DRAFT Executive Summary

TO: Project Management Committee/Administrative Advisors/ Meeting Attendees

FROM: Tammy Barkalow and Van Starner

DATE: Oct. 7, 2009

SUBJECT: Summer 2009 Project Management Committee (PMC) Meeting Minutes

Please find attached the Executive Summary and minutes from PMC discussions on July 7-9 at the Summer Meeting, Halifax, NS, Canada, and Joint Meeting with the AAFC Pest Management Centre.

The PMC wishes to thank our hosts, the AAFC Pest Management Centre, for making hotel and other meeting and agricultural tour arrangements.

If you have any questions about this report, please feel free to contact the appropriate PMC or Headquarters Staff member listed by the agenda item, or us, for clarification.
July 2009 PMC Meeting - Executive Summary

The IR-4 Project Management Committee (PMC) held its Summer 2009 meeting, July 7-8, at the Four Points Sheraton, Halifax, NS, Canada. The meeting was held in conjunction with a joint meeting of the IR-4 PMC and the AAFC Pest Management Centre. The following items were discussed:

ARS/Regions/HQ Updates

- CSREES – The 2010 RFA is anticipated to be issued in Oct., with application deadline in Nov. Funding should be available for dispersal earlier than in previous years.

- USDA/ARS - There are budget issues at some sites, and area directors want to alter the funding mechanism from using CRIS’s to another system.

- NCR – The lab has gone through a difficult year, and several projects have been transferred to a new lab in King of Prussia, PA (JRF) for analysis. A search committee (that will include members from MSU, Ms. Jau Yoh and Dr. Debbie Carpenter) has been formed related to hiring a new lab director.

- NER – The lab has had a very difficult year, but Wlodek has kept staff motivated amidst this phase-out period.

- SOR – The leader lab plans to add an assoc. laboratory coordinator to perform analyses, write ASRs and provide backup supervision. Another analytical position is to open in September. Robin Adkins is now performing functions as a backup field QA.

- WSR – The lab currently has 2 functioning LC MS/MS’s and feels this is a limiting factor in their ability to increase throughput.

- HQ – There have been several changes at the US EPA: Janet Anderson has retired from BPPD, Jeff Herndon has been promoted to Associate Director of Registration Division. Steve Knizner has replaced Jeff as Associate Director of HED. IR-4 HQ is hiring a Public Health Pesticide Manager; this position is expected to be filled by early fall. The first public health pesticide study is being designed, with field work to be conducted in FL and CA to remove a restriction on the etofenprox label (mosquito adulticide) for application near agricultural production lands. The new IR-4 database will permit instantaneous web updates and therefore provide “live” information on all IR-4 studies on the web site.

- Submission timelines – Searchable submission timelines on the website should allow lab directors to better schedule priority projects. There will be 30 studies that overlap (need to be bundled) between 2008 and 2009. If there is not a bundle, the project will remain on the 30 month timeline.

- International - A Global Minor Use Summit II has been delayed and will not take place in Australia in 2010. Feedback from commodity groups has been very vocal about harmonization of MRLs to allow access to world markets. While we have MRLs in the US for certain uses, if these were secured with non-data petitions or met only the US data requirements, we’ll need to generate data to gain an int’l MRL.

- Analytical Labs – Labs will be asked to address progress that has been made towards reduction in backlogs, and if they will be capable to meet the schedule as provided in new timelines. The charge from the PMC to the Analytical Chemistry Advisory Committee (ACAC) is to start pursuing the mandate the LRDs requested and PMC approved in Feb. 2009.
• Expanded efficacy program – IR-4 will continue to explore the expansion of the efficacy program and develop a mechanism by which national needs can be prioritized that will also be reflective of the need to preserve some work to meet regional needs.

• Training Committee – Three recommended changes were approved by PMC: a plan for rotation of committee members; a mandate wording change that the TC will act as a resource for regional training programs; and Sharon Benzen/Will Meeks replacing Ben Fraelich/Bob McReynolds who are rotating off the TC.

Other Items

• IR-4 Business Plan – After consideration of decreased/level/increased funding scenarios, PMC requested these scenarios to be revised as discussed by December 2009. Suggested changes will be incorporated and the revised set of spreadsheets will be distributed to PMC for review and discussion at the next PMC meeting. A table was also to be prepared that shows the field and lab production numbers (average # of trials per year and ranges) using the last 5 years of data. The regions will need to develop the minimum and maximum number of trials that can be placed at each field center, and what minimum $ amount is needed to keep each FRD center open.

• Draft Peer Review Response - Recommendations made in the USDA peer review need to be addressed and follow up plans provided. PMC will need to set priorities (act now, mid-term and long term) and provide the action plan. Response to the recommendations should follow the structure that is present in the peer review report.

• The IR-4 PMC and the Agriculture Ag Food Canada’s Pest Management Center/Advisory Comm. met jointly. Presentations were made to update attendees on specific aspects of each other’s programs. A tour of Nova Scotia agriculture was provided on Thursday, July 9. See appendix B in the full minutes for details of joint discussions.
The IR-4 Project Management Committee (PMC) held its Summer 2009 meeting on July 7-9, at the Four Points Sheraton, Halifax, NS, Canada.

**Attendees:**
- Jerry Baron - IR-4 Executive Director
- Tammy White Barkalow - IR-4 Assistant Director, Quality Assurance
- Doug Buhler - North Central Region Administrative Advisor
- Mary Duryea – Southern Region Administrative Advisor (Chair)
- Bob Hollingworth - North Central Region Director
- Monte Johnson - CSREES National Program Leader
- Dan Kunkel - IR-4 Associate Director, Registrations
- Marty Marshall - Southern Region Director and PMC Chair
- Marion Miller - Western Region Director
- Cristi Palmer (part-time) – IR-4 Ornamental Horticulture Program Manager
- Michael Parrella – Western Region Administrative Advisor
- Paul Schwartz - ARS Regional Director
- Dave Soderlund - Northeast Region Director
- Van Starner - IR-4 Assistant Director, Research Planning
Tuesday, July 7th

Approval of Minutes/new agenda items: Minutes of the Spring 2009 PMC meeting held February 24-26 at the Drury Hotel in San Antonio, TX, were discussed and approved, with the exception that Mary Duryea needed to be added to the list of participants. The agenda was approved with the addition of a discussion on PMC policy on approving IR-4 regional awards. Also, M. Miller commented that some critical points in the Feb. ’09 meeting minutes were not on the July agenda. Agenda is attached as appendix A.

