NRSP Review Committee Agenda Brief

Presenter: Clarence Watson

The NRSP Review Committee met on May 31, 2016 at the Atlanta Airport and had two items of business; review and form a recommendation on a new NRSP proposal (NRSP_temp11, National Agricultural Research Data Network for Harmonized Data) and discuss NRSP 8's mid-term reviews. Committee members who attended the meeting were Clarence Watson (chair & SAAESD), Doug Buhler (NCRA), Bret Hess (WAAESD), Dan Rossi (ED NERA), Don Latham (CARET), Tom Bewick (NIFA), Eric Young (ED SAAESD & executive vice chair). Members not present were Fred Servello (NERA) and Shirley Hymon-Parker (ARD).

1. **NRSP_temp11, National Agricultural Research Data Network for Harmonized Data**
    - Presentations were made on the proposed NRSP and co-PI's/administrative advisors involved were at each 1862 regional spring meeting for the discussion
    - Comments from Spring Meeting Discussions:
        - Concept is well supported, timely and appropriate, lot of power in having big data sets available for further use
            - Proposal to bring ARS, NAL, and Land-grants together on this issue is very good
            - This is similar to the plant database project, lots of data in different formats that need to be brought together for further use
            - This whole area seems too big to be led by an NRSP as a national platform
            - AES's should not be primary lead, but a smaller part of a large national effort
        - General consensus that business plan was not well developed, very hard to pull out cohesive plan from all the appendixes
            - What happens after ARS & NAL commitment ends, how would it be sustainable?
            - Amount of leveraged funding is not as great as indicated because most of it is unrecovered indirect cost and in-kind from participating Land-grants
            - Private entities should be involved, both in participation and funding
        - Lot of concern with proposed data format as the core standard, focus of that format is on crop simulation and may not be appropriate for other types of data sets
            - Like to see proof of concept work first, not convinced this is correct format for these data sets
            - Like to see alternative data formats considered
            - No specific quality control on data sets
            - Scope of data types proposed may be too broad for a single data format
        - Not well integrated, only indicates that it would be of interest to CES
            - Outreach and communication plan is not well defined

    - NRSP-RC Recommendation
        - Reject proposal as presented
        - Proposal may be resubmitted with following concerns addressed
            - Resolve issue of format that appears not applicable to many potential data types

- Business model needs to be better articulated, more realistic, better leveraged, and show sustainability beyond 5 years. A revised proposal must address the short-term commitment of NAL
- Consider bringing in additional partners for expertise and financial support (e.g., data analysis firms, consultants, private industry, other federal funding agencies, foundations, etc.)
- Develop a quality control process for data sets received
- Develop a more definitive outreach and communication plan that explains the target audience and outcomes desired for workshops or other activities; for the harmonized data sets; and for the ultimate end user of results. Define how Extension and education fit into a continuing outreach and communication effort.

2. NRSP-8 Midterm review

- Only criticism was lack of attendance by stakeholder representatives on committee at annual meeting in January, but PAG venue does not offer much for them. Project leadership might consider a separate stakeholder meeting/workshop held every 2-3 years.
- NRSP Review Committee agreed project is progressing well and no changes are needed