

PSEP Non-Government Workgroup Meeting #2 – January 28, 2013

Attendees: Allan Hovis (Bayer), Bob Magee (DuPont), Carol Black (Washington PSEP), Carol Somody (Syngenta), Don Renchie (Texas PSEP), John Jachetta (Dow), Liza Fleeson (Association of American Pesticide Control Officials), Renee Woody (North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services)

ACTION STEPS from Non-Government Workgroup – Meeting #1 (January 14, 2013)

ACTION STEP 1 – Draft spreadsheet with 1) a generic name for each option (i.e. – don't mention Ag Container Recycling Council (ACRC) – instead, National Repository), 2) description, 3) pro's and con's, 4) probable length of funding, 5) direct or managed funding (or both), 6) accountability, 7) overhead (Y/N), and 8) maximum contribution to avoid overhead.

ACTION STEP 2 – Determine if CropLife America (CLA), the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture Research Foundation (NASDARF), the National Agricultural Aviation Research and Educational Foundation (NAAREF), etc. can limit overhead when providing funds.

ACTION STEP 3 – Look at the Texas Pest Management Association as a possible model to support PSEP financially (as a partner to receive funds/distribute back to university, etc.)

ACTION STEP 4 – Start now on future PRIA. Contact CropLife America (Ray McAllister and Barbara Glenn).

DISCUSSION:

CLA is now working on the pros and cons of a dedicated national repository like ACRC for supporting the national Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP). ACRC is a non-profit, with a) member fees managed through CLA, b) most manufacturers contributing based on a formula, and c) a very tangible, quantitative work product.

CLA has also been contacted for guidance on when and how to get PSEP funding incorporated into the next round of Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) fee talks.

Of the four registrants on the call, Bayer and Syngenta have a separate foundation; Dow and DuPont do not. Dow and Syngenta would possibly prefer making grants to the PSEP program; DuPont pointed out that grant/expense decision would depend on the source budget (a selling expense if pro-rated/linked to products).

A foundation could prohibit overhead when making restricted gifts. Examples of foundations include NASDARF and CropLife Foundation (CLF). A foundation can specify no or limited overhead allowed on restricted gifts, using a Request for Applications (RFA) and, if desired, requiring a report and a university match on all or part of the gift. There are pros and cons to requiring a match – the match can compensate for overhead and even enhance funding, or reduce the ability of some PSEPs to apply for the funds (if no university match is possible). With an unrestricted gift, the university takes what overhead it wants, but some (“small”) unrestricted gifts can avoid overhead via university foundations or special accounts. Large gifts would likely invoke overhead and require a match.

Post-meeting input: The current USDA RFA for distributing the \$500K PRIA funds to PSEP requires a 50% match, which is in reality matching \$1:\$1. USDA provides \$10,000/state, and the university matches with \$10,000 (overhead included) for a \$20,000 project. If, for example, there is 23% overhead at the university, this results in \$15,400 for the PSEP from an external investment of \$10,000 ($\$7,700 + \$7,700 = \$15,400$ project).

ACTION STEP: Could CLA take a more direct role in applicator training? It was pointed out that this team should understand CropLife Canada’s (<http://www.croplife.ca/>) enhanced role in training Canadian applicators. PSEP would need to become a high priority in CLA for any enhanced role to occur in the US.

One question involved possible lack of interest by university personnel in restricted gifts, if no credit toward promotion is given by the university. However, many PSEP coordinators (not all) are non-tenure track but promotable, so the lack of credit may not be as much of an issue (but could be an issue for some). This is only one grant of many during a career, so it is not a make it/break it condition for promotion.

Some companies would NOT want to contribute directly to a PSEP, because there could be a challenge by outside entities that the money purchased favor. With small gifts to PSEPs, this has not been a problem to date.

Future PRIA funding enabling language for PSEP should designate a cap on overhead charges, because the current PRIA funding for PSEP specifies no overhead cap. Thus, the current university overhead rate on PRIA funds for PSEP is whatever universities typically charge EPA for research, instruction, or other activities agreements.

Texas Pest Management Association takes a percentage fee (1%?) for receiving and distributing funds to Texas A&M University.

Completing Action Steps 1-3 requires a survey. The workgroup started to edit the questions below, and some additional proposed edits were added after the meeting.

Please add/modify survey questions in track mode – we would like to gather as much pertinent information as possible. Recipients would include a number of the organizations on this team, plus key commodity groups and other non-government organizations that should have an interest in PSEP.

Non-Government Survey on Processing or Providing Funds for PSEP

The following questions refer to your organization's possible role in providing and/or distributing non-government grants.

1. FOR FOUNDATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS - Ability to Process Unrestricted Gifts, Grants, and/or Endowments from a Third Party to PSEP:

Can you currently process unrestricted gifts, grants, and/or endowments (with no specified work plan or required reporting) that would be designated for disbursement to university pesticide safety education programs?

If so, would your organization take overhead for processing?

If so, please provide the approximate management fee OR percentage you would take for the following scenarios:

\$500,000 distributed according to a formula to 50 states -

\$1,000,000 distributed according to a formula to 50 states -

\$3,000,000 distributed according to a formula to 50 states -

NOTE: Determine the minimum you can bill for services provided (communications to donors and recipients, contracts, payments, reporting, financial accountability, etc.)

Do you have the ability to limit/prohibit overhead by any university willing to accept the gift, grant, and/or endowment?

If so, is this because of a provision in your by-laws or policies or can you simply stipulate that requirement in order to process the gift, grant, and/or endowment?

If you cannot currently do this, would your organization be willing and able to consider this additional function?

If so, what information would you need?

2. FOR FOUNDATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS - Ability to Process Restricted Contracts from a Third Party to PSEP:

Can you currently process restricted contracts (with a specified work plan and required reporting) that would be designated for disbursement to university pesticide safety education programs?

If so, would your organization take overhead for processing?

If so, please provide the approximate management fee OR percentage you would take for the following scenarios:

\$500,000 distributed according to a formula to 50 states -

\$1,000,000 distributed according to a formula to 50 states -

\$3,000,000 distributed according to a formula to 50 states -

NOTE: Determine the minimum you can bill for services provided (communication to donors and recipients, contracts, payments, reporting, financial accountability, etc.)

Do you have the ability to limit/prohibit overhead to any university willing to enter into a contract?

If so, is this because of a provision in your by-laws or policies or can you simply stipulate that requirement in order to process the contract

If you cannot currently do this, would your organization be willing and able to consider this additional function?

If so, what information would you need?

3. FOR REGISTRANTS, FOUNDATIONS, and ASSOCIATIONS - Ability of Your Own Organization to Provide Unrestricted and/or Restricted Gifts, Grants, Endowments and/or Contracts:

Is your own organization able to provide gifts, grants, endowments, and/or contracts from your own funds to the Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP)?

What would be the range in length of any commitment? (e.g. 1 year, 1-2 years)

Can these be considered for renewal?

Are your gifts, grants, endowments, and/or contracts unrestricted, restricted, or both? (restricted with a scope of work is considered contract research with standard off-campus or full university overhead, and the capability to require a university match)

Do you have a provision in your by-laws or policies for limiting overhead that can be taken from these funds by a) a processing third party (e.g. NASDARF or CLF) or b) a university?

Do you proactively negotiate overhead on restricted gifts, or not?

4. FOR COMMODITY GROUPS:

Would it be possible to consider a commodity check-off specifically designated to the PSEP program? If so, what information would you need?