

From: [Petty, Blake D.](#)
To: ["David Palmer"](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#); [Avant, Bob](#); [Helms, Adam](#); ["lrooney@tamu.edu"](#); [Turner, Nancy](#); ["wlr@tamu.edu"](#)
Cc: ["dwesson@premarkhs.com"](#); [Brummett, Robert G.](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
Subject: PreMark-Sorghum Evaluation
Date: Wednesday, October 14, 2009 5:51:37 PM

As followup to Tuesday's meeting, Robert Brummett is drafting an Evaluation License to manage the transfer of sorghum test material from AgriLife to PreMark for evaluation. Robert will coordinate with David Palmer to determine appropriate test quantities, then work with Dr. Rooney to determine appropriate timeframe/fee for transfer.

We are striving to quickly get these materials to PreMark for evaluation...we hope to determine both sides' interest in moving forward under commercialization/licensing plan asap.

I will remain on-point for this project. Let me know if you have any questions/concerns.

BP

Blake D. Petty
Business Development Manager
Texas A&M University System

Office of Technology Commercialization
3369 TAMU; College Station, TX; 77843-3369
Ph: (979) 847-8682
Fx: (979) 845-1402
blakepetty@tamu.edu

From: [Avant, Bob](#)
To: ["Patricia Klein"](#); [Mullet, John E.](#)
Cc: [Simpson, Shay](#); ["wlr@tamu.edu"](#); ["JBlumenthal@ag.tamu.edu"](#); [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Subject: RE: Ceres Quarterly - January
Date: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 11:19:13 AM

Staff Conference is Jan 11-15

Bob Avant
Program Director
Texas AgriLife Research
979/845-2908
512/422-6171 (Cell)
bavant@tamu.edu
<http://agbioenergy.tamu.edu>

-----Original Message-----

From: Patricia Klein [<mailto:pklein@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 7:45 AM
To: Mullet, John E.
Cc: Avant, Bob; Simpson, Shay; wlr@tamu.edu; JBlumenthal@ag.tamu.edu; Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; McCutchen, Bill
Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January

I give my final exam the week of Dec. 14th and have to get my grades in. In addition, I have a Gramene advisory board meeting on Dec. 16th. That week will be hard for me. I can always send my slides with someone to present if that is the week that is decided upon.

Thanks
Trish

At 07:08 AM 10/13/2009, John Mullet wrote:

>I still like the week of Dec 14th. Why did we switch?
>
>I start teaching on the 19th, the PAG/staff conference is the week
>before, and I have a grant proposal due about the same time.
>
>John
>
>
>On Oct 12, 2009, at 9:01 PM, Patricia Klein wrote:
>
>>Bob
>>
>>Yes the Plant and Animal Genome Conference is the same week,
>>however, if we could schedule the Ceres quarterly on one end of the
>>week would that work? PAG begins on Saturday, Jan 9 and ends on
>>Wednesday, Jan 13. When does the Ag Program conference begin and end?
>>
>>Trish
>>

>>
>>----- Original Message -----
>>From: "Bob Avant" <bavant@tamu.edu>
>>To: "Bill McCutchen" <bmccutchen@tamu.edu>
>>Cc: pklein@tamu.edu, "Shay Simpson"
>><shay-simpson@tamu.edu>, wlr@tamu.edu, "John
>>E. Mullet" <jmullet@tamu.edu>, JBlumenthal@ag.tamu.edu,
>>"David Baltensperger" <dbaltensperger@ag.tamu.edu>, "Peter L.
>>Schuerman" <PSchuerman@tamu.edu>
>>Sent: Monday, October 12, 2009 7:35:31 PM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central
>>Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
>>
>>
>>Isn't this the same time as staff conference?
>>
>>Sent from my iPhone
>>
>>On Oct 12, 2009, at 5:27 PM, "McCutchen, Bill" <bmccutchen@tamu.edu
>>> wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Good idea.
>>
>>----- Original Message -----
>>From: Patricia Klein <pklein@tamu.edu >
>>To: Simpson, Shay; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu >; Mullet, John E.;
>>JÃ¼rg Blumenthal <jblumenthal@ag.tamu.edu >; Baltensperger, David;
>>McCutchen, Bill; Avant, Bob; Schuerman, Peter L.
>>Sent: Mon Oct 12 17:26:53 2009
>>Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
>>
>>Shay
>>
>>There might be several of us in San Diego for the Plant and Animal
>>Genome meetings on Jan. 9-13. Thus it would be great to either go
>>right before or right afterwards to combine it into one trip if
>>possible. Just a thought.
>>
>>Thanks
>>Trish
>>
>>
>>
>>At 01:04 PM 10/12/2009, Simpson, Shay wrote:
>>>Hi team,
>>>
>>>Last December we discussed having our Ceres meetings in January 2010
>>>instead of December 2009. We talked about scheduling for second week
>>>of Jan. However, the announcement for the Ag Program just came in to
>>>our in boxes and competes for our time that same week in January.
>>>
>>>The first week is the cotton Beltwide meetings, but we might be able
>>>to work around that - maybe. The week of 18th will probably begin
>>>classes.
>>>

>>>What is this group's wish for traveling to Thousand Oaks in January?

>>>

>>>Shay

>>>

>>>Shay Simpson, Associate Dir.

>>>Corporate Relations

>>>Texas AgriLife Research

>>>979.571.3137 mobile

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>Dr. Patricia Klein

>>Associate Professor

>>Institute for Plant Genomics and Biotechnology

>>TAMU 2123

>>Texas AgriLIFE Research

>>Texas A&M University

>>College Station, TX 77843-2123

>>

>>phone: 979-862-6308

>>fax: 979-862-4790

>>

>>--

>>Patricia Klein, Ph.D.

>>Associate Professor

>>Dept. of Horticulture and Institute for Plant Genomics and

>>Biotechnology

>>TAMU2123

>>Texas A&M University

>>College Station, TX 77843-2123

Dr. Patricia Klein

Associate Professor

Institute for Plant Genomics and Biotechnology

TAMU 2123

Texas AgriLIFE Research

Texas A&M University

College Station, TX 77843-2123

phone: 979-862-6308

fax: 979-862-4790

From: [Patricia Klein](#)
To: [Mullet, John E.](#)
Cc: [Avant, Bob](#); [Simpson, Shay](#); wlr@tamu.edu; JBlumenthal@ag.tamu.edu; [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
Date: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 7:46:01 AM

I give my final exam the week of Dec. 14th and have to get my grades in. In addition, I have a Gramene advisory board meeting on Dec. 16th. That week will be hard for me. I can always send my slides with someone to present if that is the week that is decided upon.

Thanks
Trish

At 07:08 AM 10/13/2009, John Mullet wrote:

>I still like the week of Dec 14th. Why did we switch?

>

>I start teaching on the 19th, the PAG/staff conference is the week before, and I have a grant proposal due about the same time.

>

>John

>

>

>On Oct 12, 2009, at 9:01 PM, Patricia Klein wrote:

>

>>Bob

>>

>>Yes the Plant and Animal Genome Conference is the same week, however, if we could schedule the Ceres quarterly on one end of the week would that work? PAG begins on Saturday, Jan 9 and ends on Wednesday, Jan 13. When does the Ag Program conference begin and end?

>>

>>Trish

>>

>>

>>----- Original Message -----

>>From: "Bob Avant" <bavant@tamu.edu>

>>To: "Bill McCutchen" <bmc cutchen@tamu.edu>

>>Cc: pklein@tamu.edu, "Shay Simpson"

>><shay-simpson@tamu.edu>, wlr@tamu.edu, "John

>>E. Mullet" <jmullet@tamu.edu>, JBlumenthal@ag.tamu.edu,

>>"David Baltensperger" <dbaltensperger@ag.tamu.edu>, "Peter L.

>>Schuerman" <PSchuerman@tamu.edu>

>>Sent: Monday, October 12, 2009 7:35:31 PM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central

>>Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January

>>

>>

>>Isn't this the same time as staff conference?

>>

>>Sent from my iPhone

>>

>>On Oct 12, 2009, at 5:27 PM, "McCutchen, Bill" <bmc cutchen@tamu.edu

>> > wrote:

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Good idea.
>>
>>----- Original Message -----
>>From: Patricia Klein <pklein@tamu.edu >
>>To: Simpson, Shay; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu >; Mullet, John E.;
>>JÃ¼rg Blumenthal <jblumenthal@ag.tamu.edu >; Baltensperger, David;
>>McCutchen, Bill; Avant, Bob; Schuerman, Peter L.
>>Sent: Mon Oct 12 17:26:53 2009
>>Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
>>
>>Shay
>>
>>There might be several of us in San Diego for the Plant and Animal
>>Genome meetings on Jan. 9-13. Thus is would be great to either go
>>right before or right afterwards to combine it into one trip if
>>possible. Just a thought.
>>
>>Thanks
>>Trish
>>
>>
>>
>>At 01:04 PM 10/12/2009, Simpson, Shay wrote:
>>>Hi team,
>>>
>>>Last December we discussed having our Ceres meetings in January 2010
>>>instead of December 2009. We talked about scheduling for second week
>>>of Jan. However, the announcement for the Ag Program just came in to
>>>our in boxes and competes for our time that same week in January.
>>>
>>>The first week is the cotton Beltwide meetings, but we might be able
>>>to work around that - maybe. The week of 18th will probably begin
>>>classes.
>>>
>>>What is this group's wish for traveling to Thousand Oaks in January?
>>>
>>>Shay
>>>
>>>Shay Simpson, Associate Dir.
>>>Corporate Relations
>>>Texas AgriLife Research
>>>979.571.3137 mobile
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Dr. Patricia Klein
>>Associate Professor
>>Institute for Plant Genomics and Biotechnology
>>TAMU 2123
>>Texas AgriLIFE Research

>>Texas A&M University
>>College Station, TX 77843-2123
>>
>>phone: 979-862-6308
>>fax: 979-862-4790
>>
>>--
>>Patricia Klein, Ph.D.
>>Associate Professor
>>Dept. of Horticulture and Institute for Plant Genomics and
>>Biotechnology
>>TAMU2123
>>Texas A&M University
>>College Station, TX 77843-2123

Dr. Patricia Klein
Associate Professor
Institute for Plant Genomics and Biotechnology
TAMU 2123
Texas AgriLIFE Research
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-2123

phone: 979-862-6308
fax: 979-862-4790

From: [John Mullet](#)
To: [Patricia Klein](#)
Cc: [Avant, Bob](#); pklein@tam.u.edu; [Simpson, Shay](#); wlr@tam.u.edu; JBlumenthal@ag.tam.u.edu; [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
Date: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 7:09:09 AM

I still like the week of Dec 14th. Why did we switch?

I start teaching on the 19th, the PAG/staff conference is the week before, and I have a grant proposal due about the same time.

John

On Oct 12, 2009, at 9:01 PM, Patricia Klein wrote:

> Bob
>
> Yes the Plant and Animal Genome Conference is the same week,
> however, if we could schedule the Ceres quarterly on one end of the
> week would that work? PAG begins on Saturday, Jan 9 and ends on
> Wednesday, Jan 13. When does the Ag Program conference begin and end?
>
> Trish
>
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Bob Avant" <bavant@tam.u.edu>
> To: "Bill McCutchen" <bmccutchen@tam.u.edu>
> Cc: pklein@tam.u.edu, "Shay Simpson" <shay-simpson@tam.u.edu>, wlr@tam.u.edu
> , "John E. Mullet" <jmullet@tam.u.edu>, JBlumenthal@ag.tam.u.edu,
> "David Baltensperger" <dbaltensperger@ag.tam.u.edu>, "Peter L.
> Schuerman" <PSchuerman@tam.u.edu>
> Sent: Monday, October 12, 2009 7:35:31 PM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central
> Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
>
>
> Isn't this the same time as staff conference?
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Oct 12, 2009, at 5:27 PM, "McCutchen, Bill" <bmccutchen@tam.u.edu
> > wrote:
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Good idea.
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Patricia Klein <pklein@tam.u.edu >
> To: Simpson, Shay; Bill Rooney <wlr@tam.u.edu >; Mullet, John E.;
> JÃ¼rg Blumenthal <jblumenthal@ag.tam.u.edu >; Baltensperger, David;
> McCutchen, Bill; Avant, Bob; Schuerman, Peter L.

> Sent: Mon Oct 12 17:26:53 2009
> Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
>
> Shay
>
> There might be several of us in San Diego for the Plant and Animal
> Genome meetings on Jan. 9-13. Thus it would be great to either go
> right before or right afterwards to combine it into one trip if
> possible. Just a thought.
>
> Thanks
> Trish
>
>
>
> At 01:04 PM 10/12/2009, Simpson, Shay wrote:
>> Hi team,
>>
>> Last December we discussed having our Ceres meetings in January 2010
>> instead of December 2009. We talked about scheduling for second week
>> of Jan. However, the announcement for the Ag Program just came in to
>> our in boxes and competes for our time that same week in January.
>>
>> The first week is the cotton Beltwide meetings, but we might be able
>> to work around that - maybe. The week of 18th will probably begin
>> classes.
>>
>> What is this group's wish for traveling to Thousand Oaks in January?
>>
>> Shay
>>
>> Shay Simpson, Associate Dir.
>> Corporate Relations
>> Texas AgriLife Research
>> 979.571.3137 mobile
>>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Dr. Patricia Klein
> Associate Professor
> Institute for Plant Genomics and Biotechnology
> TAMU 2123
> Texas AgriLIFE Research
> Texas A&M University
> College Station, TX 77843-2123
>
> phone: 979-862-6308
> fax: 979-862-4790
>
> --
> Patricia Klein, Ph.D.
> Associate Professor
> Dept. of Horticulture and Institute for Plant Genomics and
> Biotechnology
> TAMU2123
> Texas A&M University

> College Station, TX 77843-2123

From: [Patricia Klein](#)
To: [Avant, Bob](#)
Cc: [pklein@tamu.edu](#); [Simpson, Shay](#); [wlr@tamu.edu](#); [Mullet, John E.](#); [JBlumenthal@ag.tamu.edu](#); [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
Date: Monday, October 12, 2009 9:02:06 PM

Bob

Yes the Plant and Animal Genome Conference is the same week, however, if we could schedule the Ceres quarterly on one end of the week would that work? PAG begins on Saturday, Jan 9 and ends on Wednesday, Jan 13. When does the Ag Program conference begin and end?

