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Overview

- **Successes** - Food crops, crop grouping, ornamentals, biopesticides, public health, international harmonization.

- Annual Report and Year End Summary

- Infrastructure & Personnel

- **Challenges** – Funding & PRIA

- The Future
General Successes

• 70 new tolerances/382 new uses
  – 220 of those uses have been found on product labels

• 5 crop groups expansion/2 new crop group - codified
  ▪ Bulb Vegetable group - approved
  ▪ Small Berries and Fruit - approved
  ▪ Edible Fungi - approved
  ▪ Oilseed group –approved Dec. 8th, 2010
  ▪ Citrus Fruit group - approved Dec. 8th, 2010
  ▪ Fruiting Vegetables –approved Dec. 8th, 2010
  ▪ Pome Fruit group –approved Dec. 8th, 2010
  ▪ Stone Fruit group – Comments Nov. 9, 2011
  ▪ Tree Nut group – Comments Nov. 9, 2011
• **Ongoing crop groups**
  - Tropical Fruit group – under review
  - Herb and Spice group – under review
  - Leafy and Brassica Vegetables - under review
  - Codex parallel progress and expect fruit types to move forward in 2012, will also add “representative crops”.

• 4 new ornamental registrations and 4 amendments that impacted 2,572 Taxa/crops

• Bacteriophage of *Clavobacter michiganensis* subsp. *michiganensis* was registered on tomato and AF36 on corn.
General Successes

• Public Health Program
  – Expand registrations for existing PHP, Facilitate registrations for new technology and novel pesticides, Register products outside US to protect deployed US military personnel
    • Etofenprox – submitted in 2011
    • Resmethrin/Temephos – data requirements to maintain availability
    • New Technology
New Priority Setting Process

• On-line project nomination in Aug., by discipline: for 6\textsuperscript{th} year projects nominated as priority “A”/“B”/“C”, or not nominated (575 projects available) – FUW prioritization focused on projects that received at least one “A” nomination (211 projects)

• Regional differences in nomination of projects
• At the workshop, no quota of “A” priorities for any criteria (discipline, crop, etc.) – projects reviewed in the workshop by commodity within crop group, starting with Crop Group 1 thru Crop Group 99

• “First pass” thru 211 projects resulted in 70 projects with “A” priority

• Following discussions and “horse-trading,” 45 “A” priorities were assigned by 11 a.m. of day two (total time to review projects was ~7 hours)
Prioritization Criteria

• Availability and efficacy of alternatives
• Pest damage potential of target pest(s)
• Performance/crop safety
• Compatibility with IPM
• Use under a Section 18
• Harmonization implications due to lack of Int’l MRLs
• Other
2012 FUW

- August 15 – last day for PCRs
- August 17-30 – On line project nominations by discipline
- August 31 – FUW Printout available on website
- September 11-12 – FUW St Louis, MO
- Sept. 19 – tentative project list on website
- Oct. 3 – deadline Regional upgrades/PUPs
International

- Canada
- Codex
- Global Minor Use Summit
U.S. agricultural exports support additional services to harvest, process, package, store, transport and market product.

Economic Activity From Exports

- Supporting Business Activity = $92 Billion
- Exports = $62.3 Billion

Source: Calculated by FAS from data released by ERS/USDA
It Starts with the Pests!
• Growers can not manage production for specific export markets
• Processors mix production lots
• If there are no MRLs in major markets the pesticide is not used
Major Export Flows which drive need for harmonized MRLs
MRL Reality: Grower-Exporter’s Nightmare
MRL Harmonization: Grower-Exporter’s Wonderful World
Objective:

• Address grower pest control needs with safe effective products in a manner that does not affect trade markets

• To provide simultaneous submissions to both regulatory agencies (EPA and PMRA)

• Submissions reviewed and registrations approved in both countries at approximately the same time with harmonized tolerances/MRLs
Background:

– Started informally in 1996
– Mutual projects conducted jointly on both sides of the border - reduced data needs of each country
– From 2003 to 2012 overlap about 20 studies per year
– Data including residue, efficacy and tolerance have been collected
– Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC), will elevate joint work and reviews by Regulatory agencies
• Work with commodity groups and EPA to add uses to JMPR work plan
• Review JMPR work plan and dovetail IR-4 data with chemicals scheduled for review
• Work with EPA and Registrants to submit data to JMPR
• Consider working with other countries to nominate chemicals or add chemicals to JMPR workplan
Direct Contributions

Over $18 million

USDA-NIFA $12,180,000
USDA-ARS $ 4,000,000
USDA-ARS/DoD $ 250,000
USDA-FAS $ 500,000
USDA-APHIS $ 172,000
State Ag. Exp. Stations $ 481,182
Grants from Industry $ 1,100,000

Indirect Contributions

At least $18 million
Infrastructure & Personnel

• Laboratories
  – Closures
  – Leadership

• Field Sites

• HQ
  – Grace Lennon - SD
  – Carolyn Jolly – Writer, SD
  – Shiayi Huang - Database developer
  – Dave Thompson- E/S, research planing
Challenges

• Funding
  – Federal (NIFA & ARS)
    • Funding line consolidation
  – University
• PRIA Public Interest Finding
• Food Use Workshop Changes
USDA Budget: feedback

• FY2013 USDA Budget: feedback on proposed Crop Protection Program
  – Formal written comments
  – 7th International IPM Symposium Listening Session/March 29th
  – April 11 (via web and conference call)
  – April 16 Listening Session at NIFA offices
  – May 1, 2012 (via web and conference call)
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