

**[INTERNAL – DISCUSSION DOCUMENT – please do not forward]**

[April 18, 2013]

Daryl, Mike (Hoffmann) and Mike (Harrington):

Have you had a chance to look at how the new Crop Protection (IPM) Program is proposed in the FY14 Budget? I realize everyone is busy, but thought I'd ask and start a conversation among us on what we see in the proposal. Perhaps you've had follow up conversations or heard questions/comments from Working Group members or the network of CES & AES Directors?

I've looked at the new Crop Protection Program as reflected in the President's FY14 Budget proposal. Here's what I'm seeing. Do you have any thoughts? Additional insights? Things I'm missing? Do my observations below seem correct, and/or are these appropriate things to be asking?

FYI: The points (below) are not meant to be negative of what we accomplished or did not accomplish. I'm just candidly asking for your thoughts and analysis of the where Crop Protection seems to be headed.

1. The five lines that were combined in the President's FY14 Budget proposal for Crop Protection are recommend for funding at \$17.143M. Using the FY12 budget figures (adding up each of the five lines totals \$17.835M) as a baseline it would mean that the new Crop Protection Program budget would be reduced by \$692,000.

Five consolidated programs and budget lines in the Crop Protection Program:

- a. Expert IPM Decision Support Systems [\$0.153M]
  - b. Integrated Pest Management [\$2.362M]
  - c. Pest Management Alternatives [\$1.402M]
  - d. Pest Management (Smith Lever Section 3(d)) [\$9.918M]
  - e. Regional Pest Management Centers [\$4.000M]
2. The new Crop Protection Program will be placed into the "Integrated Activities" section of the NIFA budget.
    - a. Why here? The agency has been de-emphasizing the Integrated Activities (budget lines), so is there increased risk in putting the new combined budget into the Integrated Activities part of the budget? (NOTE: Water Quality is there, and it has constantly been proposed for reduction and now elimination in the FY14 budget proposal.) The Working Group recommended Crop Protection be inserted into Research Activities category of NIFA's Budget. Given that not all of the lines that the Working Group recommended for consolidation have been merged in this proposal and since the majority of the funds are now E-IPM, would it be easier to accomplish and do more to respect functional equivalency by instead merging the budget lines within Extension Integrated Pest Management (Smith Lever 3(d))?
    - b. If it does get moved into "Integrated Activities" then we need to watch and ask what it means for:
      - functional equivalency,
      - eligibility (who can apply), and
      - overhead/indirect cost rates.

3. The Crop Protection Working Group proposed other budget lines in the new program that were not consolidated. These were lines/programs that we asked to be restored to protect the integrity and overall functional equivalency of what we (both AES and CES ) do under the IPM program. These funds are now apparently lost. Is there an option to support these programs (and their intent) through AFRI? Perhaps there is an opportunity if AFRI receives the increase in funding that is in the FY14 budget proposal?
  - a. IPM-pipe (\$115,000)
  - b. CAR (\$1.4M)
  - c. RAMP (\$4.4M)
  
4. Methyl Bromide Transition Program (\$1.996M) is gone. What happened to the funding (I think I understand, but just asking to confirm)? This program is not well supported by CES or AES. However, there's a strong constituency base, and a partnership with EPA, so we might need to be prepared for how to respond if supporters of the program come to us and ask for our support to restore the funding? Might not need to worry about this; however, perhaps we should have a standard response between ECOP-CES and ESCOP-AES. I wouldn't be too surprised if this comes back into the budget discussions at some point. If it does come back entirely, will funding be restored? If this happens, we should watch where the funding comes from (we wouldn't want it merely be added to the new program responsibilities with just the proposed \$17.1M budget for Crop Protection). One way to handle this might be to recommend that methyl bromide transition could be addressed through IR-4 and/or AFRI.
  
5. The Explanatory Notes for NIFA offer a few items to watch and/or understand:
  - a. There was no mention of the core principle of functional equivalency (e.g., described as: Pest Management Programs will be conducted and funded as provided for in legislation). How do we follow up to make sure that functional equivalency happens as a Crop Protection Program is shaped or re-shaped?
  - b. Explanatory notes mention both (1) IPM for sustainable communities, and (2) next generation of crop protection scientists. However, there is no corresponding funding and/or budget line (actual funding level) identified for this. We should watch this closely to make sure these "new" elements are not expected within the \$17.1M budget, especially important give that the budget is proposed to be reduced by approximately \$700k. The Working Group indicated there needed to be new funding for both of these, but it did not put a number into the table. It was "to be determined," so what is the opportunity to determine that level of funding?
  - c. Also, there is no reference to enhancing coordination and improving efficiency in the explanatory notes (i.e., there is no reference to a coordinating council or national IPM coordinator). This might or might not be the place for such a reference, so don't know if this is something to worry about or not. However, seems like it might have been appropriate in the Explanatory Notes as instructing the agency to consider greater coordination and efficiency in the way a new Crop Protection Program is administered. This could be especially important with partners as the program gets shaped or re-shaped. Without the Explanatory Note reference how much emphasis will be placed on this by the agency? Seems that if we wanted to create a national IPM coordinator between the offices of the undersecretaries, don't we need some higher level of reference/authorization to get that done? Actually, do we still want this aspect of the new Crop Protection Program? If we still feel this is important, it should also have additional funding appropriated for that purpose and not "absorbed" into the proposed funding level (again, that \$17.1M amount already reflects a reduction) and/or we should also be concerned that NIFA might be forced to absorb it without specified funding . Also, given the overall funding/budget for the new Crop Protection Program, is this still a priority (i.e., how does funding for this rank where there is limited funding, and/or new funding that would be needed for – community IPM, next generation of scientists, and/or just getting an adequate level funding for the five combined lines/programs).

6. When and how should follow up actions occur? What is our strategy for next steps? Obviously, it is still very early in the process and this could change considerably as the US House and Senate work on the FY14 Budget. However, perhaps we should have a follow up call between the four of us (and possibly Cornerstone) about:
- a. What do we like, and what don't we like about this (especially, are there any major things in this that we can't live with or without)?
  - b. Are there things, positions, recommendations, advice, clarifications that should be addressed as the House and Senate act on the FY14 Budget? These could involve "tweaks" or "major revisions" to the current proposal.
  - c. Are there significant issues that should be discussed by (ECOP & ESCOP) BLCs and/or the BAC? If so, when and how does that happen?
  - d. Once the FY14 Budget is decided: when and how do we proactively (and in a positive way) engage NIFA as it shapes and re-shapes the programs under Crop Protection? This may be where we need to insert ourselves (both AES and CES) to achieve functional equivalency.

Did you see anything that I've gotten wrong, or that I've missed? Anything you are hearing?

Robin