

**PPIC Executive Board Meeting Minutes, Monday, August 5th, 2019 10 – 11:30 am, FScN 225G**

In attendance: Pam Ismail – UMN, via Webex

Amy Mathiowetz – UMN, in person

Jason Robinson – AURI, in person

Christina Connelly – Canadian Consulate, via Webex

Julie Simonson – Schwan's, via WebEx

Denis Chereau – IMPROV, via WebEx

Stacy Pyett – Wageningen University and Research, via Webex

Absent: Greg Cuomo – UMN

**1. Quick re-cap of previous Executive Board meeting (minutes in *Appendix 1*) (5 min)**

**2. PPIC general updates (15 min)**

**Objectives:**

**a. Update on Protein Basics Short Course (Sept. 5-6<sup>th</sup> 2019)**

- Increased from 30 to 45 spots due to high demand; currently at 40. Have a couple of partners still to sign membership agreements – could lead to additional 4 attendees
- How are we advertising?
  - i. Master list of PPIC contacts, FScN Departmental newsletter and website, PPIC website, Christina and Lolly advertised to Protein Highway and AURI lists respectively, social media (MNIFT and FScN Dept pages), and word of mouth. Will be sent to MNIFT newsletter in future

**b. Update on RFP (*Appendix 2*) proposals submitted**

- Sent out to 16 researchers
- 2 proposals submitted (limited time issue)
- Time will be extended for next RFP (2-3 months' time for submission)
- Jason: only sent to Center's pool of 16 researchers? Pam: yes, only researchers associated with Center

**c. Update on FFAR proposal (justification shared earlier during April meeting is in *Appendix 3* and preproposal submitted in *Appendix 4*)**

- FFAR accepted pre-proposal and investigators were invited to submit a full proposal
- Full proposal ready
  - i. 7 diverse researchers
    1. ***Principal Investigator: B. Pam Ismail***; Associate Professor in Food Chemistry with a focus on protein chemistry and functionality; Department of Food Science and Nutrition Department, University of Minnesota
    2. ***M. David Marks***; Professor of Genomics; Department of Plant and Microbial Biology, University of Minnesota
    3. ***James Anderson***; Professor of Breeding and Genetics; Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, University of Minnesota

4. **James House**; Professor of Nutritional Biochemistry; Department of Food and Human Nutritional Sciences, University of Manitoba, Canada
  5. **Gary Reineccius**; Professor of Flavor Chemistry; Department of Food Science and Nutrition Department, University of Minnesota
  6. **Zata Vickers**; Professor of Sensory Evaluation; Department of Food Science and Nutrition Department, University of Minnesota
  7. **George Annor**; Assistant Professor of Cereal Technology; Department of Food Science and Nutrition Department, University of Minnesota
- ii. Full proposal to be submitted either 8/6 or 8/7; waiting on budget finalization
  - iii. Center partners, AURI, Schwan's Foundation submitted letters of support
  - iv. Timing, when do we hear back? Pam: unsure about timeline but will look into
- d. **Update on Research Spotlight meeting (Oct 17 2019);**
- Keynote speaker: Julia Keppler, Wageningen University and Research  
Proposed title: "Technologies for meat analogues – future challenges"
  - Suggested speaker: MJ Kinney from Good Food Institute to speak on market trends
    - i. Christina: having GFI on the agenda to speak could be good in terms of drawing in wide audience as they have spoken at events across a large radius
    - ii. Christina: Based on a conversation with attendee at previous Protein Highway event, concerns that meat industry/animal sector may be turned off by GFI – observation among multiple Exec board members that GFI tends to present themselves on their website as an advocacy group instead of a science-based nonprofit looking to advance plant proteins
      1. Jason, Christina, MJ, and Pam will meet to discuss MJ's talk and make sure she understands the audience and what the objectives of PPIC and the Research Spotlight Meeting are
  - Suggested speakers from pool of PPIC researchers: Jim House (University of Manitoba), Lingyun Chen (University of Alberta), Tom Michaels, David Marks, Gary Reineccius, Pam Ismail.
    - i. Jason: suggestion to have a representative from AURI give a short talk about hemp as an industry, as AURI has a lot of expertise in hemp industry and what it needs to be successful
      1. Pam: good idea to talk about hemp industry, could give ~15 min overview before Tom Michaels talks about his research on hemp
      2. Christina: value in adding more of a broad context to the research
      3. Julie: make sure we are not taking too much away from research, as it is the purpose of the Spotlight Meeting. 15 minute opening okay. Already have GFI setting stage with market trends
    - ii. General consensus that amount of speakers is sufficient and the speakers are well-balanced in their areas of research

