review of NRSPs at the beginning of year 5.

5. The committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on new or revised NRSP project proposals and five-year budgets and makes a recommendation for approval or rejection.

6. The committee reviews annual reports and budgets of active NRSPs and approves annual budget if no increase is requested from initial five-year budget. If a budget increase is requested, the committee reports and makes a recommendation for approval or disapproval at the ESS Fall meeting.

IV. ESTABLISHING NEW NRSPs
(Also refer to Appendix B for the NRSP criteria; Appendix C for the NRSP proposal format; and Appendix D for the NRSP Review Forms.)

In addition to addressing the criteria described in the General section above, a proposal for a new NRSP must contain the following elements:

A. Relevance
The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, review and/or management plan. The proposal must indicate how the project meets stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship with the research to be supported. (The real stakeholders are the researchers and the funding agencies that will use the information or services generated.) The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs.

B. Management and Business Plan
Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project.

All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds.

In general, NRSPs should expect a finite period of off-the-top funding. This is not a reflection of the quality of work being conducted or the research being supported by the project. Rather, this allows the SAES system to continually assess needs and develop new projects as necessary. For this reason, the business plan of project renewals must include a transition plan and provisions for developing alternative funding or reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level.

C. Objectives and Projected Outcomes
Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes and how these assessments will be used in program planning.

D. Integration
Where applicable, projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders.

E. Outreach, communications and assessment
All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:

1. Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)

2. Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.

3. Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.

4. Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.

5. Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES is preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.

F. Budget: The NRSP team must present an annual budget for each of the five years (See Appendix F). The budget must take into account all sources of funds (Multistate Research Funds, industry, federal agencies, grants and contracts, and SAESs). There are two tables in Appendix F, one for MRF and one for Other Sources. For the SAESs, the project should estimate the in-cash and in-kind contributions. The budget narrative should provide an estimate of the per cent contribution from each funding source.

V. RENEWAL OF AN NRSP
(Also refer to Appendix B for the NRSP criteria; Appendix C for the NRSP proposal format; and Appendix D for the NRSP Review Forms.)

Prior to renewal, each NRSP must undergo a review according to the schedule presented in the timelines section. Each NRSP seeking renewal must meet/address all of the criteria for a new NRSP described in the previous section. In addition, renewal requests must address the following:

A. General
NRSPs should expect a finite period of significant levels of off the top funding. This allows "the system" to undertake new initiatives and address new priorities. For this reason the business plans of applications for renewals will be carefully scrutinized. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The proposal

should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs. The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.

B. Relevance
Proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity,

C. Assessment of Outcomes
The proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments.

The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs

D. Objectives
The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which project has been on task, on time and within budget for the previous funding period.

E. Management and Business Plan
In general, NRSPs should expect a finite period of off-the-top funding. This is not a reflection of the quality of work being conducted or the research being supported by the project. Rather, this allows the SAES system to continually assess needs and develop new projects as necessary. For this reason, the business plan of project renewals must include a transition plan and provisions for developing alternative funding or reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Included would be an assessment of transition options, and alternative funding sources.

However, not all projects may be shifted to other funding sources. Projects seeking to continue with significant amount of off the top funding should fully justify the request.

The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.

Note. Not all projects can be transitioned to other funding sources and, if the project meets an ESCOP priority, the project may continue with off-the-top funding.

F. Integration and Documentation of Research Support
The business plan must indicate the diversity of partners involved in the project as well as the multiple sources of funding. The proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which full team is engaged in project planning and implementation and discuss plans to complement any weaknesses that may have been identified.

The proposal should contain a description of how research activities nationwide will be supported by the project.

G. Outreach and Communications
The proposal should assess the success of the project's outreach and communications plan and indicate any steps to be taken to improve effectiveness. A clear description of impacts resulting from the project is required.

H. Budget: The NRSP team must present an annual budget for each of the five years (See Appendix F). The budget must take into account all sources of funds (Multistate Research Funds, industry, federal agencies, grants and contracts, and SAESs). There are two tables in Appendix F, one for MRF and one for Other Sources. For the SAESs, the project should estimate the in-cash and in-kind contributions. The budget narrative should provide an estimate of the per cent contribution from each funding source.

VI. REVIEW AND APPROVAL TIMELINES FOR NEW NRSPs OR RENEWAL OF AN EXISTING NRSP (Also, refer to Appendix A)

A. New NRSP Development

Anytime
Sponsoring Director(s) submits request to establish an NRSP writing committee to the sponsoring regional association's Executive Director following that region's standard process for initiating new multistate activities.

Sponsoring regional association assigns lead Administrative Advisor and solicits names of Co-advisors from other Executive Directors. Sponsoring regional association follows the normal process for approving the establishment of a writing committee and solicit additional participants.

NRSP writing committee membership, in consultation with Administrative Advisors, prepares initial project proposal, including projected five-year budget.
Administrative Advisors submit the project proposal and projected five-year budget, along with names of several qualified peer reviewers, to the NRSP Review Committee. The NRSP Review Committee solicits peer reviews by scientists familiar with the area and transmits review results along with Committee comments to Administrative Advisors. NRSP writing committee revises proposal and budget based on review.

Not later than Oct 1
Administrative Advisors submit revised proposal and five-year budget, along with peer review comments, to NRSP Review Committee and Executive Directors (transmission of materials to Executive Directors throughout this process implies subsequent transmission to members of corresponding regional associations).

Oct-Feb
NRSP Review Committee reviews proposal and budget and sends comments with initial recommendation to Executive Directors. Appropriate regional committees review the project proposal and projected five-year budget and report to association at their Spring meeting.

