

National C-FAR
December 18 Board Meeting Minutes
Highlights

- *New Board Officers* [until next regularly scheduled elections @ annual meeting]
 - Steve Pueppke, President & Board Chairman
 - Terry Barr, Vice President [elected to Board to succeed David Graves]
 - Tom Van Arsdall, Secretary/Treasurer
- *Reaffirmation of Need* for National C-FAR, as customer-led advocate for public investment in food & ag research; and commitment to increased effectiveness
- *Mission Statement to be Revised*, to better define benchmarks of success
- *Legislative & Research Committees Merged*, continuing government affairs and communications outreach functions
 - Evaluate effectiveness of current use of Research Success Profiles
 - Consider Hill research seminar series
 - Develop revised action plan as appropriate for consideration at annual meeting
- No further consideration of Dittus proposal
- *Monitor USDA REE Task Force* & arrange briefing for National C-FAR at appropriate time
- Review & recommend changes to bylaws
- *Facilitate Ongoing “Culture” Change*, embracing & sharing ownership with diverse membership
- Enhanced Board Oversight & Involvement, starting with conference call meeting in February



NATIONAL COALITION FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

National C-FAR Board of Directors Meeting, December 18, 2003 Minutes¹

Chairman David Graves called the Board meeting to order at 12:30 PM, with the following Board members in attendance: Glasener (CoFARM), Heider (Assn of Am Vet Medical Colleges); Layton (ASA); McAllister (CropLife America), Phillips (Biotech Industry Org), Sabin (Am Vet Medical Assn), Stallman (AFBF), Tumbleson (NCGA), Reid (IFT).² The Liaison determined presence of a quorum.

Motion to approve May 20, 2003 Minutes—Moved (Stallman) and seconded (Glasener): *Approve May 20, 2003 minutes.* Unanimously adopted without change.

Motion to elect new Board member and Board Officers—Moved (Stallman) and seconded: *Board officer slate effective December 19, until the regularly scheduled elections at the 2004 annual meeting.*

- *Dr. Terry Barr elected to Board to replace David Graves as NCFR representative.*
- *Dr. Steven Pueppke as National C-FAR President and Board Chairman.*
- *Dr. Terry Barr as Vice President.*
- *Tom Van Arsdall as Secretary/Treasurer.*

Unanimously adopted.

Following a briefing on the budget and reports and recommendations by representatives of the Research and Legislative Committees (See Attachment 1 below), each Board member was given an opportunity to comment about the future of National C-FAR (See Attachment 2 below). The Board then took action on the following:

Motion to revise Mission Statement—Moved (Stallman) and seconded (Phillips): *Direct the Liaison to develop and circulate optional proposed versions of the National C-FAR mission statement that better define benchmarks of success for the Board's consideration prior to the next Board meeting.*

Unanimously adopted.

- Suggested areas for improvement included:
 - Take “doubling” of research funding out of mission statement and consider including this desired outcome under goals.
 - Place emphasis in mission statement on more realistic characterization of outcomes, such as “enhancing” food and agricultural research & extension.
 - Near-term goal to change perception of policymakers about value of research, which helps lead them to actions in support of funding.
 - Focus messaging on research solutions or desired outcomes in advocating enhanced funding.
 - Clarification needed to help direct coalition’s legislative outreach work.

Motion to Merge Legislative and Research Committees—Moved (Layton) and seconded (McAllister): *Merge Legislative and Research Committees, continuing government affairs and communications outreach functions. Come up with appropriate name reflective of the merged committee’s activities. Committee to develop recommended strategy for consideration at annual meeting.* Unanimously adopted. (Note: interim name, Research Advocacy Committee)

Motion to Approve Proposed 2004 Budget—Moved and seconded: *Approve proposed 2004 budget.* After discussion and questions, unanimously adopted as proposed.

¹ 12/26/03 Draft, Secretary/Treasurer. Subject to approval at next Board meeting.

² Reid by conference call. Pueppke (Natl Ag Biotech Council), Sparrowe (WMI), Caspers (Natl Pork Producers) also committed to participating by conference call, but were unable to do so due to technical difficulties.

