



Leaders' Guide for the Agriculture Update Consensus

LWVUS Agriculture Update Committee

Norman Turrill,
Chair, LWVUS Board
LWVTurrill@mac.com

Sheri Latash, Illinois
Jessica Trites Rolle, Kansas
Valerie Kelly, Maine
Margaret Chasson, Maryland

Linda Hoff, Michigan
Marnie Lonsdale, Oregon
Carol Kuniholm, Pennsylvania

CONTENTS

Introduction to the Study Process	2
Scope of the Study	2
Remaining Timeline for the Study	3
What Is a Consensus?	3
Local Board Roles.....	4
Guide for Study Committees & Discussion Leaders	4
Getting to Consensus	5
Other Related LWVUS Positions	6
Tips for Consensus Meetings.....	8
After the Meeting.....	9
Discussion Guide to Consensus Questions	10
Economic Health of the Agricultural Sector	10
Animal Management	13
Research and Development	14
Food Safety.....	15
Food Labeling.....	17

Introduction to the Study Process

Studies are part of League Program and, in League parlance, League Program includes all of the positions the League uses to affect public policy as well as the procedure for adopting these programs. Program is such an integral part of the League that, according to *League Basics*, “Program is the League’s reason for being.”

Program has three parts: 1) selection of an issue, 2) study of that issue, consensus and formulating a position, and 3) use of that position to influence public policy. All LWVUS positions are included in the League publication, *Impact on Issues, 2012-2014: A Guide to Public Policy Positions*, <http://www.lwv.org/content/impact-issues>.

This guide briefly covers how we got here, and, secondly, the perspective of participating in a national study at the local level. The purpose of a study, at any level, is to educate members so that they can be informed participants in consensus and provide the necessary data for formulating the ultimate position.

Additional information about conducting a national study is on the LWVUS website at “Guidelines for LWVUS Studies,” <http://www.lwv.org/content/guidelines-lwvus-studies>.

Selection of an issue begins with the Program Planning each League is asked to do. This is where the local Leagues identify issues that deserve a study at the national level or updates of existing positions. These are issues where the LWVUS has no position, and, therefore, cannot act. Remember, Leagues cannot take action without a position.

During Program Planning before the 2012 Convention, many Leagues expressed an interest in the agriculture issue. The Agriculture Update was brought to the convention floor as a not-recommended item and adopted by the delegates to Convention 2012. Step one completed.

Study and consensus began right after Convention when the LWVUS Board appointed a study committee chair, set up the process for selecting the committee, and approved a preliminary scope and timeline for the study. This set the parameters for the study committee’s work.

The study committee’s first task was to review and suggest modifications as appropriate to the scope for the study. A **scope** describes the limits of the study, describes areas to explore and often includes focus areas. The culminating position will address only those issues delineated in the scope. The scope of this Agriculture Update was approved by the LWVUS Board and distributed to local Leagues to give them direction during the study process.

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study, as adopted by the LWVUS Board, states:

The Agriculture Update will focus narrowly on: 1) current technology issues in agriculture including genetically modified organisms (GMOs), herbicides, pesticides, agriculture water pollution, water technology, antibiotics in livestock, and accurate food labeling; and 2) current agriculture finance issues including consolidation in agriculture industries, crop subsidies and the federal agricultural regulatory process.

Leaders' Guide for the Agriculture Update Consensus

The study committee began its work of refining the areas to be studied, researching and writing background information about the different areas contained in the scope, and preparing consensus questions and other materials to help direct local League discussion to consensus. All of these materials are/will be posted at <http://www.lwv.org/member-resources/agriculture-update>.

As each local League reports its consensus (or lack thereof) the reports are consolidated, and, based on this information, a committee formulates the **position** which, when approved by the Board, can be used for action.