Feb-Mar
Regional associations discuss project proposal and projected five-year budget, along with NRSP Review Committee recommendation, at their Spring meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns to the Administrative Advisors and NRSP Review Committee.

Apr-June
NRSP Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns through further project and/or budget revisions and/or separate responses.

July 1
Final project proposal, projected five-year budget, and any additional responses are transmitted to the NRSP Review Committee and the Executive Directors.

July-Aug
Regional associations discuss the final proposal and budget at their summer meetings, or the appropriate regional committee reviews the proposal and budget, and Executive Directors transmit comments to the NRSP Review Committee.

September
The NRSP Review Committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per institution contributing off-the-top funding) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A two-thirds majority vote is required to overturn the NRSP Review Committee recommendation.

October 1
Approved NRSP starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved.

B. During Project Term (years 2-4)

January
NRSP Committee submits annual report (see below) and detailed budget for subsequent fiscal year to the NRSP Review Committee and Executive Directors by January 15.

The NRSP Review Committee reviews annual report and budget and transmits any comments to Administrative Advisors and Executive Directors. If there is no change in total annual budget from approved five-year budget, Executive Directors transmit report and budget to regional associations for their information.

If a change in the annual budget from the approved five-year budget is requested, a detailed justification must be submitted to the NRSP Review Committee and Executive Directors, and change request is reviewed through the following process.

Feb-Mar
Regional associations review budget change request during Spring meetings and transmit comments to the NRSP Review Committee.

Apr- Sep
The NRSP Review Committee interacts with CSREES and NRSP Administrative Advisors to determine and approve any budget changes for the next year.

C. Renewal of an Existing NRSP

Year 4
NRSP committee decides to renew project as NRSP and notifies the NRSP Review Committee and CSREES.NRSP committee drafts initial renewal proposal and five-year budget.

CSREES and the NRSP Review Committee jointly arrange for review of NRSP that is due to terminate at the end of year 5. Review organizer consults with the NRSP Review Committee and NRSP Administrative Advisors regarding review protocol, charge, etc.

Not later than Sep 1
Administrative Advisors submit renewal proposal and five-year budget to the NRSP Review Committee and Executive Directors.

Year 5

Sep-Nov
Review team conducts review of past four years progress and renewal proposal and transmits report to the NRSP Review Committee and Administrative Advisors.

Oct-Feb
Appropriate regional committees review report and renewal proposal with five-year budget and report to association at Spring meetings. The NRSP Review Committee reviews proposal and budget and Sends comments with initial recommendation on renewal to Executive Directors.

Feb-Mar
Regional associations discuss renewal proposal and budget along with the NRSP Review Committee recommendation, at their Spring meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns to the Administrative Advisors and the NRSP Review Committee.

Apr-June
NRSP Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns through renewal proposal and/or budget revisions and/or separate responses.

July 1
 Final renewal proposal, five-year budget, and any additional responses are transmitted to the NRSP Review Committee and the Executive Directors.

July-Aug
Regional associations discuss the final renewal proposal and budget at their summer meetings, or the appropriate regional committee reviews the proposal and budget, and Executive Directors transmit comments to the NRSP Review Committee.

September
The NRSP Review Committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per contributing institution) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A two-thirds majority vote is required to overturn the NRSP Review Committee recommendation.

October 1
NRSP approved for renewal starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved. NRSP not approved for renewal receives one-year extension (with budget equal to 5th-year budget) to transition off NRSP funding to other sources or downsize project.

VII. ANNUAL REPORT OF AN NRSP
Annually each NRSP will prepare a State Agricultural Experiment Station 422
Report (SAES-422) and include the following information:

1. Stakeholders: A description of the interaction and engagement with the stakeholders during the past year and brief description of plans for next year.

2. Activities, Accomplishments, and Impacts: A description of the activities
(ie. meetings, etc.), accomplishments (ie. publications, information sharing, etc.), and impacts (ie. demonstration of adoption of new techniques, advancement in sharing information, change is stakeholders' techniques, knowledge, or action, etc.) for the past year and a brief description of plans for next year.

3. Communication Plan: A description of the implementation of the Communication Plan as stated in the proposal and a brief description of plans for next year.

4. Research Support activities: Describe how project contributes to and supports related research programs nationwide.

VIII. Revision of Guidelines

These guidelines will be modified using the following process:

1. Periodically, the guidelines will be reviewed by the NRSP Review Committee. Proposed changes will be drafted by the Committee and incorporated into this document.
2. The proposed changes will be submitted to ESCOP for review, editing, and approval.
3. Changes will be presented to the ESS for approval by a simple majority vote at the annual meeting.

2 years prior to approval for new projects **4th year for renewals**

New Project:
    • Regional association or NRSPRC recommends development of new project as NRSP and notifies CSREES (as well as NRSPRC if they are not already aware).
    • Potential NRSP committee assigns potential lead Administrative Advisors and project leaders who then draft the initial proposal and five-year budget.
    • CSREES and the NRSPRC jointly arrange for review of new NRSP proposal. Review organizer consults with the NRSPRC and potential NRSP Administrative Advisors regarding review protocol, charge, etc.

Renewal:
    • NRSP committee decides to renew project as NRSP and notifies the NRSPRC and CSREES. NRSP committee drafts initial renewal proposal and five-year budget.
    • CSREES and the NRSPRC jointly arrange for review of NRSP that is due to terminate at the end of year 5. Review organizer c
    • review protocol, charge, etc.

