

*NASDA's 2002 Farm Policy Initiative  
Working Document for the Marketing and International Trade Committee  
June 2000*

PRODUCTION .....	Page 1 of 18	TECHNOLOGY .....	Page 15 of 18
Management Skills .....	Page 1 of 18	Research and Development .....	Page 15 of 18
MARKETS .....	Page 1 of 18	GMO's/Biotech .....	Page 16 of 18
Structural Change .....	Page 1 of 18	Internet .....	Page 17 of 18
Access .....	Page 2 of 18	<b>New Uses</b> .....	Page 17 of 18
Trade Policy .....	Page 4 of 18		
Unilateral Sanctions .....	Page 4 of 18		
Fast Track .....	Page 4 of 18		
China PNTR .....	Page 5 of 18		
U.S. Anti- Dumping Laws .....	Page 5 of 18		
<b>Harmonization of International Trade Standards</b> .....	Page 5 of 18		
Biotech Products .....	Page 6 of 18		
Promotion .....	Page 8 of 18		
Market Access Program (MAP) .....	Page 8 of 18		
Export Financing & Credit Guarantees .....	Page 8 of 18		
Consumer Preference .....	Page 8 of 18		
Mass vs. Niche .....	Page 9 of 18		
TRANSPORTATION .....	Page 10 of 18		
Cargo Preference Policy .....	Page 10 of 18		
STEWARDSHIP .....	Page 11 of 18		
Safeguarding Plants and Animals .....	Page 11 of 18		
Foreign and Domestic Animal Health Issues .....	Page 12 of 18		
Foreign And Domestic Plant Pest and Disease Issues .....	Page 12 of 18		
Safe Food .....	Page 13 of 18		
Harmonization of International Trade Standards .....	Page 13 of 18		

*Marketing & International Trade Committee*

U.S. Agriculture Profile PRODUCTION - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p><b>Management Skills</b></p> <p>To be successful in the world of today's modern farmers, training resources and programs are necessary for successful farming and should be readily available. Successful farming requires a solid management foundation.</p> <p>(The Marketing and International Trade Committee has lead responsibility for this issue.)</p>	<p>NASDA does not have a specific policy on management skills.</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile MARKETS - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p><b>Structural Change</b></p> <p>Current antitrust laws, including those applied to packers and stockyards, should be more stringently enforced. There is an indication that more spot checking would be beneficial to enforce the regulations. Pursuing violations has become more costly when dealing with large conglomerates. This</p>	<p>NASDA policy 10.4 supports a price discovery system for reporting of all packer livestock transactions, including all kinds of captive supply by both the processor and the producer. Such a system, with equal reporting responsibility by both parties to the transaction, may ease the distrust between segments of the livestock industry and provide a more level playing field for all parties involved. It also has potential for providing detailed, accurate price information to producers, while protecting the confidentiality of individual market arrangements without increasing producers' operating costs. To the greatest extent possible, all meat</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile MARKETS - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p>complicates the issue due to the added resources of those charged and adds a vast amount of time and expense to each case as compared to the past.</p> <p>The accurate reporting of all imports and exports of live animals as well as all meat and meat products would allow producers to make better informed marketing decisions. In order to be helpful, the reports need to include prices paid, volume information, destination (for exports), and need to have improved accuracy and timeliness.</p> <p>As producer-owned meat packing cooperatives and businesses are emerging as viable marketing options for producers, restrictions placed on captive supplies should be written to prevent unintended restrictions on producer-owned meat packing cooperatives and businesses which provide livestock marketing options.</p>	<p>products should be clearly labeled as to country of origin.</p> <p>NASDA believes that a fair price discovery system is necessary and that the Secretary of Agriculture should be given the authority to prevent reprisals or discrimination within the system and should be provided with the necessary funding to adequately oversee and enforce the requirements of the new system. Unfair livestock procurement practices should also be restricted by allowing the USDA to issue civil penalties as a sanction for violations.</p> <p>10.4 Concentration in Agriculture</p> <p>Other policy options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interstate Meat Shipment</li> <li>• Modify US DOJ anti-trust authority</li> <li>• Increase GIPSA authority</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Access</b></p> <p>Market access can be obtained through organics, nutraceuticals, functional foods and other marketing programs; marketing orders and check-off programs. However, consumer ignorance and fraud/labeling issues stand to impede access.