Remaining Timeline for the Study

Dates	Action
Feb. 2013 - April 2014	State and local Leagues may form study committees, examine relevant materials, hold public meetings, etc.
Jan. - April 2014	State and local Leagues hold consensus meetings.
Jan. - April 2014	Education Fund Committee proposes and Board appoints Member Agreement Committee.
Friday, April 18, 2014	Deadline for consensus reports via electronic survey form only. (There is no paper form.)
April 2014	Member Agreement Committee decides if consensus was reached, and if so, proposes a new position statement to the Education Fund Committee, which then proposes it to the full Board for adoption.
May 2014	Consensus result or new position statement is announced before Convention.

What Is a Consensus?

It is easier to say what consensus is not, than what it is. Consensus is not a vote; rather, consensus is mutual agreement of League members arrived at through discussion. During discussion, everyone has an opportunity to express their viewpoints, and the issue is examined from all sides. Consensus questions, created by the study committee and approved by the Board, provide structure for the meeting. Members discuss the pros and cons until it becomes apparent that consensus has or has not been reached on each question. A committee will analyze the consensus responses, look for areas of member understanding and agreement and, using this information, will create a position statement.

Background materials: After the scope was adopted by the LWVUS Board, committee members researched and wrote about various issues included in the scope, compiled a list of resources, consolidated information, developed a glossary and a list of acronyms, and proposed the consensus questions to the Education Fund Committee. The materials, resources, and an automated consensus response form are all posted at <http://www.lwv.org/member-resources/agriculture-update>.

When the LWVUS Board of Directors approves changes to the Agriculture position created from Agriculture Update consensus responses, it immediately becomes the League's position and is the basis for action on the issue. This type of member involvement in the consensus process tends to ensure

member commitment to the resulting positions. In addition, members have the opportunity at each Convention to decide whether or not to re-adopt these positions or update them.

Local Board Roles

There are several roles for the local League board during the study process. The board appoints a study chair and/or committee to help educate membership and the community about the study issues. It is best to have a committee to share the work and introduce less experienced members to the League process on a short-term project, but this is not always possible. Ideally, some of these members have basic knowledge of the issues and some study experience, but some may just have an interest in learning more about the subject.

With the support of the local board, the committee may schedule and facilitate community meetings about issues in the study, bring in outside speakers (local farmers, agriculture extension agents, and faculty from the agriculture department of a nearby college would be easy choices for this study). Agricultural practices, farm structures and crops vary by location. As you enter the study and consensus effort, please attempt to reach out to the diverse local farm communities to learn more about the concerns and immediate issues facing your local farming economy. These meetings may be held any time in the process after the scope is determined and often include outreach to other members of the community interested in the topics to be discussed. Such meetings are a great way to gain visibility in the community and to attract prospective members.

Then, after the consensus meeting(s) are finished and the committee prepares the consensus report, it is brought to the local board for approval before it is submitted to the national study committee. Be sure in planning consensus meetings to allow time for this board approval before the reporting deadline date.

Guide for Study Committees & Discussion Leaders

This guide is intended as a resource for local League study committees, to help presenters and facilitators knowledgeably answer questions that may arise during discussion, in a framework focused on reaching consensus. There is more detailed information included than you will want to present.

There are more questions about agriculture than we can address in the limited time available for consensus. The Agriculture Update Committee has focused the study materials on the issues that fall within the scope of the study as defined in the charge from the LWVUS Board.

A prime responsibility of the facilitator and the study committee will be to keep the discussion focused on the consensus questions and avoid distracting asides, however fascinating they may be.

Because agriculture is a large and complicated subject with complex federal agency interactions and overlapping state authority, your presentation should be carefully planned. It should be noted that the study materials were carefully developed through literature research, with limited direct input from farmers or farm organizations. Leagues are encouraged to hold workshops in which farmers from their region can discuss their perspective on the issues identified for consensus.

Leaders' Guide for the Agriculture Update Consensus

The goal of the consensus meeting(s) is to come to agreement on your League's answers to the consensus questions. The Discussion Guide to Consensus Questions section below has been compiled to help focus your discussion. It is presented in a format parallel to the consensus questions for convenience of reference. These comments and questions will enable you to "jump start" a discussion that is lagging, veered off topic or failed to start. This is **not** a script that must be followed, but ideas and aids to help you cover the material in a limited amount of time.