Other Requests, Issues Raised—

- Layton requested that the Committee look at the option of hosting periodic seminars on research topics on the Hill (referred to Diane Bellis, ASA contact).
- Layton asked for clarification that no further action will be taken on the Dittus proposal. Chairman Graves confirmed that no funds are included in the 2004 budget, and no further action would be taken on the Dittus proposal.
- Heider and several other Board members expressed interest in the potential of the USDA task force considering NIH/NSF-type approach.
 - Phillips requested a briefing for the Board at the appropriate time.
 - The Liaison also agreed to contact Leshner & Russell to determine lead USDA contact and alert National C-FAR members to public meeting opportunities (Heider offered to assist).
- Liaison inquired about reducing the dues level for regional, local and state organization members from \$500 to \$250 to facilitate recruiting such organizations.
 - Six members currently in this category. Board inquired whether any evidence that current dues level has been barrier to membership. No such evidence.
 - Dues are set in the bylaws, and advance notice is required to consider changes.
 - The Board elected to not to consider a change in the dues structure.
- The Board urged that a review of the bylaws be conducted and recommendation made in timely fashion prior to the next annual meeting.
 - It was recommended the dues structure be dropped from the bylaws.
- Liaison suggested a short Board meeting by conference call in late February to facilitate the Board's oversight, and the Board agreed.
 - The Liaison was directed to survey the Board as soon as practicable re availability for both a February Board meeting and the 2004 Annual/Board meeting.

The Liaison asked for clarification from the Board about the following plan of action based on discussions and actions taken by the Board:

- Membership/Dues—One more round of contacts with 2002 members who have not yet renewed or responded. 2004 dues notice to go out asap with transmittal message from President highlighting spirit and intent of Board decisions. Goals to Retain/Regain/Recruit and Expand/Diversify/Enrich membership. Follow up as needed. Targeted networking by Board, current members.
- Research Advocacy Committee—Provide stronger staff support, including serving as direct C-FAR representative/advocate. Merge committee functions and provide stronger support. Update committee contact list, encouraging member involvement; work with committee to (a) evaluate effectiveness to date, (b) refine current and planned initiatives like Research Success Profiles as needed to become more effective, and (c) consider new initiatives like Hill research seminars.
- Facilitate ongoing “culture” change, embracing and sharing ownership with diverse membership, enriching vocabulary to include terms like conservation, wildlife, sustainable, etc. Ask for non-traditional stakeholders' views, request speakers, etc. to help include their perspectives in strategic planning and messaging.
- Bylaws—Work with President and Rules and Operations Committee to review and develop recommended changes to the bylaws that may facilitate operation and effectiveness.

While no formal action was taken, the Board consensus seemed to be in agreement with the Liaison's proposed approach.

There being no further business, the Board meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

R. Thomas Van Arsdall, Secretary/Treasurer

Attachment 1

- *Treasurers Report*—The Liaison presented a preliminary report on the 2003 year-end budget and a proposed 2004 budget as background to give the Board a financial context in which to make decisions (See attached).
 - 2003 year-end budget expected to end in slight surplus (estimated \$5,000).
 - \$72,000 in reserves, projected \$10,000 carryover in checking account.
 - No finding in 2004 proposed budget for Dittus proposal or other new initiatives.
- *Research Committee Report*—Committee Chair Wagester briefed the Board on the series of periodic Research Success Profiles being distributed to Congressional offices and key committee staff, and plans for 2004 (See Exhibit A, Attachment 1 below).
 - 4 profiles released in 2004, with plans in place for nine more in 2004. Criteria in place for selecting additional topics.
 - Plans to expand distribution to include Administration and media contacts.
 - Little feedback has been received about the effectiveness of this effort. The Board suggested the Committee evaluate the effectiveness of the program in planning for future activities.
 - Wagester requested additional guidance from the Board.
 - Board Feedback:
 - Stallman asked about rationale for including profile on rural hospitals [response: rural development as part of mission]
 - Reid urged increased emphasis on consumer benefits in each 1-pager.
 - Phillips recommended visits with reporters and editorial boards.
- *Legislative Committee Report*—Committee representative Hedberg briefed the Board on the history of Legislative Committee activities and the results of a joint meeting of the Research and Legislative Committees.
 - Reported the committee agreed on the importance of National C-FAR maintaining continuing contacts in the policy arena so that basic message in support of increased funding for food & ag research is heard whenever issue is being considered.
 - This includes both Congress and the Administration.
 - Recommended on behalf of the two committees that they be merged to gain efficiencies and reach critical mass of participation, with communications and government affairs functions continuing through workgroups.
 - One of values of coalition is that it brings talents of members together.
 - Committee members serve as de facto staff for coalition, and can help National C-FAR maintain active presence.
 - Expressed concern that important “non-traditional” stakeholders had not been actively engaged, and that efforts would be undertaken to encourage their involvement.
 - Indicated that Jessica Donze (Am Dietary Assn) had agreed to take the lead in caucusing among members from the nutrition community to identify an individual willing to serve as chair of the combined committee.
 - This direction is being pursued to diversify membership involvement, motivated in part by timing of major nutrition statute up for reauthorization.
 - Decision re chair deferred pending further guidance from the Board (to better evaluate workload).
 - Liaison has been asked to assist in updating the committee contacts database and facilitate periodic meetings and ongoing work.
 - Asked for further guidance from the Board about what is expected of the committee(s).