</p>	<p>NASDA policy 11.7 states that Federal-state marketing programs should be continued and expanded where feasible. The Secretary should take strong position in defining the concept and use of federal marketing orders based on the original concept of marketing orders as designated in the 1937 Act. The Secretary should enforce these uses and if they are being abused take aggressive action to correct any abuses. The Federal State Market Improvement Program (FSMIP) should be continued and market oriented demonstration projects prioritized.</p> <p>Further, the Secretary should review all state/federal marketing programs</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile MARKETS - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p>Check-off programs for generic advertising promote farm products in an equitable manner. Rather than promoting a product brand, these programs assist America’s farmers by helping them to bring agricultural products to the consumer. Federal support for farm programs will soon end. These types of programs make good sense by providing farmers with a forum to promote agricultural products to consumers. NASDA supports this important and equitable tool for promoting American agriculture.</p> <p>State-Federal Memeorandums of Understanding (MOU) for certifying fresh and processed products for “quality and condition” in both domestic and export markets should be incorporated into current MOUs with APHIS to inspect and issue federal phytosanitary certificates. Certification for quality and condition is the responsibility of the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS). All domestic marketing initiatives should address the feasibility of moving into international markets.</p> <p>Through the National Dairy and Tobacco Stabilization Act, dairy farmers in the 48 contiguous states invest \$.15 /hundred pounds of milk marketed, yielding in excess of \$200 million per year, in non-brand milk and milk production promotion. Five cents</p>	<p>to determine their cost effectiveness in relation to the cost imposed on producers. Research should focus on the use of new technologies for sampling and testing, which should be used when proven cost effective. Programs should be reviewed to determine who, state or federal, does which part of the program best, and delegate that work to the appropriate party.</p> <p>Cooperative programs should be reviewed to determine the most effective and affordable delivery systems with programs structured, accordingly.</p> <p>NASDA policy 11.6 encourages the adoption of procedures to take advantage of the latest analytical and network technology. Such procedures would ensure that grain grading and inspection results of all official grain inspection laboratory services are uniform, consistent, and provide the grain grading and inspection services to efficiently market the nation’s grain crops. On occasion, USDA review teams have a tendency to treat cooperators differently than their own inspection office. The reviews by USDA compliance officers or review teams are not always consistent at all grain inspection offices. It is absolutely essential that USDA officers treat FGIS (official) and private (cooperator) grain inspection offices in exactly the same manner.</p> <p>11.6 Uniformity/Consistency Between Official Grain Inspection Labs</p> <p>11.7 Federal State Marketing Programs</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile MARKETS - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p>from the assessment must go to the National Dairy Board , which is comprised of 36 dairy farmers appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture. The remaining ten cents may be designated to state and regional USDA qualified programs. Producers are allowed to designate in which markets these funds may be expended. When producer promotional dollars are expended where target audiences are located, all producers nationwide stand to benefit economically. NASDA supports the concept of producers’ dairy promotion dollars being expended equitably on a per capita basis in support of a national plan to maximize consumer impact.</p>		
<p><b>Trade Policy</b></p> <p>U.S. Agriculture is affected by negotiated agreements in the WTO and Congressional action; fast track, China PNTR, sanctions, dumping, &amp; international food aid. New markets are primarily overseas for agriculture.</p> <p><b>Unilateral Sanctions</b>–Unilateral sanctions that limit the commercial, government-assisted, or humanitarian movement of agricultural products are disruptive to international food trade and are proven to be ineffective mechanisms for furthering foreign</p>	<p>NASDA policy 6.2 supports efforts to liberate world trade in agriculture which we believe should continue through both the multilateral process and through regional free trade agreements.</p> <p><b>Unilateral Sanctions</b>-NASDA opposes any unilateral sanctions pertaining to agricultural exports.</p> <p><b>Fast Track</b>-NASDA supports fast track negotiations authority for the Administration. Fast track should be authorized with as few conditions as possible to allow maximum flexibility for U.S. negotiators.</p> <p>NASDA believes that the United States should seek full implementation of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures by requiring that all sanitary and phytosanitary measures be based on sound science, encouraging harmonization of sanitary and phytosanitary</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile MARKETS - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p>policy goals.