1. Welcome and Opening Remarks – S.K. De Datta
Chair George Norton called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone before turning the floor over to S.K. De Datta for his opening remarks. De Datta began by reminding everyone that the IPM CRSP is approaching its sixteenth anniversary, and it is a time for reflection on all that has happened, to be pleased with all that has been achieved, and to reflect upon where the project needs to go in the next few years. Several changes have taken place on the board recently; one member retired, and another resigned, and new members have taken their place. De Datta acknowledged that the AMR which took place in 2008 was critical of the infrequency with which board meetings were being held, but this discrepancy has since been corrected. De Datta commented that the goals of the IPM CRSP contribute to the success of the mission of the US land-grant universities; he mentioned that he had recently met with the highest level of administration at Virginia Tech to present information as to how the CRSP contributed to the scholarship of the university. To date, the IPM CRSP has supported 41 graduate assistants at Virginia Tech and 123 graduate assistantships at non-VT graduate schools, produced about 3,000 publications, of which 32 were book chapters, and sponsored 98 students with masters’ degrees and 66 Ph.D. students. Additionally, Larry Vaughan has provided leadership in garnering associate awards, procuring $455,000 for fruit fly and $1 million for food security in Africa in the last six months alone. De Datta thanked Bob Hedlund for his role in these endeavors, and noted that his title has changed from Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) to Agreement Officer Technical Representative (AOTR).

De Datta urged project leaders to complete all tasks in the workplan and reminded them not to save for the proverbial “rainy day,” as USAID does not encourage pipeline. The best thing is to do as much as possible, complete all responsibilities, spend the money, and document the impacts made. He reminded the participants that each one of them is a partner in the story.

De Datta also briefly mentioned some of the topics that will be addressed, including discussion on the next phase. The RFA for the next phase of the Horticulture CRSP is
out, and from this it is possible to get a sense of what the next phase of IPM will be like: a total of $15 million broken down to $3M/year, an increase from the current funding amount of $2.4M/year. He added that Larry has a target of $5M in associate awards, and there is likely no need for competition. He thanked all participants for joining this important TC meeting and remarked that the newest member of the ME team, Annie Steed, will be joining the meeting the next day. He also thanked everyone for their assistance with the IEEs, which are a critical requirement of the project.

2. Approval of Minutes of Sept. 23, 2008
George Norton asked for approval of the minutes of the September 23, 2008 meeting, which had been made available for participants to review. A motion to approve them was made by Merle Shepard, seconded by Sue Tolin, and approved unanimously with no additional discussion.

3. Program Overview – R. Muniappan
Muniappan began this portion of the meeting by highlighting items in the participant packets, such as the new IPM Newsletter, *the BuZz*. He briefly turned the floor over to Merle Shepard, in attendance for Mike Hammig, who introduced Gerry Carner and guest Eric Benson, who had spent time in Indonesia. Muniappan then reviewed the IPM program with a PowerPoint presentation. He reminded participants that semiannual reports are due on April 15, trip reports are due within 30 days of completion, and travel requests need to be turned in even if travel is from one country to another.

De Datta inquired about the technologies taken from developing countries to developed countries, citing the example of grafting work done in Ohio State. Sally Miller explained this process and how she is working with North Carolina State and the University of Minnesota on developing this idea, which is growing in popularity and increasing in interest for use in higher value crops. De Datta praised this story as an example of how the technology is applicable to farmers in the United States, not just those overseas, and stated that this story needs to be told more widely. Sally mentioned another instance of the Tomato Yellow Leaf Curl virus that Bob Gilbertson had incorporated into his work; he would not have known about it had he not worked in Mali. Doug Pfeiffer added that he also integrates his IPM CRSP work into his classes to show students how important it is. De Datta urged everyone to share these stories with USAID; Miriam Rich replied that USAID recently started a “Telling Our Story” section on their website to promote these types of success stories. Bob Hedlund added that they [USAID] hired a new webmaster approximately one month ago. De Datta emphasized the need to tell the story about how the IPM CRSP is impacting the United States, not merely developing countries, and how all information needs to be pulled together in a coordinated and comprehensive way.