We suggest you either do your consensus meeting in one long meeting (perhaps a morning session, a break for lunch and discussion, then an afternoon session) or two shorter meetings. It is important to do background and consensus on each part at the same session so all those coming to consensus have access to the discussion during the background presentation.

For large Leagues with multiple units, the study materials and consensus questions might be divided among the units, assuming the membership of the units is fairly homogeneous. The consensus responses could then be merged at the local League level.

Trying to put all of the background and content in one meeting and consensus in another is tempting but can lead to several problems:

- Some members will attend one meeting and not the other.
- Those who attend the first meeting and not the second will receive good information but will not be able to participate in the consensus.
- Those who attend only the second meeting will not have the depth of background to follow the discussion; that can lead to repetition and frustrate those who have attended both.

Given the breadth of information and complexity of questions, it is important that you pace yourselves to have time to complete all questions. We suggest that you include in your consensus report as much as possible, leaving unanswered the response for topics that you were not able to get to. A partial consensus report is better than no report at all.

Do not use the computer form to record your session. Use the WORD or PDF form that has been provided on the website. The online form should be completed only after your board has approved the consensus.

Getting to Consensus

Almost everyone has an opinion on food, and thus on agriculture. Each may have interesting stories to share. While personal insights are valuable, it is the responsibility of the facilitator(s) to keep the group focused on the consensus questions. The following are suggestions that have been found helpful in reaching this goal.

Before the consensus meeting, committee members should:

- Review the study materials on the LWVUS website.
- Make sure that the consensus questions have been reviewed and save time at the end to make sure your information is sent to your local board for review.

Understand the ingredients of a successful meeting:

Leaders' Guide for the Agriculture Update Consensus

- There is a common focus on content.
- There is a common focus on process.
- The discussion leader or facilitator maintains an open and balanced conversational flow.
- Someone is aware of protecting individuals from personal attack.
- Everyone's role and responsibility are clearly defined and agreed upon.

In other words, everyone on the committee is on the same page.

Assign specific tasks to committee members. Decide:

- how much time to allot to each section of the discussion,
- who will present each part,
- who will facilitate the consensus part of the meeting if different from the presenters,
- who will be the recorder, and
- who will make sure the results of your consensus get to your LWV board for approval before completing the online form at <http://www.lwv.org/member-resources/agriculture-update>.

Decide how to present the study material:

Break the presentation into manageable chunks that lay people can understand. Be careful to explain any jargon and acronyms. A variety of voices and styles help people stay focused. Be prepared to answer questions for clarification along the way. The material is complicated in some areas and you will want to check for understanding.

Schedule a practice session prior to the presentation/consensus meeting:

During a practice session is helpful to have an experienced League member present to help with timing and balance between background and discussion. The recorder should come away with what needs to be recorded and what to do with questions and opinions about topics not covered by the consensus questions. (Suggestion: Have another sheet of chart paper labeled as "parking lot" where these may be noted for discussion at a later time.) Many Leagues with multiple units will hold training ahead of time for the unit leaders. This is important so that the unit leaders understand the scope, are prepared for the discussion and understand the reporting procedures.

It is important to be aware of any place where there might be a conflict and be prepared to discuss it. Copies of the local, state and national positions should be available for reference at the meetings.

Make sure committee members are familiar with any agriculture positions your state or local League may have adopted, and also the current LWVUS Statement of Position on Federal Agriculture Policy. Consult *Impact on Issues, 2012-2014: A Guide to Public Policy Positions* at <http://www.lwv.org/content/impact-issues> in the section on Natural Resources, page 56.

Other Related LWVUS Positions

The current League agriculture position continues to address important areas of concern in agriculture, and provides ample opportunity for robust advocacy in areas of sustainable farming, environmental protection, a recommended shift from farm subsidies to market-driven pricing, and appropriate investment in research. Other League positions and principles provide additional support for advocacy in

Leaders' Guide for the Agriculture Update Consensus

these areas. We list these here so that Leagues will not waste time on related issues that are already in LWVUS positions or are outside of the scope of this study.

