

## APLU BAC Proposed New Approach FAQ

- *Question*

### *Answer*

- *What would the process entail if we moved to this single ‘ask’ model, in regards to allocation of funding to individual report lines?*

The proposed allocation would be part of the ask. The one-pager describes how the increase would impact each line.

- *If appropriations to NIFA are greater than the sum of the requests for the six priority lines, then where are the additional funds allocated (do we have any control of this)?*

We hope to have this problem. As has always been the case, the only control we have is by virtue of the strength of our advocacy effort. Ideally they would add additional funding to our core priorities.

- *If the budget is cut, then how does this translate to individual lines?*

Previous answer applies on control. We would note that, other than the sequester year, any reductions in NIFA lines have occurred outside of our core priorities.

- *How do we ensure that all sections (ESCOP, ACOP, ECOP, 1890s, etc) feel represented in the budget request?*

The entire process described above should help to illustrate that a rising tide floats all boats. ACOP is the most challenging on those as they are not directly reflected in the core six lines, rather they benefit from each. The challenge will be, similar to the CREATE21 process, sections arguing for a bigger portion of an increase that has yet to be realized. The competitive and capacity lines are important across all sections and would significantly increase in the OPTIONS presented.

- *What is the purpose of a single-ask approach and why is it advantageous over the current approach of each group putting in an “ask”?*

The single-ask approach allows the entire BAA family to collectively stand behind a SINGLE ASK rather than approaching Congress for several asks. According to many years of experience, and other case studies (i.e. NIH), this strategy has a better chance at achieving actual increases for all six priority lines. This approach allows CARET delegates to deliver a simple message to Congress and provides an argument that both competitive and capacity funding is equally important.

- *What is NOT the purpose of the single-ask approach?*

The single-ask approach is NOT a consolidation of appropriations line-items, or anything dealing with the BAA’s Farm Bill priorities. The single-ask approach is simply a marketing tool to align the BAA family behind ONE ask rather than several.

- *How are priorities (funding levels) across the six lines determined? Who determines that?*

The single-ask approach does not change this fact: Congress determines which priorities are funded, across the board. The single-ask approach unifies the BAA's message to Congress, which is support for a significant increase in NIFA funding. The message remains that the BAA wants the increase to effect the six priorities that the BAA has had for several years, in the amounts that we request.

- *Does the single-ask approach open the door for appropriators to allocate funds away from any of the capacity lines to others or AFRI?*

The unified message does not inherently increase this risk.

- *How will this effort support or contradict what the President's budget and/or NIFA might be supporting?*

While this is a unique year where we are dealing with FY2017 and FY2018 simultaneously, the basic premise does not change. The President proposes and Congress disposes. In past years we have generally supported the President's request when it is higher than the preceding year, and the single-ask approach does not necessarily change this fact. The difference is that our request for FY2018 will precede the President's. Ultimately Congress determines which priorities are funded, across the board. The single-ask approach is marketing tool, and thus, does not recommend a change in the way Congress funds NIFA. When the President's budget is issued, the BAC always has the option to revise its request to reflect any necessary changes.

- *Historically, Congress has supported competitive funding but not capacity funding. How does this approach address that?*

This approach attempts to unify the system behind a single ask, which is to provide equal support for a significant increase in all six core BAA priorities for NIFA. Thus, the new approach will provide the BAA with a more unified approach to increasing all six priority lines, including the five capacity lines by capturing the political capital of the entire system for each of the six core priorities.

- *What are the arguments to seek a \$200 million increase?*

AFRI funds less than 30% of peer reviewed and approved proposals. Capacity funds (Hatch, Smith-Lever, Evans-Allen, 1890's Extension, McIntire Stennis), while higher than the levels appropriated in FY2010, have lost substantial purchasing capital and the resulting loss of infrastructure makes us less competitive, domestically and globally. In order to regain and maintain that competitive edge we must have investments in competitive AND capacity funding. \$200 million is a relatively modest additional investment in our Land-grant universities' core infrastructure and, therefore, our ability to meet the challenges of the future.

- *Who are the "blessed states"? Who will be the congressional champions?*

The blessed states are those that have a Senator or Representative on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittees from their state. Cornerstone will include the blessed states in their presentation at CARET/AHS. Regardless, once the BAC makes a decision on the FY 2018 Appropriations approach, and the PBD ratifies the decision, every BAA stakeholder, including all CARET delegates, will need to take this single ask to their Senators and Representatives. Quality and quantity of congressional support are vital if we are to achieve our goals and meet the needs of our stakeholders and the public.

- *What happens to those programs that are not included in this proposal?*  
As in years past, we continue to support the continuation of all NIFA appropriated lines and oppose any reductions below the prior fiscal year funding level.
- *If there are no new funds, is there a way to take care of the Central State University issue?*  
Additional funding is required to address any shortfall.