Trish

----- Original Message -----

From: "Bob Avant" <bavant@tamu.edu>
To: "Bill McCutchen" <bmccutchen@tamu.edu>
Cc: pklein@tamu.edu, "Shay Simpson" <shay-simpson@tamu.edu>, wlr@tamu.edu, "John E. Mullet" <jmullet@tamu.edu>, JBlumenthal@ag.tamu.edu, "David Baltensperger" <dbaltensperger@ag.tamu.edu>, "Peter L. Schuerman" <PSchuerman@tamu.edu>
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2009 7:35:31 PM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central
Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January

Isn't this the same time as staff conference?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 12, 2009, at 5:27 PM, "McCutchen, Bill" <bmccutchen@tamu.edu > wrote:

Good idea.

----- Original Message -----

From: Patricia Klein <pklein@tamu.edu >
To: Simpson, Shay; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu >; Mullet, John E.; JBlumenthal <jblumenthal@ag.tamu.edu >; Baltensperger, David; McCutchen, Bill; Avant, Bob; Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Mon Oct 12 17:26:53 2009
Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January

Shay

There might be several of us in San Diego for the Plant and Animal Genome meetings on Jan. 9-13. Thus it would be great to either go right before or right afterwards to combine it into one trip if possible. Just a thought.

Thanks
Trish

At 01:04 PM 10/12/2009, Simpson, Shay wrote:

>Hi team,
>
>Last December we discussed having our Ceres meetings in January 2010
>instead of December 2009. We talked about scheduling for second week
>of Jan. However, the announcement for the Ag Program just came in to
>our in boxes and competes for our time that same week in January.
>
>The first week is the cotton Beltwide meetings, but we might be able
>to work around that - maybe. The week of 18th will probably begin
>classes.
>
>What is this group's wish for traveling to Thousand Oaks in January?
>
>Shay
>
>Shay Simpson, Associate Dir.
>Corporate Relations
>Texas AgriLife Research
>979.571.3137 mobile
>

Dr. Patricia Klein
Associate Professor
Institute for Plant Genomics and Biotechnology
TAMU 2123
Texas AgriLIFE Research
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-2123

phone: 979-862-6308
fax: 979-862-4790

--

Patricia Klein, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Dept. of Horticulture and Institute for Plant Genomics and Biotechnology
TAMU2123
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-2123

From: [Avant, Bob](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Cc: [pklein@tamu.edu](#); [Simpson, Shay](#); [wlr@tamu.edu](#); [Mullet, John E.](#); [JBlumenthal@ag.tamu.edu](#); [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
Date: Monday, October 12, 2009 7:35:26 PM

Isn't this the same time as staff conference?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 12, 2009, at 5:27 PM, "McCutchen, Bill" <bmccutchen@tamu.edu> wrote:

Good idea.

----- Original Message -----

From: Patricia Klein <pklein@tamu.edu>

To: Simpson, Shay; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Mullet, John E.; JÃ¼rg Blumenthal <jblumenthal@ag.tamu.edu>; Baltensperger, David; McCutchen, Bill; Avant, Bob; Schuerman, Peter L.

Sent: Mon Oct 12 17:26:53 2009

Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January

Shay

There might be several of us in San Diego for the Plant and Animal Genome meetings on Jan. 9-13. Thus it would be great to either go right before or right afterwards to combine it into one trip if possible. Just a thought.

Thanks
Trish

At 01:04 PM 10/12/2009, Simpson, Shay wrote:

>Hi team,

>

>Last December we discussed having our Ceres meetings in January 2010
>instead of December 2009. We talked about scheduling for second week
>of Jan. However, the announcement for the Ag Program just came in to
>our inboxes and competes for our time that same week in January.

>

>The first week is the cotton Beltwide meetings, but we might be able
>to work around that - maybe. The week of 18th will probably begin
>classes.

>

>What is this group's wish for traveling to Thousand Oaks in January?

>

>Shay

>

>Shay Simpson, Associate Dir.

>Corporate Relations

>Texas AgriLife Research

>979.571.3137 mobile

>

Dr. Patricia Klein
Associate Professor
Institute for Plant Genomics and Biotechnology
TAMU 2123
Texas AgriLIFE Research
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-2123

phone: 979-862-6308
fax: 979-862-4790

From: [Patricia Klein](#)
To: [Simpson, Shay](#); [Bill Rooney](#); [Mullet, John E.](#); [JÃ¼rg Blumenthal](#); [Baltensperger, David](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#); [Avant, Bob](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
Date: Monday, October 12, 2009 5:28:08 PM

Shay

There might be several of us in San Diego for the Plant and Animal Genome meetings on Jan. 9-13. Thus it would be great to either go right before or right afterwards to combine it into one trip if possible. Just a thought.

Thanks
Trish

At 01:04 PM 10/12/2009, Simpson, Shay wrote:

>Hi team,
>
>Last December we discussed having our Ceres meetings in January 2010
>instead of December 2009. We talked about scheduling for second week
>of Jan. However, the announcement for the Ag Program just came in to
>our in boxes and competes for our time that same week in January.
>
>The first week is the cotton Beltwide meetings, but we might be able
>to work around that - maybe. The week of 18th will probably begin
>classes.
>
>What is this group's wish for traveling to Thousand Oaks in January?
>
>Shay
>
>Shay Simpson, Associate Dir.
>Corporate Relations
>Texas AgriLife Research
>979.571.3137 mobile
>

Dr. Patricia Klein
Associate Professor
Institute for Plant Genomics and Biotechnology
TAMU 2123
Texas AgriLIFE Research
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-2123

phone: 979-862-6308
fax: 979-862-4790

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: ["pklein@tam.u.edu"; Simpson, Shay; "wlr@tam.u.edu"; Mullet, John E.; "JBlumenthal@ag.tam.u.edu"; Baltensperger, David; Avant, Bob; Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January
Date: Monday, October 12, 2009 5:27:57 PM

Good idea.

----- Original Message -----

From: Patricia Klein <pklein@tam.u.edu>
To: Simpson, Shay; Bill Rooney <wlr@tam.u.edu>; Mullet, John E.; JBlumenthal <jblumenthal@ag.tam.u.edu>; Baltensperger, David; McCutchen, Bill; Avant, Bob; Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Mon Oct 12 17:26:53 2009
Subject: Re: Ceres Quarterly - January

Shay

There might be several of us in San Diego for the Plant and Animal Genome meetings on Jan. 9-13. Thus it would be great to either go right before or right afterwards to combine it into one trip if possible. Just a thought.

Thanks
Trish

At 01:04 PM 10/12/2009, Simpson, Shay wrote:

>Hi team,
>
>Last December we discussed having our Ceres meetings in January 2010
>instead of December 2009. We talked about scheduling for second week
>of Jan. However, the announcement for the Ag Program just came in to
>our in boxes and competes for our time that same week in January.
>
>The first week is the cotton Beltwide meetings, but we might be able
>to work around that - maybe. The week of 18th will probably begin
>classes.
>
>What is this group's wish for traveling to Thousand Oaks in January?
>
>Shay
>
>Shay Simpson, Associate Dir.
>Corporate Relations
>Texas AgriLife Research
>979.571.3137 mobile
>

Dr. Patricia Klein
Associate Professor
Institute for Plant Genomics and Biotechnology
TAMU 2123

Texas AgriLIFE Research
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-2123

phone: 979-862-6308
fax: 979-862-4790

From: [Simpson, Shay](#)
To: [Bill Rooney](#); [Mullet, John E.](#); [Jürg Blumenthal](#); [Baltensperger, David](#); [Patricia Klein](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#); [Avant, Bob](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
Subject: Ceres Quarterly - January
Date: Monday, October 12, 2009 1:04:01 PM

Hi team,

Last December we discussed having our Ceres meetings in January 2010 instead of December 2009. We talked about scheduling for second week of Jan. However, the announcement for the Ag Program just came in to our in boxes and competes for our time that same week in January.

The first week is the cotton Beltwide meetings, but we might be able to work around that - maybe. The week of 18th will probably begin classes.

What is this group's wish for traveling to Thousand Oaks in January?

Shay

Shay Simpson, Associate Dir.
Corporate Relations
Texas AgriLife Research
979.571.3137 mobile

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: [Gilliland, Diane M.](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); "[rjessup@tamu.edu](#)"
Cc: [Baltensperger, David](#); [Avant, Bob](#); [Schmitt, Brian C.](#); "[wlr@tamu.edu](#)"
Subject: Re: Russell Jessup
Date: Friday, October 09, 2009 11:11:32 AM

Thank you Diane. Apologies for the very short notice.

Bill

From: Diane Gilliland <d-gilliland@tamu.edu>
To: Schuerman, Peter L.; rjessup@tamu.edu <rjessup@tamu.edu>
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Avant, Bob; McCutchen, Bill; Schmitt, Brian C.; Bill L Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
Sent: Fri Oct 09 10:58:20 2009
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

as requested. dg

*****8

Diane,

Can you send Russell Jessup and this group PDF's of the Ceres' and Chevron agreements?

Bill F. McCutchen, Ph.D.

Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

Texas A&M University System

113 Jack K. Williams Administration Building

2142 TAMU College Station, TX 77843-2142

979-845-8488 Tel

979-458-4765 Fax

bmccutchen@tamu.edu

From: Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 7:35 AM
To: 'rjessup@tamu.edu'; McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob
Subject: Re: Russell Jessup

Russ,

Thanks for your inquiry. The agreements you ask for are available through AgriLife, and questions about policy should be directed to them as well.

I see this as less complicated than it may appear to be on the surface. Looking forward to discussing on Monday.

Best regards,
Peter Schuerman, Ph.D.
Director, Licensing and Intellectual Property
Office of Technology Commercialization

Sent from 979.571.1816

From:

To: McCutchen, Bill

Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; wlr@tamu.edu <wlr@tamu.edu>; Avant, Bob

Sent: Thu Oct 08 22:49:58 2009

Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Peter,

Towards enabling maximum progress at next Monday's meeting, I would like to frame my inquiry beforehand. Broadly, I would like to discuss encumbrances and FTO in perennial grass crops my program could deploy for biofuels, turfgrass, forage, etc. markets. Specifically:

- 1) Perennial, diploid (*S. bicolor* x *S. propinquum*) sorghum per the CERES agreement.
- 2) Perennial, polyploid (*S. bicolor* x *S. halepense*, *S. alnum*) 'columbusgrass' per the CERES agreement.
- 3) Miscanes, *Miscanthus sinensis*, *M. x giganteus*, *Erianthus ravennea*, *E. giganteum* per the Chevron agreement. 'Background IP' within the agreement and its effects upon elite, separate & distinct *M. sinensis* I could provide to Weslaco but also plan to develop as its own biomass crop.
- 4) Other 'agency' SRAs that might effect perennial grasses (Napiergrass, Pearl Millet-Napiergrass, Buffelgrass, Bermudagrass, Buffalograss, Bluegrass--TX, KY, TX x KY, Switchgrass, Kleingrass, Guineagrass).
- 5) AgriLife policy regarding 'agency' SRAs vs. traditional 'PI' limited SRAs.

Having the CERES/Chevron/etc. agreements available Monday or earlier would aid my understanding of our commitments immensely. If any further preliminary discussion would be beneficial please feel free to contact me.

Many thanks,

Russ

Russell Jessup
Assistant Professor
Perennial Grass Breeder
Dept. of Soil & Crop Sci.
Texas A&M University
rjessup@tamu.edu
979-315-4242

-----Original Message-----

From: j-slovacek@tamu.edu

Sent: Tue, 29 Sep 2009 07:44:29 -0500

To: bmccutchen@tamu.edu, kzak@tamu.edu, rjessup@tamu.edu

Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Meeting has been set for Monday, October 12th at 1:30 pm in suite 113 Jack K Williams Admin Building conference room.

Thanks all for responding! Have a great day!

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

From: Slovacek, Jackie

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 4:03 PM

To: McCutchen, Bill; Zak, Kendra; 'Russell Jessup'

Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob; Judy Young

Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Importance: High

Dear Drs. Baltensperger, Rooney and Jessup:

The following dates are available for McCutchen, Schuerman, Avant and Schmitt:

Oct 5th at 3:00 pm

Oct 6th at 3:30 pm

Oct 12th from 1:30 pm until 5:00 pm

Oct 13th from 8-10 am and 1:30 - 5:00 pm

Please let me know if any of these dates work with your schedules and I will be happy to set up this meeting.

Thanks

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

-----Original Message-----

From: McCutchen, Bill

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 3:36 PM

To: Slovacek, Jackie; Zak, Kendra

Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.;

'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob

Subject: Russell Jessup

Jackie and Kendra,

Can you please arrange for a meeting (in the next couple of weeks with this entire cc:d group) with Dr. Jessup to discuss his RD program and FTO questions?

Also, please forward to Dr. Jessup as I don't have his email on BB.

Thanks,

Bill

From: [Diane Gilliland](#)
To: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); rjessup@tamu.edu
Cc: [Baltensperger, David](#); [Avant, Bob](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#); [Schmitt, Brian C.](#); [Bill L Rooney](#)
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup
Date: Friday, October 09, 2009 11:01:17 AM
Attachments: [Chevron 4-8-11.pdf](#)
[405235-agreement.pdf](#)

as requested. dg

*****8

Diane,

Can you send Russell Jessup and this group PDF's of the Ceres' and Chevron agreements?

Bill F. McCutchen, Ph.D.

Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

Texas A&M University System

113 Jack K. Williams Administration Building

2142 TAMU College Station, TX 77843-2142

979-845-8488 Tel

979-458-4765 Fax

bmccutchen@tamu.edu

From: Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 7:35 AM
To: 'rjessup@tamu.edu'; McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob
Subject: Re: Russell Jessup

Russ,

Thanks for your inquiry. The agreements you ask for are available through AgriLife, and questions about policy should be directed to them as well.