Agenda Addition - Regional Awards: - recommendations will be presented to the PMC and recorded in the minutes. Regions will keep their awards internal for signatures, but the PMC Chair will sign the USDA/ARS awards on behalf of the IR-4 PMC. Award recommendations can be presented to the PMC for vote, votes recorded via email and recorded in minutes at the next meeting.

Brief updates:

Administrative Advisors – Budget crises!
Large budget cuts are being made at the University of Florida, but the IR-4 program is a shining star. FL is moving staff to grants and hiring faculty. The University of California (UC) is also experiencing huge budget deficits and is cutting depts. and programs. UC is looking more and more at grants that do not generate indirect costs, and will likely give less support for IR-4 than current (4¢ per $). Michigan has continued to support higher education with the knowledge that education will be the future with the auto industry declining and no cuts are anticipated for IR-4 directly. Cornell is experiencing a >$200M budget hole and 15% cut across everything; depts. are being consolidated between Geneva and Ithaca; Cornell is not hiring. Potential impacts on IR-4: 1) research station closures, 2) loss of trial conduct if furloughs take place, 3) in coming years IR-4 may be required to “pay more of their way” for space, land, etc. (i.e., creeping overhead).

ARS – The ARS minor use program is on target with their 2009 field projects. The USDA/ARS area directors are indicating that Paul can no longer tap a $500-600K of funds for IR-4 equipment needs at ARS sites; suggestion is to look at leasing large equipment, especially lab equipment, which can be done very economically

CSREES – Grant applications are under review and awards have special reviewers assigned. The last region to submits it’s CRIS forms will be held until the review costs come through. This year it’s NCR. The grant funds are anticipated to be dispersed by the end of July. The 2010 RFA is anticipated to be available by or on October 5th with applications to be submitted by November 16th. If these dates are met, a panel teleconference will be held Jan. 13th, 2010. The panel results will be provided to awards management by Feb. 4th and funds dispersed in March (somewhat dependent on status of federal budget). It is anticipated the 2010 budget should remain at $12M and there is a potential for CSREES to permit the RFA to be released with minor adjustments to funds depending how close the final amount is to $12M. With this timeline it is anticipated that the Biopesticide and Ornamental program funds will be administered from HQ. Jerry had successful discussions with Monte and USDA CSREES officials Meryl Broussard and Mike Fitzner in June to discuss the IR-4 program challenges and opportunities. Monte indicated that the upcoming RFA will need to provide for two budgeting scenarios. One for a region with an analytical laboratory and one for a region without an analytical laboratory. When submitting the application for funding, each region should choose the scenario that fits their organization.

Monte indicated that the orphaned animal drug program (NRSP-7) is very interested in tapping how IR-4 works. He suggested that additional discussions of this group with IR-4 could be very useful and that IR-4 provide them with a copy of our CLC charter to aid in their developing a similar stakeholder support group. PMC agrees to support their program.
North Central Region – B. Hollingworth reported field trials are making progress. He also commented that after a difficult year at the analytical laboratory, that progress is being made. Several projects have been sent to JRF lab in King of Prussia, PA, to aid the lab with working off its backlog. A search for a new laboratory director has been initiated, with a target to fill the job by year-end. Several IR-4 participants (including Jau Yoh from the University of Florida and Debbie Carpenter from IR-4 HQ) have been asked to serve on the search committee. Wayne will become the associate director of the analytical laboratory under the new hire, and will work as an analyst, ASR preparer, etc. Bob anticipates the lab will need 3 functional LC MSMS’s to meet the current work load and to provide for the additional capacity needed to meet future needs. The lab facility space issues are still unresolved. To move the laboratory again would require $300 to $400K in renovation costs and this is compounded because of the rental costs that are currently being paid by the NCR that would potentially be lost if the lab moved back to campus. The cost sharing on the rented space that is being co-supported by NCR IR-4 and MSU is currently being discussed.

Northeast Region – D. Soderlund stated the lab has had a very difficult year. The field program is smaller this year due in part to the increase in the need for perennial crops versus the unavailability of these crops at the current NER test sites. The Rutgers Cream Ridge test site ramp-up has also contributed to the decrease in the total number of trials that would be performed in the region. These factors have led to an increased amount of field management time needed to supervise the Cream Ridge site and manage a larger number of contracted field trials. There are no serious issues currently. Dave has met with Wlodek and is impressed with how he has managed to keep the lab personnel working during such a trying time. The personnel in turn have expressed that they are very surprised with the ease of his transition and are also impressed with his abilities. No one has moved on to new jobs anywhere yet.

Southern Region – M. Marshall announced that the analytical laboratory is currently looking to add an associate lab coordinator to be responsible for writing ASRs, conducting some analysis and supervising the lab when Jau is away. They are currently under a 14-day position announcement at U of F. Another analytical position will open in September. Robin Adkins is currently being used as a backup QA person for the field program. The Food Science Department has been involved with State of Florida required audits. The SOR IR-4 program comprises more that 30% of the department budget and the audit of the IR-4 program portion did very well.

Western Region – M. Miller reported the Western Region is functioning well. The field sites are doing 222 trials this year. The CLC/State liaison meeting was held in Bozeman, Montana in March. The SLR from Colorado (Sandra McDonald) indicated that the counties are seeing a lack of experimental support from their states. The laboratory currently has two instruments working and this is seen as a limiting influence. The UC Davis lab would like to purchase an additional instrument. They have experienced a few setbacks in the last few months (software problems, freezer malfunction, etc) and the lab at the University of Hawaii (U of H) is still a dilemma. The UC Davis lab is currently assisting the U of H by writing their ASRs, trying to get the projects completed. The U of H lab is supported by their state Department of Ag so the influence we have with this as a project is limited. Marion is working hard to maintain several high quality admin staff.