September **(2 years prior to approval for new projects; 4th year for renewals)** **ESS meeting**
• **Not later than Sep 1:** Adm   the NRSPRC and Executive Directors.

(1 year prior to approval for new projects; 5th year for renewals)
• CSREES reviews take plac   **Existing Projects:**
• NRSPRC sends   communicated to the NRSPRC by January 15.

November
New and Renewal Projects: **• By November 15:** CSREES Review team conducts review of new proposal and transmits report to the NRSPRC and Administrative Advisors.

December
New and Renewal Projects: • Continue to revise proposals for January 15 deadline.

January
New Project: **• By January 15,** Potential NRSP project team revises the proposal in response to the CSREES review team report and sends the revised proposal to the regional association offices and NRSPRC
Renewal: **• By January 15,** NRSP project team revises the proposal in response to the CSREES review team report and sends the revised proposal to the regional association offices and NRSPRC.
Existing Projects: **• By January 15,** all budget changes should be sent to the NRSPRC for regional distribution. Each region will examine the budgets at their Spring Meetings.

February
New and Renewal Projects: • Regional associations gather material for initial project reviews.

March Regional Spring Meetings
New and Renewal Projects: **• By March 30,** regional associations discuss new/renewal proposals and budget at their Spring Meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns to the lead Administrative Advisor and the NRSPRC.
Existing Projects: • Regional associations discuss existing project budgets at their Spring Meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns to the lead Administrative Advisor and the NRSPRC.

April
New/Renewal/Existing Projects: • Prepare response to regional comments/concerns.

May

New/Renewal/Existing Projects:
> • Prepare response to regional comments/concerns for June 15 deadline.

June

NRSP Review Committee:
> • **By June 1,** NRSPRC notifies CSREES of tentative budgets on all NRSPs (new/renewal/existing).

New/Renewal/Existing Project:
> • **By June 15,** Potential/Renewal NRSP Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns through (1) a revised proposal and/or (2) a budget revision and/or (3) a separate response. These comments are sent to executive director offices and NRSPRC.

July
Regional Summer Meetings

August

New/Renewal Projects:
> • **By August 1,** regional associations or an appropriate regional committee discuss the final proposal and budget at their summer meeting. The Executive Director transmits comments to the NRSPRC and the lead AA.
> • **By August 31,** the final revision of the proposal will be sent from the NRSP project team to NRSPRC.

September (5th Year)
Regional Fall Meetings at ESS Meeting

New and Renewal Projects:
> • **By September 15,** the NRSPRC prepares its report for the ESS Fall meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per contributing institution) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A two-thirds majority vote is required to overturn the NRSPRC recommendation.

NRSP Review Committee:
> • **By September 30,** the NRSPRC submits final notification to CSREES of approvals.

October (Project Approved)

New Project:
> • **October 1** New NRSP approved; starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved.

Renewal:
> • October 1 NRSP approved for renewal starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved. NRSP not approved for renewal receives one-year extension (with budget equal to 5th-year budget) to transition off NRSP funding to other sources or downsize project.

CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING OR RENEWING A NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECT
Established September 22, 2003

These criteria are based on the NRSP Guidelines adopted by the Experiment Station Section in January 2003. The Experiment Station Section adopted these specific criteria on September 22, 2003.

The following statement defines the mission of the NRSP program:

"MISSION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS
The activity of an NRSP focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies."

Based on the mission of NRSPs, all proposals (new and renewals) will be evaluated using the following criteria (renewal of an NRSP must meet all of the criteria for a new NRSP in addition to the specific criteria identified for a renewal):

A. Prerequisite criteria for NRSPs
1. Mission: All NRSPs must be consistent with the mission of an NRSP.
2. National Issue:
> a. All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. The proposal should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs.
> b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.

B. These are the criteria addressing the rationale for the NRSP.
1. (20 points) Priority Established by ESCOP/ESS: Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and support one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP (see ESCOP Science and Technology Committee and Science Roadmap)
2. (20 points) Relevance to Stakeholders:
> a. The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans. The proposal must indicate how the project meets primary and secondary stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship of the stakeholders with the research to be supported. The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs. Identify project outcomes that aide in development of or contribute to the discussion of public policy.
> b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity.

C. Criteria for implementing the NRSP proposal

1. **(15 points) Management and Business Plan:**

    a. Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. The plan should demonstrate that alternative funding sources have been explored. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project. All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds.

    b. The business plan for project renewals must include a funding plan including development of alternative funding for reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which the project has been on task, had an impact, on time and within budget for the previous funding period. The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.

2. **(15 points) Objectives and Projected Outcomes:**

    a. Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes including stakeholder use and how these assessments will be used in program planning.

    b. For renewals, the proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments. The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs. The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs.

3. **(15 points) Integration and Documentation of Research Support:**

    a. Projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders.

    b. For renewals, the proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which the full team is engaged in project planning and implementation. Discuss plans to correct any weaknesses that may have been identified.

    c. Proposals should indicate specifically how the project will support research activities nationwide.

4. **(15 points) Outreach, Communications and Assessment:**

    a. All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:

        i. Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)

ii. Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.

iii. Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project and effectiveness of the communication plan. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.

iv. Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.

v. Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES is preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.

b. For renewals, the proposal should assess the success of the project's outreach and communications plan and indicate any steps to be taken to improve effectiveness. A clear description of impacts resulting from the project is required.