I see this as less complicated than it may appear to be on the surface. Looking forward to discussing on Monday.

Best regards,
Peter Schuerman, Ph.D.
Director, Licensing and Intellectual Property

From:

To: McCutchen, Bill

Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; wlr@tamu.edu <wlr@tamu.edu>; Avant, Bob

Sent: Thu Oct 08 22:49:58 2009

Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Peter,

Towards enabling maximum progress at next Monday's meeting, I would like to frame my inquiry beforehand. Broadly, I would like to discuss encumbrances and FTO in perennial grass crops my program could deploy for biofuels, turfgrass, forage, etc. markets. Specifically:

- 1) Perennial, diploid (S. bicolor x S. propinquum) sorghum per the CERES agreement.
- 2) Perennial, polyploid (S. bicolor x S. halepense, S. alnum) 'columbusgrass' per the CERES agreement.
- 3) Miscanes, Miscanthus sinensis, M. x giganteus, Erianthus ravennea, E. giganteum per the Chevron agreement. 'Background IP' within the agreement and its effects upon elite, separate & distinct M. sinensis I could provide to Weslaco but also plan to develop as its own biomass crop.
- 4) Other 'agency' SRAs that might effect perennial grasses (Napiergrass, Pearl Millet-Napiergrass, Buffelgrass, Bermudagrass, Buffalograss, Bluegrass--TX, KY, TX x KY, Switchgrass, Kleingrass, Guineagrass).
- 5) AgriLife policy regarding 'agency' SRAs vs. traditional 'PI' limited SRAs.

Having the CERES/Chevron/etc. agreements available Monday or earlier would aid my understanding of our commitments immensely. If any further preliminary discussion would be beneficial please feel free to contact me.

Many thanks,

Russ

Russell Jessup
Assistant Professor
Perennial Grass Breeder
Dept. of Soil & Crop Sci.
Texas A&M University
rjessup@tamu.edu
979-315-4242

-----Original Message-----

From: j-slovacek@tamu.edu
Sent: Tue, 29 Sep 2009 07:44:29 -0500
To: bmccutchen@tamu.edu, kzak@tamu.edu, rjessup@tamu.edu
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Meeting has been set for Monday, October 12th at 1:30 pm in suite 113 Jack K Williams Admin Building conference room.

Thanks all for responding! Have a great day!

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

From: Slovacek, Jackie
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 4:03 PM
To: McCutchen, Bill; Zak, Kendra; 'Russell Jessup'
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob; Judy Young
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Importance: High

Dear Drs. Baltensperger, Rooney and Jessup:

The following dates are available for McCutchen, Schuerman, Avant and Schmitt:

Oct 5th at 3:00 pm

Oct 6th at 3:30 pm

Oct 12th from 1:30 pm until 5:00 pm

Oct 13th from 8-10 am and 1:30 - 5:00 pm

Please let me know if any of these dates work with your schedules and I will be happy to set up this meeting.

Thanks

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek
Assistant to the Associate Director
Texas AgriLife Research
113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg
College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

-----Original Message-----

From: McCutchen, Bill
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 3:36 PM
To: Slovacek, Jackie; Zak, Kendra
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.;
'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob
Subject: Russell Jessup

Jackie and Kendra,

Can you please arrange for a meeting (in the next couple of weeks with this entire cc:d group) with Dr. Jessup to discuss his RD program and FTO questions?

Also, please forward to Dr. Jessup as I don't have his email on BB.

Thanks,

Bill

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); "rjessup@tamu.edu"
Cc: [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schmitt, Brian C.](#); "wlr@tamu.edu"; [Avant, Bob](#)
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup
Date: Friday, October 09, 2009 7:48:22 AM

Russ,

As for policy, the agency doesn't make policy, the System makes policy.

The agreement with both Ceres and Chevron was reviewed by department heads, unit heads, administration within AgriLife Research, the OTC, the OGC and were both signed off on by then Director Elsa Murano. That said, Peter composed, wrote and negotiated on behalf of AgriLife, OTC and the System with Ceres; so he is very familiar with all aspects – since it took almost 6+ months of sometimes intense negotiations. I was the lead negotiator for AgriLife on the Chevron Master Agreement.

Thanks

Bill

Bill F. McCutchen, Ph.D.
Associate Director
Texas AgriLife Research
Texas A&M University System
113 Jack K. Williams Administration Building
2142 TAMU College Station, TX 77843-2142
979-845-8488 Tel
979-458-4765 Fax
bmccutchen@tamu.edu

From: Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 7:35 AM
To: 'rjessup@tamu.edu'; McCutchen, Bill
Cc: [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schmitt, Brian C.](#); 'wlr@tamu.edu'; [Avant, Bob](#)
Subject: Re: Russell Jessup

Russ,

Thanks for your inquiry. The agreements you ask for are available through AgriLife, and questions about policy should be directed to them as well.

I see this as less complicated than it may appear to be on the surface. Looking forward to discussing on Monday.

Best regards,
Peter Schuerman, Ph.D.
Director, Licensing and Intellectual Property
Office of Technology Commercialization

Sent from 979.571.1816

From:
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Schmitt, Brian C.](#); wlr@tamu.edu <wlr@tamu.edu>;

Avant, Bob
Sent: Thu Oct 08 22:49:58 2009
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Peter,

Towards enabling maximum progress at next Monday's meeting, I would like to frame my inquiry beforehand. Broadly, I would like to discuss encumbrances and FTO in perennial grass crops my program could deploy for biofuels, turfgrass, forage, etc. markets. Specifically:

- 1) Perennial, diploid (S. bicolor x S. propinquum) sorghum per the CERES agreement.
- 2) Perennial, polyploid (S. bicolor x S. halepense, S. alnum) 'columbusgrass' per the CERES agreement.
- 3) Miscanes, Miscanthus sinensis, M. x giganteus, Erianthus ravennea, E. giganteum per the Chevron agreement. 'Background IP' within the agreement and its effects upon elite, separate & distinct M. sinensis I could provide to Weslaco but also plan to develop as its own biomass crop.
- 4) Other 'agency' SRAs that might effect perennial grasses (Napiergrass, Pearl Millet-Napiergrass, Buffelgrass, Bermudagrass, Buffalograss, Bluegrass--TX, KY, TX x KY, Switchgrass, Kleingrass, Guineagrass).
- 5) AgriLife policy regarding 'agency' SRAs vs. traditional 'PI' limited SRAs.

Having the CERES/Chevron/etc. agreements available Monday or earlier would aid my understanding of our commitments immensely. If any further preliminary discussion would be beneficial please feel free to contact me.

Many thanks,

Russ

Russell Jessup
Assistant Professor
Perennial Grass Breeder
Dept. of Soil & Crop Sci.
Texas A&M University
rjessup@tamu.edu
979-315-4242

-----Original Message-----

From: j-slovacek@tamu.edu
Sent: Tue, 29 Sep 2009 07:44:29 -0500
To: bmccutchen@tamu.edu, kzak@tamu.edu, rjessup@tamu.edu
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Meeting has been set for Monday, October 12th at 1:30 pm in suite 113 Jack K Williams Admin

Building conference room.

Thanks all for responding! Have a great day!

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

From: Slovacek, Jackie

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 4:03 PM

To: McCutchen, Bill; Zak, Kendra; 'Russell Jessup'

Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob; Judy Young

Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Importance: High

Dear Drs. Baltensperger, Rooney and Jessup:

The following dates are available for McCutchen, Schuerman, Avant and Schmitt:

Oct 5th at 3:00 pm

Oct 6th at 3:30 pm

Oct 12th from 1:30 pm until 5:00 pm

Oct 13th from 8-10 am and 1:30 – 5:00 pm

Please let me know if any of these dates work with your schedules and I will be happy to set up this meeting.

Thanks

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

-----Original Message-----

From: McCutchen, Bill

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 3:36 PM

To: Slovacek, Jackie; Zak, Kendra

Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.;
'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob

Subject: Russell Jessup

Jackie and Kendra,

Can you please arrange for a meeting (in the next couple of weeks with this entire cc:d group) with Dr. Jessup to discuss his RD program and FTO questions?

Also, please forward to Dr. Jessup as I don't have his email on BB.

Thanks,

| Bill

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); "rjessup@tamu.edu"; [Gilliland, Diane M.](#)
Cc: [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schmitt, Brian C.](#); "wlr@tamu.edu"; [Avant, Bob](#)
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup
Date: Friday, October 09, 2009 7:47:36 AM

Diane,

Can you send Russell Jessup and this group PDF's of the Ceres' and Chevron agreements?

Bill F. McCutchen, Ph.D.
Associate Director
Texas AgriLife Research
Texas A&M University System
113 Jack K. Williams Administration Building
2142 TAMU College Station, TX 77843-2142
979-845-8488 Tel
979-458-4765 Fax
bmccutchen@tamu.edu

From: Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 7:35 AM
To: 'rjessup@tamu.edu'; McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob
Subject: Re: Russell Jessup

Russ,

Thanks for your inquiry. The agreements you ask for are available through AgriLife, and questions about policy should be directed to them as well.

I see this as less complicated than it may appear to be on the surface. Looking forward to discussing on Monday.

Best regards,
Peter Schuerman, Ph.D.
Director, Licensing and Intellectual Property
Office of Technology Commercialization

Sent from 979.571.1816

From:
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; wlr@tamu.edu <wlr@tamu.edu>; Avant, Bob
Sent: Thu Oct 08 22:49:58 2009
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Peter,

Towards enabling maximum progress at next Monday's meeting, I would like to frame my inquiry beforehand. Broadly, I would like to discuss encumbrances and FTO in perennial grass crops my program could deploy for biofuels, turfgrass, forage, etc. markets. Specifically:

- 1) Perennial, diploid (S. bicolor x S. propinquum) sorghum per the CERES agreement.
- 2) Perennial, polyploid (S. bicolor x S. halepense, S. alnum) 'columbusgrass' per the CERES agreement.
- 3) Miscanes, Miscanthus sinensis, M. x giganteus, Erianthus ravennea, E. giganteum per the Chevron agreement. 'Background IP' within the agreement and its effects upon elite, separate & distinct M. sinensis I could provide to Weslaco but also plan to develop as its own biomass crop.
- 4) Other 'agency' SRAs that might effect perennial grasses (Napiergrass, Pearl Millet-Napiergrass, Buffelgrass, Bermudagrass, Buffalograss, Bluegrass--TX, KY, TX x KY, Switchgrass, Kleingrass, Guineagrass).
- 5) AgriLife policy regarding 'agency' SRAs vs. traditional 'PI' limited SRAs.

Having the CERES/Chevron/etc. agreements available Monday or earlier would aid my understanding of our commitments immensely. If any further preliminary discussion would be beneficial please feel free to contact me.

Many thanks,

Russ

Russell Jessup
Assistant Professor
Perennial Grass Breeder
Dept. of Soil & Crop Sci.
Texas A&M University
rjessup@tamu.edu
979-315-4242

-----Original Message-----

From: j-slovacek@tamu.edu

Sent: Tue, 29 Sep 2009 07:44:29 -0500

To: bmccutchen@tamu.edu, kzak@tamu.edu, rjessup@tamu.edu

Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Meeting has been set for Monday, October 12th at 1:30 pm in suite 113 Jack K Williams Admin Building conference room.

Thanks all for responding! Have a great day!

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

From: Slovacek, Jackie

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 4:03 PM

To: McCutchen, Bill; Zak, Kendra; 'Russell Jessup'

Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob; Judy Young

Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Importance: High

Dear Drs. Baltensperger, Rooney and Jessup:

The following dates are available for McCutchen, Schuerman, Avant and Schmitt:

Oct 5th at 3:00 pm

Oct 6th at 3:30 pm

Oct 12th from 1:30 pm until 5:00 pm

Oct 13th from 8-10 am and 1:30 – 5:00 pm

Please let me know if any of these dates work with your schedules and I will be happy to set up this meeting.

Thanks

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

-----Original Message-----

From: McCutchen, Bill

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 3:36 PM

To: Slovacek, Jackie; Zak, Kendra

Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.;
'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob

Subject: Russell Jessup

Jackie and Kendra,

Can you please arrange for a meeting (in the next couple of weeks with this entire cc:d group) with Dr. Jessup to discuss his RD program and FTO questions?

Also, please forward to Dr. Jessup as I don't have his email on BB.

Thanks,

Bill

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: ["rjessup@tamu.edu"](mailto:rjessup@tamu.edu)
Cc: [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Schmitt, Brian C.](#); ["wlr@tamu.edu"](mailto:wlr@tamu.edu); [Avant, Bob](#)
Subject: Re: Russell Jessup
Date: Friday, October 09, 2009 6:32:31 AM

Thanks Russ. I'm not sure we will be able to provide clear guidance on all of the FTO questions next Monday, but this message provides a clear and concise list of issues that we can discuss. Some of these may require us to obtain an independent, outside legal opinion per FTO.

Thanks again,

Bill

From:
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; wlr@tamu.edu <wlr@tamu.edu>; Avant, Bob
Sent: Thu Oct 08 22:49:58 2009
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Peter,

Towards enabling maximum progress at next Monday's meeting, I would like to frame my inquiry beforehand. Broadly, I would like to discuss encumbrances and FTO in perennial grass crops my program could deploy for biofuels, turfgrass, forage, etc. markets. Specifically:

- 1) Perennial, diploid (S. bicolor x S. propinquum) sorghum per the CERES agreement.
- 2) Perennial, polyploid (S. bicolor x S. halepense, S. alnum) 'columbusgrass' per the CERES agreement.
- 3) Miscanes, Miscanthus sinensis, M. x giganteus, Erianthus ravennea, E. giganteum per the Chevron agreement. 'Background IP' within the agreement and its effects upon elite, separate & distinct M. sinensis I could provide to Weslaco but also plan to develop as its own biomass crop.
- 4) Other 'agency' SRAs that might effect perennial grasses (Napiergrass, Pearl Millet- Napiergrass, Buffelgrass, Bermudagrass, Buffalograss, Bluegrass--TX, KY, TX x KY, Switchgrass, Kleingrass, Guineagrass).
- 5) AgriLife policy regarding 'agency' SRAs vs. traditional 'PI' limited SRAs.

