

RIPM

Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program Southern Region

FY 2010 Request for Applications

APPLICATION DEADLINE: December 17, 2009

U.S. Department of Agriculture



National Institute of Food and Agriculture

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

REGIONAL INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT COMPETITIVE GRANTS PROGRAM – SOUTHERN REGION

INITIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE: Projects awarded under Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, ch. 79, 38 Stat. 372, 7 U.S.C. 341 *et seq.* can be found in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under 10.500. Projects awarded under Section 2(c)(1)(B) of the Act of August 4, 1965, Public Law No. 89-106, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i (c)(1)(B)) can be found in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under 10.200.

DATES: Complete, error-free applications must be received by close of business (COB) on **December 17, 2009 (5:00 p.m. or earlier Eastern Time)**. Applications received after this deadline will not be considered for funding. The agency strongly encourages applicants to submit applications well before the deadline to allow time for correction of technical errors identified by Grants.gov. Comments regarding this request for applications (RFA) are requested within six months from the issuance of this notice. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

STAKEHOLDER INPUT: The National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) is requesting comments regarding this RFA from any interested party. These comments will be considered in the development of the next RFA for the program, if applicable, and will be used to meet the requirements of section 103(c)(2) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7613(c)(2)). This section requires the Secretary to solicit and consider input on a current RFA from persons who conduct or use agricultural research, education and extension for use in formulating future RFAs for competitive programs. Written stakeholder comments on this RFA should be submitted in accordance with the deadline set forth in the DATES portion of this Notice.

Written stakeholder comments should be submitted by mail to: Policy & Oversight Branch; Office of Extramural Programs; National Institute of Food and Agriculture; USDA; STOP 2299; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2299; or via e-mail to: RFP-OEP@nifa.usda.gov. (This e-mail address is intended only for receiving comments regarding this RFA and not requesting information or forms.) In your comments, please state that you are responding to the Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program – Southern Region RFA.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: NIFA announces the availability of funds and requests applications for the Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program – Southern Region (S-RIPM) for fiscal year (FY) 2010 to help achieve National IPM goals by increasing the supply and dissemination of IPM knowledge and by enhancing collaboration among stakeholders. The amount available for support of this program in FY 2010 is approximately \$800,000.

This notice identifies the objectives for S-RIPM projects, the eligibility criteria for projects and applicants, and the application forms and associated instructions needed to apply for a S-RIPM grant. NIFA additionally requests stakeholder input from any interested party for use in the development of the next RFA for this program.

Table of Contents

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION	5
A. Legislative Authority and Background.....	5
B. Purpose and Priorities	5
C. Program Area Description	8
PART II—AWARD INFORMATION.....	9
A. Available Funding	9
B. Types of Applications.....	9
C. Project Types	9
D. Scientific Peer Review.....	11
PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION.....	13
A. Eligible Applicants	13
B. Cost Sharing or Matching	13
PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION	14
A. Electronic Application Package.....	14
B. Content and Form of Application Submission.....	15
C. Submission Dates and Times	21
D. Funding Restrictions.....	21
E. Other Submission Requirements.....	22
PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS	23
A. General.....	23
B. Evaluation Criteria.....	24
C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality	27
D. Organizational Management Information	27
PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION	28
A. General.....	28
B. Award Notice	28
C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements	29
D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements	30
PART VII—AGENCY CONTACT	31
PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION	32
A. Access to Review Information.....	32
B. Use of Funds; Changes	32
C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards.....	33
D. Regulatory Information	33
E. Definitions.....	33

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Legislative Authority and Background

Authority for the funding of Research projects is contained in Section 2(c)(1)(B) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act of August 4, 1965, Public Law No. 89-106, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i (c)(1)(B)). Authority for the funding of Extension projects is contained in Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, ch. 79, 38 Stat. 372, 7 U.S.C. 341 *et seq.* For Joint Research-Extension applications (see Part II, C. 3), separate awards will be executed for P.L. 89-106 and Smith-Lever funds.

Please note: Section 7403 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-246) amended section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act to require funds to be awarded competitively. In addition, this amendment made the 1890 land-grant institutions eligible to participate in Smith-Lever section 3(d) programs at any appropriated level. Section 7417 of FCEA amended section 208 of the District of Columbia Public Postsecondary Education Reorganization Act (P.L. No. 93-471; 88 Stat. 1428) to provide eligibility to the University of the District of Columbia for programs authorized and appropriated under Smith-Lever section 3(d). These new provisions were implemented in FY 2009.

B. Purpose and Priorities

The purpose of the S-RIPM program is to help achieve National IPM goals by increasing the supply and dissemination of IPM knowledge and by enhancing collaboration among stakeholders.

1. National IPM Goals

The goal of the RIPM program is to provide knowledge and information needed for the implementation of the National Road Map for Integrated Pest Management.

In FY 2010, the S-RIPM is soliciting proposals that address the following priorities:

- **Application of the IPM Road Map:** The National Road Map for Integrated Pest Management (<http://www.ipmcenters.org/IPMRoadMap.pdf>) identifies strategic directions for IPM research, implementation, and measurement for all pests, in all settings, throughout the nation. Proposals for all project types must explicitly address how the project relates to at least one (1) point of intersection between a future direction and a focus area delineated in the road map.

IPM Road Map future directions for IPM programming are:

- Improve the cost/benefit relationship when adopting IPM practices;
- Reduce potential human health risks from pests and related management strategies; and
- Minimize adverse environmental effects from pest and related management strategies.

The IPM Road Map focus areas for IPM programming are:

- Production agriculture;
 - Natural resources and recreational environments; and
 - Residential and public areas.
-
- **Risk:** Research, Extension and Joint Research-Extension projects must have the potential to significantly improve risk avoidance or mitigation in pest management. The IPM Evaluation project must have the potential to document the impact of IPM approaches on risk and/or to contribute to the understanding of how IPM approaches can impact risk. For all project types, risk issues addressed may be environmental, economic, and/or human health-related.

 - **Innovation:** Innovative projects with strong potential to produce or develop successful new techniques, tools, and/or strategies for IPM or IPM evaluation are encouraged. In the area of IPM evaluation, proposals are sought that will produce new evaluation tools and/or develop new and effective ways to document the impact of IPM on societal risk. In particular, projects that have the potential to be useful across a diverse range of IPM settings and projects are encouraged.

 - **Near-term benefits:** This program seeks to develop IPM knowledge, approaches and/or products that will be useful in the practice of IPM in the near term – i.e., within one (1) - three (3) years of project completion.

 - **Compatibility (*For IPM Evaluation project type only*):** with other IPM evaluation efforts is a priority: One (1) component of evaluating proposals of the IPM Evaluation project type is potential compatibility of project design and/or output with other regional or national IPM evaluation projects.

2. Southern Region Priorities

The Southern Region consists of 13 states and two (2) territories. Projects funded by S-RIPM must address pest management issues of importance to the region. The Relevance Panel sees only the Relevance Statement. Other items, including letters of support, may be cited in the Relevance Statement but will not be provided to the Relevance Panel. The Relevance Panel evaluates proposals for criteria listed in this section.

- **Multi-state partnerships:** As a regional program, S-RIPM supports projects that enhance and promote collaboration across state and territorial boundaries. For all project types, proposals that clearly involve multi-state (or territory) attributes will score the highest in this criterion. Sharing of the work and the budget between two (2) or more institutions in different states or territories, though not required, is the strongest indication of such collaboration. Other evidence includes indications of multi-state (or territory) involvement in planning, and/or indications of interest in project results from other states/territories. Formal arrangements such as subcontracts with other states are not necessarily required to indicate a positive multi-state aspect, but explicit documentation of informal relationships is encouraged.