1. Pesticide and herbicide use, chemical fertilizers, crop management practices and concentrated animal operations all impact air and water quality. While these are of ongoing concern, LWVUS positions on **Environmental Protection and Pollution Control** already offer a solid framework for advocacy at every level, with specific attention to the responsibility of federal agencies to ensure compliance.

.... The League believes that although environmental protection and pollution control are responsibilities shared by all levels of government, it is essential that the federal government provide leadership and technical and financial assistance.

The federal government should have the major role in setting standards for environmental protection and pollution control. Other levels of government should have the right to set more stringent standards. Enforcement should be carried out at the lower levels of government, but the federal government should enforce standards if other levels of government do not meet this responsibility. Standards must be enforced in a timely, consistent and equitable manner for all violators in all parts of society, including governmental units, industry, business and individuals.... (Impact on Issues 2012-2014, p 50.)

While agricultural coalitions have pushed for exemptions from standards articulated in the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act, the League position states clearly that standards should be applied across all parts of society, with the federal government ensuring enforcement if states do not fulfill this responsibility.

2. The League's **Position on Immigration** (*Impact on Issues 2013-2014*, p. 71) states that immigration policies should meet the “*Economic, business, and employment needs of the United States....*” State immigration laws combined with federal inaction on immigration reform, including expansion of the guest worker program, has caused a migrant agricultural labor shortage. According to the American Farm Bureau Federation in 2012, the lack of labor was expected to result in up to \$9 billion in losses from unharvested produce. Up to 70% of agricultural laborers are estimated to be undocumented workers.

3. The League's **Position on Meeting Basic Human Needs** (*Impact on Issues 2013-2014*, p. 74) states that “*Persons who are unable to work, whose earnings are inadequate or for whom jobs are not available, have the right to an income and/or services sufficient to meet their basic needs for food, shelter and access to health care.*” Nutrition assistance programs (SNAP, WIC, school breakfast & lunch programs) comprise more than 70% of USDA's budget. In November 2013 SNAP recipients experienced a reduction in benefits when a temporary prior increase (authorized during the 2008 recession) expired. SNAP funding has been a major topic of disagreement between the House and Senate during the Farm Bill negotiation process.

Tips for Consensus Meetings

Explain the ground rules and meeting structure

The facilitator should explain the meeting ground rules at the beginning—how the meeting will be structured, how much time will be devoted to what.

Review the difference between voting and consensus

Explain the difference between a majority vote and coming to consensus as the sense of the meeting. A senior League member or board member can help the facilitator explain. The time devoted to this will depend on the experience of the members participating.

The role of the discussion leader/facilitator is to make sure that:

- everyone has a copy of the agenda/program and knows what to expect,
- meeting format and ground rules are understood up front,
- members understand they have a role in the meeting/consensus, and
- everyone stays on track until the day's goal is met.

Define the recorder's role

The recorder should be at the front of the room in clear view of the members participating. It is best to record on large easel paper that can be viewed by everyone. After each question, check back with the participants to make sure the consensus of the room is captured before you move on. After each section, make notes to include in the comments sections of the consensus report. Remember, these are limited to 200 words or less in each comment box. Comments are optional, not required.

Review state and local positions

Facilitators and presenters should be knowledgeable of any state and local agriculture positions and present any possible conflicts up front.

Ask the group's help in keeping on topic

People will usually cooperate if they understand why you must ask them to keep their comments focused. A "Parking Lot" easel sheet is often helpful so they do not feel ignored. The focus should be on what government can do about the issues, since that is the focus of League positions and advocacy. Explaining up front encourages positive peer pressure.

Make sure everyone understands the materials presented

Encourage people to ask questions when they do not understand something. This material is often complicated and the language may be unfamiliar. Including the glossary in the handouts as a reminder of what terms mean, may be helpful. Asking for raised hands, when material is unclear, can help assure everyone is included.

How to handle "breaking news"

Many of the issues we are discussing are currently in the news, both nationally and locally. These may distract from the work of the consensus meeting(s). Events may happen the morning of your meeting. If you are aware of them, present them up front before starting the discussion. Explain that these events or

current legislation, however interesting, are not a part of the consensus process because League positions are intended to provide a long-term basis for advocacy. Acknowledge the concerns and move them to the “parking lot” for discussion at another time. This is the role of the local study committee.

