



**INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR
COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE (IICA)**

NORTHERN REGIONAL CENTER (NRC)

**PROCINORTE Umbrella Task Force
Fourth Meeting**

EXECUTIVE REPORT

**Mexico, D.F.
August 7-8, 2001**

NORTHERN REGIONAL CENTER (NRC) PROCINORTE UMBRELLA TASK FORCE FOURTH MEETING

I BASIC INFORMATION

Date: August 7 and 8, 2001

Place: Mexico, D.F.

Participants: **See Annex I**

Agenda: **See Annex II**

II OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING

- Review the goals and objectives of PROCINORTE and evaluate if they are being met.
- Discuss the approval of two new initiatives (Tropical and Sub-Tropical Fruits and Animal and Plant Health Research).
- Exchange of information on national research priorities among the three countries of the region.
- Review and amend the Action Plan for the years 2001-2002.

III OPENING AND WORKING SESSIONS

3.1 The meeting was open by the Director of INIFAP (Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales, Agrícolas y Pecuarias) of Mexico, Dr. Jesus Moncada de la Fuente who, on behalf of the Mexican Government, welcomed the participants from Canada, the United States and IICA and ratified the willingness

and commitment of INIFAP to participate in the PROCINORTE Initiative.

Following Dr. Moncada's welcoming remarks, IICA's NRC Director and Representative in the USA, Mr. John Miranda, reviewed the history of PROCINORTE, outlined the objectives of the meeting, discussed the proposed agenda with the participants and thanked the Government of Mexico on behalf of IICA and the PROCINORTE members, for the support provided to carry out the meeting.

Mr. Miranda also provided specific information on the future meetings of the III Genetic Resources Task Force scheduled for September 20 and 21 in Ottawa, Canada (postponed due to the tragedy in the United States and rescheduled for November 8-9, 2001) and the VI Agricultural Library and Information Services Initiative meeting scheduled for October 17 and 18 in Mexico.

3.2 Presentations

During the meeting the following presentations and proposals were delivered by the participating agencies:

- Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales Agrícolas y Pecuarias (INIFAP): Institutional Orientations by Jesus Moncada de la Fuente.
- Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación (SAGARPA): National Agriculture Overview by Alejandro Trueba.
- Regional Cooperative Research Program for the Northern Region (PROCINORTE): General Overview by Rodrigo Aveldaño.
- Forum for the Americas on Agricultural Research and Technology Development (FORAGRO): Technological Information System for the Agricultural Sector of the Americas (INFOTEC) by Enrique Alarcón.

3.3 Discussions on the creation of two new task forces

- Task Force on Tropical and Sub-tropical Fruits: Dr. Brad Fraleigh of Canada presented the proposal to create this task force (**Annex III.**)

The presentation was followed by an exchange of points of view and comments:

a) Summary of the concluding remarks:

- There was a general consensus to move forward with the new task force.
- The appointment of representatives from each government to integrate the Task Force would take place during the month of August.
- The initial meeting would be scheduled for late October/early November.

b) General Guidelines for the First Meeting:

- Present background information on the NRC, PROCINORTE Umbrella and the other two Task Forces.
- Identify issues that are of common interest to the three countries.
- Possibility to identify one crop to study, specifically one that could make an impact.
- Think about setting-up a conference as a first activity.

- Look at separate actions for traditional and non-traditional crops.
 - The Task Force members will identify what specific topics should be considered.
- Task Force on Animal and Plant Health Research: Dr. Carol Kramer-LeBlanc and Ms. Monica Castillo from the United States delegation presented the proposal for the creation of this task force (**Annex IV.**)

The presentation was followed by the participants' discussions.

a) Summary of the concluding remarks:

- There was a general consensus to move forward with this initiative.
- The appointment of representatives from each government to integrate the Task Force would take place during the month of October. Two representatives would be designated, one for animals and one for plants.
- The initial meeting would be scheduled for December.

b) General Guidelines for the First Meeting:

- Identify common problems to the three countries focused on research.
- Present background information on the NRC, PROCINORTE Umbrella and two other Task Forces.
- Need to coordinate with the NRC Agriculture Health and Food Safety Steering Committee.

- The first meeting of this Task Force should include delegates from both the animal and plant areas and two alternates.
- It is important to maintain a relationship with other institutions such as The North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) and special groups both within The North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and outside the region, such as the International Regional Organization for Plant and Animal Health (OIRSA).
- The United States also presented two documents which shared a broad set of viewpoints on the two new task force concept papers. These documents are: U.S. Summary Comments on Animal/Plant Health Research Task Force Proposal, included as **Annex V** and the U.S. Summary Comments on Tropical and Sub-Tropical Fruit Task Force Proposal, included as **Annex VI**.

3.4 Regional Agricultural Research Priorities

With the objective to have a better understanding among the three countries of the region on the subject of regional agricultural research priorities, and in order to identify areas of common interest, each country made a presentation covering aspects of their institutional framework, policies, Websites and Home Pages. The participants agreed to define a set of regional research priorities, working step by step.

A summary of the Canadian presentation appears as **Annex VII**. A PowerPoint version is available on request. The USA Executive Summary on Agricultural Research Priorities appears as **Annex VIII**.

Dr. Rodrigo Aveldaño complemented the presentation made by Dr. Moncada de la Puente during the opening of the meeting on

the subject of Mexican research priorities by adding that the topics of food safety, climate change, genetic resources, nutrition (maize), post harvest, are of high priority for Mexico.

During the month of September, INIFAP will unveil its Strategic Plan and Dr. Aveldaño offered to provide a summary on research priorities similar to the ones presented by Canada and the USA.

Dr. Enrique Alarcon presented an update on FORAGRO's actions subsequent to the meeting held in Mexico (2000), particularly those related to INFOTEC projects and activities carried out to move ahead with sub-regional and regional priorities. Initially, a synthesis of the three national reports could be prepared in consultation with and the support of IICA. This work could be prepared with a very preliminary vision of the priority topics for the countries in a single document, which will be consulted with the Task Force members.

3.5 PROCINORTE Action Plan 2001-2002

PROCINORTE's steering committee reviewed and updated the proposed Action Plan 2001-2002 keeping the same objectives but significantly reshaping the activities. The objectives were ratified as follows:

- Promote dialogue to identify priority research issues common to the three countries and to influence the regional, hemispheric and global agendas.
- Facilitate the exchange of experiences, information and training.
- Build linkages among public and private country institutions of the Northern region (PROCINORTE) and between the major research and technology transfer actors in the region, hemisphere and the world.
- Carry out joint activities among participating institutions in solving problems of mutual interest.

The complete Action Plan with its specific activities appears as **Annex IX**.

IV RESULTS

The following results were obtained during the IV Task Force meeting:

- 4.1 The new members of the PROCINORTE Umbrella Steering Committee ratified the priorities, goals and objectives of PROCINORTE.
- 4.2 The Committee approved two new specialized Task Forces which will begin later this year. The countries have the responsibility to designate their representatives for each task force and their first meetings will be planned for before the end of the calendar year.
- 4.3 The three countries reached a better understanding of the national research priorities to facilitate the process to identify common regional priorities in the future.
- 4.4 The Committee agreed to explore the possibility to have the PROCINORTE Steering Committee meet with the other PROCIs Steering Committees during the next FORAGRO meeting in 2002.
- 4.5 A new Action Plan for 2001-2002 containing four objectives and new activities, including the newly approved two task forces.

V NEXT PROCINORTE MEETING

The V PROCINORTE Umbrella meeting has been tentatively scheduled for mid 2002 in Canada.