Having the CERES/Chevron/etc. agreements available Monday or earlier would aid my understanding of our commitments immensely. If any further preliminary discussion would be beneficial please feel free to contact me.

Many thanks,

Russ
=====

Russell Jessup
Assistant Professor
Perennial Grass Breeder
Dept. of Soil & Crop Sci.
Texas A&M University
rjessup@tamu.edu
979-315-4242

-----Original Message-----

From: j-slovacek@tamu.edu
Sent: Tue, 29 Sep 2009 07:44:29 -0500
To: bmccutchen@tamu.edu, kzak@tamu.edu, rjessup@tamu.edu
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Meeting has been set for Monday, October 12th at 1:30 pm in suite 113 Jack K Williams Admin Building conference room.

Thanks all for responding! Have a great day!

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

From: Slovacek, Jackie
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 4:03 PM
To: McCutchen, Bill; Zak, Kendra; 'Russell Jessup'
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob; Judy Young
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup
Importance: High

Dear Drs. Baltensperger, Rooney and Jessup:

The following dates are available for McCutchen, Schuerman, Avant and Schmitt:

Oct 5th at 3:00 pm

Oct 6th at 3:30 pm

Oct 12th from 1:30 pm until 5:00 pm

Oct 13th from 8-10 am and 1:30 – 5:00 pm

Please let me know if any of these dates work with your schedules and I will be happy to set up this meeting.

Thanks

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas **AgriLife Research**

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

-----Original Message-----

From: McCutchen, Bill

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 3:36 PM

To: Slovacek, Jackie; Zak, Kendra

Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.;

'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob
Subject: Russell Jessup

Jackie and Kendra,

Can you please arrange for a meeting (in the next couple of weeks with this entire cc:d group) with Dr. Jessup to discuss his RD program and FTO questions?

Also, please forward to Dr. Jessup as I don't have his email on BB.

Thanks,

Bill

From: n behalf of [Russell Jessup](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Cc: [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Schmitt, Brian C.](#); wlr@tamu.edu; [Avant, Bob](#)
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2009 10:50:47 PM

Peter,

Towards enabling maximum progress at next Monday's meeting, I would like to frame my inquiry beforehand. Broadly, I would like to discuss encumbrances and FTO in perennial grass crops my program could deploy for biofuels, turfgrass, forage, etc. markets. Specifically:

- 1) Perennial, diploid (S. bicolor x S. propinquum) sorghum per the CERES agreement.
- 2) Perennial, polyploid (S. bicolor x S. halepense, S. alnum) 'columbusgrass' per the CERES agreement.
- 3) Miscanes, Miscanthus sinensis, M. x giganteus, Erianthus ravennea, E. giganteum per the Chevron agreement. 'Background IP' within the agreement and its effects upon elite, separate & distinct M. sinensis I could provide to Weslaco but also plan to develop as its own biomass crop.
- 4) Other 'agency' SRAs that might effect perennial grasses (Napiergrass, Pearl Millet-Napiergrass, Buffelgrass, Bermudagrass, Buffalograss, Bluegrass--TX, KY, TX x KY, Switchgrass, Kleingrass, Guineagrass).
- 5) AgriLife policy regarding 'agency' SRAs vs. traditional 'PI' limited SRAs.

Having the CERES/Chevron/etc. agreements available Monday or earlier would aid my understanding of our commitments immensely. If any further preliminary discussion would be beneficial please feel free to contact me.

Many thanks,

Russ

=====

Russell Jessup
Assistant Professor
Perennial Grass Breeder
Dept. of Soil & Crop Sci.
Texas A&M University
rjessup@tamu.edu
979-315-4242

-----Original Message-----

From: j-slovacek@tamu.edu
Sent: Tue, 29 Sep 2009 07:44:29 -0500
To: bmccutchen@tamu.edu, kzak@tamu.edu, rjessup@tamu.edu
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Meeting has been set for Monday, October 12th at 1:30 pm in suite 113 Jack K Williams Admin Building conference room.

Thanks all for responding! Have a great day!

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

From: Slovacek, Jackie
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 4:03 PM
To: McCutchen, Bill; Zak, Kendra; 'Russell Jessup'
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob; Judy Young
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup
Importance: High

Dear Drs. Baltensperger, Rooney and Jessup:

The following dates are available for McCutchen, Schuerman, Avant and Schmitt:

Oct 5th at 3:00 pm

Oct 6th at 3:30 pm

Oct 12th from 1:30 pm until 5:00 pm

Oct 13th from 8-10 am and 1:30 – 5:00 pm

Please let me know if any of these dates work with your schedules and I will be happy to set up this meeting.

Thanks

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek

Assistant to the Associate Director

Texas **AgriLife Research**

113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg

College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980

979.458.4765 Fax

-----Original Message-----

From: McCutchen, Bill

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 3:36 PM

To: Slovacek, Jackie; Zak, Kendra

Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.;

'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob

Subject: Russell Jessup

Jackie and Kendra,

Can you please arrange for a meeting (in the next couple of weeks with this entire cc:d group) with Dr. Jessup to discuss his RD program and FTO questions?

Also, please forward to Dr. Jessup as I don't have his email on BB.

Thanks,

Bill

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: ["wlr@tam.u.edu"](#); [Avant, Bob](#); ["JBlumenthal@ag.tamu.edu"](#)
Cc: ["ahelms@tam.u.edu"](#); [Mullet, John E.](#); ["s-searcy@tam.u.edu"](#); [Baltensperger, David](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
Subject: Re: DARPA project
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2009 4:24:13 PM

Hamilton is OK and informed, but his team says they can't be stretched at this time - but they are supportive of our efforts with DARPA.

Bob, can you add more as you met face to face with Hamilton in San Diego?

Peter and I have lunch with Walter and Anna tomorrow; so should learn more.

Thanks,

Bill

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tam.u.edu>
To: Avant, Bob; 'Juerg Blumenthal' <jblumenthal@ag.tamu.edu>
Cc: 'Adam Helms' <ahelms@tam.u.edu>; McCutchen, Bill; Mullet, John E.; 'Steve Searcy' <s-searcy@tam.u.edu>; Baltensperger, David
Sent: Thu Oct 08 16:19:15 2009
Subject: RE: DARPA project

Bob, Jurg et al:

Between Bob's contacts and contacts that I have on Hawaii, I think we can get the work done. Given the time and situation, I think we have to make some assumptions that we will get the work done and not be particular on whom we will be working with.

I am a little more concerned regarding the lack of interest from Ceres in participating. It seems to me that this would be an excellent opportunity to enhance their testing and with a little extra funding. Seems odd to me.... Regardless, we need to make sure that they are onboard as a commercial partner.

I'll get the contacts when I get back to College Station on Monday.

Regards,

Bill

From: Avant, Bob [<mailto:bavant@tam.u.edu>]
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2009 2:05 PM
To: Juerg Blumenthal
Cc: Adam Helms; McCutchen, Bill; Mullet, John E.; Steve Searcy; Bill L Rooney; Baltensperger, David
Subject: Re: DARPA project

I have contacts with Hawaii Bioenergy. They own 400000 acres on several islands, but we don't have time to engage now. Need to make some assumptions now

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 8, 2009, at 11:53 AM, "Juerg Blumenthal" <jblumenthal@ag.tamu.edu> wrote:

All,

We can obviously take care of College Station and it should be rather easy to take care of Pecos if Mike Foster is interested in the project. As far as Hawaii I am somewhat at a loss. I do not have any contacts there and we need somebody to commit to the work. Any suggestions?

Juerg Blumenthal

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 8, 2009, at 12:13 PM, "Avant, Bob" <bavant@tamu.edu> wrote:

Thanks Juerg,

We need to discuss. Testing must be conducted at 3 DOD strategic locations - - probably CS, Hawaii, Pecos

Their interest is jet fuel production from biomass probably using FT tech.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 8, 2009, at 9:21 AM, "Juerg Blumenthal" <JBlumenthal@ag.tamu.edu> wrote:

All,

If Ceres really does not want to do the testing, one strategy could be to run the thing through my shop at crop testing. We currently run similar projects. My suggestion would be as follows:

For this project I would need the collaboration of Brent Bean at Amarillo and Nael El-Hout at Weslaco. I will contact them as soon as a definite approach is decided on.

Tasks to the investigators:

Blumenthal: trials at 2 environments (years 1+2) and 3 environments (years 3-5) in central and east Texas, gathering of entries, packaging seed for all locations, coordinating reporting; (40% of funding).

Bean: trials at 2 environments (years 1+2) and 3 environments (years 3-5) in the Texas High Plains; (30% of funding)

El-Hout: trials at 2 environments (years 1+2) and 3 environments (years 3-5) in the Rio Grande Valley and the Coastal Bend. (30% of the

funding)

Keep me posted about your thoughts and the progress of the situation.

Jürg Blumenthal

Jürg M. Blumenthal, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
State Sorghum Cropping Systems Specialist
Soil & Crop Sciences Department
Texas A & M University
351c Heep Center
Mailstop 2474
College Station, TX 77843-2474

Phone: (979) 845-2935
Fax: (979) 845-0604

>>> "Avant, Bob" <bavant@tamu.edu> 10/8/2009 09:56 >>>
CONFIDENTIAL

It looks like Ceres may not want to take on Task 1. As Plan B we need
to prepare an approach where we conduct the trialing - - ASAP.

Bob Avant
Program Director
Texas AgriLife Research
979/845-2908
512/422-6171 (Cell)
bavant@tamu.edu
<http://agbioenergy.tamu.edu>

-----Original Message-----

From: Avant, Bob
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2009 9:53 AM
To: 'Walter Nelson'
Subject: RE: DARPA project

Thanks Walter,

I'll watch for your call and step out of meeting.

Bob Avant
Program Director
Texas AgriLife Research
979/845-2908
512/422-6171 (Cell)
bavant@tamu.edu
<http://agbioenergy.tamu.edu>

-----Original Message-----

From: Walter Nelson [<mailto:wnelson@ceres.net>]
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2009 6:21 AM

To: Avant, Bob
Subject: DARPA project

Bob,

Didn't get to followup with everyone here till late last night and then had to go to dinner with family. Leave for Austin on 6:50am flight this morning so won't be avail by phone till about 9:30 your time in San Diego.

Had discussions around ideas we discussed and our current position would still prefer A&M handle the research proposal trialing with language saying Ceres will negotiate with DARPA for commercial access to materials as preferred customer etc....

Also spoke to Richard briefly last night and am keen to try to find a solution that will work well for all. Intend to discuss with McCutchin tomorrow at lunch.

Will try reaching during my drive from Austin to College Station.

Walter

-----Original Message-----

From: Avant, Bob [<mailto:bavant@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2009 7:56 PM
To: Helms, Adam
Cc: wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; Mullet, John E.; ssearcy@tamu.edu; jwrichardson@tamu.edu; jmgould@ag.tamu.edu; pklein@tamu.edu; Russell Jessup; thomasson@tamu.edu; Nael El-Hout; Walter Nelson; Juerg Blumenthal; Simpson, Shay; Spurlin, Shayna; Nelson, Michelle; Bridges, Brenda; McCutchen, Bill
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Thanks Adam

This is presented well and the changes are essential. I would reiterate the importance of receiving the changes by COB Thursday.

PI's please take care to follow a consistent format so we can avoid major reformatting. Please call if you have questions.

In addition to these changes, we will need to redo the milestones document, redo the Gantt chart, prepare the PPT.
Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, "Helms, Adam"
<ahelms@dsmail.tamu.edu>
wrote:

> Good evening:

- >
- >
- >
- > Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented - whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.
- >
- >
- >
- > First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the "over-arching" goals, deliverables and metrics for this project -
- >
- >
- >
- > Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.
- >
- > Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.
- >
- > Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower
- >
- >
- >
- > Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.
- >
- > Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.
- >

> Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and

> optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

>

>

>

> Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide

> hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with

> energy cane and other energy grasses.

>

> Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated

> vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding

> of

> the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

>

> Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from

> crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting

> energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy

> grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse

> agricultural and climatic conditions.

>

>

>

>

>

> To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to

> DARPA, we need the following:

>

> 1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the

> narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the "work

> plan" presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Del

> iverables document. I have attached an example

> "Narrative MDexample

> " from John Mullet's Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your

> task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this forma

> t and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the

> specifi

> c milestones are more specific than in the narrative.

>

>

>

>

>

> 2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36

> month

> "Go/No Go" quantifiable metrics. These "Go/No Go"

> quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we

> are

> funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize tha

> t this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but plea

> se remember, we don't want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 mo

> nths will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if th

> e metric isn't obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%,

> and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is

> still research.

>

>

>

> For example:

>

>

>

> Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) - State the objective

>

> Milestones

>

> Deliverables

>

> 18 month and 36 month

> quantifiable metrics

>

>

>

> The 60 month metrics ould be the 3 overarching metrics listed above

> - the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of

> many metrics per goal and per task.

>

>

>

>

>

> 3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a

> short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple

> formatting.

>

>

>

>

>

> Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest

> convenience if you have any questions/comments.

>

>

>

> Best,
>
>
>
> Adam
>
>
>
> Adam Helms
>
> AgriLife Research Corporate Relations
>
> 979-255-0752 (mobile)
>
> 979-458-2677 (office)
>
>
>
> <DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc>
> <DARPA MILESTONES AND DELIVERABLES Master.doc>
> <Narrative MD example.doc>

From: [Gary C Peterson](#)
To: [Baltensperger, David](#); [Jaroy Moore](#); [Steve Brown](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Cc: [Hurley, Janie C.](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Dugas, William](#); [Bill L Rooney](#)
Subject: RE: Rosenow Release Observation
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2009 9:58:38 AM
Attachments: [IMAGE.bmp](#)

Bill,

There are older releases, introductions from other countries, and a few converted lines that should be freely available. The first group of lines, [REDACTED] was released but a release announcement never distributed (that I am aware of). Most of the lines have not been released and an MTA should be required per existing policy. The first column (Status) gives information as to whether the lines have been released or origin, etc. The second column (Recommendation) lists whether an MTA should be required based on my understanding of current release policy.

