

Subject: Re: Action requested: micro-website review & media follow-ups

From: Fred Gould <fgould@ncsu.edu>

Date: 4/27/2017 8:23 AM

To: "Godwin@ncsu.edu" <godwin@ncsu.edu>

CC: Heath Packard <heath.packard@islandconservation.org>, Karl Campbell <karl.campbell@islandconservation.org>, Gregg Howald <gregg.howald@islandconservation.org>, "jrgodwinnc@gmail.com" <jrgodwinnc@gmail.com>, "Piaggio, Antoinette J - APHIS" <toni.j.piaggio@aphis.usda.gov>, David Threadgill <dwthreadgill@tamu.edu>, "tompkinsd@landcareresearch.co.nz" <tompkinsd@landcareresearch.co.nz>, "paul.thomas@adelaide.edu.au" <paul.thomas@adelaide.edu.au>, "gbird@lists.ncsu.edu" <gbird@lists.ncsu.edu>

Hi Heath,

I like the webpage. Good going!

I also like John's suggestions for changes.

Here are a few more suggestions from my perspective:

I would eliminate this text--

Every year billions of dollars are lost to damaged infrastructure, crop losses and associated hunger, and disease and illnesses caused by invasive rodents.

It starts the reader out with the idea that we are about more than island conservation —I think our focus should just be on islands.

Seeking a transformative innovation to prevent extinctions and protect communities —could this be revised to say

Seeking a transformative innovation to **responsibly** prevent extinctions and protect communities

partnership of seven world-renowned organizations.

To John's question about organizations that need to sign on officially. For now, could we just say partnership of **diverse experts from** seven world-renowned organizations

conservation rodenticides —these are just rodenticides, it sounds like PR to call them "conservation rodenticides" I think we should just call them rodenticides on the website.

Our step-wise, values-based, scientific, social, ethical, and risk-assessments aim to answer the following key questions in the coming decade:

This seems to conflate categories —

non-native This is an indirect way of saying synthetic. I think we should be direct and call it "Synthetic"

Should we do it? This section is much shorter than the “Can we do it” section — I suggest that we refer to the IGERT students’ website about this topic as well as the NASEM report.—Maybe even a quote.

The investigation of the suitability of gene drive for food security, human health, and conservation purposes requires time, expertise, and collaboration. Again, I think we should stick with Island Conservation and not get into broader potential applications.

I know that many of us find GBIRD to be a confusing acronym even though the full title it represents is good.

I wonder if we could come up with another acronym if instead of “genetic biocontrol” we used “evolutionary strategies”.

Maybe evolution is not politically appropriate and maybe it is too clunky but it could be something direct like

Evolutionary Strategies for Mouse Suppression —ESMS— I’m not good at this kind of thing but just wanted to throw some alternative out there.

On Apr 26, 2017, at 10:16 PM, John Godwin <godwin@ncsu.edu> wrote:

Hi Heath,

Apologies for the slow response. I think it looks great overall and have just a few comments and suggestions below. I also wanted to ask about sharing this with our PIO folks here. I'm realizing that I'm not actually aware how they approach having NCSU included there (Fred - thoughts on that?). The MOU is not yet signed and wanted to note that since it could conceivably factor in.

Thanks, John

"The Genetic Biocontrol of Invasive Rodents (GBIRD) program is a partnership of seven world-renowned not-for-profit organizations"

- wondering if it would be better to say something along the lines of 'research universities, governmental research organizations, and a non-profit conservation organization'.

"**Should we do it?** However, we know that many other assessments need to be done and questions remain to be answered."

- maybe 'we know that critical questions remain to be answered and careful assessments are necessary.'

"We are obligated to take this research cautiously, thoroughly, and step-wise."

- thinking "We are obligated to undertake this research in a cautious, thorough, and step-wise fashion."

Under "This will take time" there is the sentence "*The diversity of assessments will need to run their course before we can ask ourselves 'Could we?', 'Should we?', and 'Under what conditions'?*"

- I think that is good overall, but am wondering whether avoiding 'ourselves' would be better - e.g., 'before we can collectively ask key questions including 'Could we?', 'Should we?', and 'Under what conditions'?"

Last sentence: "*The investigation of the suitability of gene drive for food security...*" - this reads slightly awkwardly to me, which could be helped by making it 'gene drive approaches' I think.

On Wed, Apr 26, 2017 at 9:05 PM, Heath Packard <heath.packard@islandconservation.org> wrote:

Friendly reminder folks...we need your feedback on this site this week!

We intend to launch this next week so we've got an online presence for the GBIRD spokespersons presenting the Australia Vertebrate Pest Conference next week.

Thanks to those who have already responded!

On another note, we did not receive the grant for the branding strategy. We need to regroup. I think I'll get some quotes from a couple marketing firms who do this kind of work, so we can have a concrete proposal to shop and a sense internally of the investment needed. More soon.

Best,

Heath Packard

www.islandconservation.org

[360.584.3051](tel:360.584.3051) (mobile)

From: Heath Packard

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 4:03 PM

To: Karl Campbell <Karl.Campbell@islandconservation.org>; Gregg Howald <Gregg.Howald@islandconservation.org>; 'fgould@ncsu.edu' <fgould@ncsu.edu>; 'jrgodwinnc@gmail.com' <jrgodwinnc@gmail.com>; 'godwin@ncsu.edu' <godwin@ncsu.edu>; 'Piaggio, Antoinette J - APHIS' <toni.j.piaggio@aphis.usda.gov>; 'David Threadgill' <dwthreadgill@tamu.edu>; 'tompkinsd@landcareresearch.co.nz' <tompkinsd@landcareresearch.co.nz>; 'paul.thomas@adelaide.edu.au' <paul.thomas@adelaide.edu.au>; Royden Saah <royden.saah@islandconservation.org>

Cc: gbird@lists.ncsu.edu (<gbird@lists.ncsu.edu>) <gbird@lists.ncsu.edu>

Subject: Action requested: micro-website review & media follow-ups

Importance: High

Hi all,

A beta (development) version of our phase one website (a micro site 'placeholder' until we can develop/launch comprehensive site) is [here for your review](#)! The text is attached in word. What's missing at this point is a newsletter sign-up module, another picture or two, and a bunch of technical back-end stuff. This is not live and should not be shared outside this group at this point. However, some GBIRD partners would like to point people to this at their talks during a conference beginning May 1, 2017.

So, if there is any way humanly possible, could you please review/edit (word using tracked changes) and/or sign-off on this micro-site going live by April 26? Please delegate or engage others from your organization as warranted and note that we do have partner logos and hyperlinks on the site currently...I know this will trigger external affairs or PIO reviews for some of you. Thanks!

Second, we've developed the attached template for you to use as an immediate follow-up with reporters once you've first engaged with them. This will help to ensure as balanced partner attribution and coverage in our media engagements as possible.

Cheers,

Heath Packard

Director of Marketing & Communications

Island Conservation

[360.584.3051](tel:360.584.3051) (mobile)

Learn more www.islandconservation.org

Network www.linkedin.com/company/island-conservation

Keep in touch www.facebook.com/preventingextinctions

Talk to us www.twitter.com/noextinctions

<image001.jpg>

--

**

John Godwin

Department of Biological Sciences, North Carolina State University

mail: Dept. Biological Sciences, Box 7614, NCSU,

Raleigh, NC 27695-7617

Office location: 156 David Clark Laboratories

phone: 919-513-2936, fax: 919-515-5327

website: <http://godwin.wordpress.ncsu.edu/>
