

Report and Recommendations

NORTHEAST MULTISTATE ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE MEETING

Via Teleconference

June 13, 2016 [11:00-11:37am]

Chair, Fred Servello (ME)

Members: Tim Phipps (WV), Gary Thompson (PA), Cameron Faustman (CT), Pat Vittum (MA/NEED), Ken La Valley (NH/NEED)
NERA: Dan Rossi, Rick Rhodes III, and Rubie Mize (Recorder)

1. Request to approve multistate proposal, NE_TEMP1640 (currently NE 1040): Plant-Parasitic Nematode Management as a Component of Sustainable Soil Health Programs in Horticultural and Field Crop Production Systems [10/2016-09/2021]

Discussion: MAC members were generally in agreement with the peer reviewers, specifically on the need for an economist to be a member of the team. Another concern raised is that it was not strongly justified why a separate Northeast multistate project is needed if membership, like the other regions', is open to scientists all over the country. In fact, the proposal has participants from Southern and North Central states. Are they truly different or is there efficiency in combining with other regions? Some groups, if too big, may lose the cohesiveness to work closely and others may not actively participate. A MAC member had attended the NE1040 meeting in West Virginia and was impressed with the make-up of the group. The members felt that this group should continue their work as a Northeast project, but should try to meet jointly and work collaboratively with the other regions, and encourage them to add an economist.

Action: Motion made was seconded and passed, to approve the proposal and encourage the group to add an economist and look for opportunities to work collaboratively with the other regions' multistate projects -- S1066, NC1197, and W3186.

2. Request to Write a Proposal for NE1048 – Mastitis Resistance to Enhance Dairy Food Safety [10/2017-09/2022]

Action: MAC members reviewed the issues and justification submitted by the Technical Committee and recommends approval of Request to Write.

3. NRSPs

- Minutes of the NRSP Review Committee Meeting

- Action on new proposal NRSP_TEMP0011: National Agricultural Research Data Network for Harmonized Data (NARDN-HD) – Email to Advisors attached

Chair Servello summarized NRSPRC’s recommendations and requested Dan to expound on the deliberations, specifically of the proposed NRSP_TEMP0011, at the NERA meeting next week. Dan attended the fly-in of the NRSPRC on May 31st in Atlanta.

4. Advisor assignments:

- NE1049: Community Health and Resilience [10/2012-09/2017]

Action: Directors whose names were suggested will be approached to confirm if one or both may be able to serve as Advisor/Co-Advisor for this project. Dan is currently serving as Advisor of NE1049 and is preparing a Midterm Review for submission with the Request to Write for consideration at MAC’s fall meeting. NE1049 is scheduled to terminate in 2017.

5. Other Business

- For information only:
 - *NE1227: Ovarian Influences on Reproductive Success in Ruminants* submitted as Northeast nomination for the 2016 ESS National Multistate Research Award – ESCOP Science and Technology Committee currently reviewing nominations.
 - 2016/17 NERA Planning Grant RFA will be released July 2016.
- Tim Phipps agreed to extend for another year, to 2017, as a MAC member.

Meeting end at 11:37AM

Current MAC members:

- Fred Servello, ME (2015-2018) – Chair
- Cameron Faustman, CTS (2014-2017)
- Tim Phipps, WV (2013-2017)
- Gary Thompson, PA (2015-2018)
- Pat Vittum, MA/NEED (2014-2017)
- Ken La Valley, NH/NEED (2014-2017)