Attachment 1, Exhibit A

National C-FAR Research Committee Report Topics that have already been selected for N C-FAR Success Stories

First Batch

Information is prepared and ready to go

- Witchweed – will be sent in December
- Penicillin - Mailed to house and senate personal offices plus ag and science committee and Ag approps subcommittee 10/31
- Mastitis – Mailed to house and senate personal offices plus ag, resource, and science committee and VA HUD and Ag approps subcommittee 11/24
- Anthrax – mailed to House and Senate Personal offices on 9/29 and 9/30.

Second Batch

Still compiling information

- **Health promoting phytochemicals – original from OSU – one paragraph.**
 - Received information from:
 - ASNS
 - Agronomy, Crop and Soil Science Societies
- **Standard Establishment for Frozen Foods – original submitted by FASS – press release.**
- **Wine Industry Growth – Original submitted by American Vintners Association. Full page**
 - Received information from:
 - American Vintners Association
- **Emerging Zoonotic & Animal Diseases**
 - Received information from:
 - FASS
- **Elimination of Food Allergens – Original received from ASPB – one page**
 - Received information from:
 - American Society of Plant Biologists

Third Batch

Selected in July 2003 – still compiling information

- **Low Fat Meats – Original information submitted from OSU – one paragraph**
 - Received information from:
 - ASNS
 - FASS
- **Hospital Transitions and Consolidation in Rural Communities – original from C-FARE – two paragraphs.**
 - Received information from:
 - C-FARE
- **Diabetes – Original information received from Food Nutrition & Policy Consultants – one sentence. Also an unknown source one paragraph.**
 - Received information from:
 - ASNS
- **Economic Analysis of Benefits Obtained from Conservation Programs – original received from WMI – full page.**
 - Received information from:
 - Wildlife Management Institute

December 11, 2003

Attachment 2

December 18 National C-FAR Board Meeting

Chairman's Opening Remarks

Graves cited the recent Peter Jennings report as reinforcement that National C-FAR has opportunities to advocate public investment in food and agricultural research. He urged the Board to be involved on a regular basis, providing direction and oversight on progress and results. He also indicated the organization needs active and engaged membership. He suggested that past research advocacy has focused too much on asking for funds, with too time spent on providing policymakers information through their constituents sufficient for them to decide to be for funding research. This means increased emphasis on communications about the benefits of research.

Board Member Comments³

Board members were provided the following suggested questions as a frame of reference to facilitate discussion and decision-making:

- Are there reasons for continuing National C-FAR?
 - Is National C-FAR's mission still important to Your Constituents?
 - Is an important *near-term priority* for National C-FAR to Minimize Cuts in Public Funding in Ag Research?
- If so, what should National C-FAR be doing to achieve its goals?
 - Does the Strategic Approach Need to be Modified?
 - What do you think about the current and planned activities of the Legislative and Research Committees?
 - Do you support implementation of the Dittus proposal, Phase I, as approved by the Board last May?
 - Is your organization willing to support convening a summit on your broad issue area?
 - Is your organization willing to help raise the funds needed to underwrite the planning and implementation process for such a summit?
 - If you don't support the Dittus proposal, Phase I, is there another initiative that should be undertaken?