If you have a “talkative group”

You know your League. If they like to talk, have trouble keeping focused, or have a lot of opinions, it may be useful to have a timed agenda and a time-keeper to assist the facilitator.

The importance of the end of the meeting review

It is important to allow ten or fifteen minutes at the end of the meeting for the recorder to review the notes and reaffirm the sense of the meeting. This is reassuring to everyone that his/her thoughts have been heard.

After the Meeting

Schedule a committee debriefing: Schedule a meeting of your committee to debrief as soon as possible after the consensus meeting(s) so discussion is still fresh in their minds. Early access to the recorder’s notes by email is helpful. **Do not** file the report electronically yet. Prepare your report using the WORD version that is included in this kit and present it to your local League board for approval. If you have had more than one meeting or come to consensus in multiple unit meetings, it will be the job of the committee to consolidate these reports and make one report for your board. After that approval, one delegated person will go to the website and file the online report at <http://www.lwv.org/member-resources/agriculture-update>. Full instructions will be provided when you log into the website to access the consensus response form, and only one report per League will be accepted.

Discussion Guide to Consensus Questions

With the consensus questions keyed to the research papers.

Please Note: Each question provides an opportunity to comment. Each comment section has a 250 word limit. Please include the letter(s) from each questions that is relevant to the comment(s).

For example: In question 1, if you wanted to make a comments about Disaster assistance and crop insurance, you would include the letter 'b' before your comments on Disaster assistance and 'c' before your comments on crop insurance.

Comments:

a:

Your comments on disaster assistance would go here.

b:

Your comments on crop insurance would go here.

Economic Health of the Agricultural Sector

To answer the first four questions members should be familiar with the pros and cons of current and past agricultural subsidy programs which are described briefly in A1 on the USDA, in F1 which describes different types of agricultural subsidies, and in F2 which describes the crop insurance program. Some of the areas of current or potential government support listed in the questions are not covered or only briefly mentioned in the overview materials (e.g., dairy program, livestock program, specialty crops, and best management practices). Members are asked to consider these questions from the perspective of their local and state agricultural interests and knowledge they have obtained from farmers in their area. For cases where there is some relevant discussion for one of the sub-question topics, we have noted the resource paper and section of relevance below.

Question 1:

(a) Subsidized agricultural credit (loans): F1 Overview of Subsidies, page 6 has a link to a recommended reading that describes 10 agricultural loan programs.

(b) Disaster assistance: F1 Overview of Subsidies, page 3 and a recommended reading on page 6

(c) Crop insurance: F2 Overview of Crop Insurance, entire paper

(d) Farms that supply local and regional markets: T1 Overview of Farm Management, pages 1-2 on Farm Characteristics and Consolidation, page 4 on Vertical Integration, and pages 6-7 on Small Farms, Urban Farms, and Local Food Systems; T7 Overview of Animal Management, page 3 on AFO/local farm issues and pages 4-5 on issues of vertical integration and consolidation

(e) Subsidized implementation of best management practices: T5 Overview of Soil Management, page 2 on Incentives for good soil management; T6 Overview of Water Management, several mentions of incentives to encourage good water management practices throughout the document; T1 Overview of Farm Management, page 5 on Influence of Government Policies provides an illustration of negative incentives for BMP

(f) Commodity crop programs: T7 Overview of Animal Management, page 5 illustrates how commodity crop subsidies affect animal production choices; A1 USDA, page 3 mentions current issues concerning commodity crop subsidies; F1 Overview of Subsidies, pages 1-3 on descriptions of different types of current subsidies and many of the recommended readings

(g) Commodity livestock program: Not mentioned specifically in any document but indirect subsidies affecting AFO production decisions are mentioned in T7 Overview of Animal Management, page 5

(h) Commodity dairy program: Not specifically mentioned in any document but a brief description of current price support program for milk producers is available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Milk_Income_Loss_Contract_Payments