If additional information is need let me know.

Regards,

Gary



Gary C. Peterson
Professor
Texas AgriLife Research & Extension Center
1102 E. FM 1294
Lubbock, TX 79403
g-peterson1@tamu.edu or gpeterso@ag.tamu.edu
tel: 806-746-4019
fax: 806-746-6528

>>> "McCutchen, Bill" <bmccutchen@tamu.edu> 10/7/2009 7:36 AM >>>

Gary,

Can I assume that these are parental lines from the Rosenow nursery which are publicly available? If so, then we certainly keep them publicly available, but with all other material we should require an MTA, per our existing System policy. I am going to forward this list to Janie and OTC so that they have a record as well.

Thanks for the heads up.

Bill

Bill F. McCutchen, Ph.D.
Associate Director

Texas AgriLife Research
Texas A&M University System
113 Jack K. Williams Administration Building
2142 TAMU College Station, TX 77843-2142
979-845-8488 Tel
979-458-4765 Fax
bmccutchen@tamu.edu

From: Gary C Peterson [mailto:g-peterson1@tamu.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 10:44 AM
To: Baltensperger, David; Jaroy Moore; Steve Brown; McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Bill L Rooney
Subject: Rosenow Release Observation

Bill,

A list of breeding lines (see attached) from the Rosenow breeding program was distributed to many sorghum scientists in August. The breeding lines represent the range of germplasm in that program. Individuals evaluating the lines at either College Station or Lubbock were told the material would be available with an MTA.

I have classified the lines for status - released, unreleased, etc - and whether an MTA is appropriate. Bill Rooney has looked at the list and the status/recommendation.

If there are any questions please call.

Regards,

Gary

Gary C. Peterson
Professor
Texas AgriLife Research & Extension Center
1102 E. FM 1294
Lubbock, TX 79403
g-peterson1@tamu.edu or gpeterso@ag.tamu.edu
tel: 806-746-4019
fax: 806-746-6528

From: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2009 9:57:17 AM

Got it

From: McCutchen, Bill
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 4:32 PM
To: Schuerman, Peter L.
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Peter,

I don't disagree, but I like to play Texas hold'em as well. I want to be able to pose some hardball questions of Ceres if they are looking to cave us on what seems to be a "trivial" matter for us - but not for them. Perhaps we can secure some additional major funding for sorghum, sorcane and/or sormiscane, as an example. Matching sponsorship for DARPA?

Thanks,

Bill

From: Schuerman, Peter L.
To: McCutchen, Bill
Sent: Wed Oct 07 16:23:51 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill - I recommend we just have the discussion on Friday at lunch and table this for now. Our position is both secure and reasonable.
Sent from 979.571.1816

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; Mullet, John E.
Cc: Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 16:11:47 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bottom-line, how much is it worth to potentially alienate Ceres and can we work around without too much trouble?

In other words, how critical to our RD program are these recessive alleles and corresponding markers in [REDACTED] to advance our causes?

Understand that we will try to negotiate a deal with Ceres, but IF they make a "stand" over THIS...? Knowing that we could gain significant political chips for future and current endeavors and negotiations.

Bill

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
To: Mullet, John E.

Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 11:32:56 2009
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

John has an excellent point with the markers... hadn't thought about that.

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 11:31 AM
To: Bill Rooney
Cc: 'McCutchen, Bill'; 'Helms, Adam'; 'Avant, Bob'; stelly@tamu.edu; 'Schuerman, Peter L.'; 'Hurley, Janie C.'
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill Mc,

I concur that keeping FTO on the [REDACTED] versions of [REDACTED] is useful because they are now in many other backgrounds and useful for energy crop development. In other words, if you license [REDACTED] it seems wise to retain FTO on these alleles at a minimum. Even though they are now in different backgrounds, it will be easy to trace the alleles back to [REDACTED]

John
On Oct 7, 2009, at 11:21 AM, Bill Rooney wrote:

Bill and John:

[REDACTED] has [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that might be of value to us. However, we've got those alleles in a lot of other material now and as long as that material is not turned over to Ceres, I think we'll be fine.

[REDACTED] has value in the sorghum world as a pollinator. In the sorghum scenario, the pollinator is mostly derived from sugarcane. Hence it is on that seed parent side of things where sorghum is more important (right now). So, sweet seed parents – when and if those are licensed – it would be critical to maintain our breeding rights to move high sugar into [REDACTED] seed parent backgrounds.

Regards,

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:53 AM
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob; wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill,

Currently as you know, Bill is using a modified version of [REDACTED] for WH development. Also, [REDACTED] has two genes of current value in breeding energy crops ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] that confer early flowering in inbreds, but late flowering in specific hybrids). These genes may be valuable for WH at some point (where cane is modified to be early flowering [REDACTED] for example but WH are late flowering). So you might want to retain rights to use [REDACTED] or the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] genes per se.

In addition, the genome of [REDACTED] will be segregating in a large number of our energy sorghum breeding lines, and we can see some additional traits derived from [REDACTED] that will be useful for energy crop design. I am not sure how you want to handle this aspect of [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 8:16 AM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

In other words, is [REDACTED] critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorcane RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the

following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.
2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don’t want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn’t obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms
AgriLife Research Corporate Relations
979-255-0752 (mobile)
979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES AND
DELIVERABLES_Master.doc><Narrative_MD example.doc>

From: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
To: [Mullet, John E.](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Cc: [Bill Rooney](#)
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2009 9:55:59 AM

Understood; thanks.

From: John Mullet [mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 5:42 PM
To: McCutchen, Bill; Schuerman, Peter L.
Cc: Bill Rooney
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill and Peter,

For WH, we could work around the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] alleles if need be either by using recessive alleles of other maturity genes, or by generating EMS recessives of [REDACTED] genes in a different background. Just so you know there are options.

The main point for me is to be sure we can continue using the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] alleles and alleles for other [REDACTED] genes in Bill's energy hybrid breeding program.

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 4:11 PM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

Bottom-line, how much is it worth to potentially alienate Ceres and can we work around without too much trouble?

In other words, how critical to our RD program are these recessive alleles and corresponding markers in [REDACTED] to advance our causes?

Understand that we will try to negotiate a deal with Ceres, but IF they make a "stand" over THIS...? Knowing that we could gain significant political chips for future and current endeavors and negotiations.

Bill

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
To: Mullet, John E.
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 11:32:56 2009
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

John has an excellent point with the markers... hadn't thought about that.

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 11:31 AM
To: Bill Rooney
Cc: 'McCutchen, Bill'; 'Helms, Adam'; 'Avant, Bob'; stelly@tamu.edu; 'Schuerman, Peter L.'; 'Hurley, Janie C.'
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill Mc,

I concur that keeping FTO on the [REDACTED] versions of [REDACTED] is useful because they are now in many other backgrounds and useful for energy crop development. In other words, if you license [REDACTED] it seems wise to retain FTO on these alleles at a minimum. Even though they are now in different backgrounds, it will be easy to trace the alleles back to [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 11:21 AM, Bill Rooney wrote:

Bill and John:

[REDACTED] has [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that might be of value to us. However, we've got those alleles in a lot of other material now and as long as that material is not turned over to Ceres, I think we'll be fine.

[REDACTED] has value in the sorghum world as a pollinator. In the sorghum scenario, the pollinator is mostly derived from sugarcane. Hence it is on that seed parent side of things where sorghum is more important (right now). So, sweet seed parents – when and if those are licensed – it would be critical to maintain our breeding rights to move high sugar into [REDACTED] seed parent backgrounds.

Regards,

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:53 AM
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob; wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill,

Currently as you know, Bill is using a modified version of [REDACTED] for WH development. Also, [REDACTED] has two genes of current value in breeding energy crops ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] that confer early flowering in inbreds, but late flowering in specific hybrids). These genes may be valuable for WH at some point (where cane is modified to be early flowering [REDACTED] for example but WH are late flowering). So you might want to retain rights to use [REDACTED] or the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] genes per se.

In addition, the genome of [REDACTED] will be segregating in a large number of our energy sorghum breeding lines, and we can see some additional traits derived from [REDACTED] that will be useful for energy crop design. I am not sure how you want to handle this aspect of [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 8:16 AM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

In other words, is [REDACTED] critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorcane RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that

in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.

2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don’t want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn’t obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms

AgriLife Research Corporate Relations

979-255-0752 (mobile)

979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES AND
DELIVERABLES_Master.doc><Narrative_MD example.doc>

From: [Bill Rooney](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#); [Mullet, John E.](#)
Cc: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Hurley, Janie C.](#)
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2009 2:11:31 AM

Bill Mc (and others)

It seems to me that the license agreement (which I just read) specifically allows the use of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for future breeding and research work. If I'm reading that correctly, then I think we are in good shape and don't have a need to push any further.

As of right now, the photoperiod sensitivity in the hybrids is provided by the sugarcane parent. While it is likely that we may want to breed, manipulate and even extract genes using [REDACTED] at some point, it probably will not be in the next 1-2 as we still have to understand what we are working with. At that point we would be ready and the Ceres project will be in the process of negotiation for renewal and we can address it at that point.

Regards,

Bill

From: McCutchen, Bill [mailto:bmccutchen@tamu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 4:12 PM
To: wlr@tamu.edu; Mullet, John E.
Cc: Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bottom-line, how much is it worth to potentially alienate Ceres and can we work around without too much trouble?

In other words, how critical to our RD program are these recessive alleles and corresponding markers in [REDACTED] to advance our causes?

Understand that we will try to negotiate a deal with Ceres, but IF they make a "stand" over THIS...? Knowing that we could gain significant political chips for future and current endeavors and negotiations.

Bill

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
To: Mullet, John E.
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 11:32:56 2009
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

John has an excellent point with the markers... hadn't thought about that.

Bill

From: John Mullet [mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 11:31 AM

To: Bill Rooney

Cc: 'McCutchen, Bill'; 'Helms, Adam'; 'Avant, Bob'; stelly@tamu.edu; 'Schuerman, Peter L.'; 'Hurley, Janie C.'

Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill Mc,

I concur that keeping FTO on the [REDACTED] versions of [REDACTED] is useful because they are now in many other backgrounds and useful for energy crop development. In other words, if you license [REDACTED] it seems wise to retain FTO on these alleles at a minimum. Even though they are now in different backgrounds, it will be easy to trace the alleles back to [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 11:21 AM, Bill Rooney wrote:

Bill and John:

[REDACTED] has [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that might be of value to us. However, we've got those alleles in a lot of other material now and as long as that material is not turned over to Ceres, I think we'll be fine.

[REDACTED] has value in the sorghum world as a pollinator. In the sorghum scenario, the pollinator is mostly derived from sugarcane. Hence it is on that seed parent side of things where sorghum is more important (right now). So, sweet seed parents – when and if those are licensed – it would be critical to maintain our breeding rights to move high sugar into [REDACTED] seed parent backgrounds.

Regards,

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]

Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:53 AM

To: McCutchen, Bill

Cc: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob; wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.

Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill,

Currently as you know, Bill is using a modified version of [REDACTED] for WH development. Also, [REDACTED] has two genes of current value in breeding energy crops ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] that confer early flowering in inbreds, but late flowering in specific hybrids). These genes may be valuable for WH at some point (where cane is modified to be early flowering [REDACTED] for example but WH are late flowering). So you might want to retain rights to use [REDACTED] or the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] genes per se.

In addition, the genome of [REDACTED] will be segregating in a large number of our energy sorghum breeding lines, and we can see some additional traits derived from [REDACTED] that will be useful for energy crop design. I am not sure how you want to handle this aspect of [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 8:16 AM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

In other words, is [REDACTED] critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorcane RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy

Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.
2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don’t want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn’t obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms

AgriLife Research Corporate Relations

979-255-0752 (mobile)

979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES AND
DELIVERABLES_Master.doc><Narrative_MD example.doc>

From: [John Mullet](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
Cc: [Bill Rooney](#)
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 5:42:18 PM

Bill and Peter,

For WH, we could work around the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] alleles if need be either by using recessive alleles of other maturity genes, or by generating EMS recessives of [REDACTED] genes in a different background. Just so you know there are options.

The main point for me is to be sure we can continue using the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] alleles and alleles for other [REDACTED] genes in Bill's energy hybrid breeding program.

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 4:11 PM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

Bottom-line, how much is it worth to potentially alienate Ceres and can we work around without too much trouble?

In other words, how critical to our RD program are these recessive alleles and corresponding markers in [REDACTED] to advance our causes?

Understand that we will try to negotiate a deal with Ceres, but IF they make a "stand" over THIS...? Knowing that we could gain significant political chips for future and current endeavors and negotiations.

Bill

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
To: Mullet, John E.
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 11:32:56 2009
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

John has an excellent point with the markers... hadn't thought about that.

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 11:31 AM
To: Bill Rooney
Cc: 'McCutchen, Bill'; 'Helms, Adam'; 'Avant, Bob'; stelly@tamu.edu; 'Schuerman, Peter L.'; 'Hurley, Janie C.'
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill Mc,

I concur that keeping FTO on the [REDACTED] versions of [REDACTED] is useful because

they are now in many other backgrounds and useful for energy crop development. In other words, if you license [REDACTED] it seems wise to retain FTO on these alleles at a minimum. Even though they are now in different backgrounds, it will be easy to trace the alleles back to [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 11:21 AM, Bill Rooney wrote:

Bill and John:

[REDACTED] has [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that might be of value to us. However, we've got those alleles in a lot of other material now and as long as that material is not turned over to Ceres, I think we'll be fine.