NRSP Proposal Outline
15 Page limit

Project Title: (140 characters)
Requested Duration:
Administrative Advisor:
CSREES Representative:

STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND JUSTIFICATION:

Prerequisite Criteria:

1. How is the NRSP consistent with the mission? (8,000 characters)
   a. Mission: The activity of an NRSP focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research, as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies."

2. How does this NRSP pertain as a national issue? (10,000 characters)
   a. All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. The proposal should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs.
   b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.

Rationale:

1. Priority Established by ESCOP/ESS: Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and support one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP (see ESCOP Science and Technology Committee and Science Roadmap) (8,000 characters)
2. Relevance to stakeholders: (8,000 characters)
   a. The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans. The proposal must indicate how the project meets primary and secondary stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship of the stakeholders with the research to be supported. The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs. Identify project outcomes that aide in development of or contribute to the discussion of public policy.
   b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Objectives and Projected Outcomes: (4,000 characters)
    a. Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes including stakeholder use and how these assessments will be used in program planning.
    b. For renewals, the proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments. The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs. The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs.

2. Management, Budget, and Business Plan: (16,000 characters)
    a. Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. The plan should demonstrate that alternative funding sources have been explored. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project. All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds.
    b. The business plan for project renewals must include a funding plan including development of alternative funding for reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which the project has been on task, had an impact, on time and within budget for the previous funding period. The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.

3. Integration and Documentation of Research Support: (5,000 characters)
    a. Projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders.
    b. For renewals, the proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which the full team is engaged in project planning and implementation. Discuss plans to correct any weaknesses that may have been identified.
    c. Proposals should indicate specifically how the project will support research activities nationwide.

4. Outreach, Communications and Assessment: (15,000 characters)
    a. All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:

i. Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)

ii. Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.

iii. Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project and effectiveness of the communication plan. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.

iv. Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.

v. Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES is preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.

PROJECT PARTICIPATION: Appendix E

LITERATURE CITED:

BUDGET: The NRSP must present an annual budget for each of five years (See Appendix F). Information should be provided on funding from MRF and funding from other sources (i.e. industry, federal agencies, grants and contracts, and SAESs). **(Refer to Appendix F)**

APPENDIX D
NRSP Proposals Review Form

The following statement defines the mission of the NRSP program:

MISSION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS
The activity of an NRSP focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies."

Based on the mission of NRSPs, all proposals will be evaluated using the following criteria:

A. Prerequisite criteria for NRSPs:		Circle One:
1. Mission: Is the NRSP consistent with the mission of an NRSP?		**Yes / No**
2. National Issue:		
	1. All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. The proposal should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs.	**Yes / No**
	2. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.	**Yes / No**
Comments:		

B. These are the criteria addressing the rationale for the NRSP:		Total Points:
a. **(20 points) Priority Established by ESCOP/ESS:** Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and support one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP (see ESCOP Science and Technology Committee and Science Roadmap)		__ / 20
2. (20 points) Relevance to Stakeholders:		__ / 20
	a. The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans. The proposal must indicate how the project meets primary and secondary stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship of the stakeholders with the research to be supported. The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs. Identify project outcomes that aide in development of or contribute to the discussion of public policy. **b.** For renewals, proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity.	

Comments:	

C. Criteria for implementing the NRSP proposal	Total Points:
1. (15 points) Management, Budget and Business Plan:	__ / 15
a. Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. The plan should demonstrate that alternative funding sources have been explored. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project. All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds. **b.** The business plan for project renewals must include a funding plan including development of alternative funding for reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which the project has been on task, had an impact, on time and within budget for the previous funding period. The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.	
2. (15 points) Objectives and Projected Outcomes:	__ / 15
a. Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes including stakeholder use and how these assessments will be used in program planning. **b.** For renewals, the proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments. The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs. The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs.	
3. (15 points) Integration and Documentation of Research Support:	__ / 15
a. Projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders. **b.** For renewals, the proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which the full team is engaged in project planning and implementation. Discuss plans to correct any weaknesses that may have been identified. c. Proposals should indicate specifically how the project will support research activities nationwide.	

4. (15 points) Outreach, Communications and Assessment:	__ / 15

	a. All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:	
	i) Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)	**Yes / No**
	ii) Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.	**Yes / No**
	iii) Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project and effectiveness of the communication plan. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.	**Yes / No**
	iv) Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.	**Yes / No**
	v) Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES is preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.	**Yes / No**
	b. For renewals, the proposal should assess the success of the project's outreach and communications plan and indicate any steps to be taken to improve effectiveness. A clear description of impacts resulting from the project is required.	
Comments:		

	Total Points:	___ / 100

APPENDIX E
Format for Reporting Projected Participation

For each participant in this activity, include his/her name and e-mail address, employing institution/agency, and department; plus, as applicable:

- For research commitment, indicate the CRIS classifications [Research Problem Area(s) (RPA), Subject(s) of Investigation (SOI), and Field(s) of Science (FOS)], and estimates of time commitment by Scientists Years (SY) (not less than 0.1 SY), Professional Years (PY), and Technical Years (TY);

- For extension commitment, indicate FTE and one or more of the seven extension programs (See http://www.reeusda.gov/1700/programs/baseprog.htm); and,

- Objective(s) under which the each participant will conduct their studies.