(i) Specialty crops: Not specifically mentioned in terms of support programs but T1 Overview of Farm Management, pages 1-2 on Farm Characteristics and page 5 on Influence of Government Policies is of some relevance

(j) Other production methods: Not specifically mentioned in terms of government support but T1 Overview of Farm Management, page 5 describes Organic Agriculture, and page 6 mentions a variety of other production techniques used by Small Farms/Urban Farms/Local Food Systems

1. *Should government financial support for agriculture be directed to:*

- a) Subsidized agricultural credit (loans) (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- b) Disaster assistance (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- c) Crop insurance (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- d) Farms that supply local and regional markets (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- e) Subsidized implementation of best management practices (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- f) Commodity crop programs, e.g., corn, soybeans, sugar, cotton, wheat (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- g) Commodity livestock program (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- h) Commodity dairy program (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- i) Specialty crops, e.g. fruits, vegetables, nuts, etc. (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- j) Other production methods, e.g. organic, hydroponic, urban, etc. farms (Yes, No, No Consensus)

Comments:

Question 2: All of the F1 Overview of Subsidies paper should be read.

2. What changes should government make regarding direct payment programs to farm operators?

Note: Farm operators can be anything between family farms to huge corporations.

- a) *Eliminate* direct payments to farm operators (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- b) *Update* the rules for direct payments to farm operators to support sustainability (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- c) *Broaden* the types of farms that are eligible (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- d) *Broaden* the types of crops that are eligible (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- e) Effectively *enforce* existing rules (Yes, No, No Consensus)

Comments:

Question 3: All of the F2 Overview of Crop Insurance paper should be read.

3. What changes to current crop insurance programs should government make?

- a) Extend to more types of crops (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- b) Link to the use of conservation practices (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- c) Limit insurance for the cultivation of marginal and environmentally sensitive land (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- d) Cap amount of premium subsidy to a single farm operator (see note in question 2) (Yes, No, No Consensus)

Comments:

Question 4: All of the A8 Patent and Trademark Office, A9 Federal Antitrust Agencies, T1 Overview of Farm Management and T7 Overview of Animal Management papers should be read (T7 is included for consideration of local butchering operations).

4. Should government act on any of the following?

- a) Revise anti-trust legislation to ensure competitive agricultural markets (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- b) Enforce anti-trust laws as they relate to agriculture (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- c) Promote alternative marketing systems, including regional hub markets, farmer cooperatives, farm markets, etc. (Yes, No, No Consensus)

Comments:

Animal Management

We recommend that you read the entire T7 Overview of Animal Management paper for helpful background for questions 5 and 6.

Question 5: Look in particular at the section on Consolidation (pp. 1-5), EPA Regulation of CAFOs (p. 6), Right to Farm Laws (p. 7), Animal Health and Welfare (p. 7) and Aquaculture (pp. 11-12).

Question 6: Read Consolidation (pp. 1-5), Indirect and Direct Subsidy of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (p. 5), EPA Regulation of CAFOs (p. 6), Right to Farm Laws, (p. 7) and Aquaculture (pp. 11-12), and Climate Change (p. 13). See also paper T5 Overview of Soil Management, section on Nutrient Management, page 2.

5. Which of the following approaches to animal management should government achieve?

- a) Transparently collect and disclose data about regulated animal feeding operations (AFOs) or aquaculture operations and about the health of animals in such regulated operations (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- b) Apply and enforce existing clean air and clean water regulations to animal or seafood management facilities (Yes, No, No Consensus)

Comments:

6. Which of the following approaches to animal waste management should government require or bring about?

- a) Treat animal waste with environmentally sound technologies for all regulated AFOs (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- b) Prioritize federal funds to mitigate existing environmental challenges (such as Environmental Quality Incentives Program, cost share, loans, etc.) rather than construction of new facilities (Yes, No, No Consensus)

Comments:

Research and Development

Question 7: Research and development (R&D) uses science and engineering to gain a basic understanding of processes and structures of organisms, to create new products or processes for agriculture, to determine health and safety of a product, to determine the environmental impact of a product or process, to develop conservation methods, and to improve efficiency, among other things. R&D utilizes scientific methods and statistical testing to achieve valid repeatable results.