[REDACTED] has value in the sorghum world as a pollinator. In the sorghum scenario, the pollinator is mostly derived from sugarcane. Hence it is on that seed parent side of things where sorghum is more important (right now). So, sweet seed parents – when and if those are licensed – it would be critical to maintain our breeding rights to move high sugar into [REDACTED] seed parent backgrounds.

Regards,

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]

Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:53 AM

To: McCutchen, Bill

Cc: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob; wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.

Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill,

Currently as you know, Bill is using a modified version of [REDACTED] for WH development. Also, [REDACTED] has two genes of current value in breeding energy crops ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] that confer early flowering in inbreds, but late flowering in specific hybrids). These genes may be valuable for WH at some point (where cane is modified to be early flowering [REDACTED] for example but WH are late flowering). So you might want to retain rights to use [REDACTED] or the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] genes per se.

In addition, the genome of [REDACTED] will be segregating in a large number of our energy sorghum breeding lines, and we can see some additional traits derived from [REDACTED] that will be useful for energy crop design. I am not sure how you want to handle this aspect of [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 8:16 AM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

In other words, is [REDACTED] critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorcane RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.
2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please

remember, we don't want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn't obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms
AgriLife Research Corporate Relations
979-255-0752 (mobile)
979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES
AND DELIVERABLES_Master.doc><Narrative_MD
example.doc>

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 4:31:59 PM

Peter,

I don't disagree, but I like to play Texas hold'em as well. I want to be able to pose some hardball questions of Ceres if they are looking to cave us on what seems to be a "trivial" matter for us - but not for them. Perhaps we can secure some additional major funding for sorghum, sorcane and/or sormiscane, as an example. Matching sponsorship for DARPA?

Thanks,

Bill

From: Schuerman, Peter L.
To: McCutchen, Bill
Sent: Wed Oct 07 16:23:51 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill - I recommend we just have the discussion on Friday at lunch and table this for now. Our position is both secure and reasonable.
Sent from 979.571.1816

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; Mullet, John E.
Cc: Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 16:11:47 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bottom-line, how much is it worth to potentially alienate Ceres and can we work around without too much trouble?

In other words, how critical to our RD program are these recessive alleles and corresponding markers in [REDACTED] to advance our causes?

Understand that we will try to negotiate a deal with Ceres, but IF they make a "stand" over THIS...? Knowing that we could gain significant political chips for future and current endeavors and negotiations.

Bill

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
To: Mullet, John E.
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 11:32:56 2009
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

John has an excellent point with the markers... hadn't thought about that.

Bill

From: John Mullet [mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 11:31 AM
To: Bill Rooney
Cc: 'McCutchen, Bill'; 'Helms, Adam'; 'Avant, Bob'; stelly@tamu.edu; 'Schuerman, Peter L.'; 'Hurley, Janie C.'
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill Mc,

I concur that keeping FTO on the [REDACTED] versions of [REDACTED] is useful because they are now in many other backgrounds and useful for energy crop development. In other words, if you license [REDACTED] it seems wise to retain FTO on these alleles at a minimum. Even though they are now in different backgrounds, it will be easy to trace the alleles back to [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 11:21 AM, Bill Rooney wrote:

Bill and John:

[REDACTED] has [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that might be of value to us. However, we've got those alleles in a lot of other material now and as long as that material is not turned over to Ceres, I think we'll be fine.

[REDACTED] has value in the sorghum world as a pollinator. In the sorcane scenario, the pollinator is mostly derived from sugarcane. Hence it is on that seed parent side of things where sorghum is more important (right now). So, sweet seed parents – when and if those are licensed – it would be critical to maintain our breeding rights to move high sugar into [REDACTED] seed parent backgrounds.

Regards,

Bill

From: John Mullet [mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:53 AM
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob; wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill,

Currently as you know, Bill is using a modified version of [REDACTED] for WH development. Also, [REDACTED] has two genes of current value in breeding energy crops ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] that confer early flowering in inbreds, but late flowering in specific hybrids). These genes may be valuable for WH at some point (where cane is modified to be early flowering [REDACTED] for example but WH are late flowering). So you might want to retain rights to use [REDACTED] or the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] genes per se.

In addition, the genome of [REDACTED] will be segregating in a large number of our energy sorghum breeding lines, and we can see some additional traits derived from [REDACTED] that will be useful for energy crop design. I am not sure how you want to handle this aspect of [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 8:16 AM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

In other words, is [REDACTED] critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorcane RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.
2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don’t want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn’t obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms

AgriLife Research Corporate Relations

979-255-0752 (mobile)

979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES AND
DELIVERABLES_Master.doc><Narrative_MD example.doc>

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: ["wlr@tamu.edu"; Mullet, John E.](#)
Cc: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Hurley, Janie C.](#)
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 4:11:48 PM

Bottom-line, how much is it worth to potentially alienate Ceres and can we work around without too much trouble?

In other words, how critical to our RD program are these recessive alleles and corresponding markers in [REDACTED] to advance our causes?

Understand that we will try to negotiate a deal with Ceres, but IF they make a "stand" over THIS...? Knowing that we could gain significant political chips for future and current endeavors and negotiations.

Bill

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
To: Mullet, John E.
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 11:32:56 2009
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

John has an excellent point with the markers... hadn't thought about that.

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 11:31 AM
To: Bill Rooney
Cc: 'McCutchen, Bill'; 'Helms, Adam'; 'Avant, Bob'; stelly@tamu.edu; 'Schuerman, Peter L.'; 'Hurley, Janie C.'
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill Mc,

I concur that keeping FTO on the [REDACTED] versions of [REDACTED] is useful because they are now in many other backgrounds and useful for energy crop development. In other words, if you license [REDACTED] it seems wise to retain FTO on these alleles at a minimum. Even though they are now in different backgrounds, it will be easy to trace the alleles back to [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 11:21 AM, Bill Rooney wrote:

Bill and John:

[REDACTED] has [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that might be of value to us. However, we've got those alleles in a lot of other material now and as long as that material is not turned over to Ceres, I think we'll be fine.

[REDACTED] has value in the sorghum world as a pollinator. In the sorcane scenario, the pollinator is

mostly derived from sugarcane. Hence it is on that seed parent side of things where sorghum is more important (right now). So, sweet seed parents – when and if those are licensed – it would be critical to maintain our breeding rights to move high sugar into [REDACTED] seed parent backgrounds.

Regards,

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:53 AM
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob; wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill,

Currently as you know, Bill is using a modified version of [REDACTED] for WH development. Also, [REDACTED] has two genes of current value in breeding energy crops ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] that confer early flowering in inbreds, but late flowering in specific hybrids). These genes may be valuable for WH at some point (where cane is modified to be early flowering [REDACTED] for example but WH are late flowering). So you might want to retain rights to use [REDACTED] or the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] genes per se.

In addition, the genome of [REDACTED] will be segregating in a large number of our energy sorghum breeding lines, and we can see some additional traits derived from [REDACTED] that will be useful for energy crop design. I am not sure how you want to handle this aspect of [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 8:16 AM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

In other words, is [REDACTED] critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorghum RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009

Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.
2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don’t want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn’t obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms
AgriLife Research Corporate Relations
979-255-0752 (mobile)
979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES AND
DELIVERABLES_Master.doc><Narrative_MD example.doc>

From: [Bill Rooney](#)
To: [Mullet, John E.](#)
Cc: [McCutchen, Bill](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Hurley, Janie C.](#)
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 11:33:16 AM

John has an excellent point with the markers... hadn't thought about that.

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 11:31 AM
To: Bill Rooney
Cc: 'McCutchen, Bill'; 'Helms, Adam'; 'Avant, Bob'; stelly@tamu.edu; 'Schuerman, Peter L.'; 'Hurley, Janie C.'
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill Mc,

I concur that keeping FTO on the [REDACTED] versions of [REDACTED] is useful because they are now in many other backgrounds and useful for energy crop development. In other words, if you license [REDACTED] it seems wise to retain FTO on these alleles at a minimum. Even though they are now in different backgrounds, it will be easy to trace the alleles back to [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 11:21 AM, Bill Rooney wrote:

Bill and John:

[REDACTED] has [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that might be of value to us. However, we've got those alleles in a lot of other material now and as long as that material is not turned over to Ceres, I think we'll be fine.

[REDACTED] has value in the sorghum world as a pollinator. In the sorghum scenario, the pollinator is mostly derived from sugarcane. Hence it is on that seed parent side of things where sorghum is more important (right now). So, sweet seed parents – when and if those are licensed – it would be critical to maintain our breeding rights to move high sugar into [REDACTED] seed parent backgrounds.

Regards,

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:53 AM
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob; wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill,

Currently as you know, Bill is using a modified version of [REDACTED] for WH development.

Also, [REDACTED] has two genes of current value in breeding energy crops ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] that confer early flowering in inbreds, but late flowering in specific hybrids). These genes may be valuable for WH at some point (where cane is modified to be early flowering [REDACTED] for example but WH are late flowering). So you might want to retain rights to use [REDACTED] or the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] genes per se.

In addition, the genome of [REDACTED] will be segregating in a large number of our energy sorghum breeding lines, and we can see some additional traits derived from [REDACTED] that will be useful for energy crop design. I am not sure how you want to handle this aspect of [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 8:16 AM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

In other words, is [REDACTED] critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorcane RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific

milestones are more specific than in the narrative.

2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don’t want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn’t obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms

AgriLife Research Corporate Relations

979-255-0752 (mobile)

979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES AND
DELIVERABLES_Master.doc><Narrative_MD example.doc>

From: [John Mullet](#)
To: [Bill Rooney](#)
Cc: [McCutchen, Bill](#); [Helms, Adam](#); [Avant, Bob](#); stelly@tamu.edu; [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Hurley, Janie C.](#)
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 11:31:08 AM

Bill Mc,

I concur that keeping FTO on the [REDACTED] versions of [REDACTED] is useful because they are now in many other backgrounds and useful for energy crop development. In other words, if you license [REDACTED] it seems wise to retain FTO on these alleles at a minimum. Even though they are now in different backgrounds, it will be easy to trace the alleles back to [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 11:21 AM, Bill Rooney wrote:

Bill and John:

[REDACTED] has [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that might be of value to us. However, we've got those alleles in a lot of other material now and as long as that material is not turned over to Ceres, I think we'll be fine.

[REDACTED] has value in the sorghum world as a pollinator. In the sorghum scenario, the pollinator is mostly derived from sugarcane. Hence it is on that seed parent side of things where sorghum is more important (right now). So, sweet seed parents – when and if those are licensed – it would be critical to maintain our breeding rights to move high sugar into [REDACTED] seed parent backgrounds.

Regards,

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:53 AM
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob; wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill,

Currently as you know, Bill is using a modified version of [REDACTED] for WH development. Also, [REDACTED] has two genes of current value in breeding energy crops ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] that confer early flowering in inbreds, but late flowering in specific hybrids). These genes may be valuable for WH at some point (where cane is modified to be early flowering [REDACTED] for example but WH are late flowering). So you might want to retain rights to use [REDACTED] or the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] genes per se.

In addition, the genome of [REDACTED] will be segregating in a large number of our energy sorghum breeding lines, and we can see some additional traits derived from [REDACTED] that will be useful for energy crop design. I am not sure how you want to handle this aspect of [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 8:16 AM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

In other words, is [REDACTED] critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorcane RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.

2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don’t want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn’t obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms
AgriLife Research Corporate Relations
979-255-0752 (mobile)
979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES
AND DELIVERABLES_Master.doc><Narrative_MD
example.doc>

From: [Bill Rooney](#)
To: [Mullet, John E.](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Cc: [Helms, Adam](#); [Avant, Bob](#); stelly@tamu.edu; [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Hurley, Janie C.](#)
Subject: RE: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 11:23:36 AM

Bill and John:

■■■ has ■■■ and ■■■ and that might be of value to us. However, we've got those alleles in a lot of other material now and as long as that material is not turned over to Ceres, I think we'll be fine.

■■■ has value in the sorghum world as a pollinator. In the sorghum scenario, the pollinator is mostly derived from sugarcane. Hence it is on that seed parent side of things where sorghum is more important (right now). So, sweet seed parents – when and if those are licensed – it would be critical to maintain our breeding rights to move high sugar into ■■■ seed parent backgrounds.

Regards,

Bill

From: John Mullet [<mailto:jmullet@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:53 AM
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob; wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Bill,

Currently as you know, Bill is using a modified version of ■■■ for WH development. Also, ■■■ has two genes of current value in breeding energy crops (■■■ ■■■ that confer early flowering in inbreds, but late flowering in specific hybrids). These genes may be valuable for WH at some point (where cane is modified to be early flowering ■■■ for example but WH are late flowering). So you might want to retain rights to use ■■■ or the ■■■ ■■■ genes per se.

In addition, the genome of ■■■ will be segregating in a large number of our energy sorghum breeding lines, and we can see some additional traits derived from ■■■ that will be useful for energy crop design. I am not sure how you want to handle this aspect of ■■■

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 8:16 AM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

In other words, is ■■■ critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.;

Hurley, Janie C.

Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009

Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorcane RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>

To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob

Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>

Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009

Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for

biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.
2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don’t want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn’t obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any

questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms

AgriLife Research Corporate Relations

979-255-0752 (mobile)

979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES AND
DELIVERABLES_Master.doc><Narrative_MD example.doc>

From: [John Mullet](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Cc: [Helms, Adam](#); [Avant, Bob](#); wlr@tamu.edu; stelly@tamu.edu; [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Hurley, Janie C.](#)
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:54:13 AM

Bill,

Currently as you know, Bill is using a modified version of [REDACTED] for WH development. Also, [REDACTED] has two genes of current value in breeding energy crops ([REDACTED] [REDACTED] that confer early flowering in inbreds, but late flowering in specific hybrids). These genes may be valuable for WH at some point (where cane is modified to be early flowering = [REDACTED] for example but WH are late flowering). So you might want to retain rights to use [REDACTED] or the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] genes per se.