Project or Activity Designation and Number (if applicable): _____
Project or Activity Title: _____
Administrative Advisor: _____

Participant Name and E-Mail Address	Institution and Department	Research						Extension		Project Objectives				
		CRIS Codes			Personnel									
		RPA	SOI	FOS	SY	PY	TY	FTE	National Program	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F: NRSP BUDGET REQUESTS SUMMARY

Project Number and Title

	MRF FUNDING									
DESCRIPTION	**Proposed FY (year 1)**		**Proposed FY (year 2)**		**Proposed FY (year 3)**		**Proposed FY (year 4)**		**Proposed FY (year 5)**	
	Dollars	**FTE**	**Dollars**	**FTE**	**Dollars**	**FTE**	**Dollars**	**FTE**	**Dollars**	**FTE**
SALARIES										
FRINGE BENEFITS										
WAGES										
TRAVEL										
SUPPLIES										
MAINTENANCE										
EQUIPMENT/ CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT										
TOTAL										

OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING
Please check one of the following:　　Industry　　Federal Agencies　　Grants/Contracts　　SAESs

Other (please list): _____

DESCRIPTION	**Proposed FY (year 1)**		**Proposed FY (year 2)**		**Proposed FY (year 3)**		**Proposed FY (year 4)**		**Proposed FY (year 5)**	
	Dollars	**FTE**	**Dollars**	**FTE**	**Dollars**	**FTE**	**Dollars**	**FTE**	**Dollars**	**FTE**
SALARIES										
FRINGE BENEFITS										
WAGES										
TRAVEL										
SUPPLIES										
MAINTENANCE										
EQUIPMENT/ CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT										
TOTAL										

Item 7.0   National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee
Presenter: Eric Young for Lee Sommers
Background Information:

The National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee met on May 29, 2007 in Beltsville, MD at the ARS Carver Center just prior to the Plant Germplasm Operations Committee (PGOC). Several NPGCC members also attended the first day of the PGOC meeting.

The following agenda items were discussed during the NPGCC meeting.

1. **NRSP-5 and -6 Funding.** Regional feedback on NRSP-5 and -6 was reviewed and the funding issues discussed. Feedback indicated support for maintaining funding at least at the FY06 levels. One question that was frequently asked is: Should fees be assessed to recover costs for distribution of plant germplasm? Peter Bretting indicated that the ARS rationale for free distribution has been addressed in the past and white papers have been developed to explain the current system. The NPGCC will review a white paper written several years ago on this topic.
   a. Motion was passed endorsing off the top funding mechanism for NRSP-5 and -6 at least at the FY06 level.
   b. Memo with motion was sent to NRSP Review Committee with cc to Colien Hefernan, Ralph Otto, Exec Directors, and ESCOP chair Ron Pardini
   c. To continue communication, NPGCC will provide ESCOP with agenda briefs describing it's activities and every 2-3 years request time on the ESS annual meeting agenda for a more complete report.

2. **International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources and the Standard Material Transfer Agreement.** ESCOP solicited comments from SAES Directors on the Treaty and SMTA and the memo from Ron Pardini summarizing feedback was discussed. June Blaylock, ARS Tech Transfer, shared her perspectives of prior activities on this issue. The Executive Branch supports the Treaty, which now requires ratification by the Senate (not scheduled for action at this time). American Seed Trade Association also has endorsed the treaty. Points from the discussion include:
   a. Complex document and SAES system needs educational material to implement the Treaty.
   b. Treaty includes a list of 64 crops affected; some major US crops are not included such as soybean and cotton.
   c. NPGS must comply if plant material comes to US from 1) country signing Treaty or 2) CG International Research Centers.
   d. SMTA follows material and is a contract between original seed provider and recipient. That is, seed from a CG center distributed by a US plant introduction station to a university results in a SMTA between the CG center and the university.
   e. An issue requiring further clarification is payment of royalties to the international trust if germplasm is a component of commercialized product or if restrictions of use imposed.
   f. Current holdings in the NPGS are NOT affected if distributed within the US – no SMTA required.
   g. ARS members of NPGCC will draft a flow chart with details of the Treaty/SMTA process, which will be shared with SAES Directors.

3. **Representation on NPGCC from Other Interested Groups.**   The pros and cons of having liaisons from related organizations were discussed. Some possible criteria for liaison members included commitment to NPGS, users of NPGS, advocate for NPGS, provide a mutual benefit, and/or lack of a formal entry point into the NPGS. The following groups were identified as having missions related to NPGCC: ASTA, AOSCA, Am Assoc Industrial Crops (AAIC), and Organic Seed Alliance.

   However, the committee decided that it was premature to invite formal liaison members. Instead the NPGCC will volunteer to give presentations on the roles, functions, and components of the NPGS at major meetings of selected national organizations. Initial targets are ASTA, AOSCA and AAIC. A standardized PowerPoint presentation will be developed for the NPGCC member to use.

4. **Marketing the NPGS.** Possible marketing activities and several approaches to marketing were discussed and the following suggested:
   a. Target - SAES: regular agenda briefs and request in-depth session every 2-3 years at ESS annual meeting.
   b. Target – related organizations: presentations at their meeting by a NPGCC member.
   c. Target – LGU system: develop web site with NPGCC information; post PowerPoint presentations, white papers, links, etc.

5. **Next Meeting.** It was decided to meet face to face each year at the PGOC meeting to facilitate our interaction with the leaders of NPGS.   Quarterly conference calls will also be scheduled to update the NPGCC on NPGS activities and issues. The first call will be scheduled for early October to report on ESS meeting discussions and results of NRSP funding decision.

Action Requested: For information

Item 8.0 Lead-21
Presenter: Bill Ravlin
Background:

No brief was provided

Discussion:

The Lead-21 committee met in Chicago in March 2007. An evaluation study of the program has been commissioned. There are 55 participants for the current and the program needs 75 to be adequate.