Private corporations, universities, consulting organizations and laboratories, and government agencies perform agricultural R&D. Agricultural research by public universities began in 1862 when the Morrill Act established land grant universities across the United States; much of the basic research on agriculture was developed through these universities. Private R&D is generally more applied than basic and is motivated by the desire to produce a profitable product. Government agencies review this private research when regulatory approval for a product or process is required. And many government agencies conduct their own research.

To learn more about required research and development for agricultural *products and processes*, we recommend you review the study papers addressing Overview of Key Agencies (A0), the Food and Drug Administration (A4), the Environmental Protection Agency (A3) and US Department of Agriculture (A1 and A2). For an *overview* of public and private R&D funding, see the paper on Subsidies (F1). The Patent and Trademark Office paper (A8) discussion of the Bayh-Dole Act is particularly relevant as a driver of agricultural *R&D policy*. Review the papers on the Plant Breeding (T2), Genetic Engineering and GE Foods (T3), Nanotechnology and other Technologies (T8), and CDC and NIH (A6) for information on *specific types of R&D*. The papers on Farm Management (T1), Pesticide Management (T4), Water Management (T6), Animal Management (T7) and Soil Management (T5) provide links to R&D on *agricultural processes*.

In evaluating the materials and suggested references and links, please consider the sources. Blogs, newspaper articles, and information pieces from sources with an identified bias may not necessary reflect all information on the topic and should be treated accordingly. The validity of scientific information increases as hypotheses are repeatedly tested. Thus a *single* paper reporting a research result should not be considered as the final truth.

7. Which of the following approaches to research and development (R&D) should government fund or accomplish?

Note: For the purpose of these questions and some questions below, “**developed using any new technology**” or “**new technologies**” refer to any of many scientific processes for developing new crops or animals with genetic engineering, nanotechnology or other new techniques, which are not the traditional breeding or hybridization techniques.

- a) Basic research (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- b) Independent third-party (such as an academic institution) risk assessment of products *developed using any new technology* (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- c) Research to assess the impacts of *new technologies* on human health and the environment, prior to their widespread adoption (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- d) Research that advances the continuation of diversified and sustainable agricultural systems (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- e) Seed banking, research, and other means that promote and preserve genetic diversity (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- f) Both transparency in the reporting of research studies related to approval of new products **and** respect for intellectual property rights of private enterprises engaged in research (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- g) Research on long-term effects of new crops, products and processes (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- h) Development of new practices and technologies to promote conservation for all types of farms (Yes, No, No Consensus)

Comments:

Food Safety

Question 8: The United States has a complex food system. Risks to food safety can occur during the development of new plant and animal hybrids, during the growing of foods, during the harvest and processing of foods and during shipment and storage. Additional risk may accompany imported foods. Risk includes contamination with chemicals used in production, contamination with bacteria, fungi or viruses from multiple sources, nutrient loss due to processing or production techniques, introduction of allergens or other cross contamination.

To increase food safety, federal agencies have developed a variety of standards, and guidelines. Testing to meet these standards is performed by private groups and governmental agencies. To learn more about safety requirements we recommend you review the paper on Overview of Key Agencies (A0). Learn more about the role of the USDA (A1), the EPA (A3), the FDA (A4), the CDC and NIH (A6) and the Interaction of Federal Agencies (A7). Please note that in some instances testing and reporting is mandatory and in other instances guidelines are provided with the onus placed on the producer to meet standards. For specific examples of requirements and approaches read the papers on GE and GE Foods (T3), Nano and Other Technologies (T8), Pesticide Management (T4) and Animal Management (T7).

Sections of the above papers that are directly relevant to each of the Food Safety consensus questions are listed below, with page references and section names.