HQ – J. Baron provided a brief update of the strategic plan and indicated that the CSREES peer review went very well. The US EPA TWG meetings continue to be very productive. Another IR-4 meeting is being scheduled with EPA management to discuss PRIA issues. IR-4 continues to discuss with EPA, on a case-by-case basis, submission of data generated by manufacturers to support uses for minor crop growers. Jeff Herndon is now Associate Director of EPA’s Registration Division. Steve Knizer has replaced Jeff in his former HED capacity. Janet Anderson has retired from the US EPA and her replacement has not yet been announced. Company meetings this spring/summer are nearly complete. The major take home message has been that companies had a slow year this past year and while slow, the Ag. Divisions have not been hurt as bad; the overall financial prosperity of companies has declined. There are new active ingredients in the pipeline, but the numbers are not very robust.
Jerry briefed PMC on progress with the public health program and shared that a new position has been created to manage this program (utilizing the new dollars associated with this initiative). The USDA ARS are very supportive of this effort into public health pesticides. A specific project is being developed to generate residue samples on agricultural crops to alleviate the restriction of using etofenprox as an adult mosquitocide near agricultural production land. The field work will take place in CA and FL. The placement of residue samples was discussed and it was concluded that given the IR-4 labs are in transition and dealing with internal scheduling challenges, the samples should go to a contract lab for analysis. There was favorable discussion in changing the name of the initiative from public health pesticides to “regulatory support for vector-borne diseases.” or RSVBD It was advised that communications on this area of research should be inclusive as to not give the impression this is an IR-4 HQ only initiative.

HQ has been working on a new database which is to go live on July 15th. D. Infante has led the process and received input from the regions on the database and its content available on the web site.

The Global Minor Use Summit II has been delayed. It will not be held in association with the IUPAC meeting in Australia in July of 2010. The organizing committee is currently considering going back to Rome in early 2011 and holding the meeting in association with the UN’s Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

**International Update** – D. Kunkel updated the PMC on the capacity building workshop in which he participated (gave information on the organization and working structure of the IR-4 program) by invitation that was held in Egypt in March of 2009. Dan attended the CODEX meeting in Beijing, China in April 2009. Several IR-4 submissions are being worked on. The use of crop groupings has been very well received and is being worked on through CODEX. Between three to five IR-4 submissions are being made to JMPR a year. Many uses are included in each submission to JMPR. The global regulatory system is being encouraged to be used as part of the capacity building push. Feedback from our commodity groups has been very vocal on the topic of international availability of markets. The hops industry is a very good example. While we have MRLs in the US for certain uses, if these were non-data petitions or met only the US data requirements, we will need to generate data/additional data to gain an international MRL. We need to be aware of these types of needs and structure our programs so we can not only meet domestic regulatory requirements, but build in international data needs when the market for the intended commodity is the international market.

**EPA Registrations, Work Plans, FDB/ASR Completion Status, 30-month Timeline Status, EPA Update** - Dan indicated that clearances are currently running behind the 2008 pace right now. The EPA should be able to hit 35 to 40 chemicals in 2009, with maybe 1000 uses being registered on behalf of IR-4. Endothall may or may not be completed this year. Chlorantraniliprole uses that were submitted by DuPont may also be approved this year. Six chemicals have been submitted so far this year, with another 17 that will be ready to go in the near future. The total submission for 2009 should be around 30 chemicals.

The new IR-4 database includes a new search and report for project submission timelines. This information will be available on the website for all IR-4 participants to access. Dan indicated there are 69 chemicals being worked on in 2009. This optimally needs to be around 45. The analyses are becoming more difficult, especially with the need to analyze metabolites. The new timeline on the database should help with communications about scheduling and bundling, and allow lab directors to better schedule which projects are to be done first. There will be 30 studies that overlap (need to be bundled) between 2008 and 2009. If there is not a bundle, the project will remain on the 30 month timeline.

**Ornamental Program** (slides included in meeting materials) – Eleven data summaries have been received this year. Another 5 to 7 should be coming in soon. There is a need to better track those projects where work is complete but the data did not result in a registration. If this data is not used, it underestimates the deliverables of the program.
Outreach and education of ornamental stakeholders is very important. The PMC advised that additional outreach to extension would be a beneficial avenue to get the word out. Cristi was asked to put together a presentation that could be distributed to extension personnel that would describe and highlight the IR-4 Ornamentals program for stakeholders. Cristi is already working on such a presentation that highlights the recent success of the thrips program. The thought is that more of our communication efforts need to be focused on state to state education and not focused on dissemination at larger meetings (which are seeing a reduction in attendance due to tightening budgets). If contacts are made with state extension, the regional field coordinators will be kept in the loop.

The 2009 ornamentals program at USDA ARS sites was derailed when the manufacturer withdrew their support of the project. But, the USDA ARS sites were able to readjust and move into other projects very quickly.

Cristi and Mike Parrella attended a USDA APHIS meeting where the farm bill funding was discussed. Cooperation with IR-4 is listed on their top 5 list of objectives. A more focused working arrangement with USDA APHIS and the IR-4 program on development of pesticides to combat invasive pests would be beneficial to both parties.

Cristi recommended the recognition of 4 individuals that were very important in the formation of the IR-4 ornamentals program 30 years ago Paul Schwartz, Chuck Powell, Dick Lindquist, Ray Frank). Jerry presented the motion with Dave’s second. Motion passed (with 1 abstention). Official recognition of these four will be made at the Oct. ornamentals workshop in Cleveland.

**Biopesticides and Organic Support Program update**

The 2009 grant research program is out in the field. The program is getting ready for this year’s RFA which will include organic support.

**Public Health**

See the section above with Jerry’s update from HQ which includes an update on this topic. Additional discussion included specifics that the etofenprox study could begin as early as fall 2009. The new name, RSVBD, could be used to seek additional support from the CDC. Possible next projects include work with novaluron as an ovicide and a multilateral/multi country review of vector borne disease management needs. Part of this project will include collaboration with and support of the USDA ARS as they develop new technologies for vector control.

**Communications**

IR-4 publicity has included several magazine articles and an informative group of videos produced to support IR-4’s global residue study participants. The videos are on You-tube and can be viewed at: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o23QUBJm7rc&feature=related](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o23QUBJm7rc&feature=related) for video 1 of 4. The other 3 videos can be found listed as related videos.

It should be noted that persons with USDA ARS computer accounts (and maybe other federal governmental units) cannot access You-tube or Facebook. Their computer security systems do not permit viewing.

Sherri has updated the specialty crop brochure. The newest newsletter is out to the printer. IR-4 has changed vendors and anticipates the new vendor to be more user friendly and willing to update the distribution list on an as-needed basis.