Linda Martin will become Chair and a representative from Extension is to be named Chair-Elect.

Action Requested: For information

Strategic Planning Alternatives for ESCOP and the SAES System

Discussion Paper
Prepared by Arlen Leholm and Dan Rossi

July 2007

<u>Background</u>

- The last comprehensive strategic planning process for the SAES system was completed nearly ten years ago in 1998 and focused on the period 1999 – 2003. This "Medium Term Strategic Plan" followed and built upon the "Issues to Action" process. "Issues to Action" was an integrated approach to cross-functional planning including teaching, research and Extension. It involved a series of regional listening sessions followed by a synthesis of issues and a plan of action. Previous strategic planning primarily focused on developing a strategic agenda of research priorities.
- An ESCOP and NASULGC task force of nationally recognized scholars prepared "A Science Roadmap for Agriculture" in 2001 which identified research opportunities for agricultural science for a 10 to 20 year time frame. The task force focused on "opportunities to enact positive change and help to set a course of research activity that would better serve the needs of our stakeholders." In 2004, a survey of land grant research, Extension and academic program directors was conducted and the challenge areas and objectives of the Science Roadmap were updated.
- Over the ten years since the last strategic plan was developed, a number of significant changes have occurred in the economy, society, politics and science. Some of these changes include:
  - September 11, 2001 and a renewed interest in national security and, in particular, biosecurity
  - Escalated prices for petroleum based products and a more competitive market for bio-based fuels and products
  - Increasing concerns over the impacts of global warming
  - A better understanding of the relationships between food, nutrition and health and growing concerns over obesity
  - Increasing call for changes in federal funding mechanisms and increased accountability in the use of public funds
  - Higher budget deficits and limited flexibility in budget development and appropriations
  - The development of the CREATE 21 proposal
  - A new Farm Bill with emphasis on bio-energy and specialty crops
  - Continual decline in the economic and political clout of traditional agriculture
  - Changes in the political arena and the absence of a statesman or woman who has the interest and ability to champion agriculture

- A growing need to partner with the private sector to support agricultural initiatives

Planning Alternatives

- **Development of an ESCOP Operational Plan**
  - o Advantages:
    - Identifies short-term priorities and strategies
    - Keeps ESCOP focused
    - Not costly in terms of time and effort
  - o Disadvantages:
    - Fails to identify long-term priorities and strategies
    - Does not include extensive external input and buy-in
    - Does not assist in developing strategic funding path
    - Could result in "rearranging the chairs on the Titanic"

- **Development of a SAES System Strategic Plan**
  - o Advantages
    - Identifies top line, high priority issues
    - Positions SAES system for increased support
    - Provides opportunities for stakeholder and legislator input and buy-in
    - Will provide longer-term guiding principles
    - Addresses quantum changes that are occurring
  - o Disadvantages
    - Requires considerable time (one to two years) and effort
    - The term "strategic planning" often results in directors' eyes glazing over
    - Does not provide immediate focus of effort

- **Development of Both a Short-Term ESCOP Operational and a Longer-Term SAES System Strategic Plan**
  - o Advantages
    - Allows time to properly launch a strategic planning effort while providing immediate focus
    - Identifies short-term and longer-term priorities and strategies
    - Provides opportunities for external input and support
  - o Disadvantages
    - Requires significant commitment on part of the SAES system

- **Doing Nothing**
  - o Advantages
    - Requires no commitment of time or effort
  - o Disadvantages
    - Missed opportunities for funding and support
    - Lack of focus on priorities

Item 10.0   CREATE-21/Farm Bill Update
Presenter: Steve Slack/Mike Harrington
Background:

The C-21 bill was introduced in both the Senate and House. The latter bill included the Farm Bill recommendations and also removed the proposed reorganization of USDA. Testimony was provided in support of the bill by the BAC. The research title has many features of the C-21 proposal. Cornerstone continues to effectively to provide language and input into the Bill.

The latest information on C-21 is posted in the website at http://www.create-21.org.

Action Requested: For information

Item 11.0   Multistate Research Awards
Presenter: EDs
Background:

Experiment Station Section

Awards for Excellence in Multistate Research

Purpose
The fundamental mandate of the Multistate Research authority allows State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES) to *interdependently* collaborate in projects that two or more states share as a priority, but for which no one state could address singularly. This is a very high standard for any research project, and has become a hallmark of the Multistate Research Program's management objectives.

The Multistate Research authority allows other non-SAES partners to join in these project-based collaborations. Thus, many multistate projects include extension specialists as members as well as Agricultural Research Service or Forest Service research scientists. In addition many projects even have private sector and foreign participants. Moreover, the majority of multistate projects have participants from more than a single region, with many having representation from all regions such that they are national in scope.

To many the Multistate Research Program is one of the "best kept secrets" of the Land-Grant University System.

The purpose of this program is to annually recognize those scientists who are conducting exemplary multistate activities and in doing so enhance the visibility of the multistate program.

Award
- A recipient Multistate Project will be selected from the pool of nominees submitted by the five regional research associations (NCRA, NERA, SAAESD, WAAESD, and ARD), and deemed by the review panel to exhibit sustained, meritorious and exceptional multistate activities.

Award and Presentation

The National Excellence in Multistate Research Award will consist of a plaque for the project's group chair and a certificate for each participating scientist to be presented by the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy Chair and USDA/Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service (CSREES) Administrator during the Awards Program held at the NASULGC Annual Meeting. ESCOP will contribute 50% of the travel expenses for the national winner to attend the awards ceremony.

