

2017 Current Fiscal Year Report: Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture

Report Run Date: 06/19/2019 03:27:17 PM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Agriculture

2. Fiscal Year

2017

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture

3b. GSA Committee No.

16568

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

03/13/2015

6. Expected Renewal Date

03/13/2017

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

Yes

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

03/13/2017

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Terminate

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

No

10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority

Agency Authority

12. Specific Establishment Authority

Agency Decision Document

13. Effective Date

02/13/2003

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

Other Committee

16a. Total Number of Reports

1

16b. Report Date

12/08/2016

Report Title

A Framework for Local Coexistence Discussions

Number of Committee Reports Listed: 1

17a. Open 0 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 0

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$13,000.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00

18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$300.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$13,300.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.10	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

To maintain an intensive and regular dialogue to explore and understand the broad array of issues related to the expanding dimensions and importance of agricultural biotechnology, including: beneficial new agricultural products; assure the safety of new products with a science based approach; protecting public health and safety, the natural environment; contributing to long-term global food needs; and maintain a competitive position for American agricultural products in the international environment. The Committee is charged with examining the long-term impacts of biotechnology on the U.S. food and agriculture system and USDA, and providing guidance to USDA on pressing individual issues, identified by the Office of the Secretary, related to the application of biotechnology in agriculture. The AC21 delivered a major report to USDA in November 2012 on enhancing coexistence between different agricultural production methods. In a follow-up addressing a recommendation in that report that USDA lacks the authority to implement, in December 2015, the AC21 received a new charge, namely, In the AC21's November 2012 report to USDA, the Committee recommended that USDA provide incentives for neighboring farmers to develop joint coexistence plans. It has been determined that USDA currently lacks the authority to put in place such incentives. Is there an approach by which farmers could be encouraged to work with their neighbors to develop joint coexistence plans at the state or local level? If so, how might the Federal government assist in that process? To address this charge, 3 ad hoc subcommittees were established after the December 2015 meeting to gather information for the full committee to consider: an Identity-Preserved Production Guidance Document subcommittee, composed of Mary-Howell Martens, Paul Anderson, Gregory Jaffe, Alan Kemper, Darren Ihnen, Lynn Clarkson, and Angela Olsen; a Models and Incentives for Local Coexistence Conversations subcommittee, composed of Marty Matlock, David Johnston, Jerry Slocum, Douglas Goehring, Isaura Andaluz, Laura Batcha, and Keith Kisling; and a Venues and Conveners for Local Coexistence Discussions subcommittee, composed of Latresia Wilson, Leon Corzine, Josette Lewis, Barry Bushue, Melissa Hughes, and Charles Benbrook.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Membership consists of 20 to 25 individuals who will be knowledgeable in one or more of the following areas: recombinant-DNA (rDNA) research and applications using plants,

animals, and microbes; food science; silviculture and related forest science; fisheries science; ecology; veterinary medicine; the broad range of farming or agricultural practices; weed science; entomology; nematology; plant pathology; biodiversity; applicable laws and regulations relevant to agricultural biotechnology policy; risk assessment; consumer advocacy and public attitudes; public health/epidemiology; ethics, including bioethics; human medicine; biotechnology industry activities and structure; intellectual property rights systems; and international trade.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

When a specific charge is set for the committee's work by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Committee may meet 4 times a year. The meetings are vital for USDA to address new and ongoing issues revolving around biotechnology in agriculture.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

The topics the Committee will be considering are complex and of crucial concern in the conduct of agricultural biotechnology research, regulation, and commercialization. USDA believes it is important to maintain an intensive and regular dialogue to explore and understand all aspects of the issues dealing with agriculture and biotechnology, and believes the advisory committee process is the best forum for this dialogue. The Committee provides USDA with advice on individual issues identified by the Secretary, and provides USDA with an analytical tool for anticipating long-term biotechnology impacts on agriculture that cannot be provided through any other source.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

Not applicable.

21. Remarks

The Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture (AC21) completed all substantive in four previous fiscal year meetings. There were no meetings in FY2017; however, the report was finalized and delivered to the Secretary of Agriculture during the first quarter of this fiscal year (12/2016). Cost associated for this committee's activities to the complete the report and initiate the charter renewal.

