In preparation for my presidency of NAICC, I did a great deal of soul searching and sought advice from many professionals that I have crossed paths with to get input on their ideology and viewpoints on leadership and especially on managing organizations. Many of the people I spoke with were past NAICC presidents, but I also consulted with CEO’s and others with leadership roles in various organizations. Of course, as everyone has different strategies, ideas, viewpoints, and styles, it was interesting to take in all the perspectives. Many discussed professional organizations they are involved with and gave me a good idea of what they themselves felt made a successful professional organization. And as you would expect, those ideas were as dynamic as the individuals.

I took the time to look up several quotes from some famous and successful people regarding professional organizations in general. The quotes that follow are contrasting, and many may not reflect what you, I, or other NAICC members feel makes a great and successful organization. However I believe consideration of these quotes may lend perspective when considering the goals and achievements of the NAICC. Which of these quotes best reflects your passion for NAICC and its direction? Email me at blaineviator@gmail.com and let me know your favorite quote relating to organizations. If you have any other quotes, or even one of your own, I’d like to you to send them my way.

“The achievements of an organization are the results of the combined effort of each individual.” – Vince Lombardi

“An organization’s ability to learn, and translate that learning into action rapidly, is the ultimate competitive advantage.” – Jack Welch

“In the successful organization, no detail is too small to escape close attention.” – Lou Holtz

“There are people who are really good managers, people who can manage a big organization, and then there are people who are very analytic or focused on strategy. Those two types don’t usually tend to be in the same person. I would put myself much more in the latter camp.” – Mark Zuckerberg

“In any great organization it is far, far safer to be wrong with the majority than to be right alone.” – John Kenneth Galbraith

“The productivity of a work group seems to depend on how the group members see their own goals in relation to the goals of the organization.” – Ken Blanchard

“The quality of an organization can never exceed the quality of the minds that make it up.” – McAlindon, Harold R.

“The person who figures out how to harness the collective genius of his or her organization is going to blow the competition away.” – Walter Wriston

“Albrecht’s Law - Intelligent people, when assembled into an organization, will tend toward collective stupidity.” – Karl Albrecht

“Ethics must begin at the top of an organization. It is a leadership issue and the chief executive must set the example.” – Edward Hennessy

“The secret of all victory lies in the organization of the non-obvious.” – Marcus Aurelius

“Meetings are a symptom of bad organization. The fewer meetings the better.” – Peter F. Drucker

“Research indicates that workers have three prime needs: Interesting work, recognition for doing a good job, and being let in on things that are going on in the company.” – Zig Ziglar

“An organization that is strong and stable and is ready to commit time, money, and patience will be more apt to reap rewards than the quick-hitting opportunist.” – Richard Miller

“I am personally convinced that one person can be a change catalyst, a “transformer” in any situation, any organization. Such an individual is yeast that can leaven an entire loaf. It requires vision, initiative, patience, respect, persistence, courage, and faith to be a transforming leader.” – Stephen R. Covey

“Organization doesn't really accomplish anything. Plans don't accomplish anything, either. Theories of management don't much matter. Endeavors succeed or fail because of the people involved. Only by attracting the best people will you accomplish great deeds.” – Colin Powell

*Continued on next page*
"A business leader has to keep their organization focused on the mission. That sounds easy, but it can be tremendously challenging in today’s competitive and ever-changing business environment. A leader also has to motivate potential partners to join."

– Meg Whitman

"The only things that evolve by themselves in an organization are disorder, friction, and malperformance."

– Peter F. Drucker

Happenings on the Hill

Be Careful of What You Wish For

By Jim Steffel

When we met in Reno, there were rumblings that some of our contract research (CR) members were being disqualified as locations for GLP studies because their facilities had never been audited by EPA. As you might expect, those members were anxious for a means to request an EPA audit and made that known to the Board and Government Affairs Committee. As might be expected, other CR’s were opposed to any efforts on the part of NAICC to encourage more audits.

While CR’s were gingerly discussing the imposition of EPA audit requirements by sponsors, our quality assurance (QA) members were hearing of a sponsor’s worst nightmare: a study rejection during the regulatory review process of a submission for registration. A costly problem: the study needs to be repeated, the registration is delayed and the product loses time in the marketplace – that translates into real money! This study rejection did not occur in the US, but rather in Europe as part of an OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) submission. OECD is sort of an Economic Treaty between member nations to set international standards and policies designed to harmonize business and regulatory guidelines. International pesticide guidelines have been part of this system for many years. A key provision of this treaty as it applies to pesticide registrations is Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD). That provision allows companies to submit data developed, according to GLP, in any OECD member country. The member countries agree to accept that data submission to support registration in their respective jurisdictions. Like our process here in the US there are guidelines for the conduct of these studies very similar to our GLP’s to insure data integrity. Testing facilities in most countries are required to participate in a certification program that includes re-certification of GLP compliance every 2 to 4 years depending on the country where the facility is located. When the MAD agreement was ratified other OECD members accepted EPA’s audit system as a certification substitute for US studies. The assumption being those audits served as a de facto certification system.