- iii. Stacy: How much [research] will be available to talk about at the Spotlight Meeting? Be careful to manage expectations of attendees if they are expecting more research while we are still in preliminary stages
      - 1. Won't be a lot of research that is currently funded by PPIC but we can provide preliminary research and scope of the work
      - 2. The Center's researchers can share their own research activity in that plant protein space, not necessarily funded by PPIC.
- Registration will be opened mid-August; free for partners and supporters
  - i. Minimum registration fee (\$250) to cover rentals and meals
- Considerations for event timeline
  - i. Networking dinner Oct. 16<sup>th</sup> at Axel's
  - ii. Time frame: 7:30-4:30
    - 1. 7:00 am registration
    - 2. 7:30 with breakfast,
    - 3. start 8-8:30,
    - 4. lunch and snack breaks,
    - 5. 4:30-6 cash bar with snacks,
  - iii. Jason, based on AURI's experiences, feedback often that agenda too packed with not enough time for networking. Recommends 7:30-8:30 networking breakfast
  - iv. Currently 8 presentations with potential ~15 minute hemp overview
    - 1. Denis: good to give speakers 30 minutes including questions
  - v. Allot time for student poster session (will invite students of Center researchers)
- Booths free of charge for partners and supporters to showcase whatever they would like to showcase (research, products, ingredients, etc.)

### 3. Efforts to recruit new members (10 min)

#### Objectives:

#### a. Announcing potential new members (Ingredient, Coca Cola and Nutriati)

- a. In process of signing membership
- b. Ingredient joining at partner level; representative joined technical committee meeting last week (Wajira Ratnayake)
- c. Coca Cola; Ingredient group would like to join at Associate level; unsure if it's a perfect fit as they are just starting to work with protein-based beverages
  - i. Changed bylaws due to enough demand for this option – large companies can join 1 year non-renewable at associate level
  - ii. Jason, heard same feedback from LOL: want to be able to get some benefits without joining at partner level; Jason will reconnect with them to let them know of change to bylaws; Pam will also be sitting down with LOL in near future
- d. Nutriati: smaller chickpea protein startup. Reviewing proposal and will sign membership mid-August
- e. Summary of conversation around changing bylaws to allow larger companies financially eligible to join at partner level to join instead at associate level for 1 year non-renewable

- i. Current partners have been informed of this change in bylaws
  - ii. Stacy/Julie: what's the risk of going down this path? Don't want companies to take advantage of the option to join at lower level
    - 1. Pam clarified contingencies of this option – after 1 year, large companies will have to choose whether or not to join partner level, cannot remain at associate level if eligible financially for partner level
    - 2. Companies that choose this option like Coca-Cola will pay less but will ultimately reap fewer benefits; for example, they will not have a seat on tech committee and will not have as much say in direction of research
  - iii. Stacy: could potentially define type of business for each membership type. Looser terms for membership based on type of company
  - iv. Concern that 1 year at associate level may not be sufficient time for companies to determine whether/how they could benefit from Center
    - 1. How much research are we going to see within a year that will be directly applicable to them? Important to be transparent with companies about what Center will realistically accomplish within 1 year; make upfront disclaimer about time required for research
    - 2. Christina: hopefully enough for companies just to see the amount of activity that is taking place with Center outside of research (tech and exec meetings, short course, spotlight meeting, etc.)
    - 3. Could also be helpful to get feedback from these companies wishing to join as associate level as to what they specifically expect in terms benefits to their company from being part of the Center
  - v. Concern of possible negative perception of PPIC if companies decide to leave after their “trial” associate period because they do not see immediate return and are not yet ready to join at partner level
    - 1. Jason: Could consider allowing large companies to stay at associate level beyond one year for an increased cost that is still below what they would pay at partner level
- b. Share conversations with different companies (excel sheet)**  
\*members to visit shared Excel sheet and follow-up as necessary
  - c. Discuss new strategies for recruiting additional partners**  
\*tabled due to time constraints