VI ANNEXES

- Annex I: Final List of Participants
- Annex II: Final Agenda

- Annex III: Task Force on Tropical and Sub-Tropical Fruits
- Annex IV: Task Force on Animal Health Research
- Annex V: U.S. Summary Comments on Animal/Plant Health Research Task Force Proposal
- Annex VI: U.S. Summary Comments on Tropical and Sub-Tropical Fruit Task Force Proposal
- Annex VII: Canadian Agricultural Research Priorities
- Annex VIII: USA Executive Summary on Agricultural Research Priorities
- Annex IX: Action Plan 2001-2002

ANNEX I – ANEXO I

***PROCINORTE UMBRELLA TASK FORCE
FOURTH MEETING
GRUPO DE TRABAJO PARAGUAS DEL PROCINORTE
CUARTA REUNION***

<i>FINAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS LISTA FINAL DE PARTICIPANTES</i>

CANADA

Brad Fraleigh
Special Advisor on Biodiversity and Genetic Resources
Research, Planning and Coordination Directorate
Research Branch
Agriculture and AgriFood Canada
Room 773, Sir John Carling
930 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C5 Canada
Phone: (613) 759-7847
Fax: (613) 759-7769
E-mail: fraleighb@em.agr.ca

MEXICO

Jesús Moncada de la Fuente
Director en Jefe
Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones
Forestales, Agrícolas y Pecuarias (INIFAP)
Serapio Rendón No. 83 –3er Piso
Colonia San Rafael
06470 México, D.F., México
Telefono: (525) 566-3638
Fax: (525) 546-4235
E-mail: moncadaj@inifap.conacyt.mx

Rodrigo Aveldaño Salazar
Director General de la División Agrícola
Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales,
Agrícolas y Pecuarias (INIFAP)
Serapio Rendón No. 83 – 2do Piso
Col. San Rafael
06470 México, D.F., México
Tel. (525) 140-1651
Fax: (525) 546-9020
E-mail: aveldar@inifap.conacyt.mx

Miguel Moneta Porto
Coordinación de Intercambio Científico
Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales,
Agrícolas y Pecuarias
Serapio Rendón No. 83
Col. San Rafael
06470 México, D.F. México
Tel. (525) 5140-1659
Fax: (525) 5546-3621
E-mail: atenom@inifap2.inifap.conacyt.mx

Alfredo Zamarripa Colmenero
Director de Cultivos Industriales y de Exportaciones
Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales,
Agrícolas y Pecuarias
Serapio Rendón No. 83
Col. San Rafael
06470 México, D.F. México
Tel. (525) 5140-1651
Fax: (525) 546-9020

Gustavo Frías Treviño
Director de Regulación Fitosanitaria
Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal
Subsecretaría de Agricultura
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural
Pesca y Alimentación (SAGARPA)
Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127
Colonia Coyoacán

Tel. (525) 5545-147 – 658-1417
Fax: (525) 658-0696
E-mail: afrias@sagar.gob.mx

Alejandro Trueba Carranza
Director General de Fomento a la Agricultura
Subsecretaría de Agricultura
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural,
Pesca y alimentación (SAGARPA)
Lope de Vega No. 125-10 Piso
Col. Chapultepec Morales
Delegación Miguel Hidalgo
C.P. 11570
Tel. (525) 250-9465 – 254-2286
Fax: (525) 250-7882
E-mail: atrueba@sagarpa.gob.mx

UNITED STATES

Carol Kramer-LeBlanc
Director, Research and Scientific Exchanges Division
Foreign Agricultural Service
International Cooperation and Development
United States Department of Agriculture
1400 Independence Ave., S.W., Room 3222
Washington, D.C. 20250
Telephone: (202) 690-4872
Facsimile: (202) 690-0892
E-mail: kramer-leblanc@fas.usda.gov

Monica Castillo
International Affairs Specialist
Research and Scientific Exchanges Division
Foreign Agricultural Service
International Cooperation and Development
United States Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250
Telephone: (202) 690-3893
Facsimile: (202) 690-0892
E-mail: castillo@fas.usda.gov

IICA

John Miranda
Director, Northern Regional Center and
Representative in the United States
IICA
1775 K Street, N.W., Suite 320
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 458-3767
Facsimile: (202) 458-6335
E-mail: jmiranda@iicawash.org

Juan Jose Salazar
Representative
IICA Cooperation Agency in Mexico
Insurgentes Sur No. 1106, 5to. Piso
Colonia Del Valle
03100 Mexico, D.F., Mexico
Telephone: (525) 559-8963 and 559-8477
Facsimile: (525) 559-8887
E-mail: jsalazar@iica.org.mx

Enrique Alarcón
Director for Science and Technology and Natural Resources
IICA
P.O. Box 55
2200 Coronado, Costa Rica
Telephone: (506) 216-0222
Facsimile: (506) 216-0233
E-mail: ealarcon@iica.ac.cr

Guillermo Grajales
Regional Coordinator for Planning,
Programming and Technical Support of the NRC
IICA
1775 K Street, N.W., Suite 320
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 458-3767
Facsimile: (202) 458-6335
E-mail: ggrajales@iicawash.org

Victor M. Tunarosa
Deputy Representative and
Management Specialist for
Sustainable Rural Development
IICA Cooperation Agency in Mexico
Insurgentes Sur No. 1106, 5to. Piso
Colonia Del Valle
03100 Mexico, D.F., Mexico
Telephone: (525) 559-8963 and 559-8477
Facsimile: (525) 559-8887
E-mail: vtunarosa@iica.org.mx

Armando Mateos
Animal Health Specialist
IICA Cooperation Agency in Mexico
Insurgentes Sur No. 1106, 5to. Piso
Colonia Del Valle
03100 Mexico, D.F., Mexico
Telephone: (525) 559-8963 and 559-8477
Facsimile: (525) 559-8887
E-mail: amateos@iica.org.mx

ANNEX II – ANEXO II

PROCINORTE UMBRELLA TASK FORCE
FOURTH MEETING
GRUPO DE TRABAJO PARAGUAS DEL PROCINORTE
CUARTA REUNION

DATE/FECHA: August 7-8, 2001

*PLACE/LUGAR: Plaza Florencia Hotel – Vivaldi Conference Room
Dom. Florencia No. 61, Zona Rosa
Mexico City, Mexico
Telephone: (525) 242-4700, Fax: (525) 242-4785*

FINAL AGENDA /AGENDA FINAL

TUESDAY, AUGUST 7 / MARTES 7 DE AGOSTO

9:30 a.m. *Opening / Apertura*

- *Jesús Moncada de la Fuente, INIFAP*
- *John Miranda, IICA/CRN*

**10:00 a.m. *National Agriculture Overview / Perspectivas de la
Agricultural Nacional***

- *Alejandro Trueba, SAGARPA*

**10:30 *PROCINORTE General Overview / Perspectiva General
sobre el PROCINORTE***

- *Rodrigo Aveldaño, INIFAP*

**11:00 a.m. *Presentation and discussion of following initiatives / Presentación y
discusión de las siguientes iniciativas:***

- ***Tropical and Subtropical Fruits / Frutas Tropicales y
Subtropicales***
- *Brad Fraleigh, AgriFood Canada*

- Agricultural Health / Sanidad Agropecuaria

- Carol Kramer-LeBlanc, USDA-FAS

1:00 p.m. Luncheon hosted by IICA-Mexico / Almuerzo ofrecido por el IICA-México

2:30 p.m. FORAGRO-INFOTECH Presentation / Presentación FORAGRO-INFOTECH

- Enrique Alarcón, IICA

4:00 p.m. Review of activities related to the Plan of Action / Revisión de actividades relacionadas con el Plan de Acción

- NRC / CRN
- Canada / Canadá
- México / México
- United States / Estados Unidos

8:15 p.m. Dinner hosted by the NRC / Cena ofrecida por el CRN Cicero Restaurant / Restaurante Cicero

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 8 / MIÉRCOLES 8 DE AGOSTO

9:30 a.m. Discussion and update of PROCINORTE's 2001-2002 Plan of Action / Discusión y actualización del Plan de Acción de PROCINORTE 2001-2002

- All

11:00 a.m. Other issues / Otros asuntos

1:00 p.m. Clausura/Adjournment

- John Miranda, IICA

ANNEX III – ANEXO III

CANADIAN PROPOSAL

PROCINORTE: theme proposed by Canada

Sept. 5, 2000

TROPICAL AND SUB-TROPICAL FRUITS

Potential Collaborators:

Canada: Dr. Gilles Doyon, FRDC, 3600 Casavant O., St-Hyacinthe, Quebec., Canada)
USDA
Mexico
PROCITROPICOS
PROCICARIBE

Rationale:

Large quantities of fresh foods of tropical and sub tropical origin are imported into Canada and the United States. Mexico is a significant producer. Few scientists are available to understand and predict the shelf life of these commodities. More data on species, growing regions and capability for processing and preservation are needed.