So how does all this affect us? The rejected study mentioned above was conducted in the U.S. and the report contained a signed GLP compliance statement. The rejection had nothing to do with the technical merit of the work; the problem was the test facility had never been audited by EPA! A fact discovered when the OECD member country reviewing the submission contacted EPA to confirm the testing facility certification requirement. As it turned out, the facility was relatively new when the study was conducted. During the time lag between conducting the study and the audit confirmation request, the facility went out of business. Therefore, not only had the facility not been subjected to a regular audit but now it was not even possible to conduct an after the fact audit.

As might be expected, this event not only generated concern at the sponsor Company, but also with regulatory agencies in Europe. The study had to be repeated and the sponsor did that work in Europe at a lab with current OECD GLP certification. Since that incident there have been others and most sponsors have now adopted a rigid policy of selectively placing any potential OECD submission study at EPA audited facilities.

As if that was not enough cause for concern, the budget situation in Washington has added another complication. In recent years, budgetary constraints at EPA have impacted the resources available for compliance monitoring, resulting in staffing reductions and travel restrictions. That directly impacts the number of facilities operated by our CR’s that can be audited. Over the past 5 years, the number of GLP facilities audited annually has declined. In fact, in EPA’s fiscal year 2010 (Oct 1, 2010-September 30, 2011) there were only 14 EPA inspections conducted at field facilities. Some might say that is good….. Be careful what you wish for! Although EPA has given assurance that there will be no further reductions in audits during 2012, we can assume the number will not increase toward historic levels. Considering the red flag now up with OECD member countries, it is likely a recent EPA audit will become a pre-requisite for placement of most regulatory studies in the US.

NAICC, along with several other professional associations representing FIFRA regulated industries, has aligned with CropLife America supporting an effort to bring attention to this situation within EPA and government representatives in Washington. A Task Force has been established with participants from CropLife and SQA as well as from industry and Renee Daniel will represent NAICC. The objective of the Task Force is to create a survey to determine the total number of testing sites in the US that require EPA GLP monitoring as well as the potential economic risk to the US, in terms of both dollars and jobs, if EPA cutbacks negatively impact the global acceptance of US GLP studies.

In late April EPA announced a limited scale pilot program designed to reduce audit costs. The program would group facilities to be audited by geographic location. The facilities would be required to submit copies of data for the selected studies to EPA headquarters. A data audit would be done in Washington with inspectors communicating questions or additional needs to the facility. The data audit would be followed by a one day facility visit with one inspector scheduling 4 facilities per week within reasonable geographic proximity to minimize travel costs. This pilot program will be initiated in the spring of 2012 and initially involve only sponsor facilities. Several sponsors have already been notified of the audits and are in the process of sending data for the selected studies to the EPA. NAICC will be following the progress of this strategy to add efficiency to EPA’s current audit system and more closely align with the obligations the US has as an OECD member and the MAD provisions of that agreement.
Senate Ag Committee Marks Up 2012 Farm Bill

By Glenn Luedke, Legislative Assistance

The Senate Ag Committee marked up and approved its version of the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act of 2012 or “Farm Bill” on April 26, 2012. The vote was 16-5. The five Senators voting against the proposed legislation included Gillibrand (Dem-NY), Cochran (Rep-MS), McConnell (Rep. KY), Chambliss (Rep. GA) and Boozman (Rep-AR).

The Committee bill includes historic reforms to commodity subsidies. Significant changes were also made in the conservation title, streamlining the existing 23 programs into 13 and reducing the acreage in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP).

According to a Senate Ag Committee press release “The bill reforms food and agricultural policy by eliminating direct payments and emphasizing the need to strengthen risk management tools for farmers, saving billions of dollars.” The intent by consolidating the two remaining farm programs into one, is so farmers will have the ability to tailor risk management coverage—meaning better protection against real risks beyond a farmer’s control.

In addition to replacing direct payments with a shallow loss revenue based payment, the bill limits payments to not more than one farm manager per farm operation. It is assumed “mega” farms and absentee investors will no longer be beneficiaries of farm programs.