</p> <p><b>Sanitary/ Phytosanitary</b>-Measures to protect humans, animals, and plants from diseases, pests, or contaminants. The final act of the Uruguay Round of the Multi-Lateral Trade Negotiations contains “ The Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures”. It applies to all sanitary (relating to animals) and phytosanitary (relating to plants) measures that may have a direct or indirect impact on international trade. The SPS agreement includes a series of understandings (trade disciplines) on how SPS measures will be established and used by countries when they establish, revise or apply their domestic laws and regulations.</p>	<p>measures on the basis of international standards, and requiring adherence to the principles of equivalence, transparency, and appropriate regionalization. The elimination of unjustified sanitary and phytosanitary measures should be a high priority for both federal and state governments.</p> <p>NASDA believes that the United States should emphasize the same sanitary and phytosanitary measures and standards are applied to genetically modified organisms in the international marketplace. Labeling of such products should conform with international standards and should not be construed in a way that acts as a barrier to trade.</p> <p><b>China PNTR</b> - NASDA supports the permanent renewal of China’s most favored nation (MFN) status with the United States. Continued trade relations with China would ensure progress towards trade liberalization and the resolution of trade disputes. Market access for agricultural products should continue to be a priority for the Administration and the Congress.</p> <p>NASDA believes that providing humanitarian assistance in the form of food is important and should continue to be supported by the United States.</p> <p>Global economic conditions impact the value and volume of trade. It is in the United States’ interest to promote and ensure a financially stable global marketplace so that trade between nations is not disrupted. To that end, NASDA supports efforts to promote and improve economic and financial stability in the global marketplace.</p> <p><b>U.S. Anti- Dumping Laws</b>-NASDA does not have a specific policy regarding “dumping”.</p> <p><b>Harmonization of International Trade Standards</b>- NASDA believes</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile MARKETS - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
	<p>that the United States should seek full implementation of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures by requiring that all sanitary and phytosanitary measures be based on sound science, encourage harmonization of sanitary and phytosanitary measures on the basis of international standards, and requiring adherence to the principles of equivalence, transparency, and appropriate regionalization. The elimination of unjustified sanitary and phytosanitary measures should be a high priority for both federal and state governments.</p> <p><b>Biotech Products-</b> NASDA policy 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 supports the principle that information relevant to the safety and healthfulness of foods should be widely disseminated. NASDA supports the policy of the Food and Drug Administration that foods produced through modern biotechnology should be labeled as such only if the foods differ from similar foods in ways that are significant and relevant to the issues of safety, efficacy, and purity. It is particularly important that labels convey useful and accurate information in a way that is not misleading to the consumer. Suggestions that biotech foods be labeled as such without regard to data demonstrating their substantial equivalence to other, unlabeled foods are unsupportable.</p> <p>3.1 Introduction to Biotechnology 3.2 Biotech’s Impact on Agriculture 3.3 Commercial Marketing of Products</p> <p>Other policy options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased state and federal efforts to educate consumers</li> <li>• Work with the FDA, EPA, and USDA to update biotech policies.</li> <li>• International negotiations to eliminate non-science based barriers to trade in biotech products</li> <li>• Oppose state level labeling requirements</li> <li>• Needs to be a different term for GMO</li> </ul>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile MARKETS - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More independent public research</li> <li>• The Administration must inform state departments of agriculture, or work in partnership</li> <li>• Federal and state cooperation</li> <li>• Development of improved processing technologies and new product development</li> <li>• Value-added products can contribute to domestic and foreign markets.