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Background
In October 2004, individuals representing various entities of IPM (e.g., American Farmland Trust, CSREES, EPA, USDA Regional IPM Centers, Universities and others) formed the National IPM Interagency Group. The purpose of this group was to evaluate the current status of IPM throughout the nation and determine the next steps needed to drive the IPM Roadmap forward. A subcommittee on evaluation was formed to examine the economic, environmental, and health impacts associated with the adoption of IPM at the national level.

Current Status
The subcommittee has been actively working with the IPM Roadmap (http://www.ncipmc.org/ipmroadmap/), the IPM Matrix (Hoffman 2004) (Figure 1) and Logic Models (University of Wisconsin-Extension 2004) to develop a framework to evaluate IPM. IPM Models have been developed for each cell of the IPM Matrix. Two examples are provided (Figure 2 and 3). Each model provides a visual representation of how IPM can impact the environment, health, and economics in production agriculture, residential/public areas, and natural resources/recreational environments. To date, the subcommittee has developed 16 IPM Models.

Next Steps
- Each IPM Model will be reviewed by experts in the respective areas of IPM.
- The revised IPM Models will be used to develop outcome level indicators. These indicators will be examined for their usefulness in grants programs and reporting systems. Moreover, these indicators will focus on the environmental, health, and economic impacts associated with adoption of IPM.
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