**Detailed discussion on IR-4 Analytical Laboratories**
The laboratory backlogs were discussed. Dave volunteered that the NER laboratory may have some capacity to assist IR4 with analysis of samples in 2009. If there was a good fit (analysis that involved a material that the NER laboratory has already worked with) samples could be analyzed at the Cornell lab and no additional funding would need to be provided.

Action Item – Dan is to send out a letter asking the laboratories if they have projects that could be transferred to the NER lab to assist in working down the back log. This letter is also to address the identification of progress that has been made towards reduction in the backlog and to ascertain if all laboratories consistently understand the definition of the ASR due dates and if they are going to be capable of meeting the schedule as provided in the new timeline.

**Analytical Chemistry Advisory Committee (ACAC)**

The PMC has reauthorized the extension of the Analytical Chemistry Advisory Committee to include PMC rep M. Miller, QA rep to be determined by QA group, SD rep to be assigned by HQ, and the group needs to convene a meeting and get organized. Their charge from the PMC is to start pursuing the mandate the LRDs requested and PMC approved in Feb. 2009:

- Elect a chair
- Generate an inventory list of equipment and its status for all IR-4 laboratories
- Review IR-4 laboratories capabilities and recommend to the PMC laboratory equipment needs

Action Item -

1. Marty is to generate and communicate the terms of reference to the committee
2. The committee is to elect a chair by August 1st
3. An evaluation of laboratory equipment is to be reported to the PMC at their next meeting. This should include discussions on what is needed for the laboratories to function at a capacity level to absorb the work from the NER lab, a description of rate limiting factors and an estimation of the useful life expectancy of the current and needed equipment.

**Wednesday, July 8th, 8:00 am – 12:00**

A joint meeting was held between IR-4 and the AAFC’s Pest Management Center and their Administrative Advisors Committee. See details in appendix B

**Wednesday, July 8th, 1:00 pm – 5:00**

**Efficacy Work Plans for 2009**

V. Starner was asked to organize proposed plans for an expanded IR-4 efficacy program, as captured in the 2009-2014 Strategic Plan. His first task was to evaluate our current program and then to expand our program to meet the future needs as identified at our strategic planning meeting.

Van identified scenarios which may get IR-4 involved in the development of efficacy data:

1. When the crop is labeled, but efficacy data is needed to add a pest.
2. When tolerances have been established, but the registrant requires efficacy or crop safety data before they label the use
3. When the registrant wants efficacy data before authorizing IR-4 to begin a residue program
4. When IR-4 identifies a pest problem with no known solution; the most familiar is the onion thrips project that Keith spearheaded; when CARZOL was identified as the best tool for insect control, a residue program ensued to support its use by the growers
5. When the registrant approves IR-4 conducting a residue study, but requires efficacy/crop safety data before registration

IR-4 has also gotten involved with the development of efficacy data when individual regions set aside funding to support their own efficacy program (i.e., the SOR program). The southern region has used ~ $50K of their IR-4 finds to provide a match for efficacy funding. The data generated as part of this program is being used to support submission of additional project requests.

PMC members voiced concern that they do not want IR-4 to appear to be competing for funding that typically goes directly to applied researchers. Also, the registrants typically provide funding with an expectation that their support will lead to the researchers distributing their findings to the scientific and applied community. Any work we do must be communicated effectively.

The need for IR-4 to get involved is due to the decrease in the number of researchers that are doing this applied kind of work and our unique structure that would add efficiencies to accomplishing this type of work. IR-4 must be careful that our work in this area and the utilization of matching dollars does not jeopardize our waiver of indirect costs and that Universities don’t see our work as jeopardizing their ability to collect indirect costs.

Action Item – Van is to continue to explore the expansion of the efficacy program and to develop a mechanism by which national needs can be prioritized that will also be reflective of the need to preserve some work to meet regional needs.

2009 Food Use Workshop/NRPM

V. Starner provided an update on the 2009 Food Use workshop (FUW) to be held in Cleveland, Ohio. He also provided an update on the 2010 meeting. This meeting will be held Sept. 14-15 in Summerlin, NV (20 minutes from the Las Vegas, NV, airport).

The nomination process for this year’s FUW is currently being tested and is to be deployed in early August. This year’s nomination process will include assigning more A priority projects (55 versus 39) and allowing for 25 regional upgrades/upgrade proposals. It is anticipated that the 2010 research program will consist of ~610 field trials (to include ~110 USAD ARS, 50 Canadian trials and 50 red A trials). The 2010 field budget is to be funded at ~ $2.5M. This would include ~$250K for conducting B projects and maintain efficacy work at a level like 2009.

The Training Committee (TC)

V. Starner presented Debbie Carpenter’s update (Chair of TC). The training program held in Feb. was very successful. Debbie proposed a couple of changes to the committee’s procedures:

The TC proposed:
1. A plan for the rotation of members of the committee.
2. A change to the committee procedures to eliminate the wording that the TC needs to review regional training programs and instead the TC will act as a resource for regional training programs.
3. That two new members be approved. Sharon Benzen and Will Meeks will be joining the committee and Ben Fraelich and Bob McReynolds will be rotating off.

Action – The changes were moved, seconded and approved by the PMC.
**Quality Assurance Update**

T. Barkalow presented her QA report which included an analysis of the QA program work load (by region and by individual full time QA participant). The information presented was detailed and thorough. This analysis was conducted to provide a quantitative expectation for QA auditing workload that could be used in the future when making QA work assignments. The QA will continue to strive for efficiencies and for equity when distributing the auditing/inspection workloads.

**NRSP-4 Peer Review**

The peer review went very well. One of the most prominent suggestions was for the generation of an IR-4 business plan. Jerry provided a draft plan which provides for three scenarios:

1. Level funding for 2010 through 2013
2. Level funding in 2010 followed by an increase in funding of 10% in 2011 and 2012, plus 5% in 2013
3. A decrease of funding by 10% in 2010 and another 5% in 2011 that levels off in 2012 and 2013

Jerry presented his spreadsheets and the group discussed the merits and possible changes.