</li> <li>• Adoption of uniform quality standards</li> <li>• Need federally approved chemicals, vaccines, and therapeutic compounds to increase productivity</li> <li>• Increase research funding</li> <li>• Change basic misconceptions in Congress and make research and development a higher priority</li> <li>• Crop Insurance for Aquaculture</li> <li>• Permits for water discharge (water cost is too high)</li> <li>• Availability of the Internet</li> <li>• Re-negotiate WTO amber box issues</li> <li>• Anti-dumping laws</li> <li>• Unilateral Sanctions</li> <li>• Fast Track</li> </ul> <p>Resource(s):</p> <p>Genetic Engineering the Technological Revolution@, Suzanne Wuerthele, US EPA, 999 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Denver, CO 80202, (303) 312-6039. (Speaker at Accord 1999).</p> <p>Application of Biotechnology to Crops; Benefits and Risks@ Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST), Number 12, December 1999.</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile MARKETS - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
	<p>Crop Busters@ pg. 44, by Michael Fumento. Reason Magazine, January 2000.</p> <p>Crop Busters Take On Monsanto@, by James Gillis and Anne Swarzdson, Tuesday, October 26, 1999 page E01.</p> <p>The Real Losers from Seattle, The Economist, December 11-17, 1999.</p> <p>Biotechnology: Trade Crisis or Path to Future@, Global Food Quarterly, Summer 1999, Number 28.</p>	
<p><b>Promotion</b></p> <p>USDA’s Foreign Agriculture Service (FAS) has provided tremendous assistance to state departments of agriculture, agricultural producers, and farmers in promoting the sale and consumption of United States’ grown agricultural products. Through a variety of programs, including foreign market development, market production, outreach, direct credits and loan guarantees, the FAS assists U.S. producers of both bulk commodities and high valued food products in establishing and maintaining markets around the world.</p>	<p>NASDA believes the Foreign Agricultural Service’s expertise in developing markets for agricultural products is invaluable to the industry. We support FAS programs aimed at meeting the objective of expanding trade for agricultural products.</p> <p><b>Market Access Program (MAP)</b>-NASDA supports the objectives of the Market Access Program (MAP) and believes the federal government and the Congress should support this critical resource for agricultural producers and promote an equitable international market place for agricultural purposes.</p> <p><b>Export Financing &amp; Credit Guarantees</b> - NASDA believes that export financing and credit guarantee programs are important resources for agricultural producers entering the foreign market place. We believe these programs should be expanded to cover transportation costs from the U.S., border to export destinations. This expanded coverage would fulfill the programs’ stated purpose in assisting foreign buyers with the purchase of U.S. agricultural commodities, thereby furthering the goal of maintaining or increasing the export of such products.</p> <p>6.3 addresses the programs issue of federal domestic policies effecting</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile MARKETS - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
	trade.	
<p><b>Consumer Preference</b></p> <p>Attacks on food production methods and safety are causing harm to the image of GMOs in agriculture. At the same time, a niche market for organics has been developing. Consumers need to be educated on GMOs and organics so that they can make an informed decision. The free flow of agricultural products and the financial security of producers must be protected. Laws and regulations requiring factual information must be used when making allegations against agricultural products and producers must protect their industry and enhance the general public welfare by prohibiting the dissemination of false, disparaging, and economically damaging information. Federal law requires most imports, including many food items, to bear labels informing the ultimate purchaser of their country of origin. By expanding country of origin labeling requirements, American consumers will be made aware of the source of their retail food supply and include that knowledge in selecting their purchases. Further, as we continue to shift towards a global economy and market place, imports will likely continue to increase. Consumers have the right to be made aware of the origin</p>	<p>NASDA policy 10.4 supports a price discovery system for reporting all packer livestock transactions, including all kinds of captive supply by both the processor and the producer. Such a system, with equal reporting responsibility by both parties to the transaction, may ease the distrust between segments of the livestock industry and provide a more level playing field for all parties involved. It also has potential for providing detailed, accurate market price information to producers, while protecting the confidentiality of individual market arrangements without increasing producers' operating costs. To the greatest extent possible, all meat products should be clearly labeled as to country of origin.</p> <p>6.6 supports country of origin. 4.10 discusses disparagement laws.</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile MARKETS - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
of the food products they purchase.		