- **Integrated approaches:** This program encourages projects that enhance the integration of appropriate tactics (including, but not limited to, biological controls, host plant resistance, mechanical controls, cultural management, and appropriate pesticides) in a sustainable IPM system. Proposals that address only one (1) tactic are acceptable if the work will contribute to strengthening the suite of tactics and approaches available for the system involved. Projects that promote a single tactic approach to pest management are not encouraged.
- **Stakeholder-identified IPM priorities:** S-RIPM is committed to addressing the pest management needs expressed by diverse stakeholders. Applications should include explicit citations that document the stakeholder-identified needs addressed by the proposed project. Explicitly citing such sources demonstrates both that a project is important, and that the Project Directors (PDs) and the grants program are engaged with the community. This criterion does not apply to the IPM Evaluation project type. Sources of stakeholder-identified needs include, but are not limited to:
 - The Southern Region IPM Center (SRIPMC) priorities web page and database (<http://www.sripmc.org/Policy/Priorities/>);
 - The database of Southern Region Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSPs) (http://www.sripmc.org/pmsp/pmsp_form.cfm);
 - Plant and Pest Biology Stakeholder Workshop 2007. Examination of the needs, concerns, and planning for plant-related programs (<http://aspb.org/publicaffairs/stakeholders/2007/FinalStakeholdersReport2007.pdf>)
 - USDA-NIFA Stakeholder Input Sources: Plants and Plant Products (http://www.nifa.usda.gov/business/reporting/stakeholder/pl_stakeholder.html)
 - Citable recommendations, meeting minutes and reports from program advisory committees or similar stakeholder groups
 - Other documented needs assessment evaluations.
- Letters of support will be accepted as attachments to the proposal in the R&R Other Project Information Form (Field 11 in the form and more fully described in the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide), but are not viewed by the Relevance Panel. Proposal evaluation relative to this criterion will be based on factors including the number and diversity of stakeholders represented, whether the documents are publicly available, to what extent the priority described exists independent of the proposed project, and timeliness of the priority. A more detailed discussion of such evaluation can be found in the document “Addressing Stakeholder-Identified Priorities” found online at <http://www.sripmc.org/fund/sripm/stakeholders.cfm>
- **IPM issues important to the Southern Region:** For all project types, the relative importance of the IPM setting (e.g., a crop, a type of building) to the region will be used to rank proposals. Evidence of a setting’s importance is often but not exclusively indicated by measures such as acreage, monetary value, and number of people involved (e.g.,

students in a school system). Within the setting, the relative importance of a pest or group of pests will be used to rank proposals. A project addressing the entire pest complex in a setting would be more highly rated than a project addressing an occasional pest that rarely causes significant loss.

C. Program Area Description

For purposes of S-RIPM applications the program code name is “**Southern RIPM**” and the program code is “**QQ.S**”.

PART II—AWARD INFORMATION

A. Available Funding

There is no commitment by USDA to fund any particular grant application or to make a specific number of awards. Approximately \$800,000 is available to fund applications in FY 2010. Of this amount, approximately \$430,000 is available for Research projects, \$70,000 for Extension projects and \$200,000 for Joint Research-Extension projects. Up to \$100,000 is available for a single IPM Evaluation Project. Project duration is up to three (3) years, and size of awards depends on the project type and the degree of collaboration among states/territories in the Southern region (see Part II,C.).

B. Types of Applications

In FY 2010, applications may be submitted to the S–RIPM Program as one (1) of the following types of requests:

(1) New application. This is a project application that has not been previously submitted to the S–RIPM Program. All new applications will be reviewed competitively using the selection process and evaluation criteria described in Part V—Application Review Requirements.

(2) Renewal application. This is a project application that requests additional funding for a project beyond the period that was approved in an original or amended award. Applications for renewed funding must contain the same information as required for new applications, and additionally must contain a Progress Report (report must be added to the Project Narrative, Part IV, B.3.b.(vi)). Renewal applications must be received by the relevant due dates, will be evaluated in competition with other pending applications in appropriate area to which they are assigned, and will be reviewed according to the same evaluation criteria as new applications.

C. Project Types

Four types of project proposals can be submitted to the S- RIPM program in FY 2010: Research, Extension, Joint Research-Extension, or IPM Evaluation. States and territories included in the S-IPM region are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Applicants must indicate the type of project they are proposing on the Relevance Statement and on the Project Summary.

- **Research**

This funding category develops the research base needed for the construction of comprehensive pest management systems that have a strong likelihood of contributing to ongoing IPM implementation efforts. Projects may develop individual tactics needed for pest management systems (e.g., biocontrol, cultural control, host resistance) or help increase understanding of how interactions among tactics alter the effectiveness of pest management within agricultural, forest, suburban, and urban ecosystems. Where appropriate, the experimental approach should emphasize field-scale experiments spanning multiple seasons

or locations. Practices should be designed to reduce initial pest populations, lower the carrying capacity of the ecosystem for pests, or increase tolerance of hosts to pest injury. Long-term fundamental research is not appropriate for funding.