Sam Kyamanywa asked whether people training in Uganda have to be put into TraiNet, and Hedlund replied that you do not need to do this; Muniappan then briefly reviewed the criteria for entering data into TraiNet. Vaughan added that when training is documented and mentioned in a report, the matter is adequately covered. De Datta emphasized the need to tell the story about how the IPM CRSP is impacting the United States, not merely developing countries, and how all information needs to be pulled together in a coordinated and comprehensive way.
Hedlund followed up with a brief history of the TraiNet system. De Datta stated that TraiNet will be required for short-term, long-term training, and a discussion of using J-1 visas ensued. Norton cautioned that the J-1 requirements for graduate students will mean fewer host country students down the road on the project. Kyamanywa inquired as to whether or not there is a mechanism for a “fast-track” status for people who come to the United States frequently. Norton remarked that it is necessary to remain in compliance regarding the visa status of visitors, but the issue can often be problematic.

Norton provided a summary of Kitty Cardwell’s comments as external member of the Technical Committee. She had gone through the annual report and provided some feedback. She was surprised that there wasn’t more threshold analysis, and also thought that the program should be surveying plant pests, which she wants real-time everywhere on the project. Sue Tolin commented that these suggestions take far more funding than what is currently available, but it is a goal for which the project should strive. Norton added that Cardwell had praise for the gender analysis going on as well as the pesticide safety work and the IPDN work, but called for more coordination between IPDN and NPDN and more work on impacts assessment. Her comments are available for committee members’ review. De Datta remarked that Virginia Tech President Charles Steger felt there should be more IT in all the projects and found it interesting that Cardwell had said something similar. Tolin noted that the capability for web-based tracking on a real-time basis has just come into the United States; Merle Shepard added that the whole economic threshold issue is largely a Western mindset. Many developing countries in which IPM is practiced do not have this available to them, and he takes issue with it.

4. **EGAT meeting – Larry Vaughan**

Vaughan reviewed the Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade (EGAT) meeting that took place about a month ago; all IPM CRSP programs fall under EGAT. This was the first meeting for the new office director, Josette Lewis, which permitted her to become more familiar with the programs. She concentrated her remarks on the new section on the USAID website, “Telling Our Story,” which serves as a higher-level telling of the story of the importance of CRSPs to USAID. Lewis mentioned that within USAID, outside of EGAT, there is a feeling that CRSPs are earmark entitlements and that people do not appreciate the importance of CRSPs to agriculture. An important component of the meeting was the discussion of how these stories can be publicized, both short-term and also long-term. There are six topics on which they focus:

- Pathways from poverty
- Linking farmers to market
- Technology for improved product
- Increasing nutrition
- Institutional development
- Managing risk in a developing world

The need to focus on the Initiative to End Hunger in Africa (IEHA) was also discussed. Hedlund pointed out that although it was a presidential initiative, it was begun during the previous administration; a new initiative is forthcoming that will have some of the same goals, but possibly not exactly the same. An announcement will be made with the details
of the new program. Vaughan commented that the CRSPs had previously been criticized for not providing appropriate data, as well as having been told that the data they had provided was not used; he expressed frustration that they had not been informed sooner in order to make changes in response. Hedlund noted that in a new initiative the number of countries may be expanded, possibly to include Asian countries as well. De Datta inquired as to whether or not nutrition was a part of the IEHA.

5. Progress Reports
Norton introduced this section of the meeting as an opportunity for participants to comment on their progress. Each presentation was followed by a short question-and-answer session.