Eligibility

Any current Multistate Project listed in the NIMSS (http://nimss.umd.edu/) is eligible for consideration for an Excellence in Multistate Research Award.

Basis for Nomination

Each of the five regional research associations may nominate one Multistate Project chosen from the entire national portfolio of active projects.. Nominations shall be made to the Chair of the respective regional multistate review committee (MRC) chair via the regional Executive Director's office.

Such nominations should describe the:
- Accomplishments that have been realized by the Project as measurable outputs, outcomes and benefits (either directly or through indicators); and
- Synergistic advantages of the particular project derived through interdependency.

The documentation for this type of nomination should be sufficient to allow the review committee members to evaluate the Project according to the criteria listed below.

Criteria and Evaluation

Selection of multistate teams for an Award for Excellence will be based on panel evaluations of nominations that demonstrate: high standards of scientific quality; research relevance to a regional priority; multistate collaboration on the problem's solution; and professional leadership in the conduct of the project. All nominated shall be evaluated using the same criteria including, in descending order of importance. The Project's:

1. Accomplishments, indicated by outputs, outcomes, and impacts,
2. Added value, from the Project's interdependency;
3. Degree of institutional participation (SAES and others as well);
4. Extent of multi-disciplinary activity; and,
5. Amount of integrated activities (i.e., is it multi-functional).
6. Evidence of additional leveraged funding to further the goals of the project.

Selection Process

The ESCOP Science and Technology Committee will select from among the regional nominatees a national winner in time for public announcement and award presentation at the NASULGC Annual Meeting each year.

2

Format for Applications or Nominations

An application or nomination should be a very concise statement. It should include:

Number and Title:
Name(**s**) and addresses of individuals nominated
Phone_____
E-mail_____
(add more lines as needed for additional committee members)

Summary of Project's Significant Accomplishment(s) (should be less than 3-5 (?) pages) **noting:**

- The issue, problem or situation addressed by the project or committee;
- The project or committee's objectives;
- The outcome(s) of the research;
- The impacts of the project or activity (actual or anticipated);
- The extent of links to extension that have been formed; and
- Any additional and relevant partnerships, associations or collaborations that deserve mention.

Nominations should be submitted by email to the Office of the regional Executive Director.

3

Item 12.0 Partnership Working Group
Presenter: Bruce McPheron, Steve Slack, Eric Young
Background:

The future of the Partnership Working Group was discussed. There were questions of whether a Policy Board task force could be a replacement, and whether a group is needed to help CSREES sort out stakeholders.

Discussion indicated that the 4th goal of the Policy Board is integration. The Partnership Working Group needs to be reconstructed and could be involved in strategic planning and integration.

Action Requested: Recommendations on whether the Partnership Working Group should be continued.
Action Taken: Harrington and Young will develop a white paper regarding the potential future of the Partnership Working Group.

2007 ESS/SAES/ARD Workshop
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
September 16 – 19, 2007

Draft Agenda

Sunday, September 16

04:00 pm – 09:00 pm Registration

06:00 pm – 08:00 pm Reception

Monday, September 17

07:00 am – 12:00 pm Registration

07:00 am – 08:00 am Continental Breakfast

08:00 am – 10:00 am Regional Meetings
 ARD
 NCRA
 NERA
 SAAESD
 WAAESD

10:00 am – 10:30 am Break

10:30 am – 12:00 pm ESS Meeting

12:15 pm – 01:15 pm Lunch

01:30 pm – 03:00 pm ESS Meeting

03:00 pm – 03:30 pm Break

03:30 pm – 05:00 pm ESS Meeting

06:00 pm – 06:30 pm Reception (Cash Bar)

06:00 pm – 08:00 pm Dinner

Tuesday, September 18

07:00 am – 08:00 am Continental Breakfast

08:00 am – 09:45 am Session 1: Taking Care of Business at Home – Best Practices Workshop.
                                "Telling Our Story – Impact Assessment and Preparation"

 Background Presentation

 Breakouts

 Reporting

09:45 am – 10:15 am Break

10:15 am – 12:00 pm Session 2: Looking Ahead to FY2010 – Budget Priorities Workshop

 Background Presentation

 Breakouts

 Reporting

12:15 pm – 01:15 pm Lunch

01:30 pm – 03:00 pm Session 3: Crises in Agriculture and the Role of the SAES's – Part I

 An Example of a Crisis – Northeast Dairy Operations

 SAES Responses:

  A. Forming New Partnerships

   Presentation – New York/Pennsylvania/Vermont Dairy Consortium (B.
    McPheron/M. Hoffman/M. Vayda and/or State
    Secretaries of Agriculture)

  Discussion

  B. Developing New Markets and Market Tools

   Presentation – New Hampshire's Organic Dairy Research Farm (S. Sower)

  Discussion

03:00 pm – 3:30 pm   Break

03:30 pm – 05:00 pm Session 4:   Crises in Agriculture and the Role of the SAES's – Part II

        C. Preserving Farmers and Not Just Farmland

           Presentation – Small Farms Industry Clusters (S. Goetz)

           Discussion

        D. Addressing Environmental Regulations and Sustainability through Collaboration

           Presentation – New England Water Quality Program (A. Gold)

           Discussion

07:00 pm – 10:00 pm Optional Dinner Cruise

Wednesday, September 19

07:00 am – 08:00 am Continental Breakfast

08:00 am – 09:45 am Session 5: Industry and University Partnerships: Opportunities and Challenges

      Background Presentation – Energy Biosciences Institute

      Breakouts

      Reporting

09:45 am – 10:15 am Break

10:15 am – 12:00 pm Session 6: Taking Care of Business at Home Part II – Best Practices Workshop

      Background Presentation – Redirecting Non-Productive or Unnecessary Faculty Research Programs

      Breakouts

      Reporting

12:00 pm Adjourn

Agenda Brief : Northeast Regional Report

Presenter: Dr. Steve Goodwin, NERA Chair

Background Information:

1. Dr. Daniel Rossi took over as the new NERA Executive Director on February 15, 2007. The NERA administration has been officially transferred from the University of Maryland to Rutgers, State University of New Jersey, as of July 1.

