

# CSREES Extension Integrated Pest Management Listening Session Portland, Oregon - March 26, 2009

## Part 1: Introduction from National IPM Program Leadership

Draper

The purpose of this meeting is to solicit and record stakeholder comments on the Extension IPM request for proposals.

29 April, 2009: final deadline for written comment

Fitzner

Smith-Lever history and background

Changes in Farm Bill required IPM 3(d) funds go competitive [7 U.S.C. 343(d)]

“apply for and receive”

“compete for and receive”

17 1890, Tuskegee, and U. DC., total of 75 institutions now eligible

Draper

1971 Pilot program started Federal IPM (competitive)

Increases in competitive funding for IPM seen throughout 1970s

1978 – funds went to formula

Formula funds remained in place until 2008, when funds went competitive

Accountability is an issue behind the shift to competitive funds

Need/demand for IPM is high; requests for 2X what was available

IPM is key in: Organic, Sustainable, Water Quality, Farm profitability, Reducing adverse environmental impacts, and human health.

2008 formula program: avg. \$147,893; 57 awards

24408-634000

2009: avg. \$158,772; 53 awards

22957-500000

Caps on various areas of emphasis represented current emphasis extant at the time when last year's RFA was drafted

Max. 6 emphasis areas, max. 650,000 request

These areas of emphasis and caps may not represent the way the RFA is organized for the coming year

Likely to shift to funding on multi-year cycle (2-4 years); 2 options on how to organize this:

Continuation

First year funds dispersed; Successive yrs funded as available

New competition every 2-4 years

- Unfunded programs would reapply in next competition
- More programs funded annually
- Annual reapplication process (less onerous than initial year)
- Full initial funding
  - All years of funding would come from the first year of funds
  - New competition in 2nd year
  - Unfunded programs could apply next year
  - Fewer programs funded annually
  - No annual reapplication

#### Questions to Stakeholders

1. What is the role of CSREES funding in state, regional, national programs?
2. What should be the primary goals and objectives of the EIPM program?
3. How can we engage all eligible institutions?
4. Please provide input on evaluation criteria.
5. What specific program areas need to have national support?

## **Part 2: Open Comments from Stakeholders**

### **General Comments**

#### Funding Sources – Eligible Institutions

- Move some of the EIPM support funds into the coordination pool; also take some of the RIPM funds and move those into the Extension pool.
- EIPM support and RIPM should go to EIPM coordination.
- RIPM do not fold it into this!
- Yes to folding the Extension \$\$\$
- Inclusion of 1890's suddenly eligible, but no additional funds added to the pot. Not enough time to compete.
- Only 1 1890 competed.
- How do we engage the institutions that are not here? short-time? process?

#### IPM Coordinators

- Will / can the IPM Coordinator network be mandated in the future, under this program. There is a losing this network in the face of potential funding gaps.
- IPM Coordinator network needs to be sustained
- Strength of having a network, teams, etc.
- Network is valuable.
- Maintain network
- Maintain network
- Maybe not IPM "Coordinator". Instead perhaps "Educator".

## RFA Requirements

- Categories of emphasis. There is a fairness issue. Applicants may apply for 2-6 emphasis areas, but regardless of the number one applies for there is a set page limit. We applied for 7 areas (including infrastructure), which made it difficult to provide sufficient detail.
- Emphasis areas should have specific page limits.
- Page limits for emphasis areas are needed; this is a fairness issue.
- Not in favor of emphasis page limits.
- “Give us nuts and bolts.” Continue to provide template for budget / budget narrative. Designate whether it should be single or double spaced.
- Overlap between emphasis area. Much redundancy, uses up page limits.
- Caps and areas of emphasis should be eliminated to create freedom for local expression in 1-2 areas, etc.
- Eliminate caps
- Maintain diversity and flexibility in funding areas. Let local decisions rule on the importance.
- Leave emphasis areas, remove cap. Add livestock and misc.
- Add livestock and vertebrate IPM.
- Wheat is no. 1 in OK, but no. 4 in cash receipts, dwarfed by animal production. Need this area.
- Program implementation. Allow for emerging issues esp. in multi-year proposals.
- There is no opportunity in this RFA for a minigrants program, but this should be an acceptable option.
- Let the local people dictate the mode, minigrants, etc.
- State mini-grants program. Great pride in it. It is inclusive. Addresses emerging issues much better. 3-8K\$ which leverage a great deal. Great benefits.
- Not interested in supporting status quo, but should support infrastructure for IPM. But we should have the latitude to develop new efforts, where there is stakeholder need.
- Require address coordination and two areas of emphasis.
- No radical changes.

