

NATIONAL PROCESSED RASPBERRY COUNCIL

Research Committee

Teleconference

November 26, 2013, 1:00 p.m., PDT

Committee Members Participating:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> William Beadle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adam Enfield
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Christensen	<input type="checkbox"/> Sukh Kahlon
<input type="checkbox"/> Jon Cotton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erin Thoeny
<input type="checkbox"/> Rob Dhaliwal	

Others Participating:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Krugman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kim Spriggs
<input type="checkbox"/> Tom Skilton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leigh Selby

x = present

o = absent

A. Establish Quorum

The meeting was called to order by Adam at 1:05 p.m. A quorum was not on the call at that time. It was decided to continue discussion so that at minimum there could be an advisory recommendation to the Council during its January 15, 2014 conference call.

B. Narrative Overview

Tom Krugman was asked to walk the Committee through the PowerPoint summary of nutrition and new technology/processing research proposals. He began by reminding members of the nutrition research goal as established in the strategic plan, and how priorities for projects had been established during the Raspberry Roundtable. Nine of the fifteen project proposals received addressed either bio-availability/bio-mechanisms or diabetes, the top two priorities. Strongest consideration was given to proposals that had matching funds, drew from or supported previous research, or were unique to raspberries.

New Technology or Processing proposals had been forwarded to the NPRC by the WRRC as received in response to its RFP. Proposals received addressed applying emerging technology to food safety or new products.

Question was raised on the Edible Coating proposal, wondering whether it addressed nutrient degradation during baking or simply to prevent color leaching during baking. Erin noted work at OSU on this question, but regardless, color leaching was a huge issue for the baking industry, and if a project could minimize its occurrence, it could open new markets for frozen raspberries to this sector.

Adam felt it important that the Council focus on nutrition and health research first, then new products/technology. He recognized that two of the nutrition research proposals were to existing researchers to complete FY 2014 projects. Comments from two committee members unable to be on the call indicated a desire to keep focused and not over-extend funding commitments.

Tom then summarized proposals being recommended with Leigh indicating her ongoing discussions with representatives of the fresh raspberry industry about potential co-funding of some projects.

At 1:40 p.m., William joined the call, establishing a quorum. On a motion by Adam and seconded by Erin, minutes of the July 3, 2013 conference call of the Research Committee were unanimously approved as submitted.

Returning to discussion on proposals, William asked about funding multi-year projects as it would commit the Council before knowing the results of the studies or what proposals might be received in the future. Specifically he discussed committing \$328,000 for FY 2016 projects as part of considering the proposals before the committee. Tom said that all contracts have an escape clause, so that if a funded project was felt to be off target it could be cancelled. Tom said it was of concern to him as well in the event the Council received proposals well in excess of its ability to fund in response to the next RFP. If that was the case, projects could be deferred until the following year. He added that all recommended multi-year projects were within the Council's top priority areas for research.

Erin asked about the timing of publication of results and when there would be information that could be used in the wellness marketing program. Leigh said that all projects require progress reports with information used against established marketing themes.

C. Committee Action

On a suggestion to separate nutrition research from new technology/processing, a motion was made by Adam and seconded by William to adopt the proposals for funding in FY 2015 as recommended.

Discussion ensued on how to address the new technology processing proposals. Tom said that they could be part of the amended FY 2014 budget that would result from re-defining the fiscal year to be acted on by the Council in January. There was agreement to defer action on these proposals at this time, instead discussing them during the Council's conference call.

ADJOURNMENT

With no other Committee business, the call adjourned at 2:05 p.m. PDT.