Question	References
8(a) to 8(c)	T3 Overview of GE and GE foods, pages 2-3 (Ht and Bt crops) and pages 4-6 (Regulatory Framework for GE Crops) T8 Nano and Other Technologies, pages 3-4 (Safety and Regulation of Nanotechnology) A5 Food Labeling, page 4 (Bioengineered Foods) and page 9 (Future of Food Labeling)
8(d) & 8(f)	T7 Animal Management, pages 8-10 (Pharmaceuticals in Animal Feed) T3 Overview of GE and GE foods, pages 7-8 (GE Animals)
8(e) and 8(g)	T3 Overview of GE and GE foods, page 5 (Deregulation paragraphs) F1 Overview of Subsidies, pages 4-5 (Indirect Agricultural Subsidies for Research and Development)
8(h)	T1 Overview of Farm Management, pages 4-6 (Sustainable Agriculture and Organic Agriculture) A1 USDA, pages 3-4 (Current Issues) F1 Overview of Subsidies, entire document provides insights on incentives provided by current programs
8(i)	A7 Interaction of Federal Agencies, page 4 (Current Issues) A1 USDA, pages 2-3 (Farm Bill and Budget Authorizations) A5 Food Labeling, page 2 (FDA Funding Concern) A4 Food and Drug Administration, page 3 (Federal and State Appropriations)

8. Which of the following approaches to food safety should government perform or fund?

- a) Clarify and enforce pre-market testing requirements for new foods and food additives *developed using any new technology* (see note below question 7) (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- b) Require developers to monitor all food products *developed using any new technology* after releasing to the market (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- c) Withdraw marketing approval if products are shown to be unsafe (Yes, No, No Consensus)

- d) Require post-market monitoring of approved pharmaceutical applications in animal production for human health and environmental impacts (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- e) Require developers of new products to provide data and other materials to independent third-parties (such as academic institutions) for pre- and post-market safety assessment as appropriate (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- f) Limit use of antibiotics in animal production to treat and control disease (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- g) Fund independent third-party (such as academic institutions) risk assessment of long-term and multiple exposures from foods on human health and the environment (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- h) Promote crop management practices that decrease dependency on added chemicals (pesticides, herbicides, and synthetic fertilizers) (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- i) Fund, train and add personnel for assessment and compliance functions of regulatory agencies (Yes, No, No Consensus)

Comments:

Food Labeling

Question 9: We recommend you read all of A2 USDA-Nutrition and A5 Food Labeling.

9. How sufficient are the following regarding current food labeling?

- a) Nutrition Facts on food labels (Insufficient, Sufficient, Too much, No Consensus)
- b) Nutrition Facts on food labels as a means of consumer education (Insufficient, Sufficient, Too much, No Consensus)
- c) Common allergen labeling (Insufficient, Sufficient, Too much, No Consensus)
- d) Health and ingredient claims that consumers can understand (Insufficient, Sufficient, Too much, No Consensus)

Comments:

Question 10: We recommend you read all of A5 Food Labeling.

10. Which of the following should government achieve regarding marketing and ingredient claims on food labels?

- a) Define (and approve for use) health and safety marketing terms (e.g. immunity support, humane, pasture-raised, natural, etc.) (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- b) Regulate the use of images or other sensory advertising (Yes, No, No Consensus)
- c) Require that ingredient marketing claims accurately represent what is in the required ingredient list (Yes, No, No Consensus)

Comments:

Question 11: We recommend you read all of A5 Food Labeling, T3 GE and GE Foods and T8 Nano and Other Technologies.

11. *Recognizing that each food developed using any new technology can be unique, and assuming that required food labeling should be useful to consumers, should the following generalized information relating to how products or components are developed be presented on food labels?*

See note below question 7. All these questions also assume some percentage threshold of new technology ingredients, such as the 0.9% used in the European Union.

- a) Contains ingredients developed using any new technology stating which technologies are involved (Not Recommended, Voluntary, Mandatory, No consensus)
- b) Does **not** contain ingredients developed using any new technology (Not Recommended, Voluntary, Mandatory, No consensus)
- c) If meat, fish, eggs, or dairy products are from animals that have consumed feed developed using any new technology stating which technologies are involved (Not Recommended, Voluntary, Mandatory, No consensus)

Comments: