

**CALIFORNIA AVOCADO COMMISSION
PRODUCTION RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

March 2, 2011

A meeting of the Production Research Committee (PRC) of the California Avocado Commission (CAC) was held on Wednesday, March 2, 2011 in the CAC board room in Irvine, California, with the following people present:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Shane Tucker, Chair
John Burr (arrived @ 1:38)
Reuben Hofshi
John Lamb
Louis Santiago

CAC STAFF PRESENT:

April Aymami
Tom Bellamore
Jonathan Dixon

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Tom Royden

GUESTS PRESENT:

Norm Traner
Charley Wolk

ITEM #1 CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call/Establish Quorum- Item 1.A.

Shane Tucker, PRC Chairman, called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. with a quorum present. As a newly formed committee, Chairman Tucker asked those present to give a brief introduction of themselves.

ITEM #2 REVIEW OF PRODUCTION RESEARCH COMMITTEE'S FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Chairman Tucker began by explaining the goal for the day's meeting. He stated there would be quite a bit of work to complete, but the committee must tackle them in stages, with the main goal for this initial meeting to develop a process map that would direct how the committee interacts with CAC staff and board members, and would essentially direct the governance of CAC's technical investment program.

Chairman Tucker then went on to give a brief history of CAC's PRC explaining while the PRC has been a longstanding committee, which was very involved in the management of the production research program over the years, growing concerns as to the accountability of the program and the project approval process lead to Chairman Reeder disbanding the PRC in 2010. At that point the CAC Board decided to take back control over the production research program, and move to a system that is more aligned with CAC overarching goals and objectives.

CAC Chairman Charley Wolk addressed the PRC stating that while the PRC has made great progress over the years, the newly appointed committee has an opportunity

to decide how to best tackle the challenges faced by the industry. Mr. Wolk then went on to explain that his vision for the PRC is to function as outlined in the By Laws; to not function on its own, but be the glue between CAC staff, board and grower community. Mr. Wolk ended by stating that he felt the current PRC members have what it takes to get a solid investment return from CAC's production research efforts for the growers.

ITEM #3 DEVELOPMENT OF DECISION-MAKING PROCESS FOR GUIDING CAC'S TECHNICAL INVESTMENT

As a starting point for committee discussion, Dr. Jonathan Dixon, CAC Research Program Director, made a presentation on his view of how the PRC could use the five strategic imperatives adopted by the CAC board to guide them through the research program. Dr. Dixon discussed the need to create a business case for the production research program and how the strategic imperatives should determine industry key performance indicators (KPI) and that those KPI would then determine what industry statistics are needed. He also noted that the PRC would need to drill down on the impediments currently facing the California avocado industry, and how CAC's research program could address those issues. The last step of the process should focus on action steps/solutions in which research results could be used in cultural practices. Dr. Dixon's goal for the PRC is for the committee to look at what type of research program is appropriate and what type of research is needed. He noted that researchers would still be able to provide their ideas, but those ideas should be brought together with the committee ideas to address solving industry production issues.

Dr. Dixon's presentation is included as EXHIBIT A.

Committee discussion ensued regarding the following topics; how to gauge return on investment for the production research program, the need to further address impediments and action steps, the idea that the current PRC to also look back and build on the past PRC successes, the urgency for results from the program due to the current state of the California industry, proper dissemination of results that growers can use, etc.

Chairman Tucker then went on to explain that in order to address all the issues and ideas brought forward by committee members, the PRC needed to develop a process map for how the PRC will interact with CAC staff, board and the grower community. The committee then went on to identify key phases in the program and at which point the PRC would take recommendations to the CAC board for approval. Based on committee discussion, the following were identified as the big picture framework to begin building the process map:

- Phase I -Needs Assessment – Growers/Packers/Others
 - Where -> Related to imperatives
 - Committee derived – reported to the board
 - Impediments
 - Identify
 - Prioritize

- \$\$
- Criticality
- Phase II – RFP – Board Discussion
 - Evaluation
 - Cost
- Phase III – Implementation
 - Monitoring
 - Evaluation
 - Reporting
- Phase IV – Dissemination
 - Updates
 - Results Report
 - Applicability for growers

Following discussion from the committee, Chairman Tucker suggested that the committee take a look at a draft process map that he and Dr. Dixon had put together to see if it fit with the key phases that the PRC had identified. Dr. Dixon then went on to explain the process map, taking time to identify the responsibilities of the PRC, CAC staff and CAC board. The committee agreed that the process map provided implementation of the key phases discussed earlier in the meeting. Direction was given to simplify the process map a bit prior to presenting to the CAC board.

The Draft Process Map is included as EXHIBIT B.

Concern was given that the process map did not give any sort of timelines throughout the year. It was explained that the idea behind this type of process map is that it could be used at any time in the year when a need may arise. Further discussion took place regarding the current process in place for approving research programs and how the new process would be more flexible, allowing for multi-year contracts, and a process not bound by rigid timelines.

Chairman Tucker wrapped up by stating that the PRC would meet again before the March CAC board meeting and finalize the process map and to address what additional resources the PRC needs in order to properly identify impediments and action steps. The goal for the PRC would be to present the process map to the board in March and then the impediments and action steps in May.

ADJOURN MEETING

Chairman Tucker adjourned the PRC meeting at 4:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

April Aymami, Industry Relations Manager