Many centers of expertise are willing to collaborate or exchange information, where all parties could benefit and also for their respective industrials.

Portable laboratory, tracking and monitoring are already in place. Several web sites and many publications on vegetables are accessible. The Government of the Province of Quebec (Canada) has financed an information network since 1997 at up to C\$200,000

Potential Benefits:

- S Reduce commodity loss and maintain environmental sustainability;
- S Share expertise and better support trade by understanding produce preservation, ship and land transportation and quality characteristics;
- S Uniformity in evaluation methods for quality;
- S Quality of fresh produce for commercial trade within the Continent and Islands;
- S Better tracking of origin and quality characteristics
- S A better integrated view and action of each partner and country should reduce psychological barriers and motivate people to better understand other cultures and ways to do commerce/trade.

Indicative Goals:

For subtropical and tropical produce define local characteristics for quality and for the export market... discuss differences in perception of quality.

Quantify the perception of above goal, *i.e.* chemical, microbiological, physico-chemical and sensory factors.

Follow and trace produce (temperature, relative humidity in time) throughout the local and export food chain.

Establish the relationship between pre-harvest maturity and ripeness for different market needs (local and export).

Pre and post-harvest treatment of quality.

Guide and data handbook for consumers on preservation and utilization.

Standardize generally recognized methods: physical, chemical, microbiology, sensory and biophysical.

Developed field/portable laboratory Akits@.

Networking database and research/development plus industrial sites and setting up information network and Bulletins.

Prediction of shelf life and consumer acceptance (local and export).

Canadian perspective:

- § The Food Development and Research Centre (FRDC, AAFC, Saint-Hyacinthe, Quebec) is at the center of the largest food production area in Quebec, in proximity to the US border with 100 millions consumers
- § FRDC is Canada's largest processing and research and development facility and the center for technology development and transfer for the food sector.
- § Canada would improve consumer knowledge of produce nutritional value and storability and find new applications for them.
- § We can organize services and conferences on location (St-Hyacinthe), publish bulletins and have active industrial partners.

USDA PROPOSAL

Creating a PROCINORTE Task Force on Animal and Plant Health Research

Executive Summary

The integration of the North American economies following the implementation of NAFTA has yielded strong trade benefits to North American agricultural producers and consumers overall. However, certain problems affecting North American agriculture continue to hamper the full potential of production and trade. Foremost among these problems is agricultural health. By developing strong linkages and scientific cooperation in agricultural health research in North America, all three countries can help solve pressing agricultural health problems in the region.

A new trilateral PROCINORTE task force on animal and plant health could potentially yield a number of benefits while complementing current individual and bilateral research efforts in North America. The mechanism could serve to address research priorities on animal and plant health in the region. Given the growing importance of agricultural trade in North America and the negative impact of agricultural health on that trade, such a task force could serve to develop a coordinated approach to addressing the most economically pressing issues. It could help foster cooperation and networks among North American governments, industry, and universities to tackle agricultural health research issues and create joint solutions in the region.

Such a task force could also facilitate information exchange on agricultural health research conducted in North America, and help strengthen national research databases on agricultural health. It could develop linkages with other hemispheric groups to share information. If trilateral research projects were developed on agricultural health issues of mutual interest, cost-sharing benefits could be realized. Breakthroughs from such cooperative research in the form of new technologies could be transferred to a greater pool of North American end-users. The ultimate benefit would be realized through reduced production losses (caused by agricultural diseases and other health problems) as well as potentially greater agricultural trade in North America which would generate consumer as well as producer benefits.

Preliminary reviews of existing agricultural health research in North America suggest that there are a number of potential areas of research on agricultural health of mutual interest. A list of topics needs to be discussed and refined, and priorities among the topics would need to be established by the task force.

The question of whether to create a single animal and plant health task force or two distinct task forces—one devoted to animal health, the other to plant health—needs to be considered. A single task force offers the benefit of reduced costs, and could facilitate the cross-fertilization of ideas. Both options need to be fully explored, as there may be good reasons to create distinct task forces on animal health and plant health. The Task Force(s) on Animal and Plant Health is envisioned to include cooperation between government researchers, industry, universities, and the International Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA).

Introduction

The integration of the North American economies following the implementation of NAFTA has yielded strong trade benefits to North American agricultural producers and consumers overall. However, certain problems affecting North American agriculture continue to hamper the full potential of production and trade. Foremost among these problems is agricultural health. By developing strong linkages and scientific cooperation in agricultural health research in North America, all three countries can help solve pressing agricultural health problems in the region.

The purpose of this concept paper is to: (1) identify the benefits to Canada, Mexico, and the United States from the creation of a new animal and plant health research task force, (2) discuss some potential common areas of interest in agricultural health research, (3) discuss the advantages of having a joint task force versus two distinct animal and plant health task forces, and (4) suggest key participating institutions from each of the three North American countries. It is important to understand the PROCINORTE mechanism and its potential relationship to a new science and technology task force on animal and plant health.

The PROCINORTE Mechanism

The PROCIs are a network of regional cooperative programs in agricultural research sponsored by the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA). They aim to strengthen scientific and technological exchanges, develop new agricultural technologies, promote the multidirectional transfer of technologies, and strengthen the institutions of participating organizations. There are 7 PROCI organizations, including PROCISUR, PROCIANDINO, PROCITROPICOS, PROCICARIBE, SICTA, PROCINORTE, and PROMECAFE.¹

Established in February 1999, PROCINORTE is the Northern Region's cooperative mechanism for facilitating agricultural research and technology transfer. It serves as a catalyst to facilitate cooperative actions of mutual interest to Canada, Mexico, and the United States, including the public and private sectors. PROCINORTE generates a number of communication mechanisms, including specific task forces.

¹ The full titles are Programa Cooperativo Para el Desarrollo Tecnológico Agropecuario del Cono Sur (PROCISUR); Programa Cooperativo de Investigación y Transferencia de Tecnología para la Subregión Andina (PROCIANDINO); Programa Cooperativo de Investigación y Transferencia de Tecnología Para los Trópicos Suramericanos (PROCITROPICOS); Programa Cooperativo de Investigación y Transferencia de Tecnología Para El Caribe (PROCICARIBE); Sistema de Integración Centroamericana Para Tecnología Agropecuaria (SICTA); Programa Cooperativo en Investigación y Tecnología Agropecuaria Para la Región Norte (PROCINORTE); and Programa Cooperativo Regional Para el Desarrollo Tecnológico y Modernización de la Agricultura Para México, Centroamérica, República Dominicana y Jamaica (PROMECAFE).

Currently, there are three PROCINORTE task forces in operation. The PROCINORTE Task Force serves as an umbrella Steering Committee, composed of representatives of Canada, Mexico, the United States and IICA. It identifies areas of mutual interest, defines priorities, and oversees PROCINORTE's development. The Agricultural Library and Information Task Force is working to create a network of agricultural libraries among the countries of the Northern Region as a means to facilitate information exchange. The Genetic Resources Task Force (or NORGEN) is working to develop regional and interregional cooperation for the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources.