Level funding (realistic scenario): This would in essence lead to a decrease in available funds when inflation is factored in. Funding scenarios may need to incorporate the potential for indirect charges. The rates are 52% at MSU, 54% at UCD, 49% at U of F, 50% at Rutgers and 52% at Cornell University. However, USDA has a 22% maximum, and U of F actually averages 12%. Suggestion was that we build in the potential for indirect, instead of waiting for the University to demand it. Some of the IR-4 units are already paying for space charges. HQ already pays $300K/year for rent and utilities while MSU lab pays a third of their $110K laboratory lease payment. The western and southern regions are still receiving laboratory space free of charge from their host institutions. One question to investigate is whether any of the Universities have ever charged a rental fee to programs on campus that do not pay indirect costs.

The discussion then moved to how best to support the field test centers. Some researchers would like to know what their base funding is each year, but the Western region wants to keep the funding system as is so they can maintain their funding on a contract basis for ease of funding distribution.

One possible mechanism to maximize our current funding is to incorporate additional efficacy and crop safety trials at USDA ARS test locations that are currently underutilized with food residue trials.

Staffing increases taking place in the regions include the NCR hiring a new Laboratory Director, the western region looking to add one more person in the lab and the southern region adding a new analyst that will double as a back up to Jau in her absence.

Increased funding: The general consensus was that if additional monies were available, increases should be made to the food use program first, followed by ornamentals, then biopesticides. Increases in funding should coincide with those programs identified in the strategic plan as being important to the stakeholders. The largest area for potential increase was the efficacy program, followed by the biopesticide program. The thought of providing for a discretionary fund was discussed. The primary purpose of this fund would be to provide resources to improve lab and field infrastructure, fund special projects and to maintain field center base support. This exercise is for business planning purposes only and all specifics for budgeting would be provided in the grant proposals.

Additional funding may go to support specialty crop regulatory assistance (GMO development) or organic support (assistance to make additional products available to organic producers) or to support
additional research for invasive pest management/eradication efforts (need to organize a “protocol” on how IR-4 will be prepared to respond to new pest situations).

Reduced funding

Discussion was curtailed. Action items: The business plan should/will be drafted by October. Jerry will incorporate suggested changes from this discussion and distribute the revised set of spreadsheets to the PMC to be reviewed and discussed at the next PMC meeting. Dan will generate a table that will provide the field and laboratory production numbers (average # of trials per year and the ranges) using the last 5 years of data. The regions will need to develop the minimum and maximum number of trials that can be placed at each field center, and what minimum $ amount is needed to keep each FRD center open.

**Draft Peer Review Response:**

The recommendations made in the USDA peer review will need to be addressed and follow up plans provided. The PMC will need to set priorities (act now, mid term and long term) and provide the action plan. When responding to the recommendations, it should follow the structure that is present in the peer review report. One of the recommendations made by the Peer review team was, “How to improve the cooperation of the IR-4 program with the IPM Centers?” One idea was to invite the regional IPM directors to attend the PMC meeting and make a presentation to the PMC on their program. In addition, the IR-4 Ex. Director is encouraged to attend the IPM meetings and provide them updates on IR-4 successes and current work focuses. There is now some regional involvement with IPM centers in the West and South, and a little in the northeast. Another recommendation, related to the ornamental stakeholder request for a separate CLC focused on ornamentals, must be addressed.

**Upcoming IR-4 Meetings:**

Jerry proposed holding the next PMC meeting in association with the National Research Planning meeting (NRPM) at IR-4 HQ. The PMC will meet on October 27, in the a.m. on Oct. 28. They will then hold an “all-hands” meeting with the attendees of the NRPM on the afternoon of Oct. 28. The NRPM all day meeting will be held on Oct. 29th.

The PMC may need to rethink the timing of the CLC meeting. This will not affect 2010 or 2011. We will be meeting in late Feb. in Washington, DC. Any dates in mid March should be avoided.

**Upcoming IR-4 Events:**

- August 10-11, 2009
  NCR SLR Meeting
  Kansas City, MO

- August 25-26, 2009
  SLR Meeting
  Myrtle Beach, SC

- September 15-16, 2009
  2009 Food Use Workshop
  Cleveland, OH
- October 6-8, 2009
  2009 Ornamental Horticulture Workshop
  Cleveland, OH

- October 14-15, 2009
  2009 ARS LR Meeting
  Cleveland, OH

- October 27-29, 2009
  Fall PMC meeting, “all-hands” meeting, National Research Planning Meeting
  Princeton, NJ
Appendix A

AGENDA

PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Summer Meeting, 2009 – Halifax, NS Canada
Joint Meeting with AAFC Pest Management Centre

Four Points by Sheraton

Tuesday, Jul. 7th: 8:30 am - Noon
1. Approval of minutes, new agenda items. M. Marshall
2. Brief updates from AAs, CSREES, PMC members and CLC. Group
3. Program update. Baron et.al
   a. Food (Starner/Kunkel)
   b. QA (Barkalow)
   c. Ornamental Program
   d. Biopesticide and Organic Support
   e. Public Health
   f. International
   g. Communications
4. Detailed discussion on IR-4 Analytical Laboratories
   a. Discussion on backlog
   b. Update on consolidation/consolidation plans
   c. Laboratory Scientific Review Committee

Tuesday, Jul. 7th: 1:00 pm – 5:00 pm
5. Efficacy work plans for 2009
6. 2009 Food Use Workshop/NRPM. V. Starner
7. Training Committee V. Starner
8. Strategic Planning Document. Group
9. Budgets and Grant. Group
   a. National
   b. Regional
10. Upcoming Meetings

Wednesday, Jul. 8th: 8:30 am to Noon
11. Joint meeting of AAFC PMC and IR-4 PMC
   a. Pest Management Centre Overview – Manjeet Sethi
   b. IR-4 Overview/IR-4 Strategic Plan – Jerry Baron
   c. Movement toward equalization of contribution (effort, resources) by PMC and IR-4 associated with joint projects
   d. Establishment of Memorandum of Understanding between AAFC and IR-4
   e. Strategy to achieve harmonization in study plans/protocols, reporting, quality assurance and other minor use project management items
   f. Update on joint biopesticides work and options for enhanced collaboration - Leslie Cass
   g. Engaging other countries in multilateral research projects
Wednesday, Jul. 8th: 1:00 pm – 5:00 pm
12. NRSP-4/CSREES Review. Group
   a. Field Capacity – provide dollar amounts and capacity for Field Research Centers
   b. Lab Capacity
   c. QA Capacity – provide consultant dollars if applicable
   d. Develop a business plan document

14. NRSP-4 Document
15. Executive Session (if needed)

Thursday, Jul. 9th: 8:30 am – 6 pm
Agricultural Tour
8:00 am - Board Bus for Agricultural Tour – Kentville, NS area - return to hotel by 6 pm

¹Networking Lunch provided
Appendix B

Joint Meetings with AAFC/PMC Mon. and Wed., July 6 and 8, 2009

A joint meeting was held with the AAFC’s Pest Management Center and their Administrative Advisors Committee on July 8 in the a.m. This session was in addition to a joint meeting held Mon. afternoon July 6 between IR-4 and PMC/AAFC, at which time discussion focused entirely on harmonization ideas for field data books/RDFN, protocols/study plans, analytical summary reports and final reports for submission between the two organizations.