#### **4. Overview of technical committee meeting (minutes in *Appendix 5*) (30 min)**

##### **Objectives:**

- a. Share main action item: discussion of proposals and recommendations of the tech committee, Pam's answers to the comments (*Appendix 6*), and final recommendation and suggestions from members (*Appendix 7*)**

<b>Board Member</b>	<b>Cold Plasma Proposal</b>	<b>Hemp Proposal</b>
<b>Jason</b>	Plasma project interesting and cutting edge enough to be enticing for potential new partner companies	Proposal very relevant to what industry is looking at today – could be very helpful to attracting partners/associates including smaller companies because they are directly related to what is happening in industry today. Need to be very specific and realistic about when these deliverables will be accomplished – not clear in reading proposal
<b>Julie</b>	Exciting and novel; while pea has been around for a while, there is still plenty of knowledge to be gained Does not agree with tech committee suggestion to add a new plant protein. There is enough work to be done with one type of protein, the proposal is focused on exploring new technology. Can be tested later with another proteing	Hemp is hot topic – however proposal objectives need to be more specific as to what exactly they are trying to accomplish with this proposal. Need to focus on objective one and two as these will provide short term results. Need to state clearly the outcomes of these objectives
<b>Stacy</b>	*no specific comments noted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [Based on meeting minutes from tech committee] did not perceive lot of enthusiasm from tech committee for this hemp project in particular although overall interest in hemp</li> <li>• Obj 1 and 2 clear and do-able in time frame – consensus that these are most tangible and achievable and could also give generalizable learnings/fundamental knowledge Obj 3 and 4 more unclear about timelines</li> <li>• May suggest as Exec board which objectives to prioritize</li> </ul>
<b>Christina</b>	Perceived two different goals with reviewing proposals: choosing projects to fund that attract new members and projects to fund that satisfy existing members. Seems current projects are great for attracting new members but we also need to be attentive to whether current partners like projects	
<b>Denis</b>	*no specific comments noted	*no specific comments noted

- Additional comments from Pam:
  - Limited in budget right now, therefore limited in how many projects we can fund – saving rest of funds for FFAR matching funds

- Could fund 1-2 more projects in Spring depending on how many partners join
- Clarification that we are working with the current submissions; provide revisions to existing proposals if decide to fund

**b. Revisit structure of the review process**

- tabled due to time constraints
- Jason suggested at conclusion of meeting adding anchors for numbers in scoring sheet – make sure number means the same for everyone; will share scoring sheet AURI uses

**5. Review and vote on submitted proposals (25 min)**

Due to limited time to thoroughly review proposals, Executive Board will have until 8/12 at 10 am CST to review proposals and submit their votes and comments/suggested revisions

Voting options:

- Yes, as is
- Yes, with these suggestions & list suggestions
- No

Stacy will be unavailable for next week; submitted vote during meeting:

- Yes, with minor revisions as per tech committee for plasma project
- Yes, with major revisions as we have discussed for hemp project

**6. Next steps (5 min)**

**Objectives:**

- Finalize funding vote:** 8/12 by 10 am CST
- Communicate decision and revisions to PIs**
- Address center's goals and timeline**
- When should we meet next?**
  - Helpful to have discussion of goals/timelines before spotlight meeting
  - Before spotlight meeting and after short course
  - Stacy: after 18<sup>th</sup> of September
  - Will send doodle poll with minutes on 8/6