Research projects may last up to three (3) years. **Please note that one (1) or two (2) year Research projects may be eligible for no-cost extensions after years one (1) and two (2), but that no carryover or extension is permitted for these projects beyond three (3) years. Any unexpended funds will be lost.**

Applications should clearly demonstrate how the tactic or IPM system, once developed, can be incorporated into an existing production system. Applications that focus solely on the development and/or evaluation of pesticides will only be considered if they have extraordinary potential to reduce environmental, economic or human health risk.

Research involving chemical pesticides should be designed to reduce the risks associated with the amount, frequency, and selectivity of pesticide use. Risks that may be addressed include environmental, economic and human health issues as well as impact on beneficial organisms and development of pest populations that are resistant to pesticides.

The budget limit for research is defined only by the amount of funds available for this project type, expected to be approximately \$430,000 total. Project Directors are strongly encouraged to consider the recent history of awards for research projects funded by this program, available at http://www.sripmc.org/ripm/rfa10/sripm_history.cfm.

- **Extension**

This funding category enhances outreach efforts that support the wide-scale implementation of IPM methods. Projects should maximize opportunities to build strategic alliances with industry and user groups to expand their active participation in increasing the adoption of IPM methods. Projects may develop educational materials and information delivery systems needed for outreach efforts, conducting field-scale or on-farm demonstrations, or delivering IPM education and training. A research component is not a required element of Extension projects, but the research base should be documented.

The budget limit for Extension projects is defined only by the amount of funds available for this project type, expected to be approximately \$70,000 total. Project directors are strongly encouraged to consider the recent history of awards for Extension projects funded by this program, available at http://www.sripmc.org/ripm/rfa10/sripm_history.cfm.

Extension projects may last up to three (3) years.

- **Joint Research-Extension**

This funding category combines research and extension activities (as described above). Joint Research-Extension projects validate pest management systems, introduce new pest management tactics into local production systems, and deliver these systems to producers and their advisors through IPM education and training programs. The project team should

include both researchers and extension educators with appointments in research and extension.

The budget limit for Joint Research-Extension projects is defined only by the amount of funds available for this project type, expected to be approximately \$200,000 total. Project Directors are strongly encouraged to consider the recent history of awards for joint Research/Extension projects funded by this program, available at http://www.sripmc.org/ripm/rfa10/sripm_history.cfm.

Joint Research-Extension projects may last up to three (3) years. **Please note that one (1) or two (2) year Joint Research-Extension projects may be eligible for no-cost extensions after years one (1) and two (2), but that no carryover or extension is permitted for these projects beyond three (3) years. Any unexpended funds will be lost.**

- **IPM Evaluation**

This funding category provides support for a single project with the primary focus of IPM evaluation. An IPM Evaluation project may document adoption of IPM approaches and practices over time, and/or develop new methods or approaches for documenting changes in IPM adoption. In either case, the project must address the issue of how IPM programs ultimately impact economic, environmental or human health risks as perceived by society. The project should have strong potential to address the “So what?” question; that is, what benefits to society does IPM provide? Such questions have often been addressed in terms of proxy indicators such as “pesticides saved.” An ideal IPM Evaluation project would address terminal outcomes such as impact on measures of environmental quality, human health, and/or economic well-being.

In FY2010, this program will fund no more than one (1) IPM Evaluation project. The budget limit for the IPM evaluation project is \$100,000 total.

IPM Evaluation projects may have a duration of up to three (3) years. **Please note that one (1) or two (2) year IPM Evaluation projects may be eligible for no-cost extensions after years one (1) and two (2), but that no extension is permitted for these projects beyond three (3) years. Any unexpended funds are lost.**

D. Scientific Peer Review

Required for all Research or Joint Research-Extension Projects.

Subsection (c)(5) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act, as amended (7 USC 450i(c)(5)) requires applicants to conduct scientific peer review of their proposed research activities in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary prior to the Secretary making a grant award under this authority. Regulations implementing this requirement are set forth in 7 CFR part 3400.20. The regulations impose the following requirements:

(1) Scientific peer review. Prior to the award of a standard or continuation grant, any proposed project shall have undergone a review arranged by the grantee. For research projects, such review must be a scientific peer review conducted in accordance with 7 CFR 3400.21.

