

PPIC Executive Board Meeting, Friday, March 1, 2019 9 – 10 am, FScN 225G

In attendance: Pam Ismail – UMN

Claire Boyle – UMN

Jason Robinson – AURI

Christina Connelly – Canadian Consulate

Julie Simonson – Schwans, via WebEx

Denis Chereau – IMPROV, via WebEx

Therese Liffbrig – UMN, via WebEx

Stacy Pyett – Wageningen University and Research, via WebEx

Absent: *Greg Cuomo – UMN

**Although not mentioned in today's meeting, Greg Cuomo, the associate dean for research within CFANS, is an Executive Board member but was not able to attend today's meeting*

1. Introductions (9:04 – 9:09)

2. Inaugural Meeting Re-cap (9:10 – 9:12)

- a. Feedback survey collected information about success of various event aspects, overall positive feedback
- b. Julie: What were areas of improvement?
 - i. More networking time/longer breaks
 1. Jason: Suggested social hour following event in addition to longer break times
 - a. Inclement weather prevented more attendees from staying for networking dinner
 - ii. Difficulty seeing presentations on screens, small text
 1. Provide a slide template/format or presentation guidelines to make sure text is large enough

3. Review of Executive Board (EB) Responsibilities (9:13 – 9:25)

- a. Carefully selected individuals for this team who will provide objective input and don't have financial investment in PPIC
- b. Responsibilities 3 – 5 (defining PPIC goals, determining milestones and timelines, and making funding decisions) will be discussed at a future meeting
- c. Christina: What is the EB's role with regard to reporting?
 - i. Quarterly reports will be expected from researchers leading PPIC projects, EB will review them at meetings
 - ii. ***Add to responsibilities of EB: Oversee activities and PPIC projects by reviewing quarterly research reports***
- d. Jason: What is the scope/frequency of PPIC events on an annual basis?
 - i. One short course and one workshop per year, Technical Committee will decide on the topics of these events
- e. Stacy: Some of the EB and Director responsibilities overlap. How can we distinguish these roles/clarify expectations? (specifically, responsibilities 1 and 2)
 - i. Currently Pam is reconnecting with meeting attendees and those who weren't able to attend the inaugural meeting to discuss membership
 - ii. EB members should play an active role in identifying and communicating with potential partners, Pam is always available for questions if EB members need clarification on membership specifics
 - iii. Stacy: Important to be transparent about potential conflicts between activities and commitments to PPIC and other research affiliations

1. Pam and Stacy can have a separate conversation if these situations arise
- iv. With regard to seeking and contacting potential partners, keep it flexible and whatever EB members are comfortable with, considering other projects and affiliations
 1. Denis and Julie: Important to be strict about confidentiality
- f. Jason: As meetings with potential partners come up, should EB members be present?
 - i. Yes, if possible. Good for communicating same vision and goals.
 - ii. Upcoming meeting with Minnesota Department of Agriculture (Friday, March 8, 9 – 10am, room 153 Food Science and Nutrition building, 1334 Eckles Ave, St. Paul, MN 55108)
- g. It would be helpful to have a shared document with potential partners and contact info, will help track where PPIC is at in membership recruitment process

4. PPIC Partners/Supporters/Researchers (9:26 – 9:50)

- a. Hershey and ADM – signed on and paid 3 years membership upfront
- b. Cargill – membership agreement is with their legal team
- c. Kellogg – membership agreement is with their legal team
- d. Schwan’s corporate giving foundation – committed to supporting PPIC for 5 years in the form of 2 fellowships
- e. General Mills Inc. – No, prefer to work on specific projects/contract research directly related to their goals
- f. Ingredion – No for this year, no room in budget, but interested for next year
- g. Novozyme – No for this year, no room in budget, but interested for next year
- h. Roquette – Several conversations, waiting on response
- i. Hormel – Will contact Pam if interested
- j. DSM – Waiting on response, any contacts would be welcome as they are launching a canola protein product which is of particular interest
- k. PepsiCo – Waiting on response from protein team, contacts are more focused on plant breeding efforts
- l. AGT – Haven’t heard a response
- m. Manitoba Harvest – Funds not available in budget
- n. Still need to reach out to small companies
- o. AURI – in kind support (Appendix 2) with time and equipment
 - i. Jason: Waseca has oilseed processing capabilities (oil pressing including cold pellet extrusion, drying, milling), don’t yet have protein extraction capabilities but PPIC partnership is an opportunity to investigate new capabilities, investing in new equipment in the food grade space. Analytical lab to compliment UMN capabilities too. AURI will reevaluate partnership after year 1.
- p. Julie: Great start, more members will take time, and we need to use a strategic approach in reaching out to our networks for potential partners
 - i. Due to timing of inaugural meeting at year end, recruiting members has been slower than anticipated
- q. Christina: Shared targets document can help with new contacts and following up with previously mentioned companies
- r. Jason: Can we expand to animal nutrition?
 - i. Jason has contacts at Land O’Lakes, good opportunity because they weren’t at the inaugural meeting
- s. Stacy: What are the ambitions/critical mass for membership?