At the September 2000 PROCINORTE Task Force meeting held in Mexico City, participants agreed to initiate first steps toward developing a task force on animal and plant health research in North America. The United States offered to take the lead in the effort by drafting a concept paper. Initial reaction to the idea from the USDA's Agricultural Research Service has been quite positive. Initial contacts with researchers at Mexico's Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales, Agrícolas, y Pecuarias and the Research Branch of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada suggest there is strong support for such a task force in North America.

Benefits of an Agricultural Health Task Force in a NAFTA Environment

The implementation of NAFTA in 1994 has led to a growing integration of the three North American economies. Despite a brief downturn in trade with Mexico in 1994 due to the peso devaluation, agricultural trade has flourished in the region under NAFTA. Agricultural producers, processors, and marketers in the region have adapted to the liberalized trade environment by concentrating on those areas for which they have a relative comparative advantage. Incomes in North America have grown steadily, raising the demand for high value animal and plant products.

However, plant and animal health concerns in North America continue to constrain agricultural production and trade, and ultimately raise food costs to consumers. As an example, livestock disease losses in the United States total over \$17.5 billion each year. Animal health threats are greater today than in the past reflecting more efficient methods of production which concentrate larger numbers of animals into smaller areas. Moreover, the loss of genetic diversity in plants and animals has left the surviving genetic pool vulnerable to health threats.

Given the wide range of climatic and geographical areas in North America, and the unique distribution of agricultural products in each country, it is natural that certain agricultural health issues might affect just one or two of the region's countries. Unilateral and bilateral research efforts on many agricultural health issues in North America serve a unique and well-justified purpose. Bilateral research efforts underway currently address specific agricultural health issues affecting two countries in the region. For example, the United States and Mexico are currently working together to control the boll weevil in Mexican cotton. Since cotton is not grown in Canada, this research should remain a bilateral initiative. U.S.-Mexican cooperative research on eradicating fever ticks in cattle is another example of a unique south-regional agricultural health problem.

A new trilateral PROCINORTE task force on animal and plant health could potentially yield a number of benefits while complementing current individual and bilateral research efforts in North America. The mechanism could serve to address research priorities on animal and plant health in the region. Given the growing importance of agricultural trade in North America and the negative impact of agricultural health on that trade, such a task force could serve to develop a coordinated approach to addressing the most economically pressing issues. It could help foster cooperation and networks among North American governments, industry, and universities to tackle agricultural health research issues and create joint solutions in the region.

Such a task force could also facilitate information exchange on agricultural health research conducted in North America, and help strengthen national research databases on agricultural health. It could develop linkages with other hemispheric groups to share information. If trilateral research projects were developed on agricultural health issues of mutual interest, cost-sharing benefits could be realized. Breakthroughs from such cooperative research in the form of new technologies could be transferred to a greater pool of North American end-users, including agricultural extension specialists, producers, veterinarians, and product handlers. The ultimate benefit would be realized through reduced production losses (caused by agricultural diseases and other health problems) as well as potentially greater agricultural trade in North America which would generate consumer as well as producer benefits.

Common Areas of Interest in Agricultural Health Research

A new North American task force on animal and plant health research would have to define the range of topics to be included in the scope of “animal health” and “plant health”. While research on animal and plant diseases and reproductive health would likely be included in the group’s work, areas such as microbial pathogens in consumer-ready foods might be considered outside its domain. The primary criteria to determine whether a topic should be included in the work of the task force are:

1. Meets an accepted North American definition of an agricultural health problem
2. Problem exists in all three North American countries or has the potential to migrate to any of the countries
3. Problem is economically significant or has the potential to become economically significant for production and trade in North America.

Preliminary reviews of existing agricultural health research in North America suggest that there are a number of potential areas of research on agricultural health of mutual interest. When taking into consideration the economic impact of these areas, the list narrows. There are cross-cutting areas with respect to transporting genetic materials, germplasm, and quarantine issues in science. Many common areas appear in the area of animal health, and include development of national animal disease surveillance systems and understanding the prevalence of pathogens at the farm level. Studying the resistance of microorganisms to antibiotics appears to be another area of common interest. Common interest in specific animal diseases may exist for:

- Newcastle Disease
- Hog Cholera

- Foot-and-Mouth Disease
- Brucellosis
- Tuberculosis
- Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathies (research to assist in surveillance and prevention)

On the plant health front, pathogen reduction on fruit and vegetable crops at the farm level appears to be an area of common interest. Integrated pest management and use of beneficial insects in pest control also appear to represent common areas of interest. Research on fusarium molds may present an area of common interest.

These potential topics of common interest are intended as a point of departure for discussion. A complete list of topics would need to be discussed and refined, and priorities among the topics would need to be established by the task force.

A Single Task Force or Two Distinct Task Forces?

The question of whether to create a single animal and plant health task force or two distinct task forces—one devoted to animal health, the other to plant health—needs to be considered. A single task force offers the benefit of reduced costs, as communications, meetings, and information sharing could be streamlined. Moreover, a single task force could facilitate interaction of plant health researchers with animal health researchers, leading to cross-fertilization of ideas in developing communication channels and building information networks. This is the approach which was followed by the PROCINORTE Genetic Resources Task Force, whose members have found great benefits from a joint approach.

Both options need to be fully explored, as there may be good reasons to create distinct task forces on animal health and plant health. Perhaps it would complicate information sharing to include both plant and animal health research in a single task force. Perhaps there would be no significant benefit from animal and plant health researchers working together to share information. These questions can only be addressed by North American animal and plant health researchers.

Participating Institutions

The Task Force(s) on Animal and Plant Health is envisioned as a mechanism to include cooperation between government researchers, industry, universities, and the International Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA). In order to optimize efficiency, a single organization from each of the three North American countries should be designated to serve as a primary contact. It is suggested that Canada be represented by the Research Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada; Mexico be represented by the Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones

Forestales, Agrícolas, y Pecuarias, SAGAR; and the United States be represented by the Agricultural Research Service, USDA. These three organizations would be made responsible for deciding what other national institutions should be represented on the task force and which to include as part of an information network.

Seeking Areas of Mutual Interest in North American Agricultural Health Research

Step 1. Meets North American definition of an agricultural health problem.



Step 3. Problem is economically significant or could become economically significant for production and trade in North America.

S:\rseed\procin~1\plant&~1\pncp0101.wpd

**U.S. Summary Comments on Animal/Plant Health Research Task Force Proposal
Prepared for the 4th PROCINORTE Task Force Meeting
August 7-8, 2001 – Mexico City**

1. U.S. Contacts Generally Favorable to Proposal

- a. Reviewers indicated that such an initiative may yield a number of benefits for all parties involved.
- b. Such cooperation would enhance our knowledge and ability to deal with disease outbreaks in North America.
- c. There was support for USDA's Agriculture Research Service to serve as the lead U.S. agency on the task force. (The Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) currently serves on a North American task force mainly related to health regulations and monitoring of diseases.)