A. George Norton:
   6 components of IPM CRSP impact assessment program (PowerPoint)

Hedlund asked if this presentation meant that in September a write-up will be issued detailing the type of economic impact the IPM CRSP has had on people’s lives in developing countries; George replied that it would. De Datta commented that the table showing dollar amounts was very impressive and asked if there were similar figures to show the number of people impacted. George stated that those numbers have never been measured; instead, surveys that include adoption questions are conducted. Those adoption data could then be extrapolated, but have not been.

Vaughan asked who was adopting, and if it had been categorized by income. Norton commented that this was an issue that had been looked at in Uganda. The researchers calculated a poverty rate and set it at $1/day at first, but then ended up setting it at .75/day in Uganda, because it’s so poor. It can happen that one can have everybody close to the poverty line. It’s important to note that there are 3 different measures. One needs to look at the poverty before (the intervention), look at where the income goes, and then see how rates change before and after the introduction of new technology. One needs to consider the producers and the consumers. Results are sensitive depending on how one models things. According to Norton, even one percent is an effect. A 3% effect is not bad.

De Datta commented that some of the anecdotal stories are outstanding; he cited as an example the woman he met when he traveled to Nepal who is planning to use the extra money she is now making to provide an education for her children. He added that while in Bangladesh, farmers told him they are also sending their grandchildren to school with the extra money they can now earn. These types of stories cannot be quantified into numbers; he mentioned an additional story regarding women doing grafting in Jessore and stated that these stories are so much more meaningful than all the numbers. Norton replied that these stories are built into their reports and presentations.

B. Yulu Xia
   The Information Technology and Database Theme (PowerPoint)
Yulu Xia introduced collaborator Tom Reardon.
C. Sue Tolin  
Insect-Transmitted Virus Global Theme (PowerPoint)  
Tolin stated that she recently returned from a trip to Honduras and the Dominican Republic, and has a graduate student working with Sally Miller on the International Plant Diagnostic Network (IPDN).

Kyamanywa commented that in Africa there are challenges in raising pepper, and asked if some resistant varieties could be procured. Sue referred him to Alfredo Rueda; Sally Miller added that a virology lab is being set up in Uganda as part of a food security project, and she will also discuss this with him.

D. Naidu Rayapati  
Tospoviruses (PowerPoint)  

De Datta inquired as to which institutions are developing virus-resistant germplasm. Tolin replied that AVRDC (World Vegetable Center) has a large program focusing on that topic, and an Israeli company is developing one as well, but she was unaware of anyone doing research on how that affected hot pepper, such as Scotch bonnet.

E. Sally Miller  
IPDN (PowerPoint)  

Shepard pointed out that the photo of a pawpaw is also known as papaya.

Yulu Xia asked if there were obstacles with funding from the Gates Foundation; Miller replied that there seemed to be some caution on the part of the foundation due to stock market losses, as well as the fact that they are not British.

F. Wondi Mersie  
Parthenium (PowerPoint)  

Tolin asked if it was the same variety of weed that appears in the Caribbean; Wondi answered in the affirmative. Rayapati added that Parthenium is an alternate host for the tobacco streak virus, which is widespread and a serious problem with many different vegetable crops; the disease is transmitted by thrips carrying the pollen.

G. Doug Pfeiffer  
Eastern Europe (PowerPoint)  

Xia inquired as to the quality and availability of the Internet connections in Eastern Europe. Pfeiffer answered that there is some but that it’s not as widespread as in the United States; specialists, extension personnel, and some farmers do have access to the Internet.

H. Karim Maredia  
Central Asia (PowerPoint)
I. Merle Shepard  
Southeast Asia (PowerPoint)

Shepard noted that the system is always changing and there are always new things cropping up. De Datta noted that the two universities mentioned are considered rather weak and asked why he chose those particular ones. Shepard replied that Bogor is the most prestigious, while Sam Ratulangi is not so constrained by administrative-type issues. Government labs can become enmeshed in bureaucracy and it can be problematic to get out into the field. Xia asked what his experience was with extension systems in developing countries; Shepard’s response was that it is necessary to work with strong farmer leaders to compensate for the weak extension systems.