In addition, the genome of [REDACTED] will be segregating in a large number of our energy sorghum breeding lines, and we can see some additional traits derived from [REDACTED] that will be useful for energy crop design. I am not sure how you want to handle this aspect of [REDACTED]

John

On Oct 7, 2009, at 8:16 AM, McCutchen, Bill wrote:

In other words, is [REDACTED] critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorghum RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured,

and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the "work plan" presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example "Narrative_MDexample" from John Mullet's Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.
2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month "Go/No Go" quantifiable metrics. These "Go/No Go" quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don't want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn't obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective
Milestones
Deliverables
18 month and 36 month quantifiable
metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms
AgriLife Research Corporate Relations
979-255-0752 (mobile)
979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA
MILESTONES AND
DELIVERABLES Master.doc><Narrative MD example.doc>

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: [Mullet, John E.](#); [Helms, Adam](#); [Avant, Bob](#)
Cc: ["wlr@tamu.edu"](#); ["stelly@tamu.edu"](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Hurley, Janie C.](#)
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:16:42 AM

In other words, is [REDACTED] critical are do we have enough other germplasm not committed to Ceres that is more than viable?

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Mullet, John E.; Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.; Hurley, Janie C.
Sent: Wed Oct 07 08:15:10 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorcane RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with

the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.
2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don’t want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn’t obtained. If your

goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms
AgriLife Research Corporate Relations
979-255-0752 (mobile)
979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES AND
DELIVERABLES Master.doc><Narrative MD example.doc>

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: [Mullet, John E.](#); [Helms, Adam](#); [Avant, Bob](#)
Cc: ["wlr@tamu.edu"](#); ["stelly@tamu.edu"](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Hurley, Janie C.](#)
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 8:15:11 AM

On another subject, how important would the likes of [REDACTED] be as germplasm/seed stock for our sorcane RD? We are running into barriers with Ceres on the license?

Bill

From: John Mullet <jmullet@tamu.edu>
To: Helms, Adam; Avant, Bob
Cc: McCutchen, Bill; Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>; Stelly David Stelly <stelly@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Oct 07 07:56:07 2009
Subject: Re: Highest Priority: DARPA Energy Crops

Adam and Bob,

This looks excellent. In addition, I would suggest creating a version that adds one more layer of information - Milestones that define the path or steps to achieve the Deliverable. In this version, one could quickly understand what we intend to deliver, how success will be measured, and the steps we intend to take to achieve the goal.

I will work a bit on Goal 2 as an example and send later today so you can decide if this approach is useful (possibly for STO slides, if not for the proposal).

Thanks,

John

On Oct 6, 2009, at 9:17 PM, Helms, Adam wrote:

Good evening:

Today we met with Dr. Giroir and he gave us some advice for moving forward with the DARPA-Energy Crops Proposal. Perhaps the most relevant was how we proceed with the Milestones & Deliverables document and the discussion of the Milestone vs. Deliverable vs. Metric and how DARPA likes these presented – whether for the entire project, per goal or per task. Bob, Shay and I had a lengthy discussion about this very topic when we returned and how we felt it should best be presented.

First, for each goal there is one deliverable with quantifiable metrics. For example, below are the “over-arching” goals, deliverables and metrics for this project –

Goal 1: Grow and optimize production of current energy sorghum hybrids at sites of importance to national security.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum production maximized in locations of national security importance using optimized management practices, harvest logistics, and

economic assessment.

Metric: 10-15 dry tons of lignocellulosic biomass produced per acre per year delivered to biorefineries at ~\$60/dT providing a ~75% GHG offset for biofuels or ~95% for biopower

Goal 2: Build a full-scale integrated genomics-to-breeding technology platform that will accelerate the rate of genetic improvement of energy sorghum and wide-hybrids.

Deliverable: Energy sorghum hybrids with increased yield and optimized composition for advanced biofuels and biopower generation designed using an integrated genomics-to-energy crop breeding technology platform.

Metric: Improve energy crop yield to 15-20 dT/acre and optimize biomass composition for conversion processes.

Goal 3: Develop next generation energy crops using novel wide hybridization technology that enables sorghum to be crossed with energy cane and other energy grasses.

Deliverable: Novel wide-hybrid energy crops propagated vegetatively and/or through seed production and an understanding of the genetic basis of wide hybridization.

Metric: Development of the mass-production of hybrid seed from crosses with energy canes. 25-90+% cost reduction for planting energy canes. A suite of newly created next-generation energy grasses for advanced biofuels and biopower generation in diverse agricultural and climatic conditions.

To move forward with the process to submit another iteration to DARPA, we need the following:

1. Milestones and Deliverables document that reflects the narrative. At present, there is not a consistency between the “work plan” presented per task in the narrative to the Milestones and Deliverables document. I have attached an example “Narrative_MDexample” from John Mullet’s Task 2.1. Review the example to see if your task and milestones/deliverables are similar. Please use this format and note that in the Milestones and Documents example, the specific milestones are more specific than in the narrative.
2. For each task you are assigned, we need 18 month and 36 month “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics. These “Go/No Go” quantifiable metrics are what DARPA will use to determine if we are funded for the next 18 months and the last 24 months. I realize that this puts everyone into the middle of a year of research, but please remember, we don’t want yearly reviews from DARPA, so every 18 months will suffice. Additionally, it will not kill the project if the metric isn’t obtained. If your goal is to improve efficiency 50%, and you only achieve 40% then that is ok, DARPA understands this is still research.

For example:

Task 2.1 (which is Goal 2 Task 1) – State the objective

Milestones

Deliverables

18 month and 36 month quantifiable metrics

The 60 month metrics could be the 3 overarching metrics listed above – the reason those 3 were achieved were because of the attainment of many metrics

per goal and per task.

3. We need this by close of business Thursday. I know it is a short turn around, but for the most part, it is only simple formatting.

Thanks, and as always, please contact me at your earliest convenience if you have any questions/comments.

Best,

Adam

Adam Helms
AgriLife Research Corporate Relations
979-255-0752 (mobile)
979-458-2677 (office)

<DARPA RD Proposal SemiFinal.doc><DARPA MILESTONES AND
DELIVERABLES Master.doc><Narrative MD example.doc>

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: ["Gary C Peterson"](#); [Baltensperger, David](#); ["Jaroy Moore"](#); ["Steve Brown"](#)
Cc: ["Bill L Rooney"](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Hurley, Janie C.](#); [Dugas, William](#)
Subject: RE: Rosenow Release Observation
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 7:36:41 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Gary,

Can I assume that these are parental lines from the Rosenow nursery which are publicly available? If so, then we certainly keep them publicly available, but with all other material we should require an MTA, per our existing System policy. I am going to forward this list to Janie and OTC so that they have a record as well.

Thanks for the heads up.

Bill

Bill F. McCutchen, Ph.D.
Associate Director
Texas AgriLife Research
Texas A&M University System
113 Jack K. Williams Administration Building
2142 TAMU College Station, TX 77843-2142
979-845-8488 Tel
979-458-4765 Fax
bmccutchen@tamu.edu

From: Gary C Peterson [<mailto:g-peterson1@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 10:44 AM
To: Baltensperger, David; Jaroy Moore; Steve Brown; McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Bill L Rooney
Subject: Rosenow Release Observation

Bill,

A list of breeding lines (see attached) from the Rosenow breeding program was distributed to many sorghum scientists in August. The breeding lines represent the range of germplasm in that program. Individuals evaluating the lines at either College Station or Lubbock were told the material would be available with an MTA.

I have classified the lines for status - released, unreleased, etc - and whether an MTA is appropriate. Bill Rooney has looked at the list and the status/recommendation.

If there are any questions please call.

Regards,

Gary

Gary C. Peterson
Professor
Texas AgriLife Research & Extension Center
1102 E. FM 1294
Lubbock, TX 79403
g-peterson1@tamu.edu or gpeterso@ag.tamu.edu
tel: 806-746-4019
fax: 806-746-6528

From: [Hurley, Janie C.](#)
To: ["Bill Rooney"](#)
Cc: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
Subject: RE: Request for Approval - TAMUS 2741-2746
Date: Tuesday, October 06, 2009 3:28:45 PM

Hi Dr. Rooney,

Thanks for letting me know. Do you have a summary prepared for the characteristics for each line, including this new data? I assume that you believe these weaknesses are such that they would not even be useful for breeding purposes?

Thanks much,
Janie

From: Bill Rooney [mailto:wlr@tamu.edu]
Sent: Sunday, October 04, 2009 12:49 PM
To: Holland, L. Diane
Cc: Baltensperger, David; McCutchen, Bill; Hurley, Janie C.; 'Steve Brown'
Subject: RE: FW: Request for Approval - TAMUS 2741-2746

Diane:

Sorry for the delay; too many other things to do and not enough time for anything.

I haven't approved this distribution because things have changed with these lines. When they were originally distributed we had very little data to discriminate amongst them; hence, we made them all available. Now, two growing seasons later, we have quite a bit more data and the more recent data is clear that certain lines are better than others and that some of them have pretty significant weaknesses. These weaknesses are such that, now that we know about them, I would not feel right sending these lines to someone with licensing and fee expectations.

There are two lines in this set of six that are worthy of testing and licensing. I think the prudent approach is license those lines; if Cleanergy would like the others, knowing their weaknesses, then they could have them as negotiated between the groups.

I've copied Janie and Bill M. on this because they were not aware of the situation.
Regards,

Bill

Dr. William L. Rooney
Professor, Sorghum Breeding and Genetics
Chair, Plant Release Committee
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843-2474
979 845 2151

From: Holland, L. Diane [mailto:DHolland@tamu.edu]
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2009 1:32 PM
To: Bill Rooney
Subject: FW: FW: Request for Approval - TAMUS 2741-2746

From: Lloyd Rooney [mailto:lrooney@tamu.edu]
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2009 1:24 PM
To: Holland, L. Diane
Subject: Re: FW: Request for Approval - TAMUS 2741-2746

Hello; I think this should go to Bill Rooney not to me. I am forwarding to him as well .
lwr

>>> "Holland, L. Diane" <DHolland@tamu.edu> 9/25/2009 11:57 AM >>>
Dear Lloyd, David, and Bill,

I have received approval on the License Agreement TAMUS 2741-2746 from Steve and Warren. Could each of you email me your reply?

Thanks!
Diane

From: Holland, L. Diane
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2009 3:15 PM
To: 'Lloyd Rooney'; Baltensperger, David; 'Steve Brown'; McCutchen, Bill; DeLuca, Warren
Cc: Slovacek, Jackie; Lawson, Caroline; Hurley, Janie C.
Subject: Request for Approval - TAMUS 2741-2746
Importance: High

Gentlemen<

Attached for your consideration and approval is a draft of a proposed Non-exclusive License Agreement between Cleanergy Seeds Ltd. and The Texas A&M University System. Also attached is a brief summarizing the terms of the Agreement, and an approval form. If the Agreement is acceptable as written, please indicate your approval with an email response copying everyone on this email. In the interest of time, we are doing this routing approval via email. I look forward to hearing back from you soon.

Best Regards,

Diane Holland
Office of Technology Commercialization
Texas A&M University Systems

1700 Research Parkway, Suite 250
3369 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843-3369
979-845-8966 - phone
979-845-1402 - fax

From: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
To: [Schmitt, Brian C.](#)
Cc: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); [Zak, Kendra](#); "[ahelms@tamu.edu](#)"
Subject: Fw: Location and Time change: DARPA Meeting
Date: Tuesday, October 06, 2009 8:35:47 AM

Brian,

I know this is short notice, but you might want to attend if you can. Kendra can u send Brian and Peter current draft of DARPA?

Bill

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Zak, Kendra; Avant, Bob; Simpson, Shay; Giroir, Brett; Helms, Adam; Spurlin, Shayna; Mullet, John E.; 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'stelly@tamu.edu' <stelly@tamu.edu>; 'ssearcy@ag.tamu.edu' <ssearcy@ag.tamu.edu>; 'pklein@tamu.edu' <pklein@tamu.edu>
Cc: Slovacek, Jackie; Pollard, Claudia
Sent: Tue Oct 06 08:32:26 2009
Subject: Re: Location and Time change: DARPA Meeting

Thanks Kendra. Can you make several copies of the proposal for us to take to System's Bldg to review?

I assume meeting room is on 2nd floor in Chancellor's suite?

Bill

From: Zak, Kendra
To: Zak, Kendra; McCutchen, Bill; Avant, Bob; Simpson, Shay; Giroir, Brett; Helms, Adam; Spurlin, Shayna; Mullet, John E.; 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; 'Stelly David' <stelly@tamu.edu>; 'Steve Searcy' <ssearcy@ag.tamu.edu>; 'Patricia Klein' <pklein@tamu.edu>
Cc: Slovacek, Jackie; Pollard, Claudia
Sent: Tue Oct 06 08:26:34 2009
Subject: Location and Time change: DARPA Meeting

All,

The meeting to meet with Brett Giroir about the DARPA proposal has been changed to **1-2:30 pm** TODAY Tuesday October 6th at the **Systems HQ** building out on Hwy 6.

Kendra Zak
Administrative Assistant
AgriLife Corporate Relations
1500 Research Pkwy Suite 100
College Station, TX 77845
office: 979-845-4281
cell: 512-304-5373
fax: 979-458-2155
kzak@tamu.edu

From: Zak, Kendra
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2009 10:00 AM

To: McCutchen, Bill; Avant, Bob; Simpson, Shay; Giroir, Brett; Helms, Adam; Spurlin, Shayna; Mullet, John E.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Stelly David; Steve Searcy; Patricia Klein
Cc: Slovacek, Jackie; Pollard, Claudia
Subject: DARPA Meeting
Importance: High

All,

Brett Giroir is available to meet on Tuesday October 6th from 12:30-2pm in the Corporate Relations Conference room to discuss the DARPA Proposal. Please make arrangements to attend.