NRSP Review Committee Meeting Minutes
Hilton Atlanta Airport
May 31, 2016

1. NRSP_temp11, National Agricultural Research Data Network for Harmonized Data

- Presentations were made on the proposed NRSP or co-PI's/administrative advisors involved were at each 1862 regional spring meeting for the discussion
- Western Region Comments
 - Concept is well supported, timely and appropriate, lot of power in having big data sets available for further use
 - Lot of reservations about the proposal as it is
 - General consensus that business plan was not well developed, very hard to pull out cohesive plan from all the appendixes
 - What happens after ARS & NAL commitment ends, how would it be sustainable?
 - Might support funding for short term 1-3 years, then make another decision based on securing long-term support from other sources
 - Amount of leverage is not as great as indicated because a lot of it is unrecovered indirect cost which does not directly support the project
 - Animal science portion is very undeveloped, only tri-societies mentioned
- North Central Region Comments
 - Lot of same comments as west
 - Proposal as written is not supported
 - Lot of concern with ICASA as the core standard, focus is on crop simulation and may not be appropriate for other types of data sets
 - This whole area seems too big to be led by an NRSP as a national platform
 - AES's should not be primary lead on this, but a smaller part of a large national effort
- Northeast Region Comments
 - Many of same concerns as west
 - Like to see proof of concept work first, not convinced this is correct format for these data sets
 - Concern with budget, no plan for long-term sustainability
 - If the principle can be proven in a pilot effort, the larger proposal might be supported
 - Like to see alternative data formats considered
 - Nothing on environmental data
 - Doesn't seem to have sufficient budget to accomplish the large amount of work involved
- Southern Region Comments
 - Lot of same concerns as other regions
 - Not good budget plan, mostly dependent on unrecovered indirect costs and in-kind salaries
 - Good leverage of off-the-top funding is not indicated
 - Going after a new line in USDA NIFA budget is unrealistic
 - Very Florida centric, other institutions only contributing data
 - Not well integrated, only indicates that it would be of interest to CES
 - No specific quality control on data sets
 - Outreach and communication plan is not well defined
 - From technical standpoint, seems to be over reliant on Ag MIP

- Stakeholders Comments
 - CARET Executive met at NAL 6-7 years ago and asked about how Ag Library interacted with NIMSS and found out they didn't
 - Proposal to bring ARS, NAL, and Land Grant Universities together on this issue is very good
 - Private entities should be involved with this project, both in participation and funding
- USDA/NIFA Comments
 - From an NPL viewpoint, big data is of great interest to REE
 - This is similar to the plant database project, lots of data in different formats that need to be brought together for further use
 - The budget was presented too much like an AFRI grant with reliance on matching in-kind salaries and other support
 - Need to bring in private entities, consultants, data analysis companies, etc. to gain their support and to help ensure it is useful for industry
 - Important for Land Grant Universities to be involved in this area collectively, but the proposed structure may not be the most effective and sustainable mechanism
 - Scope of data types proposed may be too broad for a single data format
 - This type of project should lead to data models that farmers can use with their own data to improve production
- General Comments
 - Concept created lot of positive interest, but implementation details have too many problems and barriers, and does not appear to be sustainable
 - Land Grant Universities should be involved in data management at national level
 - Need to obtain competitively funded opportunities for work in this area prior to requesting NRSP funding
 - Proposal did a poor job of explaining where the direct funding needed would come from and how it could be sustained beyond a five-year term
- NRSP-RC Recommendation
 - Motion by Doug Buhler, second by Bret Hess – “Reject proposal as presented.” Passed unanimously
 - Proposal may be resubmitted with following concerns addressed, however the committee agreed revisions and new information needed was too substantial to be accomplished prior to an August conference call.
 - Resolve issue of data format that is not applicable to many potential uses of data
 - May need to consider different formats for plant and animal or other subsets or limit project to data sets where a single format is appropriate
 - Might consider applying for a NIFA planning grant to bring diverse data format expertise together to settle on best format(s)
 - Business model needs to be better articulated, more realistic, better leveraged, and show sustainability beyond 5 years. A revised proposal must address the short-term commitment of NAL, keeping in mind that a new budget line in USDA NIFA is unrealistic
 - Consider bringing in additional partners for expertise and financial support; ex. data analysis firms, consultants, private industry, other federal funding agencies, foundations, etc.
 - Develop a quality control process for data sets received
 - Develop a more definitive outreach and communication plan that explains the target audience and outcomes desired for workshops or other activities; for the harmonized data sets; and for the ultimate end user of results. Define how Extension and education fit into a continuing outreach and communication effort.