Each Board member then commented about the future of National C-FAR:

Layton, American Soybean Association

- Research is a priority of ASA, but not top priority.
- We have been unsure that our investment of money and time in C-FAR up to this time has been the best investment of our limited resources and will continue to look at that over the coming year.
- To be successful we need to either persuade the general public that ag research is important and motivate them to actively support it, which I think we do not have the resources to do or try to influence the decision makers, Congress and staff which is what I think we should do.
- Tough to energize ASA members, let alone general public.
- I do not think the Dittus proposal will work. Fundraising from industry not something ASA wants to do, as competes with their own source of funding.
- I think we should follow a multi-faceted approach including but not limited to:

³ Member-observers included Hedberg (Weed Science Societies), Wagester (C-FARE), Croker (NCGA), Cartwright (IFT), Meeker (FASS), Rushkin (Am Vet Medical Assn), Bellis (ASA/USB), Van Duyn (Nat'l Cotton Council), Sherwood (Am Toxicological Society), Buchanan (U of Georgia), Halderman (FASS).³

- Continuing to do success stories.
- A series of monthly research seminars on the hill featuring timely research topics and prominent researchers. Congress and staff should be invited and the seminars should be open to the public.
- We should have regular contact with members and staff of research committees and make statement where applicable.
- Repeated contacts, message in front of decision-makers, often.

Phillips, Biotechnology Industry Organization

- Supportive of National C-FAR moving forward. Consider briefings for media, editorial boards as part of implementation strategy.

Sabin, American Veterinary Medical Association

- Everybody's busy. Multiple coalitions, limited resources, trying to determine value of investing time in National C-FAR.
- Supportive of National C-FAR finding niche, moving forward, make program more effective.
- Not supportive of Dittus proposal.
- Believes some of existing communications products developed by member organizations could be modified for use by C-FAR.

Glasener, CoFARM

- Believes C-FAR has been good for CoFARM.
- Yes, need to continue but need increased participation and commitment of NCFAR member organizations. Majority of work at committee level by CoFARM; would like to see increased involvement by other ag groups, industry.
- Bring in nontraditional ag interests--environment, consumer, natural resources, conservation.
- Congressional/Administration needed as we did to get "doubling" language—
 - When we talk doubling, we mean an increase in ag approps sub cmte allocation.
 - We have limited resources to tackle such an ambitious public education effort such as the one produced by Dittus.
 - Need concrete, reachable goals.
- We need feedback from Congress re: success stories before we continue to deliver them to the Congress and the Administration.
- Need to pull together a game plan for how we will get increase in funding from agencies across the federal government.
- CoFARM unsure of commitment--CoFARM members have tackled much of the legislative and research committee tasks to date.

Tumbleson, National Corn Growers Association

- Bury Dittus. NCGA would not provide funding support, or help raise funds.
- Supportive of National C-FAR continuing, work to enhance effectiveness.
- Interested in NIH approach to increase research funding if designed right.
- Coalition-type approach might be good alternative. Stay in touch, get interested parties together to take action when opportunities arise.

McAllister, CropLife America

- Hard to ask CLA members for \$.
- Concern about NIH approach taking outside of USDA.
- Present approach, when working to increase research funding, competing with ourselves for limited resources.
- How do we respond when asked why we want more research funding when ag products in surplus and being subsidized now? Need to have good response.
- Look more closely at distinction between appropriations and authorizing legislation in developing strategy.

- Look at public vs. private research funding. Improve climate for private research? Sometimes means not incentives, but government getting out of the way.

Stallman, American Farm Bureau Federation

- Commented on original basis (Illinois C-FAR) and whether appropriate at national level.
- Only way to get coalition together was not to be specific. But that decreases credibility when policymakers asking for feedback on how to make choices.
- Research though important a second tier priority at AFBF.
- All busy, and research/C-FAR can't be priority at level requested.
- Revise mission (get away from doubling).
- Combine research & legislative committees.
- Dittus, no. Doesn't see value in larger, expensive PR efforts and not willing to contribute to or help raise funds.
- Think in lesser terms, background radiation to create better environment for research funding decisions. Likes the 1-pagers, could do more with.

