

IPM VOICE—DISCUSSION of PURPOSE and GAPS

From Phoenix Workshop, 12/1 and 12/2/2009; transcribed by NE IPM Center

DISCUSSION of the PURPOSE OF IPM VOICE, PART 1

Statement: No matter what we call it, are we on board to be a champion in DC for IPM?

Revised Statement: No matter what we call it, are we on board to champion IPM [in DC]?

Vision

Simple Mission

Stakeholder Input

Timeline

“How big is the tent?”

Find a way to embrace this effort. “My problem: doesn’t feel like there is sufficient detail.” Clearing up conflict.

Still need to discuss:

Affiliate with:

Progressive (means left of center); won’t embrace the political piece

“Advocacy is troubling”

Understand what the organization will do

“[I didn’t support the statement because] It sounded like a mission statement, and we came here already with one noted.”

“I abstained—from a federal approach; I can’t support the language.”

“Put a word in front of ‘IPM’, such as ‘advanced, high-level, etc.’”

“Could we say we are *advancing* IPM? Verifiable, sustainable, comprehensive.

We failed to develop a set of credible *standards*.

DISCUSSION of the PURPOSE OF IPM VOICE, PART 2

Statement we took a poll on:

“We the founding delegates of the IPM VOICE are committed to champion continually improving IPM in all venues where progress can be made.”

Poll: 20 stayed the same, 5 increased support; 3 decreased support

Comments, starting with industry representatives:

“What do you want to fund? Specifically, what are we trying to accomplish?”

“Harold’s progressive IPM is a good explanation.”

“If this is a move to set up a lobby group in D.C., our policy is not aligned (possibly) with this action.”

“We want to fit, we want to find our place in this group. Even to amend our policies.”

“What are the principles in our IPM Group?”

Company cultures

“Core competencies: we work carefully w/people in D.C. to [advocate regarding] warehouse and distribution [issues]. Outside core competencies we will not participate, especially in D.C.”

“Lobbying is a problem and outside the scope of our company policies.”

“Federal agencies can’t lobby, but we can educate. How can this IPM group get the word out differently than many other groups? What do we mean by champion?”

Foundation of CDC can receive grants.

Define lobbying by some legal support
Do we need a resolution? Scott’s statement.

Need to talk with management in my association. Lobbying is too spicy on this agenda.

Continuous improvement of IPM?

Common theme: What can we do to raise this IPM_____? A structure.

End-of-workshop statement (we did not take a poll on this; it was simply read by Scott Hutchins to the group):

“IPM VOICE is an inclusive coalition of diverse organizations that share a common goal of promoting IPM, which will coordinate and collaborate on activities that include government briefings and symposia; prioritizing research needs; promoting public awareness; and continuing to seek innovation in IPM methods.”

GAPS (Last topic of the workshop)

The “Governance and membership” didn’t get chosen by a working group and thus didn’t get discussed in small groups on the last afternoon. Once the large group reconvened, these people volunteered to work on the topic of governance and membership: Bob Rosenberg, Blaine Viator, Kim Leval, Ray McAllister, and Scott.

All participants recommended that the Planning Group be the “next steps” group and determine a steering committee, after inviting the Phoenix group to submit ideas. The Phoenix group would have two weeks to volunteer or nominate others for the steering committee. Jim VanKirk would send out an email. People who expressed an interest in being part of this committee: Dawn Gouge, Jim VanKirk, Harold Coble, Sherry Glick, and Larry Gut (also, Carrie K-L, but she was facilitating at this point so did not step out of role).

We set Dec. 11th as the deadline for an Action Plan.

Funding ideas: Get seed money; get a minigrant from an IPM Center.

Question: What can participants say outside the workshop about it?

Answer: Anything.