

Subject: Re: [gbird] www.geneticbiocontrol.org is now live!
From: Heath Packard <heath.packard@islandconservation.org>
Date: 5/7/2017 6:11 PM
To: Fred Gould <fgould@ncsu.edu>

Thanks, Fred.

Heath
360-584-3051

On May 4, 2017, at 19:26, Fred Gould <fgould@ncsu.edu> wrote:

Thanks for your quick response. I see that you have incorporated some of my suggestions. A couple right in the beginning of the website that weren't incorporated caught my attention and motivated my email. I'm not trying to be hornery but because GBIRd is a cooperative project, it seems to me that big decisions such as how to brand ourselves on the website should involve discussion when there is disagreement.

I think the wording here is very important and should reflect a consensus —so if the discussion indicates that I'm just one outlier, I will go along with what you have.

You highlighted

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

But I don't see this change made.

Thanks for adding the NCSU website and removing “conservation rodenticides”

On May 4, 2017, at 1:13 PM, Heath Packard <heath.packard@islandconservation.org> wrote:

Hi Fred,

Thanks for asking. I had eight sets of comments and attempted my best to synthesize those into an

improved approach. While I incorporated most of your edits, here is an explanation of those I did not and invitations to resolve those.

Focus solely on island species beneficiaries

I don't see a GBIRD consensus on eliminating the arguments about other potential benefits to food security, human health, infrastructure and the economy. As we are trying to appeal to a broader set of potential funders, it seems some believe this is an important argument to include in our marketing. Island Conservation's interest in this transformative innovation is in hopes that one day we will be able to achieve eradications on islands that are impossible to consider with today's tools...for example, New Zealand has declared a goal to be invasive predator free by 2050...the island restoration community does not have the tools today to achieve that...but if this works and could be applied to places like that, there will be huge benefits to biodiversity as well as human livelihoods and wellbeing.

Use synthetic gene drive instead of non-native

Message testing is pending on this, but through my anecdotal observations, and expert opinion (20 years in strategic communications), I believe that 'synthetic' is a poor way to frame this for the public. Synthetic is a term that scares some of our target audiences and confuses the fact that something like CRISPR/CAS9 is indeed a thing found in nature, not invented by mad scientists in a lab...I would be willing to compromise by saying "non-native (a.k.a. synthetic) gene drive" or "synthetic gene drive (found in nature but non-native)" to address both our concerns if that would help.

Linking to <https://research.ncsu.edu/ges/igert/igert-research/island-mice-conserving-island-biodiversity/>

This got lost in translation; I'm having the link added today.

Your naming/branding suggestions

These will be taken under advisement as we move forward and have been filed for brand strategy consideration. However, the current name and acronym has been agreed to by the Steering Committee and we cannot make unilateral decisions about our brand strategy without some expert consultant support and steering committee action.

I've highlighted the edits I did incorporate. If you feel strongly enough about focusing solely on islands, or requiring the use of "synthetic gene drives", I'm happy to poll the steering committee about this and see if we can get a consensus. We also have a message testing opportunity coming up where we can see what messages work best with our target audiences...the site and our language will need to be dynamic and evolving as our understanding does the same.

Hope this helps and thank you for the thoughtful contributions.

Best,

Heath Packard

Director of Marketing & Communications
Island Conservation
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>

From: Fred Gould [<mailto:fgould@ncsu.edu>]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2017 8:52 AM
To: Heath Packard <heath.packard@islandconservation.org>
Subject: Re: [gbird] www.geneticbiocontrol.org is now live!

Heath,

I spent time going over the proposed website language because you asked for input. Now, I see that my suggestions were not used to improve the website. I'd like to hear why you rejected each of them.

Here they are again

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 is

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 May 3, 2017, at 8:21 PM, Heath Packard
<heath.packard@islandconservation.org> wrote:

Dear friends,

Thank you all for your contributions and to GBIRD’s first website! This site is now live www.geneticbiocontrol.org/ and you are welcome to promote it and share the links in your presentations and publications. It is a micro-site, placeholder, until we can build the more robust and detailed site we all envision for the program. We did our best to incorporate all of the feedback we received on the beta version, but sometimes we could not adopt all of your ideas due to conflicting feedback.

We will address additional edits and improvements when you send them along.

Best,

Heath Packard
Director of Marketing & Communications
Island Conservation
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>