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RICECAP Management Organization

Stakeholder Advisory Board
- George Dunklin
- Emme Girardin
- Dan Kennedy
- Eric Lambe
- Dwight Roberts
- Chuck Wilson
- Dr. G. Khush (Liaison)

Scientific Advisory Board
- Dr. William Crosby
- Dr. Stephen Goff
- Dr. David Mackill
- Dr. Ron Phillips
- Dr. Mark Walton
- Dr. G. Khush (Liaison)

Executive Committee
- Dr. Neil Rutger, Chair
- Dr. Rick Cartwright
- Dr. Scot Hulbert
- Dr. Jan Leach
- Dr. Anna McClung
- Dr. Clare Nelson

Project Director
Dr. James Correll

Objective 1 Team
- Hulbert, McClung, Fjellstrom, Jia, Linscombe, Leong, Moldenhauer, Nguyen, Oard, C. Nelson

Objective 2 Team
- Yang, Ronald, Rutger, Wang

Objective 3 Team
- McClung, Correll, R. Nelson

Objective 4 Team
- Cartwright, Korsh, Lemaux, Leong, Reid

Co-PI's
- Collaborators

Data Management
Dr. Clare Nelson
Data Assistant

Grants Officer

Financial Officer

Data
Management

Co-PI's

Collaborators
Executive Committee
Dr. Neil Rutger, Chair
Dr. Rick Cartwright
Dr. Scot Hulbert
Dr. Jan Leach
Dr. Anna McClung
Dr. Clare Nelson

Executive Committee Responsibilities
1. Serve as a steering group;
2. Provide quarterly updates; and
3. Assist in biannual written reports assessing progress from all co-Project Directors at six-month intervals.
Scientific Advisory Board Responsibilities

1. Play a pivotal role in evaluating the scientific objectives of the proposal, the progress of the effort, and the guidance of the effort;
2. Meet with all of the RICECAP participants in their annual meeting; and
3. Provide recommendations to the Project Director on individual funded projects and new project proposals, and make recommendations on the appropriateness of funding.
Stakeholder Advisory Board

George Dunklin
Ernest Girouard
Dan Kennedy
Eric Larabee
Dwight Roberts
Chuck Wilson
Dr. G. Khush (Liaison)

Stakeholder Advisory Board Responsibilities

1. Play a pivotal role in evaluating the commercial and industry relevancy of the proposal, the progress of the effort, and the guidance of the effort;
2. Meet with RICECAP participants at the annual meeting; and
3. Provide recommendations with respect to changes in technical directions, management and policies of the project and any issues related to the status of collaboration with other relevant rice related projects.
Feedback from Scientific Advisory Board

- Complimentary remarks about Tucson meeting
- Areas for consideration, Executive Committee responded to all.
  - database software development
  - ontology for milling yield
  - milling yield components
  - QTL analysis
  - MAS workshop
  - bring in MAS people from other crops
  - IRRI MAS workshop in late February 2005
  - outreach audiences
  - population changes
  - wide crosses with indica types

Feedback from Scientific Advisory Board, cont’d.

- Areas for consideration, Executive Committee responded to all.
  - choose appropriate molecular markers to overcome concerns about lateness and height of donor
  - International Rice Functional Genomics Consortium, Perlegen sequencing of 2 US cultivars
  - CG system interactions, especially IRRI, CIAT
Feedback from Stakeholder Advisory Board

- Also complimentary
- Additional points to consider
  - maintain flexibility
  - add experts in milling technology
  - backup plans needed
  - identify and respond to non-performing parts early in the process

Strengths of RiceCAP
- involvement of leading scientists
- adapting technology from other crops
- plan is excellent example of cooperation and communication
- thoughtful timelines
- concentrate on two key traits
- commitment of PD and Executive Committee apparent

Feedback from Stakeholder Advisory Board, cont’d.

Possible weaknesses are few
- insure appropriate communication about the project
The next meeting is scheduled for June 13, in Little Rock.