Mon. July 6th. During the Monday discussion the following “harmonization committee” was organized to work closely on moving forward harmonization efforts: D. Kunkel, J. Baron, T. Barkalow, S. Archambault, I. Gardiner, H. Penny. This group took on the harmonization task to make the use and submissions of our joint data more uniform. In recent years the number of joint projects has increased, as well the number of studies with Canada serving as sponsor, management and Study Director, and this trend is expected to continue. This increase in joint studies has resulted in more and more IR-4 FRDs and Canadian PI’s being exposed to both countries’ field documents. In the long term it would be easier for all involved if these documents were harmonized, and thus this committee is beginning efforts to establish one standard set of documents for protocols/study plans, field data collection, analytical reporting and final report preparation.

The harmonization committee decided to establish a working group for each type of documentation to be harmonized, each group consisting of members from all appropriate aspects of operations within both IR-4 and AAFC/PMC. Each working group is to be tasked with determining what differences currently exist between the two organizations’ documents, and then determine which parts of each document should be incorporated into a final harmonized document. The target is to have draft harmonized documents prepared by summer 2010, for potential implementation/testing in 2011 joint studies.

Wed. July 8th. The joint meeting between AAFC, their Advisory committee, IR-4, and its Project Management Committee followed the agenda on the following page. Manjeet Sethi, new Exec. Director of Canada’s Pest Management Centre introduced their Advisory Comm. and Jerry Baron introduced the IR-4 PMC members, and each gave an overview presentation about the organization of each program (copies of the talks follow the agenda).

In Canada, 2008 was the end of the first phase of PMC operations, and the new phase “Growing Forward” was initiated – a 5-year Agr. Policy Framework agreement on agriculture and agrifood products policy. Regarding the initiation of the “Harmonization Committee” from the July 6 meeting, in principle harmonization of activities between AAFC and IR-4 is accepted by the AAFC Advisory Comm., but they need additional time to secure Canadian stakeholder buy-in before agreeing to wholesale harmonization.

Additional joint discussions focused on collaboration between the two groups regarding biopesticide projects, and Leslie Cass from the PMC’s Pesticide Risk Reduction Program spoke about some ongoing joint projects (see her presentation on the following pages. Finally, Marcos Alvarez, Canadian Research Sites Manager summarized the AAFC/IR-4 partnership over the years, and then addressed a needed change regarding assignment of residue sample analyses in joint studies managed by AAFC. There is a target of 2011 to have in place a Memorandum of Understanding between the two organizations so that Canada can directly fund IR-4 labs to conduct such analyses thru the typical IR-4 funding process, with Canadian funds transferred to the assigned labs thru IR-4 HQ.
Agenda A

Joint AAFC – IR-4 Advisory and Project Management Committees Meeting
July 8, 2009, Halifax, NS
08:30 – 12:00

- THE WAY FORWARD -

8:30-8:40 Welcome – Manjeet Sethi & AAFC Advisory Committee Chair

8:40-9:00 IR-4 Overview and Project Management Committee introduction – Jerry Baron

9:00-9:20 Pest Management Centre Overview & introduction of Advisory Committee – Manjeet Sethi

9:20-9:45 Movement toward equalization of AAFC and IR-4 contribution (effort, resources) on joint projects – Ian Gardiner, Jerry Baron et al
  ➢ In 2008/2009 AAFC took ownership of 3 out of 16 joint projects (i.e., management and analytical funding). [In 2007/2008 – 2 and in 2006/2007 – 1]
  ➢ Confirmation that both IR-4 PMC and AAFC Advisory Committee agree to:
    o Joint projects sponsorship
    o Harmonization of GLP documents (final report, RDFN/FDB, Study plans/protocols)

9:45-10:10 Strategy to achieve operational harmonization – Ian Gardiner, Jerry Baron et al
  ➢ Study plans/protocols, reporting, quality assurance and other minor use project management items
    o Set aside resources to form a harmonization working group
    o Timelines:
      • Reporting timeframe
      • Finalization timeframe
  ➢ Analytical chemistry/ residue analysis training for AAFC by IR-4

10:10-10:30 Update on joint biopesticides work and options for enhanced collaboration – Leslie Cass
  ➢ The PMC’s Pesticide Risk Reduction Program and IR-4’s Biopesticide Program have teamed up with US-EPA and PMRA to conduct collaborative biopesticide trials as a pilot in 2009. An update will be provided and some avenues for improving/enhancing our collaboration will be explored.