1. Particular topics of interest and suggestions

- a. *Single versus two distinct task forces.* There was wide variation on this question, but overall, the majority favored the creation of two distinct task forces.
- b. *Disease surveillance systems.* Many of the animal diseases listed on page 5 are exotic to the United States (Newcastle Disease, Hog Cholera and Foot-and-Mouth Disease); however, national disease surveillance systems are needed in order to have rapid identification, containment and eradication of such diseases.
- c. *Identification and traceback technologies.* Growing demand for product origin and health information, particularly from trading partners in the wake of the BSE crisis, is driving the need to develop identification and traceback systems in agriculture.
- d. *Expansion of list of disease or pest issues, particularly on the plant health side.* The list provided may need to be expanded and/or modified based upon consensus of the three countries. Specific suggestions to include on plant health include:
 - i. Fruit fly
 - ii. Karnal Bunt
 - iii. Plum Pox
 - iv. Potato diseases and pests (e.g., Potato Wart and Golden Nematode)
 - v. Citrus Canker

I. Specific concerns

- A. *Funding of activities.* There were concerns about whether the task force would have funds available for specific studies or activities. There was the concern that a lack of adequate funding would weaken the task force's ability to define the research priorities.
- B. *Equitable sharing of information.* U.S. farmers will want to see open and fair opportunities for trade and not perceive the research data generated by the Task Force as creating a bias in favor of one country over another.
- C. *Disagreement with the statement on p. 3 that growing animal health threats are linked to more efficient methods of livestock production.* While animal concentration has increased, biosecurity and other preventive medicine efforts have also increased to potentially reduce the threat to animal health. If there is an increased threat, it may be due to increased international trade and movement of people, not the concentration of animals.

I. Institutions contacted to review proposal

(In some instances, more than one reviewer from each institution was contacted)

- A. Agricultural Research Service, USDA
- B. Animal Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA
- C. Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, USDA *
- D. Economic Research Service, USDA
- E. Colorado State University
- F. American Veterinary Medical Association
- G. University of California Davis (past President of the American Phytopathological Society) *
- H. Texas A and M University *

* Still awaiting comments/response.

C:\My Documents\PROCINORTE\IV USDA pahsumm.wpd

ANNEX VI – ANEXO VI

U.S. Summary Comments on Tropical and Sub-Tropical Fruit Task Force Proposal Prepared for the 4th PROCINORTE Task Force Meeting August 7-8, 2001 – Mexico City

1. **U.S. Contacts Generally Favorable to Proposal**
 - a. There is consensus among those contacted in U.S. universities, the private sector, and Federal Government about the potential benefits of a Tropical and Sub-Tropical Fruits Task Force in North America.
 - b. The proposal covers commodities that are rapidly gaining in popularity in the United States. Growth in per capita consumption of certain tropical fruits such as mangos and papayas have been growing at a faster rate than many major fruit crops grown in the U.S. during the 1990's.
 - c. Except for avocados, domestic supplies of tropical fruits are heavily dependent on imports. Thus, it would benefit the United States to have a better scientific understanding of the products entering our market.
 - d. The goals of the proposal are good and are forward-looking.
 - e. U.S. institutions are willing to collaborate with any agency/institution on postharvest and value-added (food science) research and development projects.
 - f. The South Florida tropical and subtropical fruit industry has long demanded the type of information included in the proposal.
 - g. From a U.S. retail standpoint, there is increasing interest in tropical and subtropical fruits.

1. **Particular topics of interest**
 - a. *First priority: Research and compile existing information to avoid duplication.* Various extension services and agriculture departments could provide valuable information. Also, USAID has funded related projects in Central America. Exporter Associations in Caribbean Basin countries are good sources of information.
 - b. *New research data and guides* should help reduce tropical fruit losses and extend shelf life. There is a lack of knowledge about proper storage, temperature, handling, and food safety procedures, especially among handlers and store-level management. It seems despite groceries' adequate supplies of existing training materials, inbound inspection standards, and links to trade associations that provide information, results have been lacking.
 - c. *Introducing products to supermarket consumers.* Lack of knowledge of how to buy, store, and prepare unfamiliar items can limit sales, as can a perceived high price. A great deal of information already exists, but effective communication with consumers is still a problem. Marketing efforts, sampling programs, advertising and other ways of reaching consumers can be very expensive. Promotional funds for such programs are seldom available for exotic fruits due to

the relatively small size of the growers, their disperse geographical locations, and the low volume of sales.

1. **Specific concerns**

- a. *Funding.* Government agencies, universities and the private sector all raised this as a key concern for program development.
- b. *Current inspection data availability.* Lack of mandatory inspection information for tropical fruit imports limits available information for research on quality and perishability of these products (i.e., at point of entry, along the distribution chain, and at point of final destination)
- c. *More emphasis on food safety needed in the initiative.* The United States is quite sensitive to this issue in the aftermath of the highly publicized Cyclospora outbreak linked to imported berries from Guatemala which had a devastating ripple effect on California strawberries.
- d. *How to ensure free trade while safeguarding U.S. agriculture.* There are concerns that inadequate inspections at our borders may lead to invasive species, introduced pests, and diseases.
- e. *Concerning goal to create a guide and data handbook for consumers on preservation and utilization:* Much of that information is already available through sources such as PMA's www.aboutproduce.com, importers such as Brook's Tropicals, and publication companies such as Tri-Foods.
- f. *Disagreement about the statement "Few scientists are available to understand and predict the shelf life of these commodities".* Expertise in postharvest handling or processing of tropical/subtropical fruits exists at the University of Florida, University of Hawaii, University of Puerto Rico, University of California, and University of Guam. At the University of Florida, there is an active program on postharvest handling on crops such as avocado, lime, mango, papaya, carambola, lychee, longan, and more. The University of Florida also has an active value-added and processing research on tropical fruits.
- g. *Proposal may be too broad.* Proposal could have focused on one or a few of the "indicative goals".

I. **Useful websites recommended on handling tropical/subtropical fruit (courtesy of AMS/USDA)**

<http://www.ams.usda.gov/tmd/Tropical/index.htm> and
<http://www.ams.usda.gov/tmd/export/index.htm>

http://www.codexalimentarius.net/STANDARD/volume5B/vol5b_E.htm

<http://postharvest.ucdavis.edu/>

<http://www.fntrac.com/gain/>

<http://iifir.org/2enpubouvragestheme.asp?T=8>

<http://www.1webblvd.com/coosemans/guide.htm>

<http://www.friedas.com/>

<http://www.foodsafety.gov/~dms/fs-toc.html#prod>

http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ppq/manuals/pdf_files/20Fruits%20and%20Vegetables.pdf

<http://www.thepacker.com/TheGuide/TheGuide-about.asp>

<http://www.fao.org/inpho/>

<http://www.iarw.org/index.htm>

<http://www.pma.com/ii/products.cfm>

<http://agrss.sherman.hawaii.edu/bookshelf/fb.shtml>

<http://www.web-agri.com/>

I. Institutions contacted to review proposal

(In some instances, more than one reviewer from each institution was contacted)

- A. Agricultural Research Service, USDA
- B. Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA
- C. Economic Research Service, USDA
- D. Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service *
- E. University of Florida
- F. University of California Davis *
- G. University of Puerto Rico *
- H. Produce Marketing Association
- I. United Fresh Fruit

* Still awaiting comments/response.

C:\My Documents\PROCINORTE\IV USDA tsfsumm.wpd

ANNEX VII – ANEXO VII

CANADA'S AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PRIORITIES

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATION GIVEN DURING THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE PROCINORTE UMBRELLA COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mexico City, August 7-8, 2001

Dr. Brad Fraleigh
Research Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

This summary provides information on recommendations for priorities generated by multi-stakeholder consultations, as well as priorities adopted by Canada's most significant agricultural research organization, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. Within this context, each private and public research organization in Canada defines its own priorities.

Canadian Agri-Food Research Council (CARC)

CARC is a national coordinating system for agri-food research and technology transfer in Canada and is a catalyst for building consensus on research prioritization. CARC's committee system consists of participants from all stakeholders (industry, university, scientific societies, civil society organizations and government) who identify issues and opportunities to be addressed through research. In this regard, research and technology transfer are oriented to assist the agriculture and food industry to be: (i) globally competitive, (ii) environmentally sustainable and (iii) socially responsible.