<b>Mass vs. Niche</b>  Consumer Preference	NASDA does not have specific policy addressing mass or niche marketing.	

U.S. Agriculture Profile TRANSPORTATION - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<b>Cargo Preference Policy</b>  The Cargo Preference Act (P.L. 83-3664) requires up to 75 percent of all U.S. concessional food aid shipments to be shipped on U.S. flag vessels when the federal government pays for equipment, material, or commodities shipped to other countries. A minimum percentage of gross tonnage shipped by sea must go by U.S. flag vessels. Since freight charges on U.S. flag vessels are generally higher than those on non-U.S. flag vessels, the cargo preference requirements increase the cost of shipping food aid and reduce the quantity of food aid that can be made available to needy countries who are eligible for federal export subsidy programs.  The Jones Act is a common reference for Section 27 of Merchant Marine Act of 1920,	These laws create a competitive disadvantage for American agriculture, as compared to our foreign counterparts. NASDA policy 6.2 supports the repeal of the Cargo Preference Laws and the Jones Act.  6.2 Expansion of Trade Opportunities	

<p>which requires that all water transportation between U.S. ports be on U.S. built, owned, manned, and operated ships. The purpose of the law is to support the U.S. merchant marine industry, but agricultural interests generally oppose it because, they contend, it raises the cost of shipping the goods, making them less competitive with foreign sources.</p>		

<b>U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP - Issue Description</b>	<b>Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)</b>	<b>Comments/Recommendations</b>
<p><b>Safeguarding Plants and Animals</b></p> <p>The need for basic and applied animal health protection and disease control research continues to demand attention. There is a critical need to strengthen integrated animal health management programs to facilitate the transfer of information and technology from laboratory to the producer/consumer. Research is needed to prevent introduction of pathogens into the food chain by developing methods to reduce or eliminate them from animals during production. As international trade had increased, the threat of an outbreak of a foreign animal disease in the United States has also increased.</p> <p>Classical biological control is a pest control strategy that involves the importation of new</p>	<p>Currently, there is no coordinated effort between federal government and the state departments of agriculture to support and promote classical biological control at regional and national levels. NASDA policy 2.4 believes that a coordinated approach is essential so as to encourage continued importation of new natural enemies into the United States. NASDA supports classic biological control in dealing with exotic pests and rangeland weeds.</p> <p>NASDA believes that the USDA should encourage the use of irradiation for pest control. This is an important technology that can be applied to agricultural products to ensure a safe and healthy food supply.</p> <p>Other Policy/Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dialogue and agreement among NAFTA members</li> <li>• Private Research &amp; Research from our land grant institutions is necessary to improve agricultural production.</li> <li>• If the federal government bans or quarantines a product, there needs to be guidelines for implementation of said ban.</li> </ul>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p>natural enemies to control introduced pests. The use of this strategy of pest management is experiencing renewed attention because it is extremely cost effective and environmentally sound.</p> <p>Today's farmers and ranchers are being criticized for abusing our natural resources while still being asked to provide more and cheaper food. Two practices currently expanding in use are Integrated Crop Management (ICM) and Integrated Pest Management (IPM). IPM should be implemented nationally to reduce the reliance in chemical pesticides and increase the use of non-chemical tools over the long term.</p>	<p>(Reimbursement to producer , methods, and time line of action.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contractors must share risk with producers.</li> <li>• Biological Pest Control (2.4)</li> <li>• Integrated Pest Management (2.4)</li> </ul> <p>Safeguarding American Plant Resources@, A Stakeholder Review of the APHIS-PPQ Safeguarding System, July 1, 1999, National Plant Board at the request of UDAS-APHIS.</p> <p>“Pulling Together”, National Strategy for Invasive Plant Management</p>	
<p><b>Foreign and Domestic Animal Health Issues</b></p> <p>The completion of several disease control programs of significance to the economic viability of livestock production agriculture in the United States is nearing. Bovine tuberculosis, bovine brucellosis, swine brucellosis and psuedo rabies are examples of diseases that will likely be eradicated by the year 2000. Funding cuts and other resource constraints threaten the ability of USDA, specifically the Animal and Health Inspection Service (APHIS), to complete these</p>	<p>NASDA does not have broad policy on foreign and domestic animal health issues, but supports eradication and control efforts.</p> <p>“Safeguarding American Plant Resources”, A Stakeholder Review of the APHIS-PPQ Safeguarding System, July 1, 1999, National Plant Board at the request of UDAS-APHIS.</p> <p>“Pulling Together”, National Strategy for Invasive Plant Management</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
important programs.		