## Funding structure, amount & timing

- Increase to 3 yrs with continuation
- Continuation model, for 3 years
- 3-yr continuation model
- Exclude successful competitors in next round.
- RFA release in mid-July, 8 weeks later.
- Due no earlier than mid-September
- Funding should reach Universities no later than October 1 each year
- Smith Lever funding should be increased in the future.
- Budget difficult. Splitting people up.
- Funding multi-year with continuation. 3-yr duration
- Not in favor of multi-year, need all states

- Exclude successful competitors in next round.
- \$300,000 cap overall
- It is critical to request \$20 million for 3(d) program in FY09
- Cap to \$300,000
- 4-yr continuation.
- In favor of the continuation model; 3 years is good.
- Program building; keep good people on. 4-yrs with no-cost ext. for 1 year.
- Everyone should be funded if acceptable, somehow.
- We need to be VERY efficient. Think we should do continuation right now! Is this close enough to good?
- Run money out like center model. Most money ends up being discretionary.
- Maybe emphases are multi-year. Coordinator is 1-year.

### Proposal Review

- Provide template to panelists to increase consistency.
- Proposal review. IPM Center directors as ex-officio members.
- 1 or 2 IPM Coordinator serve on this committee, recusing when necessary.
- Panel composition. Need some coordinators or other IPM program people. Maybe chairs of regional coordinating committees.
- Review panel: There is a need for a relevancy panel separate from the technical review, or there should be a requirement for evidence of stakeholder input just to document what is important locally.
- We are against sharing information about past formula funding with the review panel. This goes to regional limits as well. This is not relevant to a competitive program.
- A large portion of what we requested in AZ was for salaries. Reviewers criticized this, basically misunderstanding what “infrastructure” is.
- Panel members must understand what Extension is. Extension is an integration of research and education.
- Review did provide some benefit and quality to the proposals. Yet, some of the comments showed lack of understanding. We need people who understand what extension is.

### Evaluation of IPM

- Who is going to capture the overall national IPM successes? We used to report on our federal allotment only, which is a small portion of all of our IPM efforts (due to leverage).
- Evaluation: Logic model is recognized by CSREES. Diversity of opinion on use of the logic model, and other means of measurement should be accepted. Difficult to measure.
- Extension “program”. Evaluate on-going programs.
- Long-term outputs. Fear the short-term measurements. Not conducive to program. Don't like to have an advisory board.

- If there is a summer call; there will be no opportunity to report on previous year's outcomes, since most of us will not see our funds until June. If this is the timing for the call, next year's funds should not be contingent on reporting this year's outcomes. In the future, we should require performance reporting.

#### Miscellaneous

- Apply limited resources to critical issues. Generating leverage is outstanding under old program.
- Going competitive can make you big. No, we need to leverage.
- At least in the West, this is the first time IPM monies have been put in the hands of IPM coordinators in some states; a good outcome of going competitive.
- For us in Arizona, the new RFA brought new people to the table.
- Costs, faculty and staff time to prepare proposals. \$300K spend annually. Lost programming time.
- Need a retreat for IPM Coordinators and Regional Center staff to develop a regional proposal; work as team.
- 2050, increase to 394 million people in U.S. We need increased productivity, and Extension will play a role. Short-term evaluations do not reflect this need.

#### **Areas of Emphasis:**

##### Coordination / Infrastructure

- When you empanel the next review panel, make it clear that EIPM is funding not a project, but a program. We need infrastructure.
- Extension "program". Evaluate on-going programs.
- Need 2-tiers, base for coordination at \$50,000/yr for IPM Coordinator
- Increase in coordination
- Need to fund basic infrastructure; states struggling. Increase coordination beyond \$25K.
- Increase coordination to \$75K
- Increase to \$75K on coordination.
- Require address coordination and two areas of emphasis.
- Program building. Coordination. Collaboration. Good communications.
- A large portion of what we requested in AZ was for salaries. Reviewers criticized this, basically misunderstanding what "infrastructure" is.
- Most important stakeholder. Multi-institutional involvement encouraged. Everyone leverages this very small amount of money. Raise the limits of coordination, therefore.
- Increase the coordinator to \$75K but not if it locks people out. Need a separate evaluation process. Justifications should be pretty similar across the board.
- No to annual requests for coordination.

## Collaboration

- Collaboration should be reduced to \$10K.
- Collaboration, not much incentive. Increase or eliminate and make requisite.
- Lose collaboration and fold-in.
- Program building. Coordination. Collaboration. Good communications.
- Collaboration is important. Either raise the cap for this specific area, or make collaboration part of the point system for assessing the whole proposal.
- Expand collaboration and planning have been enhanced.

IPM in Agronomic Crops – no specific comments

IPM in High Value Crops – no specific comments

IPM Support for Diagnostics

- Need to fund diagnostic labs, up the cap.

IPM in Schools – no specific comments

IPM on Recreational Lands – no specific comments

Consumer / Urban IPM – no specific comments