Designated Federal Officer

Michael G. Schechtman Biotechnology Coordinator

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Andaluz, Isaura	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Executive Director, Cuatro Puertas	Representative Member

Anderson, Paul	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Executive Director, International Programs, Donald Danforth Plant Science Center (retired)	Representative Member
Batcha, Laura	06/24/2013	06/23/2017	Executive Director	Representative Member
Benbrook, Charles	06/24/2011	06/24/2017	President, Benbrook Consulting Services	Representative Member
Bushue, Barry	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Farmer and President, Oregon Farm Bureau	Representative Member
Clarkson, Lynn	06/24/2013	06/23/2017	President, Clarkson Grain Company	Representative Member
Corzine, Leon	06/24/2013	06/23/2017	Farmer	Representative Member
Goehring, Douglas	06/24/2013	06/23/2017	North Dakota Commissioner of Agriculture	Representative Member
Hughes, Melissa	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Corporate Counsel/Director of Government Affairs, CROPP Cooperative/Organic Valley Family of Farms	Representative Member
Ihnen, Darrin	06/24/2013	06/23/2017	Farmer	Representative Member
Jaffe, Gregory	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Director, Biotechnology Project, Center for Science in the Public Interest	Representative Member
Johnson, David	06/24/2013	06/24/2017	crop breeder	Representative Member
Kemper, Alan	07/25/2013	07/24/2017	Farmer	Representative Member
Kisling, Keith	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Farmer	Representative Member
Lewis, Josette	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Associate Director, World Food Center, University of California at Davis	Representative Member
Martens, Mary-Howell	06/24/2013	06/23/2017	Farmer and Manager, Lakeview Organic Grain, LLC	Representative Member
Matlock, Marty	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Professor of Ecological Engineering, University of Arkansas	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Olsen, Angela	06/24/2013	06/23/2017	Senior Advisor and Associate General Counsel, DuPont Company/Pioneer Hi-Bred	Representative Member
Redding, Russell	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Pennsylvania Secretary of Agriculture	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Slocum, Jerome	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Farmer and President, North Mississippi Grain Company	Representative Member
Wilson, Latresia	06/24/2011	06/23/2017	Vice President, Black farmers and Agriculturalists, FL Chapter, and Emergency Room Physician	Representative Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 21

Narrative Description

The AC21 considers broad topics and issues that have arisen or will arise as agricultural biotechnology is used in the future. Though the AC21 is supported by USDA's Agricultural Research Service, it has focused thus far on identifying or clarifying such topics and issues for the whole of USDA, which can lead to better prioritization, policies, and resource allocations for the Department. Because of the broad range of opinions represented on the committee, few recommendations emerged in the past. However, in 2011 the Bylaws and Operating Procedures were changed to encourage the development of recommendations for USDA. The last reports with substantive recommendations were released on December 2012 and December 2017.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety



- Trust in government
- Major policy changes
- Advance in scientific research
- Effective grant making
- Improved service delivery
- Increased customer satisfaction
- Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements
- Other

Outcome Comments

Much of the AC21's work prior to 2011 was fact-finding and there were few actual policy recommendations to be implemented. The committee report issued on November 19, 2012 offered significant new policy recommendations.

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- None
- Unable to Determine
- Under \$100,000
- \$100,000 - \$500,000
- \$500,001 - \$1,000,000
- \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000
- \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000
- Over \$10,000,000
- Cost Savings Other

Cost Savings Comments

The committee's work has not been directed toward cost saving.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

12

Number of Recommendations Comments

Total # of recommendations for the life of the committee = 12. The AC21's December 2016 report contained seven major numbered recommendations. 5 previous recommendations from the December 2012 report.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or

will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

NA

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

100%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

Portions of each of the 5 major recommendations from 2012 have been implemented: USDA has completed or begun implementation of nearly all recommended activities that it currently has the authority to implement. Because the recommendations vary widely in scope, duration, and impact, and some require new legal authority, it is difficult to provide a meaningful response at the level of sub-recommendations.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes No Not Applicable

Agency Feedback Comments

Because the report addresses activities of multiple USDA agencies, feedback about committee recommendations has come from the Office of the Secretary. The Secretary has indicated his intent to see how USDA can implement the recommendations, and the AC21 is being kept apprised on progress in their implementation.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

	Checked if Applies
Reorganized Priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

The AC21 did not propose new legislation but made several recommendations for USDA

actions that are likely to require new legal authorities in order for USDA to implement them. These will also likely entail the rulemaking process. Additionally, the AC21 did not perform any grant reviews. However, it did make recommendations for USDA research activities which will entail USDA review of grants in those areas.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

Not Applicable

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Contact DFO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Online Agency Web Site | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Online Committee Web Site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Online GSA FACA Web Site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Publications | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Access Comments

N/A