J. Ed Rajotte – South Asia (PowerPoint)

Rajotte discussed the story of cuelure, which prompted De Datta to expound on the successes of IPM in encouraging the use of sticky traps.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 for a lunch break and reconvened at 1:10. At this time, the group was joined by Larry Olson and Joe Kovach from Ohio State, who represented Mark Erbaugh.

K. Don Mullins – West Africa (PowerPoint)

De Datta asked what type of impacts the residue analysis lab has had. Mullins replied that they are not yet certified; they must first demonstrate they can do certain kinds of analysis. The rapid extraction and analysis of fruits and vegetables is still a problem; their equipment is aging and new instruments must be added every few years. Vaughan noted that they are now doing contract research; Mullins clarified that they have moved to a fee-basis analysis for internal consumption, which is not overseen by regulations.

L. Joe Kovach – East Africa (PowerPoint)

Kovach made the observation that things must be done differently at different elevations.

Muniappan asked about the status of grafting, since it was not mentioned in the presentation. Kyamanywa stated that they are doing quite a bit of it, including testing of stalks received from AVRDC. Rayapati mentioned a project that ICIPE is conducting on IPM management of thrips diseases, funded by GTZ, and asked if the two projects were connected; Kyamanywa replied that they were somewhat related.

M. Jeff Alwang – Latin America and the Caribbean (PowerPoint)

Miller mentioned that she had attended a meeting in Africa in October and had met a man with whom Jeff might be interested in networking; she will provide him with the name. Shepard asked if the banana weevil was the same variety as that in South Asia; Muniappan answered in the affirmative. Shepard asked if there were any pheromone trappings taking place; Alwang replied that some have been done. De Datta noted that the
presentation indicated some publications have been published in plant protection journals and asked if these reports were also able to be published in ag-econ journals; Alwang replied that they could be.

Norton then opened the floor for general discussion.

6. One-Sentence Program Highlight Re-Cap

De Datta asked that every presenter say ONE thing that they felt was the most important for them.

**George Norton**: In terms of the impact of the impact—a couple of the articles, especially the one on poverty assessment, as well as having standardization of impact assessment methods, which can help make credible the documentation of millions of dollars of impact.

**Yulu Xia**: My goal is to enrich every country.

**Sue Tolin**: Virus management—we have increased the awareness of scientific knowledge about viruses and how that fits that into an IPM scheme.

**Sally Miller**: Just the establishment of this network, getting these people together who’ve never gotten together before.

**Wondie Mersie**: The baseline quarantine facility and the training of five staff members in quarantine procedures.

**Doug Pfeiffer**: Bringing non-chemical control tactics to IPM; we’ve had great success using cultural methods in developing non-pesticidal control tactics.

**Merle Shepard**: The farmer production of microbials.

**George Norton for Ed Rajotte**: The grafting and pheromones.

**Naidu Rayapati**: Bringing awareness and education to India regarding thrips, tospoviruses, and diagnostic technologies.

**Don Mullins**: The pesticide safety training, which serves as a means/model for other practices and for developing a philosophy. The concern in developing all types of disease diagnostics for disease management.

**Sam Kyamanywa for Mark Erbaugh**: The awareness we have created among farmers that pesticide use is not good; it shows we have developed human capacity—people learning to work together.