<p><b>Foreign And Domestic Plant Pest and Disease Issues</b></p> <p>The agriculture industry is faced with wide-ranging plant pests and diseases that threaten to damage crops and cause farmers to suffer severe economic losses. States should evaluate their current pest prevention programs for conformity with the National Plant Board guidelines and consider modifying their programs in order to achieve uniformity with those guidelines.</p>	<p>NASDA policy 2.2 recognizes the importance of controlling these devastating pests and believes that the federal government should be provided the adequate funding to carry out existing programs and to perform research to find ways to control and eradicate these pests and diseases.</p> <p>NASDA supports the efforts of the federal government to improve the efficiency for dealing with plant pests and diseases and to consolidate the functions and responsibilities of various agencies. We encourage the federal government to complete its work and submit to Congress for approval. We believe effective coordination and consolidation should include provisions that delegate uniform emergency action authority to the Secretary of Agriculture and that provides for the detection, control, eradication, suppression, prevention, or retardation of the spread of plant pests necessary for the protection of agriculture, the environment, and the economy of the United States.</p> <p>NASDA believes that the National Plant Board should work with USDA-APHIS-PPQ, USDA-ARS and other appropriate groups to address this issue. USDA-APHIS-PPQ should coordinate this effort. NASDA also believes it would be beneficial for a catalog of existing taxonomic expertise in the United States to be developed and recognizes that the catalog will need regular updating and suggests APHIS maintain the catalog.</p> <p>“Safeguarding American Plant Resources”, A Stakeholder Review of the APHIS-PPQ Safeguarding System, July 1, 1999, National Plant Board at the request of UDAS-APHIS.</p> <p>“Pulling Together”, National Strategy for Invasive Plant Management</p>	
<b>Safe Food</b>	<b>Harmonization of International Trade Standards</b> - NASDA believes	

U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p>U.S. Agriculture has an opportunity to market food as safe, wholesome, abundant, and affordable. There is a need to increase guidance and education on pesticide policy.</p> <p>Harmonization of pesticide policy and tolerances among trading policies is another important goal. These goals are hampered by incidents of food-borne illness, more science-based public health concerns, and reports of pesticide dangers and food scares (ex: Alar). EPA reexamination of pesticides under the 1996 Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) has already begun to result in restrictions or bans on pesticides. Policies may also be used as a trade barrier. The United States enjoys the safest food supply in the world, not by accident but rather due to the current laws and regulations protecting health and safety of the American public. However, even a system that ensures the safest food supply can become outdated and inefficient if it does not keep pace with emerging threats and technological advances. Agriculture has an opportunity to further improve food safety and productivity through technologies and enhance the farm-to-table food safety system. Producers can enhance marketing and competition by marketing foods as safe, wholesome, abundant, and affordable. There is also a need for harmonization of food safety standards among trading partners.</p>	<p>that the United States should seek full implementation of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures by requiring that all sanitary and phytosanitary measures be based on sound science, encourage harmonization of sanitary and phytosanitary measures on the basis of international standards, and requiring adherence to the principles of equivalence, transparency, and appropriate regionalization. The elimination of unjustified sanitary and phytosanitary measures should be a high priority for both federal and state governments.</p> <p>Policy Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FQPA implementation, pesticide risk determinations and methodology, data needs, and consumer education.</li> <li>• Increased research on nutraceuticals and phytochemicals.</li> <li>• Review federal dietary supplements policy.</li> <li>• Increase education on dietary habits.</li> <li>• Multi-lateral financial institution funding for cold-chain infrastructure improvements.</li> <li>• Section 18 emergency uses, reduced risk pesticides, certification and training, and worker protection.</li> <li>• Increase state/fed efforts to educate consumers</li> <li>• Reduced-risk pesticides, integrated pest management , precision farming, research.</li> <li>• Market foods as safe, wholesome, abundant, and affordable</li> </ul>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP - Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