There are approximately 37 members on CARC's main body. CARC has an extensive committee system consisting of provincial, national, standing and sub- committees. When necessary, an *ad hoc* committee or working group is formed to address a specific issue. CARC's national and provincial committee structure involves more than 800 participants from across the country who identify issues and opportunities to be addressed through agri-food research and development. Provincial agricultural coordinating committees represent regional research and development interests and interact with CARC's Canada committees to resolve issues of national interest.

On an annual basis, CARC's Priority Setting Committee, with the assistance of the committee system, identifies major priority areas. Priorities are rated according to impact, urgency and capability. Some matters are addressed directly to federal and provincial departments and/or agencies, universities and granting agencies for resolution. Often these issues serve as a guide in the identification of possible research projects and for the allocation of resources within appropriate jurisdictions. Committees also develop recommendations and actions via workshops, reviews or studies. Issues deemed to be of national significance, not resolvable by committees alone, are forwarded to CARC for action.

In 2000-2001 the following national issues were brought forward by the Standing Committee on Issues and Priorities (SCIP) and accepted by CARC:

- X **Brush management research:** The Expert Committee on Forage Crops recommended that research in the area of brush management be given top priority for future research needs and that a meeting of provincial and federal land management agencies and research institutions be held to develop a future research initiative.

- X **Minor Use Pesticides:** There is continuing concern about the minor use pesticide program. Several important pesticides will likely be de-registered in the US, and this will effectively eliminate their use in Canada if we are to export products to that country. Thus, an effective minor use program is essential to test new products to replace these. Specific products of concern to the forage industry, which may be de-registered, will be identified and a letter will be sent to the Assistant Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's Strategic Policy Branch on this issue.

- X **National workshop on gene transformation, enhanced IP protection and the free exchange of germplasm:** The SCIP proposed the concept of holding a national workshop on gene transformation, enhanced IP protection and the free exchange of germplasm. The Board supported the SCIP and the SCIP will develop such a proposal.

In addition to the above items, the various committees are dealing with a number of other issues. These issues, concerns and recommended actions are directed to relevant departments and agencies for action and response. Issues are grouped under the three categories of global competitiveness, environmental sustainability, and social responsibility, in accordance with CARC's mission.

Details of the priorities identified by the CARC committees, national priorities identified by CARC in previous years, as well as other information about CARC, can be found on the CARC internet web site at <<http://www.carc-crac.ca/>>

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC)

AAFC is Canada's ministry of agriculture. Each year it presents a Report on Plans and Priorities (RPP) to Canada's Parliament outlining, for the sector and for Canadians, what the department's focus will be during the next 12 months. The RPP shows how AAFC intends to work with the sector, the provinces, and other partners to build an industry that is recognized world-wide as a leader in providing safe, high quality food and other agricultural-based products that are produced in an environmentally responsible, and economically sustainable manner.

The 2000-2001 RPP identified "Innovation for a Sustainable Future" as one of AAFC's four business lines. It included AAFC's research and development and technology transfer activities as well as participation by the agriculture and agri-food sector in AAFC programs/services aimed

at the conservation and management of agricultural resources. This approach promoted a better understanding of the environmental issues affecting the sector and the development of appropriate technologies and practices that support long-term environmental sustainability in agriculture. In addition, emphasis was placed on more fully integrating environmental and economic considerations into policy and program development within the Department. Research Branch, Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration (PFRA) and Policy Branch (Environment Bureau) collaborated, on an ongoing basis, with the provinces, universities, rural communities, and the private sector to actively pursue the objectives of this business line.

The objective of the business line was to work with industry and partners to support the sector's efforts to develop and produce competitive products and processes in an environmentally sustainable manner. Three "Key Result Areas" were defined as: Innovation (\$272.4 million), Sustainable Resource Use (\$59.7 million) and Integrated Policy and Decision-Making (\$1.5 million). The key results/commitments for the Innovation area were:

- 1) Increased development, availability and adoption of products, processes, practices and technologies that conserve soil, water, and air quality, as well as preserving genetic resources.
- 2) Development and introduction of new crop varieties which have greater stress-resistance, are higher yielding, and have improved quality, including quality parameters to address niche market opportunities and new crop protection and production systems that promote environmental sustainability.
- 3) Animal research on production technologies that address: animal welfare and environmental concerns; alternative production systems/practices; techniques for improving animal productivity; product quality and safety; reduction of costs of production and development of value-added products.
- 4) Introduction of new value-added food and non-food products, processes and technologies including nutraceuticals and molecular farming.
- 5) Increased level of collaborative research between industry, provincial governments, universities, other countries and the department.

More recently, in order to help the sector seize the many opportunities which lie ahead, AAFC reviewed the strategies and key results it plans to achieve. This work has led to a redefinition of AAFC's business lines, which were presented in the 2001-2002 RPP. Research contributes to the success of each business line. The objectives of the business lines have been defined as follows:

Security of the Food System — to make Canada the world leader in producing, processing, and distributing safe and reliable food to meet the needs and preferences of consumers. The overall security of the agriculture and agri-food industry, from sound financial risk management to food safety and consumer confidence, is an area of high priority.

Health of the Environment – to make Canada the world leader in using environmental resources in a manner that ensures their quality and availability for present and future generations.

Innovation for Growth – to foster innovation in order to make Canada the world leader in developing food and other related agricultural products and services that capture opportunities in diversified domestic and global markets.

More information on AAFC's plans and priorities can be found on the internet at <<http://www.agr.ca/rpp/rppe.html>>. More information on AAFC's research programs can be found on AAFC's research web page at <http://aceis.agr.ca/res_e.phtml>.

Federal-Provincial-Territorial Ministers of Agriculture

Canada has a federal system of government, and agriculture is a shared responsibility of both the federal and provincial-territorial levels of government. An Agricultural Policy Framework was agreed by federal, provincial and territorial ministers in June 2001. The Ministers' priorities are identified as environment, food safety, renewal, safety nets and science.

The environment component of the Policy Framework takes the approach of whole-farm environmental management. Inputs such as technology, capital, labour, energy, nutrients etc. are applied to agriculture's natural capital (land, water, air and biological resources) to obtain outputs of crops, livestock, landscape, fibre, etc. as well as wastes and other potential sources of pollution. Indicators and results have been identified such as the degree of decrease in the proportion of farmland at high risk of contaminating water and the decrease of greenhouse gas emissions. Management practice objectives were identified such as integrated pest management and the use of nutrient management plans.

The science component of the Policy Framework takes a Life Sciences approach. These are the sciences which deal with knowledge of living things (crops, plants, animals, humans and the overall ecosystem). They provide knowledge used to create new products and new benefits, to diversify sources of farm income, to shift from non-renewable to renewable resources, to address environmental challenges and to protect and enhance human health. The Ministers were convinced that Life Sciences are driving the next phase of the knowledge-based economy. To achieve success in the Life Sciences Economy, it was recognized that we need a common vision, where governments, communities, farm and fisheries sectors, industry, academia, researchers, developers and investors work together to achieve diverse and sustainable agriculture, food and bio-products systems. Work must focus on building Canada's competitive advantage in areas such as innovative foods, nutraceuticals and functional foods, bio-energy, bio-materials, bio-health, and environmental protection. Achieving this vision will require integrated action across the areas of human resources, research and development, the business environment, and investment, taking into account the need to maintain the confidence of the public and the livelihood of farmers. A federal-provincial-territorial action plan has been developed, and research activities will take place within this new context.

ANNEX VIII – ANEXO VIII

Executive Summary: Agricultural Research Priorities in the United States

Prepared for the 4th PROCINORTE Task Force Meeting

August 7-8, 2001 – Mexico City

Introduction

USDA's International Cooperation and Development (ICD) Program area of the Foreign Agricultural Service is the lead body in coordinating agricultural research and scientific exchange activities for the Department internationally. ICD's Research and Scientific Exchanges Division (RSED) identifies priority collaborative research activities and facilitates cooperation between U.S. and foreign scientists on a broad range of agricultural, forestry, and food and nutrition topics.