(2) Credible and independent review. A review arranged by the grantee must provide for a credible and independent assessment of the proposed project. A credible review is one (1) that provides an appraisal of technical quality and relevance sufficient for an organizational representative to make an informed judgment as to whether the proposal is appropriate for submission for Federal support. To provide for an independent review, such review may include USDA employees, but should not be conducted solely by USDA employees.

(3) Notice of completion and retention of records. A notice of completion of the review shall be conveyed in writing to NIFA as part of the Other Attachments (Field 11. of the R&R Other Project Information Form). The written notice constitutes certification by the applicant that a review in compliance with these regulations has occurred. Applicants are not required to submit results of the review to NIFA; however, proper documentation of the review process and results should be retained by the applicant. **Please note: award funds cannot be released until the Scientific Peer Review Certification is received.**

PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

Organizations eligible to receive Research awards are: state agricultural experiment stations, 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, 1994 land-grant colleges and universities, research foundations established by land-grant colleges and universities, colleges and universities receiving funds under the Act of October 10, 1962 (16 USC 582a *et seq.*), accredited schools or colleges of veterinary medicine, and the University of the District of Columbia.

Organizations eligible to receive Extension awards are 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, and the University of the District of Columbia.

Research and Extension personnel from other USDA/IPM regions can participate as members of project teams. **Applications will only be accepted from Project Directors (PDs) in the Southern IPM Region.**

Award recipients may subcontract to organizations not eligible to apply provided such organizations are necessary for the conduct of the project. An applicant's failure to meet an eligibility criterion by the time of an application deadline will result in NIFA not accepting the application or, even though an application may be reviewed, will preclude NIFA from making an award.

B. Cost Sharing or Matching

There are no matching requirements associated with the RIPM program and matching resources will not be factored into the review process as evaluation criteria.

PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. Electronic Application Package

Only electronic applications may be submitted via Grants.gov to NIFA in response to this RFA.

Prior to preparing an application, it is suggested that the PD/PI first contact an Authorized Representative (AR) (also referred to as Authorized Organizational Representative or AOR) to determine if the organization is prepared to submit electronic applications through Grant.gov. If the organization is not prepared, the AR should see http://www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp for steps for preparing to submit applications through Grants.gov.

The steps to access application materials are as follows:

1. In order to access, complete and submit applications, applicants must download and install a version of Adobe Reader compatible with Grants.gov. This software is essential to apply for NIFA Federal assistance awards. For basic system requirements and download instructions, please see http://www.grants.gov/help/download_software.jsp. To verify that you have a compatible version of Adobe Reader, Grants.gov established a test package that will assist you in making that determination. Grants.gov Adobe Versioning Test Package: <http://www.grants.gov/applicants/AdobeVersioningTestOnly.jsp>.
2. The application package must be obtained via Grants.gov, go to <http://www.grants.gov>, click on “Apply for Grants” in the left-hand column, click on “**Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package and Instructions,**” enter the funding opportunity number **USDA-NIFA-RIPM-002667** in the appropriate box and click “Download Package.” From the search results, click “Download” to access the application package.

Contained within the application package is the “NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for Preparation and Submission of NIFA Applications via Grants.gov.” This Guide contains an introduction and general Grants.gov instructions, information about how to use a Grant Application Package in Grants.gov, and instructions on how to complete the application forms.

If assistance is needed to access the application package (e.g., downloading or navigating Adobe forms), refer to resources available on the Grants.gov Web site first (<http://grants.gov/>). Grants.gov assistance is also available as follows:

- Grants.gov customer support
Toll Free: 1-800-518-4726
Business Hours: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Closed on [Federal Holidays](#).
Email: support@grants.gov

See <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/electronic.html> for additional resources for applying electronically.

B. Content and Form of Application Submission

Electronic applications should be prepared following Part V and VI of the document entitled “A Guide for Preparation and Submission of NIFA Applications via Grants.gov.” This guide is part of the corresponding application package (see Section A. of this Part). The following is **additional information** needed in order to prepare an application in response to this RFA. If there is discrepancy between the two (2) documents, the information contained in this RFA is overriding.