10:30-10:50 Health Break

10:50-11:30 Establishment of Memorandum of Understanding between AAFC and IR-4 – Marcos Alvarez / Jerry Baron
  ➢ Purpose, scope, fiscal management considerations

11:30-12:00 Engaging other countries in multilateral research projects – Jerry Baron

12:00 Joint meeting ends, Lunch in the Navigator West
The IR-4 Project

**Future Strategic and Tactical Directions**

- Deliverables
- Strategic Plan
  - Process/Outcome/Impact
- Tactical (Business) Plan
- Global Situation

---

**Products & Deliverables**

- 999 Food Program “Clearances”
- Four new crop groups will be codified soon (NAFTA)
- Ornamental data impacted 3095 crops
- Significant progress on GMUS “Action Items”

---

**Background**

First IR-4 Strategic Plan in 1989
Updated several times, last update in 2006
IR-4 Project – Strategic Plan 2006-2008
Three year plan – Marry with USDA Review Process
"The Mission of the IR-4 Project is to provide safe and effective pest management solutions for growers of specialty crops"
**Process**

- IR-4 Strategic Planning Conference
  - December 9-10 in Washington, DC
  - Attended by 125 interested parties
  - Topical presentations on Day 1
  - SWOT Analysis on Day 2
  - Professional facilitators
  - Real time capture of comments

---

**Process (continued)**

- Tactical items vs. Strategic items
  - Good internal presence at conference
- Draft 1 – Solicited comments from PMC and CLC
- Draft 2 – Broad stakeholder solicitation
  - Several mass emails
  - Domestic and international publications
  - Direct

---

**Comments**

- I have reviewed the strategic plan for IR-4 and I feel that it is very comprehensive and meets the appropriate target needs. Well done! I really believe that the Section under Objective 4 is particularly important to the industry as we seek to market more of our production in international markets. 
  - Tom Davenport, National Grape Cooperative and CLC Member
- Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on your strategic plan for 2009-2013. The plan’s initiatives include objectives that are consistent with our Department’s objectives that encourages integrated pest management and reduced risk pest management. It also includes coordinated efforts to address invasive pests which is currently an issue in California. We support the strategic plan and welcome the opportunity to discuss these with you if we can be of assistance. 
  - Mary Lou K. Verba
  - CResp. DVM, RVPVM, Assistant Director, Pesticide Programs Division, California Department of Pesticide Regulation
- Another well-written IR-4 product. Hats off to you all for all your good, hard work!
  - Truong Chou, Acting Director, Office of Pest Management Policy

---

**IR-4 Project Strategic Plan**

**Mission**

To Facilitate Registration of Sustainable Pest Management Technology for Specialty Crops and Minor Uses
**Core Objectives**

- Continues productive:
  - Food Program
  - Ornamental Horticulture Program
  - Biopesticide and Organic Solutions Program

**Enhanced Food Program**

- Comparative Product Performance
  - Priority Pest Management Voids
  - Invasive Pests
  - Facilitating Grower Use – Pesticides tolerance should not be success matrix
    - Support domestic registrations
    - Assist with removing pesticides as trade barrier

**Enhanced Ornamental Program**

- Expand on efficacy and phytotoxicity data development
  - Respond rapidly to needs
  - Expand to investigate invasive pests
  - Characterize resistance management issues and impact on beneficial organisms

**Enhanced Biopesticide Program**

- Renamed Biopesticide and Organic Support Program
- Facilitate approval of Plant Incorporated Protectants and other traits for specialty crops
- Support the expanding organic crop production industry
New Cooperative Program

Pesticides for Management of Medically Important Arthropods
- In cooperation with ARS and DoD
- Registration support by HQ for ARS’s new technology as well as cooperating with industry to expand registrations
- New Hire
- Potential Residue Program

Business Plan

Modeled 3 funding levels for Core Activities
- Realistic - Level NIFA funding until 2014
- Ideal - Budget increases in 2012 and 2013 w/increased activity in all program areas
- Reduced - Reductions in 2010 and 2011 - Less activities

Enhancements will require new funds
Mainly from new grants

Global Situation

- Cooperative Global Workshare continues
- Some tangible success, more to come
- Hazard vs. Risk Assessment challenges
- European Minor Use Program
- Global data development/global zoning

Thank You!
Pest Management Centre
Pest Management Advisory Committee and IR-4 Meeting
Halifax, July 7-9, 2009
Manjeet Sethi
Executive Director

Although the roles of the PMC are quite different than those of HC's PMRA, we work closely together

PMC Roles

- Work with stakeholders to identify key pest management issues
- Generate data and regulatory submissions for new minor uses
- Implement projects which will enhance environmental stewardship
- Improve access to pesticides to help growers compete in global and domestic markets

Pest Management Regulatory Agency Roles

- Federal regulator and registrar of pesticides
- Develops, delivers and enforces federal pesticide policies and guidelines
- Evaluates pesticide registration proposals
- Promotes sustainable pest management
- Looks to improve regulatory process to improve efficiency

Pest Management Centre Created in 2002

- A part of the "Building Public Confidence in Pesticide Regulation" programming which involved:
  - Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Pest Management Regulatory Agency, Environment Canada, Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Canadian Food Inspection Agency
- Objectives
  - Improve grower access to new pest management tools and technologies
  - Increase public and stakeholder confidence in the pesticide regulatory system
  - Protect health and environment
  - Increase the competitiveness of the agri-food and forestry sectors
From AFP to Growing Forward

- The Agricultural Policy Framework (APF) Implementation Agreements with provinces and territories expired in March 2008. The APF has been replaced by Growing Forward, the new five year multilateral framework agreement on agriculture, agri-food products policy.

- The Framework Agreement paves the way for new programs that support the Growing Forward vision, in addition to outlining three common policy outcomes:
  - A Competitive and Innovative Sector
  - A Sector that Contributes to Society's Priorities
  - A Sector that is Proactive in Managing Risks

From APF to Growing Forward

- Market-focused and stakeholder-driven improvement on the Agricultural Policy Framework (APF)
  - Puts much greater focus on competitiveness through science and innovation, business development, growing markets
  - Continues and improves on APF effort in the environment and food safety
  - Positions industry to better manage risks, such as the challenges posed by animal and plant diseases

From APF to Growing Forward

- In March 2009 Treasury Board approved Growing Forward’s Agricultural Regulatory Action Plan aimed at addressing federal regulatory challenges impacting sector innovation and competitiveness in minor use pesticides, veterinary drugs, health claims, novel foods, and ingredients, and food fortification

- AAFC and Health Canada have begun to communicate interdepartmentally and with stakeholders about the plan, acquire new staff expertise, develop and begin to implement work plans, and collaborate on priority setting

- AAFC and the PMRA will continue joint work to deliver the Pesticides Risk Reduction Programs initiated under the Building Public Confidence in Pesticide Regulation and Improving Access to Pest Management Products Horizontal initiative.