2. NRSP-8 Midterm review

- Only criticism was lack of attendance by stakeholder representatives on committee at annual meeting in January, but PAG venue does not offer much for them. Project leadership might consider a separate stakeholder meeting/workshop held every 2-3 years.
- NRSP Review Committee agreed project is progressing well and no changes are needed

3. Potential new NRSP-7 proposal

- As far as the committee members know, nothing has changed with that group and its relationship with industry or efforts to find additional support
- There is authorization for funding in the Farm Bill, but nothing has been done to seek appropriations
- A new NRSP proposal from them is not expected.

Subject: [escop-nrsp] NRSP Review Committee Recommendation on NRSP_Temp 11
From: Eric Young <eyoung@ncsu.edu>
Date: 6/7/2016 12:01 PM
To: "Burns, Jacqueline K" <jkbu@ufl.edu>, "Plaut, Karen I" <kplaut@purdue.edu>, "Burgess, Shane C - (shaneburgess)" <sburgess@cals.arizona.edu>, jpn2@cornell.edu
CC: "escop-nrsp@lists.ncsu.edu" <escop-nrsp@lists.ncsu.edu>, Mike Harrington <wdal@lamar.colostate.edu>, Dan Rossi <rossi@AESOP.Rutgers.edu>, "Jacobsen, Jeffrey" <jjacobsn@anr.msu.edu>, Clarence Watson <cwatson1@uark.edu>

To: NRSP_Temp 11 Administrative Advisors
Jackie Burns
Karen Plaut
Jan Nyrop
Shane Burgess

From: Clarence Watson, Chair, NRSP Review Committee

The NRSP Review Committee met in Atlanta on Tuesday, May 31 and had an extensive discussion about the proposed new NRSP_Temp 11, National Agricultural Research Data Network for Harmonized Data. The committee's deliberations were informed by not only the proposal and appendices, but also presentations and discussion at the recent spring regional AES directors meetings.

After careful consideration the Review Committee unanimously agreed to make the following recommendation to the Experiment Station Section during their business meeting September 21 in Jackson Hole, WY. Please pass this decision on to the proposal writing committee.

The NRSP-RC recommends rejecting the proposal as presented. The proposal may be resubmitted for consideration next year, or future years, provided the following concerns are addressed.

- There was a lot of concern with ICASA as the core standard, its focus is on crop simulation and may not be appropriate for other types of data sets. Alternative data formats should be considered, the scope of data types proposed may be too broad for a single data format. A revised proposal should resolve the issue of a data format that is not applicable to many potential uses of data.
 - The proposal may need to consider different formats for plant and animal or other subsets of data types or limit the project to data sets where a single format is appropriate.
 - The writing committee might consider applying for a NIFA planning grant to bring diverse data format expertise together to settle on the best format(s).
- The business model needs to be better articulated, more realistic, better leveraged, and show sustainability beyond 5 years. A revised proposal must address the short-term commitment of NAL, keeping in mind that a new budget line in USDA NIFA is unrealistic. Also, leveraged support should not be primarily in-kind salaries and unrecovered IDC.
- Consider bringing in additional partners, particularly private entities, for expertise and financial support; ex. data analysis firms, consultants, private industry, other federal funding agencies, foundations, etc.
- Develop a quality control process for data sets being received to ensure harmonized data is reliable.
- Develop a more definitive outreach and communication plan that explains the target audience and outcomes desired for workshops or other activities; for the harmonized data sets; and for the ultimate end user of results. Define how Extension and education fit into a continuing outreach and communication effort.

The committee would like you to know that the concept is well supported, timely, appropriate, and created lot of positive interest; but implementation details as presented have too many problems and barriers, and do not appear to be sustainable. There is clearly significant power in having big data sets available for further use and the proposal to bring ARS, NAL, and Land Grant Universities together on this issue is very good.

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like further clarification on any of the comments above.

Thank you.

Eric Young, Executive Director
Southern Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors
North Carolina State University
203 Patterson Hall
Box 7561
Raleigh, NC 27695
Phone 919-513-1746