Have a terrific Thursday,

Kendra Zak
Administrative Assistant
AgriLife Corporate Relations
1500 Research Pkwy Suite 100
College Station, TX 77845
office: 979-845-4281
cell: 512-304-5373
fax: 979-458-2155
kzak@tamu.edu

From: [Helms, Adam](#)
To: [Avant, Bob](#); [McCutchen, Bill](#); [Simpson, Shay](#); [Spurlin, Shayna](#); [Bridges, Brenda](#); [Nelson, Michelle](#); [Zak, Kendra](#); [Slovacek, Jackie](#); [Penn, Nancye B](#); [Schuerman, Peter L.](#); ["itcothren@tamu.edu"](#); ["Frank Hons"](#); ["David Zuberer"](#); ["KMcInnes@ag.tamu.edu"](#); [Lunt, David](#); [Gibbs, Pete](#); ["Terry J Gentry"](#); ["hallmark@tamu.edu"](#); [Baltensperger, David](#); ["Dave Byrne"](#); [Davis, Tim](#); ["Doug Welsh"](#); ["Juerg Blumenthal"](#); ["Bill L Rooney"](#); [Mullet, John E.](#); ["pklein@tamu.edu"](#); ["ssearcy@tamu.edu"](#); ["Scott Senseman"](#); ["Amy Macaulay"](#); ["Travis Miller"](#); ["Anna J Fox"](#); [Smith, Wayne](#); ["Steve Hague"](#); ["Amir M Ibrahim"](#); ["Steve Brown"](#); ["Scott Stanislav"](#); [Leonardo Rivera](#); [Howell, Bill](#); [Cornwell, Brett L.](#); [Charlie Hall](#); [Lacewell, Ron](#); [s-feagley@tamu.edu](#); ["Archie Abrameit"](#)
Subject: Thesis Defense
Date: Tuesday, October 06, 2009 12:23:07 AM
Attachments: [Helms Defense.pdf](#)

Better late than never, please come if you can.

Adam Helms
Project Manager
Corporate Relations
Texas AgriLife Research
Texas A&M University System
100E Centeq Building A, Research Park
1500 Research Parkway
College Station, Texas 77843-2583
979-255-0752 (mobile)
979-458-2677 (office)

From: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
To: [Bill Rooney](#)
Cc: [McCutchen, Bill](#); [Avant, Bob](#)
Subject: TGI
Date: Tuesday, September 29, 2009 4:08:00 PM

Bill, do you want to talk about intergeneric hybridization with TGI?

They are doing breeding of a "sugar corn" which is basically a non-flowering corn that accumulates sugar in the stalk. I thought it might be great parent material.

If this sounds good I'll get an NDA in place so you can talk with the breeder for that program.

Best regards,

-Peter

From: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
To: [Holland, L. Diane](#)
Subject: Fw: Russell Jessup
Date: Tuesday, September 29, 2009 8:17:22 AM

Please confirm that this is on my calendar.
Sent from 979.571.1816

From: Slovacek, Jackie
To: McCutchen, Bill; Zak, Kendra; 'Russell Jessup' <rjessup@tamu.edu>
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; Avant, Bob; 'Judy Young' <j-young@tamu.edu>
Sent: Tue Sep 29 07:44:29 2009
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup

Meeting has been set for Monday, October 12th at 1:30 pm in suite 113 Jack K Williams Admin Building conference room.

Thanks all for responding! Have a great day!

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek
Assistant to the Associate Director
Texas AgriLife Research
113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg
College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980
979.458.4765 Fax

From: Slovacek, Jackie
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 4:03 PM
To: McCutchen, Bill; Zak, Kendra; 'Russell Jessup'
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.; 'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob; Judy Young
Subject: RE: Russell Jessup
Importance: High

Dear Drs. Baltensperger, Rooney and Jessup:

The following dates are available for McCutchen, Schuerman, Avant and Schmitt:

Oct 5th at 3:00 pm

Oct 6th at 3:30 pm

Oct 12th from 1:30 pm until 5:00 pm

Oct 13th from 8-10 am and 1:30 – 5:00 pm

Please let me know if any of these dates work with your schedules and I will be happy to set up this meeting.

Thanks

Jackie

Jackie Slovacek
Assistant to the Associate Director
Texas AgriLife Research
113 Jack K Williams Administration Bldg
College Station, Texas 77843-2142

979.845.7980
979.458.4765 Fax

-----Original Message-----

From: McCutchen, Bill
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 3:36 PM
To: Slovacek, Jackie; Zak, Kendra
Cc: Baltensperger, David; Schuerman, Peter L.; Schmitt, Brian C.;
'wlr@tamu.edu'; Avant, Bob
Subject: Russell Jessup

Jackie and Kendra,

Can you please arrange for a meeting (in the next couple of weeks with this entire cc:d group) with Dr. Jessup to discuss his RD program and FTO questions?

Also, please forward to Dr. Jessup as I don't have his email on BB.

Thanks,

Bill

From: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#); "wlr@tamu.edu"; [Brummett, Robert G.](#)
Subject: FW: proposal
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2009 7:05:00 PM

FYI

From: Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2009 7:05 PM
To: 'Bob Harris'
Subject: proposal

Bob,

I am contacting you after some internal discussions about how we might go forward. As you know, committing the output of our breeding program in an area is something that we have had to consider very carefully, but there is a strong interest here in working with NIC/Silver Palate. Accordingly, we would be willing to proceed in providing a license to existing black and yellow sorghum varieties, plus rights in future black and yellow sorghums, in exchange for a 4% royalty rate on all sorghum product sales and a \$50,000 as a one time up front fee, with a minimum annual royalty payment \$200,000 per year. This means that the license costs a minimum of \$200,000 per year, but this amount is creditable against royalties owed. We would expect that sales of products incorporating the sorghum varieties would occur in each year of the license, and we believe you would have the same expectation.

Once you have had the opportunity to review and consider this, please feel free to give me a call. Thanks in advance for your consideration.

Best regards,

Peter

Peter Schuerman, Ph.D.

Director, Licensing and Intellectual Property

Texas A&M University System <http://otc.tamu.edu>

Office of Technology Commercialization 979.845.0907

From: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Subject: Re: harris
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2009 3:10:53 PM

Thanks

Sent from 979.571.1816

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Schuerman, Peter L.; 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Sep 23 15:09:46 2009
Subject: Re: harris

Peter, I left Bill a message to call you.

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Schuerman, Peter L.; 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Sep 23 15:07:36 2009
Subject: Re: harris

Peter,

Have you and Bill Rooney talked yet? This is critical so that we are in alignment.

Bill

From: Schuerman, Peter L.
To: McCutchen, Bill; 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>
Sent: Wed Sep 23 15:06:04 2009
Subject: Re: harris

No; I need clarification on what we're trying to achieve. Were the terms I proposed earlier amenable to all? Our discussion this evening should help.
Sent from 979.571.1816

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Tue Sep 22 12:08:02 2009
Subject: Re: harris

Peter,

We are ready to roll. Have you had a chance to talk with Bob?

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Tue Sep 22 11:46:14 2009
Subject: RE: harris

Weren't we going to have a phone call and discuss.

bill

Dr. William L. Rooney
Professor, Sorghum Breeding and Genetics
Chair, Plant Release Committee
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843-2474
979 845 2151

-----Original Message-----

From: McCutchen, Bill [mailto:bmccutchen@tamu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2009 11:45 AM
To: Schuerman, Peter L.
Cc: wlr@tamu.edu
Subject: Fw: harris

?

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
To: McCutchen, Bill
Sent: Tue Sep 22 11:33:31 2009
Subject: harris

Bill:

we need to resolve something on Harris. Any plans for a meeting or phone call.

I got an e-mail from him today wondering if anything is happening.

bill

Dr. William L. Rooney
Professor, Sorghum Breeding and Genetics
Chair, Plant Release Committee
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843-2474
979 845 2151

From: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#); "[wlr@tamu.edu](#)"
Subject: Re: harris
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2009 3:06:04 PM

No; I need clarification on what we're trying to achieve. Were the terms I proposed earlier amenable to all? Our discussion this evening should help.

Sent from 979.571.1816

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Tue Sep 22 12:08:02 2009
Subject: Re: harris

Peter,

We are ready to roll. Have you had a chance to talk with Bob?

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Tue Sep 22 11:46:14 2009
Subject: RE: harris

Weren't we going to have a phone call and discuss.

bill

Dr. William L. Rooney
Professor, Sorghum Breeding and Genetics
Chair, Plant Release Committee
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843-2474
979 845 2151

-----Original Message-----

From: McCutchen, Bill [mailto:bmccutchen@tamu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2009 11:45 AM
To: Schuerman, Peter L.
Cc: wlr@tamu.edu
Subject: Fw: harris

?

From: Bill Rooney <wlr@tamu.edu>
To: McCutchen, Bill
Sent: Tue Sep 22 11:33:31 2009
Subject: harris

Bill:

we need to resolve something on Harris. Any plans for a meeting or phone call.

I got an e-mail from him today wondering if anything is happening.

bill

Dr. William L. Rooney
Professor, Sorghum Breeding and Genetics
Chair, Plant Release Committee
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843-2474
979 845 2151

From: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#)
Cc: ["lrooney@tamu.edu"](#); ["wlr@tamu.edu"](#); [Slovacek, Jackie](#); [Brummett, Robert G.](#)
Subject: Re: phone conversation
Date: Sunday, September 13, 2009 8:06:12 PM

Bill,

We need to coalesce. If the goal is to strike a deal before they start selling product, that isn't going to happen. And it doesn't have to be our goal. We can do this anytime the parties agree

Internally, we need to all agree, for what will be granted and what we need to get in exchange, our goal and our walk-away, before going back to Bob.

Sent from 979.571.1816

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: Schuerman, Peter L.
Cc: 'lrooney@tamu.edu' <lrooney@tamu.edu>; 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>; Slovacek, Jackie
Sent: Sat Sep 12 19:43:56 2009
Subject: Fw: phone conversation

Peter,

First we need to coalesce our thoughts.
Do you want to call Harris or both of us?

I will be at DH retreat in Bastrop Tue and Weds but can step out.

From: Robert Harris
To: McCutchen, Bill
Cc: Peter B. Harris
Sent: Sat Sep 12 15:05:00 2009
Subject: phone conversation

Happy to talk to you anytime. I will be in town Monday and then will be in Boston rest of week until Friday.

Bob

From: [Schuerman, Peter L.](#)
To: [McCutchen, Bill](#); "wlr@tamu.edu"
Cc: "jmoore@ag.tamu.edu"; [McConnell, Bill](#); [Dugas, William](#)
Subject: Re: Texas Public Information Act Request - AR-2009-008
Date: Sunday, September 13, 2009 1:37:17 PM

I have given Brooks Moore in the OGC all copies - in OTC's possession - of MTAs and the original SRA and IP Rights Agreement, and have marked the portions which might be arguably redacted as per the PIA exceptions clauses.

Sent from 979.571.1816

----- Original Message -----

From: McCutchen, Bill
To: 'wlr@tamu.edu' <wlr@tamu.edu>
Cc: 'jmoore@ag.tamu.edu' <jmoore@ag.tamu.edu>; McConnell, Bill; Dugas, William; Schuerman, Peter L.
Sent: Sat Sep 12 20:10:37 2009
Subject: Fw: Texas Public Information Act Request - AR-2009-008

No speculation at all please! Just info that we have is what we report and what is required. I have been through the ringer in industry settings, and the Golden Rule is no speculation.

In the interim, we need to let Ceres know of this request. I have a call set with Walter Nelson and lunch meeting with Richard Hamilton this week whereby I can broach this subject.

We are good as long as we respond accurately and if something needs to be treated as CBI and justified that is also our call with OGC's concurrence.

Thanks,

Bill

----- Original Message -----

From: Dugas, William
To: McCutchen, Bill
Sent: Sat Sep 12 11:11:12 2009
Subject: FW: Texas Public Information Act Request - AR-2009-008

Bill,

We probably need to discuss this over the phone this week.

Bill

Wm. A. Dugas
Associate Vice Chancellor for Agriculture and Life Sciences
Associate Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Interim Director, Texas AgriLife Research
113 Jack K. Williams Administration Building
2142 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843-2142
979 862 6712

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Rooney [<mailto:wlr@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Saturday, September 12, 2009 9:08 AM
To: Dugas, William; 'Jaroy Moore'; Baltensperger, David; 'Bill McConnell'

Cc: 'Juerg Blumenthal'; 'Gary C Peterson'; 'Carol Rhodes'
Subject: RE: Texas Public Information Act Request - AR-2009-008

Drs. Moore, Dugas and Baltensperger:

I have two sets of comments with regard to the request of Mr. Hammond:

I know that the sorghum hybrids ES5140, ES5150 are NOT derived from our germplasm. They are wholly generated by Ceres (ie, they had them before they got any germplasm from us). I do not know the pedigree. And thus cannot provide any passport information.

ES5200 and ES5201 are Ceres designations - we did not assign those designations. I expect/assume that they are using lines that were generated and/or provided from our program, but again, I don't have the precise pedigree of these materials. Since they don't provide complete pedigrees for all of the material that they send back to me for testing, I can only speculate on the pedigree of the hybrids of those designations. Should I speculate?

Regards,

Bill

Dr. William L. Rooney
Professor, Sorghum Breeding and Genetics
Chair, Plant Release Committee
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843-2474
979 845 2151

-----Original Message-----

From: Dugas, William [<mailto:w-dugas@tamu.edu>]
Sent: Saturday, September 12, 2009 5:18 AM
To: Jaroy Moore; Baltensperger, David
Cc: Bill McConnell
Subject: FW: Texas Public Information Act Request - AR-2009-008

Jaroy and David,

Attached is another request for information by Mr. Hammond. He is seeking passport information for each exotic germplasm accession that contributed to the sorghum cultivar ES 5200, ES 5201, ES 5140, and ES 5150.

Based upon the recent, similar request, you may have faculty (e.g. Gary P. and Bill R.) that can provide this information to Bill.

Please review, visit w/ your faculty and contact Bill McConnell.

It would be good if Bill knew by Wed. when this information could be available.

Thanks.

Bill

Wm. A. Dugas
Associate Vice Chancellor for Agriculture and Life Sciences Associate Dean,