Section 7308 of the Senate bill contains explicit authorization for the USDA Regional IPM Centers. Authorization in the Farm Bill ensures ongoing support for the Centers, which were established in 2000 and have a very successful record operating programs and managing grants that connect public and private IPM stakeholders to provide effective pest management solutions.

Authorization language for the Centers was part of the Farm Bill initiatives drafted by IPM Voice members and IPM stakeholders. While in DC in March 2102, NAICC Executive Board brought this language to the attention of House and Senate leaders encouraging them to include the language in the Farm Bill.

The Senate is in recess this week and there is no certainty when the legislation will even be considered by the full Senate. Meanwhile, the House Ag Committee continues to hold hearings on their version of the farm bill.

Committee Approves FY13 Agriculture and Energy Appropriations Bills

By Allison Jones, EVP

The Senate Committee on Appropriations approved the FY 2013 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies; and Energy and Water Development Appropriations bills by a vote of 28-1. Both measures will now be reported to the full Senate for its consideration.

The ag spending bill contains provisions for research by providing $1.239 billion for the National Institute on Food and Agriculture (NIFA) and $1.101 billion for the Agricultural Research Service. Farm Service Agency received $411 million for farm loan programs and $1.208 billion for salaries and expenses. The bill also fully funded the Market Access Program (MAP) at $200 million and the Foreign Market Development (FMD) program at $34.5 million. Conservation programs received $828 million for the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

IR-4 funding under the Minor Crop Pest Management program remained the same as 2012 at $11.9 million. The bill also holds IPM funding at FY 2012 levels. The bill does not include the administration’s proposed Crop Protection Program which consolidates IPM and IR-4 funding and functions. Proposed 2013 IPM budget numbers reflect last year’s amounts:

- $4 million for Regional Pest Management Centers
- $9.918 million for E-IPM - State-based IPM Coordinators
- $1.402 million for the Pest Management Alternatives Program
- $2.362 million for the Regional IPM Grants Program (RIPM)
- $153,000 for Expert IPM Decision Support System

Child Labor Update

By Allison Jones, EVP

The Department of Labor dropped their proposed changes to child labor laws. The proposed changes seemed centered on rural/ag youth. Republicans and Democrats jointly opposed the proposals. The Department of Labor began a public comment period in February resulting in the decision to fully withdraw the rule.

According to the Department of Labor, the parental exemption allows children of any age who are employed by their parent, or a person standing in the place of a parent, to perform any job on a farm owned or operated by their parent or such person standing in the place of a parent. Congress created the parental exemption in 1966 when it expanded protections for children employed in agriculture and prohibited their employment in jobs the Department of Labor declared particularly hazardous for children under the age of 16 to perform.
NAICC Welcomes New Members WAPCC and Fine America, Inc.

The Washington Association of Professional Crop Consultants (WAPCC) is a newly formed state consulting organization in Washington. Their mission is to advance agriculture through “Science, Education and Advocacy”. WAPCC advances technical knowledge, skills, and a professional reputation among agricultural consultant members, as well as formulates and enhances sound agronomic principles within the industry.

WAPCC’s goal is to provide venues for networking and an exchange of information for highly qualified individuals. Membership is open to consultants, industry reps, university extension, state officials and research associates in all crop growing regions of the Pacific Northwest. WAPCC members represent a variety of crops from row crops and root crops to vine and tree fruit crops.

We are also delighted to welcome Fine America, Inc., as a new Sustaining Member! Fine America, Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Fine Holdings Ltd., Worcester, UK. Founded in 1983, Fine focuses on the development and marketing of plant growth regulators for fruit and ornamental crops. The company received its ISO 9001 accreditation in 1992 and continually strives to improve plant growth regulator technology to meet the exacting demands of today’s quality-conscious growers.

In the U.S., Fine Americas markets Exilis® Plus, Falgro®, Novagil® and Perlan® for use in a variety of fruit crops. In addition, the company currently is developing Blush® to promote color change in Gala, Fuji, Macintosh and other bi-color apple varieties. For more information on Fine Americas and its products, please visit www.fine-americas.com.

Kevin Forney from Bakersfield, CA is the NAICC contact for Fine America, Inc., and represented the company at the 2012 NAICC Annual Meeting in Reno. Kevin has been with Fine Americas for seven years as the Technical Services Manager for North America and South America. His areas of responsibility include new product development as well as provide technical support to our sales team and retail customers with our existing product line. He works closely with a number of university and independent researchers on a day-to-day basis, many whom belong to NAICC.
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CLASSIFIED AD:
FOR SALE: Field Queen Forage Harvester with 60” x 41” x 29” weigh hopper. 3-row x 30 inch row head. Used for measuring forage yield. Contact Doug Nord, dwnord@gbta.net, 620-285-3380