**Jeff Alwang**: Human capacity is the biggest long-term impact; also the cacao plantain package—45,000 hectares that have benefited from IPM research.
De Datta remarked on the huge impact of the IPM CRSP, comparing where the program was in 1993 and where it is now. Maria Elisa Christie responded that regarding gender, some things have been done but they are not enough. There have been some major gains but very little response to the additional gender funds. Although some projects were previously incorporating gender work, there are still things that need to be done to improve women’s involvement. Christie pointed out that there is evidence showing that when women are permitted to become involved, things really improve; she stated that involving women is not only investing in women—they are capable economic agents and, if sought out, can ensure a successful experiment. There has been sufficient documentation to prove that gender can indeed be incorporated into IPM, but one project cannot carry the entire program, and more investment in the younger generation is necessary. De Datta inquired as to whether or not the next RFA should have more stringent requirements written into it; Christie replied that there is understanding and interest in many if not most of the projects already featured. Alwang added that he had always been impressed by what he had perceived to be the scope of incorporation of gender into INIAP in Ecuador, but Kathleen DeWalt had said that it was not as extensive as it appeared, and people often overstate the reality. Christie acknowledged that it does require persistence and commented that Alwang’s project actually did do something with gender; it is available on the IPM website and can be downloaded.

7. Larry Vaughan – IEEs
Vaughan stated that the PERSUAPs have been completed; now the needs for the next phase of the IPM CRSP should be anticipated. Vaughan stated that the reports are a means of obtaining USAID’s approval for completed work, but the second half, which contains the “Safe Use Action Plan,” indicates a commitment on the part of the IPM CRSP that the products are used in a safe manner and people have been properly trained in the use of these products. He emphasized the importance of making the effort to train people who have not already received the necessary instruction. Vaughan cautioned participants to make sure that the required personal protection equipment is actually available; i.e., it may be necessary to purchase gloves to be taken to the host country, and reminded everyone that the Safe Use Action Plan is really a commitment as well.

De Datta asked if all of the reports were found in one place; Vaughan responded that there was a template on the IPM CRSP website. De Datta recommended that for more favorable results, the template be removed and all the reports be compiled into a single hard-copy document to facilitate their review by USAID. Hedlund replied that such a step would be unnecessary, as USAID is well aware of the IEE capabilities of the IPM CRSP, and cited the Heinz tomato project and the ACDI Voca project in Haiti as examples of the reputation IPM CRSP already enjoys for excellence. He stated that everybody is well aware that if they experience any trouble with an IEE, the IPM CRSP is there as a resource. De Datta pointed out that institutional players often change, and it could be useful and relevant to have something in place. Norton suggested that an IEE section in the web page would suffice.

Kyamanywa commented that the IEE had become a big problem for his project and expressed his thanks to the ME for their assistance. Tolin asked if the tomato seed to which he had referred in his report was produced in the region; Kyamanywa replied that
the participants were saving their own seeds, which created the most pressing problem. Rayapati noted that whether these viruses are really seed-borne or not should be carefully documented.

The group adjourned at 2:30 for a brief coffee break and reconvened at 3:00.

8. Renewal of IPM CRSP – Phase IV
Hedlund stated that, as expected, the CRSP will likely be renewed for another five years in August or September. During the past 5 years, the awards actually became four-year awards due to the length of time required to process them. USAID is going to request that everyone rebid for the next competitive round of awards; no current award is going to be automatically extended. The terms of the competitive bidding process will give everybody with an existing award equal footing, although having significantly more experience may prove to be an advantage. But it is necessary to structure the awards in this manner; there will be no automatic renewals, and proposals must be submitted for panel review for all sub-awards. All participants who wish to continue their existing work will have to cite their accomplishments. Hedlund emphasized that this will be a highly competitive process with no one being given a distinct advantage.

Hedlund expressed his hope that all proposals will be evaluated by October 1. Although there are expense details that must be resolved before he can give the ME instructions to begin the process, he noted that others at Virginia Tech have started this and have provided what appears to be a good example. A letter with further information will be issued. Originally a stipulation for 25% IEHA\(^1\) spending requirement had been in place, although the new initiative that will replace IEHA will likely be substituted. Other topics for compliance will be added as well, such as conditions that will strengthen the gender requirement. Hedlund added that the IPM CRSP has been praised by both bodies—EEP and AMR—for being so broad, yet at the same time cautioned that they were spreading themselves far too thin with limited funds. A more focused list of countries will probably be recommended, which will likely result in combining programs and/or dropping one or more regional programs. Hedlund concluded his presentation by stating that if programs are going well, USAID should honor the funding at $3M/year for another five years.