Constraints to these goals are consumer confidence and acceptance, food scares, and disparagement of agricultural products, cold-chain limitations, and potentially unsafe import foods.	NASDA policy on safe food can be found in sections 9.1 & 9.5, and 9.6-9.9	

U.S. Agriculture Profile TECHNOLOGY- Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p><b>Research and Development</b></p> <p>The Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform (FAIR) Act (the 1996 Farm Bill) began the process of fundamental change in agriculture. The seven-year phase-out of commodity programs, which the legislation initiated, emphasizes the need for greater global competitiveness in agriculture. This increases the demand for sound, progressive agricultural research.</p> <p>In the past, public investments in agriculture research have paid large dividends to society, and the global, high-tech, environmentally- sensitive era we have now entered requires support of public research. The nation’s land grant universities must remain a strategic resource for agriculture and the general public. They must be used wisely and fully to support the needs of an ever expanding domestic and world population.</p> <p>R&amp;D allows development of new technologies, value added products, vaccines and chemicals. Barriers are unclear environmental standards, marketing research, need research, extension and market development w/ltd. resources.</p>	<p>NASDA policy 1.9 states aquaculture should be considered a form of agriculture in the broadest sense and aquaculture products should be viewed and treated as agricultural commodities. NASDA believes regulatory constraints imposed upon the aquaculture industry should be clarified, streamlined, and consolidated.</p> <p>NASDA believes the development of improved processing technologies and new products development represent important opportunities for the aquaculture industry. NASDA endorses the HACCP principles for aquaculture processing and encourages USDA and the FDA to provide on-going training for the industry that is both cost effective and focused. NASDA believes the process of development of minimum health standards by USDA should be with the direct involvement of the major aquaculture organizations, insuring coverage of all species groups and uses for the interstate and international movement of aquatic animals and plants.</p> <p>Other policy options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of improved processing technologies and new product development</li> <li>• Value-added products can contribute to domestic and foreign markets.</li> <li>• Adoption of uniform quality standards</li> <li>• Need federally approved chemicals, vaccines, and therapeutic compounds to increase productivity</li> <li>• Increase research funding</li> <li>• Change basic misconceptions in Congress and make research and development a higher priority</li> <li>• Crop Insurance for Aquaculture</li> <li>• Permits for water discharge (water cost is too high)</li> </ul>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile TECHNOLOGY- Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of the Internet</li> </ul>	
<p><b>GMO's/Biotech</b></p> <p>The American agricultural industry has developed the world's safest, most productive, most economically competitive and stable source of food and fiber by using the most advanced scientific knowledge available.</p> <p>Modern biotechnology is the fastest-growing science that allows researchers to link traditional biology with new technologies incorporating chemistry, genetics, engineering, biochemistry, cell biology, and computer science. Biotechnology can confer desirable traits to enhance pest and parasite resistance, improve nutrient utilization, improve the efficacy of biocontrol agents and reduce production inputs into the environment to assure the sustainability of agricultural production.</p> <p>The first products of modern agriculture biotechnology have entered the commercial market. Companies are actively marketing genetically engineered crop plants, plant products and animal products. Even though federal agencies are defining the appropriate regulatory process and labeling of bioengineered products, public interest and concern continue to be heightened as increased visibility of these products and</p>	<p>NASDA supports the principle that information relevant to the safety and healthfulness of foods should be widely disseminated. NASDA supports the policy of the Food and Drug Administration that foods produced through modern biotechnology should be labeled as such only if the foods differ from similar foods in ways that are significant and relevant to the issues of safety, efficacy, and purity. It is particularly important that labels convey useful and accurate information in a way that is not misleading to the consumer. Suggestions that biotech foods be labeled as such without regard to data demonstrating their substantial equivalence to other unlabeled foods are unsupportable.