Note the attachment requirements (e.g., portable document format) in Part III section 3. of the Guide. ANY PROPOSALS CONTAINING NON-PDF DOCUMENTS WILL BE AT RISK OF BEING EXCLUDED FROM NIFA REVIEW. Partial applications will be excluded from NIFA review. With documented prior approval, resubmitted applications will be accepted until close of business on the closing date in the RFA.

If you do not own PDF-generating software, Grants.gov provides online tools to assist applicants. Users will find a link to “Convert Documents to PDF” on <http://grants.gov/assets/PDFConversion.pdf>.

1. SF 424 R&R Cover Sheet

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 2. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

2. SF 424 R&R Project/Performance Site Location(s)

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 3. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

3. R&R Other Project Information Form

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 4. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

a. Field 6. Project Summary/Abstract.

(i) Project Type (choose one (1)): Research; Extension; Joint Research-Extension; or IPM Evaluation.

(ii) Summary Statement. The first line of your summary should state the type of project you are submitting, for example, “This is a Research project” or “This is an Extension project.” For Joint Research-Extension projects, the summary statement must indicate how many dollars are being requested from each respective source (Smith-Lever funds are for extension activities, the Act of August 4, 1965 (P.L. 89-106) funds are for research activities). The summary should be a self-contained, specific description of the activity to be undertaken and should focus on: overall project goal(s) and supporting objectives; plans to accomplish project goal(s); and relevance of the project to the purposes and priorities of the S-RIPM program (see Part I, B.).

b. Field 7. Project Narrative.

PLEASE NOTE: The Project Narrative shall not exceed **16** pages single-spaced, with 1-inch margins on all sides and font no smaller than 12 point. No additional pages for figures and tables will be accepted. This maximum of **16** pages of text, figures and tables has been established to ensure fair and equitable competition.

Please note: A Relevance Statement, described in subsection c., is required for any proposal for Research, Extension, or Joint Research-Extension projects. Evaluation projects do not require a Relevance Statement. The Relevance Statement, submitted separately as an appendix, has its own page limit. Additionally, for renewal applications, requirements in subsection b.(vi) 'Progress Reports and Review Responses', shall not exceed three (3) pages of written text in total. Pages used on the Relevance Statement and the Progress Reports and Review Responses are not counted toward the page limit for the Project Narrative.

Appendices to the Project Narrative are allowed if they are directly germane to the proposed project. The addition of appendices should not be used to circumvent the page limit.

The Project Narrative must include all of the following:

(i) Problem, Background and Justification

Project type: The initial sentence should state the project type (Research, Extension, Joint Research/Extension, or Evaluation) and the amount of the request. If the proposal is for a Joint Research/Extension project, indicate the amount requested for the Research component and the amount requested in the Extension component.

Problem: Describe, in simple terms, the problem. Consider including the economic importance of the crop or problem, the importance of the pest(s), and the reason for your study (e.g., conventional pest-control strategies no longer work; beneficial insects are being harmed by available pest-control options; there is a lack of training or implementation of new IPM tactics).

Background: Address the specific need(s) identified by growers and other stakeholders in the Southern Region. Cite at least one (1) needs-assessment evaluation used to formulate your project (sources include but are not limited to Pest Management Strategic Plans at http://www.sripmc.org/pmsp/pmsp_form.cfm and web page submissions at <http://www.sripmc.org/Policy/Priorities/>). Demonstrate that you are engaged with constituents on some level and that your project addresses their needs.

Review ongoing or completed work (local/regional/national) that is relevant to your project, and include references. Describe how previous work funded by the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program or other sources might contribute to the proposed project.

Justification: Specify who in the Southern Region stands to benefit from your project. Consider environmental, health, and/or economic benefits.

Describe why current technologies and practices are inadequate, or explain how the proposed approach will (1) help to improve or implement existing pest management systems and (2) address the specific needs identified in this solicitation.

Discuss the potential applicability of the proposed approach to other production regions and the relevance of the project to the priorities of the S-RIPM program (see Part I, B. of this RFA).

(ii) Objectives and Anticipated Impacts.