PMC Program

Issues to address:

- Organizational structure
- Staffing
- Backlog
The Backlog Plan

Almost all the backlog projects were initiated in the PMC's infancy

- Review and finalization of backlog list
- Identify resources needed
- Letter requesting PMLC, CHC, and PMRA to review and make suggestions on priorities - Completed
- Appointment of Backlog/Submission Coordinator - Completed
- Re-prioritized projects by PMLC/CHC, completed - Completed
- Schedules established for the projects including milestones and timelines - Completed
- Executive Director PM/PMC to advise/consult Chief Registrar/PMRA regarding the backlog submissions schedule and seek their cooperation for the submissions - In progress
NAFTA MINOR USE PROJECTS

• MU Joint Reviews:
  - Joint Review candidates proposed by IR-4 and AAFC
  - Must have joint residue trials done co-operatively by IR-4 and PMC
  - Goal:
    • To address grower pest control needs with safe effective products in a manner
      that does not affect trade.
    • To provide simultaneous submissions to both regulatory agencies (EPA and
      PMRA)
    • To obtain harmonized registration timelines with harmonized tolerances (i.e.,
      MRL)
  • Successes of Joint Reviews allow for reduction of need for import MRLs
    from the US & Canada and growers are able to export to and from
    Canada using the same product

NAFTA Level

• MRL Harmonization:
  - Promotion of NAFTA and OECD submissions
  - Provides more solutions to Canadian and American growers
  - Levels the competitive field between NAFTA countries
  - Reduces/eliminates import/export barriers
  - CODEX MRLs

Future – The way forward

• Increase collaboration with IR-4

• Operational harmonization (study plans, field data
  notebooks, final reports)

• Increase involvement at the international level including
  OECD, CODEX

PMC Advisory Committee

• Mandate is to provide strategic advice to the Executive Director

• Membership to consist of a broad cross of industry stakeholders.

• Minor Use Pesticides and Pesticides Risk Reduction Technical
  Working Groups (TWGs) report to Advisory Committee

• TWGs study technical issues such as emerging crop/pest issues,
  submission mechanics.
Thank You

Manjeet Sethi
Email: manjeet.sethi@agr.gc.ca
Website: www.agr.gc.ca/rrmup
NAFTA Biopesticide Project

- Developed in context of NAFTA Technical Working Group on Pesticides
- Involves US-EPA, IR-4, AAFC-PMC, and Health Canada’s PMRA
- Goals are two-fold:
  - Demonstrate effectiveness of biopesticides to promote adoption
  - Generate data to support registrations in Canada

NAFTA Biopesticide Project

- Pest management issues of priority to growers in both countries were identified
- Projects initiated spring 2009 on 4 of these:
  - Lowbush blueberry insect pests
  - Onion thrips management
  - Use of biofungicides in Sclerotinia management in field crops
  - Downy mildew management in cucumber
- US-EPA provides funding through IR-4 grants program for projects conducted in the US
- AAFC-Pesticide Risk Reduction Program funds Canadian trials
- Total commitment in 2009 is CAD$160K combined

Lowbush blueberry insect pests

Objective:
To demonstrate the efficacy and integration of B. bassiana-based biopesticides into the IPM of blueberry maggot fly, blueberry spanworm & blueberry flea beetle (CAN only)

Project leads:
Chris Cutler (Nova Scotia Agricultural College)
Francis Drummond (University of Maine)

Canadian site:
Wild blueberry farm in Nova Scotia

US sites:
Univ. of Maine Blueberry Hill Research station and nearby farm sites
Onion thrips IPM with biopesticides

Objective:
To demonstrate and evaluate the use of different biopesticides and pest control product rotations for the control of onion thrips

Project leads:
Jeff Tolman & Heather Peill (AAFC Research Branch)
Silvia Ronconi (Oregon State University)

Canadian sites:
AAFC Research station in Delhi, ON
Onion farm near Kentville, NS

US sites:
Hermiston Agricultural Research
& Extension Centre, OR

Biofungicides in Integrated Sclerotinia management

Objective:
To demonstrate the integration of use of biofungicides in the integrated management of Sclerotinia diseases

Project leads:
Kari Coles (Southern Applied Research Association, Alberta)
William Kirk (University of Michigan)

Canadian sites:
10 farms in Canadian prairies (Lethbridge, AB area)

US sites:
4 field sites near East Lansing, Michigan, MI

Downy Mildew management in cucumber

Objective:
To evaluate the efficacy of various biofungicides for the management of downy mildew in cucumber

Project leads:
Jeff Tolman & Geoff Riddle (AAFC Research Branch)
Margaret Tuttle-McGath (Cornell University)

Canadian sites:
AAFC research stations in Harrow, ON and Delhi, ON

US sites:
Cornell University,
Long Island Horticultural Research
and Extension Centre,
Riverhead, NY

Next Steps

- AAFC-PMC will use data generated to support registration packages for submission in Canada
- Project results will be communicated to growers to encourage uptake of new biopesticide tools available to growers
- This pilot of joint biopesticide trials will be assessed for opportunities to refine/improve collaboration
Enhancing Collaboration: some thoughts

- Joint projects work best when researchers collaborate at project proposal stage
- Establish process in Canada to run on parallel schedule to that of IR-4 Pesticide Program (?)
- Establish formal priority setting mechanism for joint projects (?)
- Demonstrate the results of the projects by proactive inclusion in planned grower field day events (US & Canada)
- Prepare joint Canada-US communication pieces inform about projects & performance of products
MoU IR-4 - AAFC
Pest Management Centre Advisory Committee
July 7, 2009
Marcos Alvarez
Research Sites Manager
Canada

Background - PMC - IR-4 Partnership

- PMC modeled after the IR-4 Program
- Since inception AAFC has interacted with IR-4

IR-4 / AAFC Collaboration/Partnership

- Nature of interaction has been informal but successful
- To date 114 joint projects have been selected
- Initially study director was from IR-4
- All samples for pesticide residue analysis directly sent to IR-4 labs

Current status of interaction

- Recently AAFC has expanded role by taking the lead on some of the joint projects
- Pesticide residue analyses done under contract labs
Change in the current model

• Need to have pesticide residue analysis done at IR-4 labs
  • Samples are generated in both countries
  • Due to GLP requirements residue analysis should be done by the same lab
• Need to establish mechanism for fund transfer

Memorandum of Understanding

• Objectives
  • Joint submissions
  • Fund transfer
• Scope
  • Sharing information
  • Sharing training needs
  • Sharing scientific expertise
  • Sharing lab analysis

Next steps

• Identify counterparts
• Timeframe