De Datta commented that more information must be available before they can accurately respond to the proposed plans; however, regardless of whether a project has been in existence long-term or about to begin, they will focus on whatever is started knowing that it must be finished within five years. He stated that very specific guidelines for gender had been written into the current RFAs and all proposals accepted had a strong plan on gender. He assured Hedlund that there would be a management team in place and that it will have the expertise necessary to do IEEs and to make sure everything is in place. De Datta agreed that this cannot be perceived as an entitlement and promised to write a tight RFA that evaluators can see stands strong on merit alone. He recommended Kitty Cardwell as a potential candidate for an evaluator based on her history of international experience. De Datta also offered to address comments from last year’s AMR in the RFA, clarifying all critical points and sharing information in a transparent manner. He

\(^{1}\) This 25% requirement was not included in the RFA from USAID.
reiterated his own expectation that whatever work is started will be finished in five years in order to guarantee the success and continuity of IPM CRSP, stating that if IPM CRSP were to die, he would feel as if they had failed the world community.

Hedlund summarized his announcement as a call for a workplan for a five-year extension with the aforementioned changes, emphasizing his concern that all were aware of the need for a more focused approach that would result in fewer sub-awards with fewer countries. He added that the plan is to get the informational letters sent before August, but that is the latest date anticipated for USAID to receive notification of their funding capability. Alwang stated that the previous process was made more difficult due to lack of guidance regarding resources; they were told to request more than required, which complicated the subsequent cutting back of funds; he asked that the proposals be written in a more realistic manner this time. Miller wondered how much influence the current TC would have on the process, and expressed concerns that the RFA could be totally wide open with no clarification as to who would decide the global themes that would be merged. Norton answered that the programs do have different lengths of time, and it would be necessary to show the demonstrated regional programs, noting that the key is in the wording of the RFA to state that it is a five-year project. De Datta clarified that the ME would be responsible for writing the RFA. Kyamanywa inquired as to whether there might be alternative methods of submitting bids for the projects, as they had originally prepared a kind of ten-year proposal for this phase. Hedlund explained that the application submitted previously contained a percentage of the funds to carry on valuable research without competition, and said that a similar application can be prepared, but funding got mixed up with pipeline left over from the previous award. Kyamanywa responded that he still wanted competition, but felt that the competition should come from within the group.

De Datta then asked Larry Olsen, as chairman of our board, to provide feedback on the correct balance for successful project management and asked if perhaps the IPM CRSP had too many programs. De Datta compared IPM to another CRSP for which he serves as the PI, noting that they have far fewer projects and a lot more money, yet have not accomplished as much. Olsen replied that during the first IPM meeting he had attended, he observed participants stating that they had too much to do and not enough funding. Norton agreed that a minimum of $100,000 per region each year is necessary in order to sustain training and all other elements of a project. Alwang concurred, stating that funding for Ecuador is now only $28,000 per year in contrast to the peak funding of $128,000; this decrease reduces the influence and impact a project can have in a country. De Datta pointed out that this is the type of situation where the EEP will have to make a judgment. Several participants added that the number of countries involved in the project does have an impact; Tolin explained that the global themes component consisted of four countries, two IARCs, and two U.S. investigators, which is too little to be effective; more buy-in from the regional sites is required in order to be successful. People do stay with the projects because they want to learn something.