RSED has conducted a review of current and forward-looking priorities in U.S. agricultural research. The United States agricultural research and technology development community is comprised of a vast and diverse group of institutions belonging to public and private spheres. Public sector research involves a partnership between the Federal Government (primarily USDA) and the States.

U.S. public sector agricultural research priorities are in a state of transition currently, as the new Administration sets new priorities and as strategic goals established under the 1996 Farm Bill are replaced by those that will emerge from the 2002 Farm Bill. This report focuses on national agricultural research priorities as articulated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), and the National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board (NAREEEAB).

Current Priorities for USDA

Within the USDA, several agencies falling into different key mission areas have responsibilities for conducting agricultural, forestry, and food and nutrition research and/or extension activities. One of seven major divisions of the USDA, the Research, Education, and Economics (REE) mission area of the USDA is assigned primary Federal responsibility for the creation and dissemination of knowledge spanning the biological, physical, and social sciences related to agricultural research, economic analysis, statistics, extension, and higher education. The following represent key goals and initiatives of REE's 5-year Strategic Plan, a document which is attached.

1. **An Agricultural System That is Highly Competitive in the Global Economy**

Strategic Initiatives:

- a. Expand the scope of statistical, economic, and technical information provided to public and private decision makers to promote efficient resource use, enhance productivity, develop new markets, and increase international trade.
- b. Strengthen cooperation with partners throughout the agricultural sector to ease the transition prescribed by the 1996 Farm Bill, while remaining competitive in the global agricultural market.
- c. Assist participants in U.S. agriculture to respond to international consumer expectations, worldwide health and environmental concerns, noneconomic trade barriers, and unexpected threats to production or delivery capabilities.

1. **A Safe and Secure Food and Fiber System**

Strategic Initiatives:

- a. Direct resources to (a) expand the fundamental knowledge base needed to address unanticipated threats to agricultural production; (b) develop integrated management systems for plant and animal production that help producers balance the multiple objectives of the food and fiber system; and (c) improve resistance to animal and plant pests through genetic improvement, biocontrol strategies, and other alternatives.
- b. Expand programs contributing to food safety including (a) development and improvement of rapid diagnostic tests for microbial pathogens on meat, poultry, and seafood; (b) develop research-based guidance to inform the HACCP system; and (c) conduct training and educational programs for food producers, processors, and consumers.
- c. Strengthen data collection and develop systems to monitor the health and economic impact of food-borne illnesses on society and the food system.
- d. Strengthen research regarding genetic diversity and genome mapping and strengthen the various germplasm collections.

1. **Healthy, Well-Nourished Children, Youth and Families**

Strategic Initiatives:

- a. Strengthen and reorient human nutrition research to focus on: (a) food, phytonutrients, and health; (b) healthy body weight to avoid diabetes and other diseases; (c) brain function and resistance to mental decline; (d) bone growth and protection from osteoporosis; and (e) the role of foods and nutrients in infectious diseases.
- b. Focus nutrition education programs to ensure access to a safe, affordable, reliable, and nutritious food supply that promotes healthy, well-nourished children, youth, and families. Nutrition education programs must (a) provide nutrition education to high-risk populations, including women, infants, and young children; (b) improve the health of the general population through optimal diet and nutrition, and (c) evaluate the effectiveness of nutrition education efforts.

- c. Focus on plant and animal research to improve the nutritional value of foods by developing beneficial alterations in the composition of foods using biotechnology, genetics, and new food processing technologies.

1. **Greater Harmony Between Agriculture and the Environment**

Strategic Initiatives:

- a. Enhance data collection programs, including the census of agriculture, to ensure that physical, biological, and socioeconomic data support rigorous cross-disciplinary research needed to underpin sustainable agriculture and environmental quality. Fully integrating the Farm Costs and Returns Survey with the cropping practices and chemical use surveys is a priority. Provide producers with simple, cost-effective IPM practices that will lead to a high adoption rate of effective IPM techniques.
- b. Continue development of and education efforts to help producers improve and safeguard water quality through simple, cost effective agricultural practices. Because point sources of pollution were controlled first, agricultural nonpoint sources are the Nation's largest remaining single water quality focus.
- c. Better understand livestock waste management issues, including what alternative practices, might be required in response to changes in the scale and location of production, technology, consumer demand, and environmental concerns. Animal waste depletes oxygen in surface waters and is a significant source of salts and pathogens.
- d. Better understand the relationship between agricultural trade, natural resource use, and environmental quality. Continued liberalization evidenced by recent trade agreements makes it increasingly imperative to understand the effects of trade and trade policies on the environment and the effects of resource and environmental policies, programs, and management systems on trade and competitiveness.

1. **Enhanced Economic Opportunity and Quality of Life for Citizens and Communities**

Strategic Initiatives:

- a. Implement the Fund for Rural America, giving emphasis to projects that integrated research, education, and Extension activities designed to expand economic opportunities.
- b. Assess the capital, infrastructure, labor, and technical assistance needs of rural firms to better address those needs and improve the economic well-being of those firms and their surrounding communities.
- c. Establish agreements with State economic development agencies to facilitate entrepreneurial partnerships that link market opportunities with new technologies through CRADAs and other technology transfer mechanisms.
- d. In partnership with the land-grant universities and other State and Federal agencies, expand and strengthen outreach programs that assist at-risk children, youth and families.

Current and Future Priorities for NASULGC

Agricultural research priorities of the U.S. State Universities and Land Grant Colleges are closely aligned with those of the USDA. A recent concept paper prepared by the NASULGC Farm Bill Task Force, entitled “The 2002 Farm Bill: Opportunities and Challenges for U.S. Agriculture, Rural Communities and the State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges” outlines their agricultural education and research priorities within each Title of the Farm Bill. The paper (attached) lists some of the topics which have been funded in recent years by mandatory US Government competitive grants, which include:

- Food genome
- Food safety
- Food technology and human nutrition
- New and alternative uses and production of agricultural commodities and products
- Agricultural biotechnology
- Natural resource management, including precision agriculture

While the most relevant portion of the U.S. Farm Bill is Title VIII, Research, Education and Extension, all of the Titles contain areas of priority research and education objectives:

- Title I: The Agricultural Market Transition Act (AMTA)
- Title II: Agricultural Trade
- Title III: Conservation
- Title IV: Nutrition/Food Assistance
- Title V: Agricultural Promotion
- Title VI: Credit
- Title VII: Rural Development
- Title VIII: Research, Extension and Education
- Title IX: Miscellaneous

NAREEEAB’s Recommended Priorities for Future Research

The National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board (the Board) was established by the 1996 Farm Bill to advise the Secretary of Agriculture and Land-Grant University partners on policies and priorities for research, extension, education, and economics. The Board is required by statute to review annually (1) the relevance to the priorities established for all agricultural research, extension, or education activities conducted or funded by the Department; and (2) the adequacy of the funding. In its recent review of the REE portfolio, the Advisory Board proposed that four areas of special emphasis in agriculture be addressed by the current Administration.

- I. Develop a better understanding of the nature and impact of the accelerating consolidation, concentration, and change in structure of American food and fiber production, processing and distribution systems.
- II. Integrate American health factors, human nutrition and food and fiber production, processing and distribution research and education in ways that make it possible for America's producers to meet specific nutrition and health objectives.
- III. Design and implement expanded research and more targeted education and outreach programs to meet the needs of the public on issues such as agricultural biotechnology, alternative energy sources, and all other segments of the food, agriculture, and natural resources systems.
- IV. Incorporate into all technological research efforts analyses that clearly identify expected public benefits and indirect effects that likely will result from implementation of the products of research.