- i. Pam originally wanted 10 by March 2019, but progress is slower than anticipated. Aiming for 10 members by the end of the year. More membership dollars allows for larger matching opportunities through FFAR.
- t. Stacy: What is the intended balance between producers and users/ingredient companies and CPGs? Are we on track?
 - i. Hope for 50/50 balance, currently on track (Cargill and ADM vs. Hershey and Kellogg). PPIC research should aim to benefit both.
- u. Stacy: Companies have preferred suppliers or users. It is beneficial to inquire about these as potential partners.
 - i. This topic will be included in Technical Committee meeting agenda
- v. Jason: Can we develop a 2 – 3 minute pitch to communicate the same info to potential partners?
 - i. Pam and Denis discussed creating 2 – 3 slides to be added to IMPROV website
 - ii. Julie: A pitch would be helpful for conferences and expos when interacting with suppliers
 - iii. Jason: Good for communicating PPIC activities to economic development organizations like Greater MSP, MN Dept of Ag
 - iv. Christina: Pitch should include details of membership cost
 - 1. Pitch should also highlight benefits of membership (Appendix 3)
- w. Julie: Robust list of benefits, but if we start to hear reasons why not to become a PPIC member, we should reevaluate membership benefits
- x. Jim House and Buddhi Lamsal are the two external researchers, haven't sought out researchers because of funding limitations, don't want to be spread too thin
 - i. Suggestions for researchers to invite are welcome, can be included in a shared document
 - ii. Start slow with recruiting scientists until research pipeline is in place

5. Brief overview of funds – topic will be addressed more thoroughly at a future meeting (9:51 – 9:56)

- a. Hershey and ADM have paid 3 years of membership fees up front (32,000/yr at discounted rate = 96,000 spread over 3 years). CFANS taxes 15%, so total current funds = \$166,956
- b. Kellogg and Cargill have not paid yet, but anticipated to double to \$333,912
- c. Pam will meet with program leader of FFAR to discuss submitting proposals for fund matching
 - i. Julie: Can Schwan's Corporate Giving Foundation funds be used in matching request? Even to match for more fellowship funding?
 - 1. Details of Schwan's support is confidential for now, should be available in time for submitting proposals

6. Ranking research priorities – will review at next meeting

- a. Can review Appendix 4 before next meeting

7. Next steps (9:57)

- a. Future meetings will have specific topics
- b. Julie: During PPIC start-up, EB meetings should be more frequent to maintain momentum, every 4 – 6 weeks
 - i. A Doodle poll will be sent out to schedule another meeting at the end of March. This meeting will include updates from Technical Committee meeting on March 11
- c. Once center is up and started, expectation is to meet twice a year unless there is a specific need
- d. Jason: Monthly meetings through June would be helpful

- e. Christina: Topics for next meeting – related short courses and workshops, focus areas and dates to avoid scheduling conflicts
- f. Jason: PPIC short courses and workshops should be different from others (ex. AACCI or AOCS), what is PPIC's unique value proposition?
 - i. Because PPIC has companies on board, building in market research or consumer insights would be very valuable and unique, information beyond the benchtop research
 - 1. Difficult to create this data on our own, can connect with specific institutions for directed studies (Hartman Group), ex. Consumer attitudes towards plant proteins
 - 2. CPGs may have in-house consumer insight groups, we can give them an opportunity to share if they are willing

8. Post-meeting discussion points

- a. Post Consumer Brands – hard to connect with, seek out contacts
- b. AgroPur – interested in dairy alternatives (Land O'Lakes as well)
- c. Avena Foods
- d. Christina will seek contacts at AGT, Avena Foods, AgroPur, ConAgra, Hemp Oil
- e. Jason will seek contacts at Land O'Lakes, we should also find contacts at Kraft Heinz as they may be looking for innovation investment opportunities following their recent earnings report
 - i. No contacts for Kraft Heinz yet, suggestions from board members are welcome
- f. SunOpta – No right now, not in a place financially for membership
- g. Hormel has a giving institute, more focused on cancer research and investing in Austin, MN
- h. Mayo Clinic – removed from food, but may be interested in gut microbiome research as it relates to plant proteins
- i. March 27, AURI New Uses Forum