Olsen agreed that it will be difficult for the ME to prescribe how the regionalization can be implemented in the new RFAs. Norton suggested that they specify the number of
global themes and regional themes and do nothing further. De Datta reminded them that this time the yearly budget will be for $3M. Miller added that another problem is a lack of coordination between global themes and regional sites, and suggested writing a quota for proportional bids into the submitted proposals. Pfeiffer pointed out that doing so could potentially assume an equal allocation to each project, even though a small project would not have as much to give. More discussion of Miller’s proposal followed, including an idea from Josette Lewis to diversify into staple crops rather than concentrate exclusively on high-value crops. Hedlund cautioned against that, since the CG centers do staple crops and eliminate the competitive advantage of the CRSP. Instead, he suggested working to reword the proposals in different formats. Norton proposed having the EEP review the RFP for continuity; De Datta agreed that he reads other CRSP impacts and would like someone to compare all the CRSP reports to see how IPM compares. Alwang argued that this would not be a good comparison and what needs to be studied is what is currently being done versus what could be done with additional funding. De Datta noted that all input will be taken into account.

Olsen observed that there is no single model for regional coordination that is a model. He recommended that participants talk with one another about what works and does not work in coordination models. Norton agreed that as reports are read, some models do appear to work better than others. Tolin asked if a description of the management plan should be incorporated into the regional proposal, but Norton cautioned that a management plan in one situation may not be appropriate for another. Mullins suggested focusing on lessons learned and writing those ideas into how funding will be managed in order to improve pipeline; he noted that lapses in communication have sometimes led to misunderstandings as to the worth and value of project components. Rajotte concurred that many of these projects had been under stress the last several years and things fell through the cracks. Miller agreed, adding that having to leverage additional money caused further pressure; Alwang added that most participants could not do this work unless they had the assistance of a graduate student. Rajotte noted that in order for it to work, there had to be one person who “rides herd;” if it is perceived to be a difficult and frustrating experience, many are discouraged from doing it. Miller suggested an alternative strategy of having certain levels in place combined with the option of going out for a specific project. Alwang commented that he has missed the degree of multidisciplinarity that had been involved previously; he felt he had benefited from working with an entomologist, for example, to give him the opportunity to piece things together in a team approach. He stated that the team approach emphasizes thinking together, which creates a much more sensible program, and expressed his regrets that it is part of what has been sacrificed due to budget constraints. Rajotte agreed that the system had worked very well for the first twelve years.

9. Closing Remarks – Bob Hedlund and SK De Datta
Hedlund thanked everyone for their presentations and stated that he appreciated seeing the accomplishments. He felt that the format for this meeting was conducive to showcasing the work. Hedlund acknowledged that everyone has very busy schedules, and that the work necessary to prepare for the next round of proposals is neither trivial nor inconsequential. He expressed his pleasure at having worked in this realm for the past 16 years as well as his opinion that this meeting was one of the most positive TC sessions to
date. Hedlund encouraged everyone to attend the posters and presentations of other colleagues at the conference to get additional ideas.

De Datta announced that there would be an award presentation at the next day’s luncheon and invited everyone to attend. He expressed his pride with all participants and the work they have accomplished, noting that this will be the last TC meeting of this phase. De Datta reiterated his praise for the group on behalf of the ME and added particular thanks to Norton and his tireless efforts as the chair, noting that he is respected because of his fairness. He also thanked Hedlund for looking out for the best interests of the IPM CRSP.

De Datta remarked that the TC had been fully engaged in order to ensure the success of the IPM CRSP. He thanked Larry Olsen for his presence at the meeting, which gave him the chance to see how the TC functions. He also acknowledged that the program can do better, and will incorporate the pointers given by the EEP as well as by the AMR. De Datta next thanked his hard-working ME colleagues, and assured everyone that all their suggestions will be considered, even if they cannot all be implemented. He predicted that IPM CRSP will extend far beyond the year 2014.

Hedlund added that before leaving on Friday, he did accruals for the most recent quarter; IPM CRSP has $1.4 M left for the last 6 months. Norton reminded everyone that on Thursday morning there will be several conference sessions featuring the IPM CRSP, including one led by Short Heinrichs. De Datta also thanked Debbie Francis and Annie Steed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.