</p> <p>It is critical that federal and state officials be informed, knowledgeable, and included as working partners in all phases of the ongoing biotechnology regulatory policy process. It is essential that state agencies be active partners, sharing oversight responsibilities with federal agencies, while carrying out their responsibilities to the state's agricultural community and the consuming public at large.</p> <p>Other policy options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased state and federal efforts to educate consumers</li> <li>Work with the FDA, EPA, and USDA to update biotech policies.</li> <li>International negotiations to eliminate non-science based barriers to trade in biotech products</li> <li>Oppose state level labeling requirements</li> <li>Needs to be a different term for GMO</li> <li>More independent public research</li> <li>The Administration must inform state departments of agriculture, or work in partnership</li> <li>Federal and state cooperation</li> </ul> <p>Resource(s):</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile TECHNOLOGY- Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p>issues develop. The broadening scope of perception, based misrepresentations of the value, safety, and usefulness of biotechnology, is affecting the availability of bioengineered tools for the producers and new products reaching consumers.</p>	<p>“Genetic Engineering the Technological Revolution”, Suzanne Wuerthele, US EPA 999 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Denver, CO 80202, (303) 312-6039. (Speaker at Accord 1999).</p> <p>“Application of Biotechnology to Crops; Benefits and Risks”, Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST) Number 12, December 1999.</p> <p>“Crop Busters”, pg. 44, by Michael Fumento, Reason Magazine, January 2000.</p> <p>“Crop Busters Take On Monsanto”, by James Gillis and Anne Swardsdon, Tuesday, October 26, 1999 page E01.</p> <p>“The Real Losers from Seattle,” The Economist, December 11-17, 1999.</p> <p>“Biotechnology: Trade Crisis or Path to Future”, Global Food Quarterly, Summer 1999, Number 28.</p>	
<p><b>Internet</b></p> <p>The Internet opens the door for e-commerce and access to information. However privacy/security concerns, availability in rural areas and state sales tax are obstacles to the success of agricultural e-commerce</p>	<p>No specific NASDA policy on the Internet</p>	
<p><b>New Uses</b></p> <p>Throughout history, agriculture’s primary purpose has been to provide a source of food and fiber. Agricultural policies reflect that purpose by focusing more on increasing yields for traditional uses and in expanding</p>	<p>NASDA policy 11.9 states that industrial and pharmaceutical uses for agricultural products offer U.S. farmers an opportunity for market growth. In order for new uses of agricultural products to be realized to the greatest extent practicable. NASDA believes that additional crop research is needed to develop alternatives to traditional uses for agricultural products. Agriculture’s expansion into non-traditional industries will boost rural economies, with a positive economic and environmental ripple effect</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile TECHNOLOGY- Issue Description	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments/Recommendations
<p>international markets, rather than finding new uses for farm commodities. That focus has changed recently, as yields have expanded and supply for food and fiber commodities have begun to exceed demand. International trade competition has increased. At the same time, the use of non-renewable sources, such as fossil fuels and petrochemical plastics are causing environmental concern.</p> <p>The high environmental costs of retrieving, transporting, using, and disposing of non-renewable resources has become increasingly apparent. There is an increasing industrial need and demand for agricultural-based products as an alternative to those produced from fossil fuels. Also, many other non-renewable resources have to be imported, increasing the nation's trade deficit.</p>	<p>throughout the nation.</p> <p>11.9 New Uses of Agricultural Products</p> <p>Other policy options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of capital</li> <li>• Biotech</li> <li>• Pharmaceuticals</li> <li>• Renewable</li> <li>• Biomass</li> </ul>	