2. NERA held its summer meeting on July 9-10, in conjunction with the Northeast Joint Session (mini-land grant), at the Renaissance Hotel, in Providence, Rhode Island. The Joint Session was attended by deans, research and extension directors and the CARET representatives.

3. Personnel Changes:
   New Hampshire – Dr. Tom Brady, Dean and Director [effective July 2007]
   Maine – Dr. Edward Ashworth, Dean and Director [effective Sept. 2006]

4. The 2007 ESS/SAES/ARD Workshop will be held in the Northeast. The Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station will host the event at the Sheraton Society Hill, on September 16-19, 2007.

Actions Requested: For information only.

SAAESD Report to ESCOP

July 25, 2007

SAAESD Website
The SAAESD web site (http://www.cals.ncsu.edu:8050/saaesd/) is in the process of being completely redesigned to make it more user-friendly and contemporary in its function and appearance. Also, our new web site will be developed and reside on the servers owned by the Southern Region IPM Center and the NCSU IPM Center. These servers are housed in the office suite where SAAESD is located and are maintained by IT personnel on site. This will make maintenance and upgrading much more efficient than with current college server and support system.

Grantsmanship Workshops
SAAESD will now manage the NRI grant that funds travel grants for minor-serving institutions' faculty to attend the CSREES Competitive Programs and Writing Successful Grants workshops held each fall in Washington, D.C. and the western US. SAAESD is also co-sponsoring, along with the Northeast Regional Association, the workshops to be held in Washington, D.C. October 9-10.

Bioenergy Committee
In conjunction with the Association of Southern Region Extension Directors (ASRED), a Bioenergy Committee was established this spring to facilitate coordination of 1862 LGU's regional research and extension activities related to bioenergy. This committee has compiled an inventory of the southern region's current capacity in a broad range of bioenergy areas, which includes information by state on faculty expertise, web sites, extension programming, and research facilities. The committee also is facilitating the establishment of a Southern Research-Extension Activity (SERA) on bioenergy that will initially be focused on multistate extension programming and integration of regional research and extension activites.

Experiment Station Database
ASRED has maintained a financial and personnel on-line database hosted by TAMU extension since 2005, to which directors submit data annually in numerous areas. This database allows extension directors, business officers, and others with access to easily obtain state-by-state data and regional averages that can be used as comparison for university, state, and federal reports and many other purposes. SAAESD will enter similar data for the experiment stations into the database beginning this fall. The experiment station data will include some elements unique to research and some identical to those collected by extension, which will allow comparison across functions.

SAAESD Leadership Award
Drs. Vance Watson (Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Director, and Director, Mississippi Agriculture & Forestry Experiment Station) and Nancy Cox (Associate Dean for Research, Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station) were presented the SAAESD Leadership Award. This award is given annually to recognize those who have served the Southern Experiment Stations, SAAESD, and the national Land-Grant System with exemplary distinction. Through this person's leadership he/she shall have personified the highest level of excellence by enhancing the cause and performance of the SAAESD in achieving its mission, the vision for the Southern Agricultural Experiment Stations, and the Land-Grant ideal.

SAAESD Officers
Chair – Susan Barefoot (Clemson)
Chair-Elect – Tom Klindt (Univ. of Tennessee)
Past-Chair – David Boethel (Louisiana State Univ.)
Treasurer – Steve Leath (North Carolina State Univ.)
Member-at-Large – Mary Duryea (Univ. of Florida)
Multistate Research Committee Chair – David Morrison (Louisiana State Univ.)

SAAESD Future Meetings
Fall meeting, September 17, 2007, Philadelphia, PA
Spring meeting, March 31 – April 2, 2008, Knoxville, TN

ESCOP Agenda Brief
July, 2007, Philadelphia, PA
Item: Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors Report

Presenter: CY Hu

Current Officers for the WAAESD:
- Chair – CY Hu (HI)
- Chair-elect – Greg Bohach (ID)
- Treasurer – Jeff Jacobsen (MT)
- Secretary – Jan Auyong (OR)
- Executive Committee Members-at-large – David Thawley (NV), Steve Miller (WY)

Elections for 2008 will occur at the Joint Summer meeting is Jackson, WY. (Terms begin at the end of ESS meeting):

2007 Spring meeting, joint with the NCRA on the Big Island of Hawai`i: Joint discussion were held on the convergence of energy and agriculture and approaches to develop meaningful inter-regional collaborations. Several ideas for new collaborations were developed in breakout group discussions. As a result of the formal discussions and informal interactions during the field trip, a new project on grass fed beef has been initiated.

2007 Joint Summer Meeting: The WAAESD will meet jointly with the other western region Deans and Directors in Jackson, WY July 15-18. The AES, CES and Academic Programs Directors will have a joint session on energy and agriculture.

AES Director Changes: Reg Gomes has retired as Vice President for Agriculture at the University of California.

Future meetings:
- WAAESD will meet in September at the SAES/ARD Workshop in Philadelphia
- The WAAESD will meet jointly with the Western Extension Directors in March