The Board plans to convene symposia/listening sessions in the upcoming fiscal year for stakeholders and experts to voice their concerns in areas such as:

- I. Energy, natural resource management and the environment
- II. Trade, globalization and foreign policy issues
- III. Health, nutrition, food, and agricultural production

C:\WINDOWS.000\Temporary Internet Files\OLKC0B5\execsu~2.wpd

ANNEX IX – ANEXO IX

PROCINORTE's APPROVED PLAN OF ACTION 2001-2002 PLAN DE ACCION 2001-2002 APROBADO PARA PROCINORTE

OBJECTIVE 1

Promote dialogue to identify priority research issues common to the three countries and to influence the regional, hemispheric and global agendas

OBJETIVO 1

Promover el diálogo para identificar temas prioritarios en el campo de la investigación comunes a los tres países e influenciar las agendas regionales, hemisféricas y globales

ACTIONS/ACCIONES	RESPONSIBLE RESPONSABLES	DEADLINE FECHA LIMITE
<p>1. Each country Representative will continue to work with the local research stakeholders, private and public sector to identify priority actions.</p> <p><i>Cada Representante de país continuará trabajando con los investigadores locales, el sector privado y público para identificar acciones prioritarias.</i></p>	<p>All <i>Todos</i></p>	<p>On-going <i>En curso</i></p>
<p>2. Participate in the FORAGRO Agenda</p> <p><i>Participación en la agenda de FORAGRO</i></p>	<p>PROCINORTE Representatives <i>Representantes de PROCINORTE</i></p>	<p>On-going <i>En curso</i></p>
<p>3. Exchange information on research priorities of the three countries.</p> <p><i>Intercambio de información sobre prioridades en investigación de los tres países.</i></p>	<p>All <i>Todos</i></p>	<p>On-going <i>En curso</i></p>
<p>4. Identification of common research opportunities</p> <p><i>Identificación de oportunidades comunes en investigación.</i></p>	<p>All <i>Todos</i></p>	<p>On-going <i>En curso</i></p>
<p>5. PROCINORTE representatives to participate in other PROCIs meetings as appropriate</p> <p><i>Participación de los representantes de PROCINORTE en otras reuniones de los PROCIs conforme se considere apropiado</i></p>	<p>PROCINORTE Representatives IICA Country office <i>Representantes de PROCINORTE y oficinas del IICA</i></p>	<p>On-going <i>En curso</i></p>

OBJECTIVE 2

To facilitate the exchange of experiences, information and training

OBJETIVO 2

Facilitar el intercambio de experiencias, información y capacitación

ACTIONS/ACCIONES	RESPONSIBLE RESPONSABLE	DEADLINE FECHA LIMITE
1. Maintain PROCINORTE in the NRC web site <i>Mantener a PROCINORTE en el sitio Web del CRN</i>	IICA/NRC, all IICA/CRN, todos	On-going En curso
2. Access linkages INFOTEC project <i>Acceso a los enlaces del proyecto INFOTEC</i> 2.1 Project information delivered to Representatives <i>Envío de información sobre el proyecto a los Representantes</i> 2.2 Representatives to review proposal and discuss with national colleagues <i>Revisión de la propuesta por parte de los Representantes y discusión con sus colegas nacionales</i> 2.3 Dialogue between PROCINORTE and National Representatives for decision making process <i>Diálogo entre PROCINORTE y representantes nacionales durante el proceso de toma de decisiones</i>	Area II All Todos All Todos	August 2001 Agosto 2001 October 2001 Octubre 2001 December 2001 Diciembre 2001
3. Continue to provide information on training opportunities through the NRC web site and other web sites and establish linkages with PROCIS, FORAGRO and other institutions and training programs of interest to the three countries <i>Continuar suministrando información sobre oportunidades de capacitación a través del sitio Web del CRN y otros, y establecer enlaces con los PROCIS, FORAGRO y otras instituciones y programas de capacitación de interés de los tres países.</i>	Area II/NRC Area II/CRN	On going En curso
4. Explore the possibility to have the PROCINORTE steering committee meet with other PROCIS steering committees during the next FORAGRO meeting in 2002. <i>Explorar la posibilidad de que el Comité Directivo del PROCINORTE se reúna con otros Comités Directivos de los PROCIS durante la próxima reunión de FORAGRO en el año 2002.</i>	Area II	February, 2002 Febrero 2002

OBJECTIVE 3

To build linkages among public and private country institutions of the Northern region (PROCINORTE) and between the major research and technology transfer actors in the region, hemisphere and the world

OBJETIVO 3

Establecer enlaces entre instituciones públicas y privadas de los países de la región Norte (PROCINORTE) y los actores principales en el campo de la investigación y transferencia de tecnología de la región, el hemisferio y el Mundo.

ACTIONS/ACCIONES	RESPONSIBLE RESPONSABLE	DEADLINE FECHA LIMITE
<p>1. Maintain an updated fact sheet on PROCINORTE for distribution</p> <p><i>Mantener una hoja informativa actualizada sobre PROCINORTE para su distribución</i></p>	<p>NRC CRN</p>	<p>On-going En curso</p>
<p>2. Link PROCINORTE web site with partners at the regional, hemispheric and global levels</p> <p><i>Enlace del sitio Web de PROCINORTE con socios a nivel regional, hemisférico y global.</i></p>	<p>NRC CRN</p>	<p>On-going En curso</p>
<p>3. Facilitate among the PROCINORTE countries access to information developed by all PROCIS and other similar mechanisms</p> <p><i>Facilitar entre los países de PROCINORTE acceso a la información generada por todos los PROCIS y otros mecanismos similares</i></p>	<p>Area II – NRC Area II - CRN</p>	<p>On-going En curso</p>
<p>4. Exchange information on opportunities to participate in scientific meetings where technological transfer is addressed and report on the results</p> <p><i>Intercambio de información sobre oportunidades para participar en reuniones científicas donde se discutan temas sobre transferencia tecnológica e informar sobre los resultados.</i></p>	<p>All Todos</p>	<p>On-going En curso</p>

OBJECTIVE 4

To carry out joint activities among participating institutions in solving problems of mutual interest

OBJETIVO 4

Realizar actividades conjuntas con las instituciones participantes y resolver problemas de mutuo interés

ACTIONS/ACCIONES	RESPONSIBLE RESPONSABLE	DEADLINE FECHA LIMITE
<p>1. Support PROCINORTE's specialized task forces particularly by means of PROCINORTE Representatives and the IICA offices in the countries</p> <p><i>Apoyar los Grupo de Trabajo Especializados de PROCINORTE particularmente a través de los Representantes de PROCINORTE y las oficinas del IICA en los países</i></p>	<p>All Todos</p>	<p>On-going En curso</p>

<p>2. Establish a Plant and Animal Health Task Force by:</p> <p>A) Designating representatives B) Holding a first meeting C) Holding subsequent meetings</p> <p><i>Creación de un Grupo de Trabajo sobre Sanidad Vegetal y Salud animal, por medio de:</i></p> <p>A) <i>Designación de representantes</i> B) <i>Realización de un primera reunión</i> C) <i>Realización de reuniones posteriores</i></p>	<p>All <i>Todos</i></p>	<p>October, 2001 December, 2001 2002 <i>Octubre 2001</i> <i>December 2001</i> 2002</p>
<p>3. Establish a task force on tropical and subtropical fruits by:</p> <p>A) Designating representatives B) Holding a first meeting C) Holding subsequent meetings</p> <p><i>Creación de un Grupo de Trabajo sobre Frutas Tropicales y Subtropicales, por medio de:</i></p> <p>A) <i>Designación de representantes</i> B) <i>Realización de una primera reunión</i> C) <i>Realización de reuniones posteriores</i></p>	<p>All <i>Todos</i></p>	<p>August 2001 Fall 2001 2002 <i>Agosto 2001</i> <i>Otoño 2001</i> 2002</p>