Heider, Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges
(comments at meeting, supplemented via e-mail)

- AAVMC believes that the mission of NCFAR is important. However, we think (as opposed to "we know") that NCFAR has not been productive. We recognize that NCFAR is a very young organization as these things go, and it may be too soon to evaluate effectiveness.
- Because we think NCFAR may not be effective, we are considering our membership status. But, if we knew that the mission of NCFAR is important to the commodity groups, we would wish to be supportive, recognizing that our (AAVMC's) members stand to benefit from effective efforts by NCFAR.
- We do not think the "doubling" statement is helpful, and should be dropped in favor of general terms that allow adjustment to current and changing fiscal environments.
- We do not think (again we don't know) that the one-pagers are effective. We think that they might be effective if used as statements left with those with whom we meet to argue the case for research funding for food and agriculture.
- Need more appropriate name for the combined committee, reflective of its activities.
- Not interested in supporting Dittus proposal.
- Very interested in the report due this year from the Secretary's Task Force on a National Institute for Food and Agriculture. We will be watching this, and if something comes of it, it may be important for us to be prepared to lobby for appropriation as well as authorization.
- AAVMC plans to attend the next meeting of the TF in St. Louis on January 28, 2004. We hope that NCFAR, perhaps through representatives of member institutions, will be alert to the efforts of the TF.
- Additional input following meeting:
 - We think that although food isn't often associated with issues causing deaths, food is a problem through food borne diseases. e.g. E. coli 0157, listeriosis, cryptosporidiosis, salmonellosis etc.
 - Also, food availability is an issue for the significant portion of our population living below the government defined poverty level.
 - Furthermore, the CDC and NIH lists of potential agents of bioterrorism are almost all diseases of animals transmissible to man. FMD is an agent of potential bioterrorism that if used, could devastate the economy of this country.
 - All these issues are issues that must be supported in any agenda to acquire food and agriculture research funding. Public health is important. Food and agriculture are important to the public health.
 - Our issues may not be as scary as cancer and heart disease, but they are very important to public health. Unfortunately, it is CDC, NIH and others but not the Dept. of Agriculture that is tuned into the need for research in these areas.

Graves, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives

- We face continued dilemma in agriculture, with research title in farm bill and stakeholders relegating research to second tier when asked to make funding choices.
- Something created C-FAR. What has changed, if anything to change premise?
- Understand why previous efforts have failed, and avoid temptation to change directions and support latest “new” idea. NIH-type approach is essentially retreat.
- Need to redefine mission, what defines success.

Jordan, National Cotton Council

(via phone call to Liaison prior to Board meeting)

- Wants to remain on Board and remains supportive of National C-FAR as “only game in town” that brings research community and organizations benefiting from research together in support of research funding. Supportive of objectives, recognizes challenging climate & competing interests.

Reid, Institute of Food Technologists

(via phone call to Liaison after Board meeting)

- Very supportive of National C-FAR.
- Not supportive of Dittus proposal.
- IFT may be willing to collaborate with other groups to develop materials for 1-pagers.
- IFT member of CoFARM, and both IFT and CoFARM members of National C-FAR. What does C-FAR add that CoFARM doesn’t already provide? Believes that C-FAR brings “consumer” voice and benefits into the equation.
- C-FAR should emphasize integrated nature of the food & ag system in its communications. IFT suggested “frozen foods” 1-pager as example of interrelationships.
- Highlight science, yes, but strengthen benefits to farmers, environment, quality of life, etc. in messaging.
- Two-way question:
 - What communications products do members already have that could be converted efficiently to C-FAR use?
 - What can C-FAR members do to make better use of C-FAR 1-pagers?

Sparrowe, Wildlife Management Institute

(via e-mail to Liaison after Board meeting)

- I remain interested in the outcome and direction received from the groups for the future of NCFAR, and seeing where we might be of help in providing fish and wildlife conservation input, and being a bridge to our community.

Pueppke, National Agricultural Biotechnology Association

(via e-mail to Liaison after Board meeting)

- Reiterated importance of research “customers” playing leading role in coalition. Encouraged that Board engaged and made important decisions to redefine mission and focus efforts on communications and outreach.

Revised, Dec 26, 2003--RTVA