Provide clear, concise, and logically numbered statement(s) of the specific aims of the proposed effort. **If you are writing a Joint Research-Extension proposal, please separate the research and extension objectives.**

Describe the anticipated impacts that could be associated with the fulfillment of your objectives (you may do this in list or table format). Both your objectives and your impacts should connect to the goals of the National IPM Road Map, which are to advance the implementation of IPM to safeguard human health, safeguard the environment, and promote economic benefits.

(iii) Approach and Procedures:

Procedures should be numbered to correspond to Objectives. Describe how each of the stated objectives will be reached. Include appropriate experimental design and experimental units, reference methods to be used, and appropriate statistical analysis. Include a timetable for the start and completion of each phase of the project. For a Joint Research-Extension application, describe how the project will be managed, particularly how coordination between research and extension components will be achieved and maintained.

(iv) Evaluation Plans.

Provide detailed plans for evaluation of the project and indicate how successful impacts and outcomes will be measured. Include specific evaluation objectives with specific impact indicators (e.g., adoption rate, number of areas impacted, pesticide use, profitability) that will be used to measure the success of the project. Logic models or other established methods may be used. For more information on logic models, please consult the following websites:

<http://www.ipm.gov/LogicModels/about.html>,

<http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html>, and

http://www.nifa.usda.gov/about/strat_plan_logic_models.html.

- **Research Projects:** Provide detailed plans for evaluation of the project, indicating how you will determine whether the anticipated impacts stated in “Objectives and Anticipated Impacts” above have been achieved. If measurement of these anticipated impacts will not be possible in the context of the proposed project, describe how the tactic or system you studied, once developed, might be incorporated into an existing crop management program on a large scale.
- **Extension Projects and Joint Research-Extension Projects:** Provide detailed plans for evaluation of the project. Evaluation plans that include surveys should indicate survey expertise of investigators and/or describe the survey methodology that will be used.

- IPM Evaluation Projects: Evaluation plans are not required for IPM Evaluation Projects.

(v) **Timetable or Timeline.**

The proposal should outline all important phases as a function of time, year by year, for the entire project, including periods beyond the grant funding period.

(vi) Progress Reports – For renewal applications (as defined in Part II.B.), a progress report must be included.

c. Field 11. Other Attachments

Relevance Statement

A Relevance Statement is required for Research, Extension, and Joint Research-Extension Project types. No Relevance Statement is required for IPM Evaluation project type. The Relevance Statement may be no more than 3 pages, with 1-inch margins on all sides and font no smaller than 12 point. **The Relevance Statement must be submitted with the full application but as a separately attached PDF file under Field number 11. Name the file “RELEVANCE [PDs last name].pdf.”**

The Relevance Statement must describe the relevance of the project to S-RIPM program priorities discussed in Part I, B.2., “Southern Region Priorities”. **NOTE: The Relevance Statement and the Project Summary form are the only documents seen by the Relevance Panel.** Additional documentation will NOT be shown to the Relevance Panel. PDs are encouraged to quote from or otherwise refer to such supporting documents, if appropriate. The Relevance Statement should contain, in this order:

(i) Names and institutions of PDs and major cooperators;

(ii) Project title;

(iii) Project type (choose one (1)): Research; Extension; or Joint Research-Extension (Relevance Statement is not required for IPM Evaluation project type);

(iv) Description of the problem, background, justification and an overview the project approach;

(v) Anticipated outcomes and impacts. Describe the anticipated outcomes and potential impacts that could be associated with the fulfillment of your objectives (you may do this in table format). Anticipated impacts should connect to the goals of the National Road Map for IPM, which are to advance the implementation of IPM to safeguard human health, safeguard the environment and promote economic benefits. You do not need to include a list of references, letters of support, budget, or other forms with the Relevance Statement, and any materials included beyond the three (3) page limit will not be shown to the Relevance Panel; and

(vi) Describe how your project addresses each of the six (6) regional priorities outlined in Part I, B.2 “Southern Region Priorities” of this RFA:

- Level of multi-state involvement in the project and potential multi-state impacts resulting from the project;
- Integration of appropriate tactics in a sustainable IPM system;
- Link to priorities explicitly identified by stakeholders in the Southern Region as being of high priority for IPM research and/or extension. Cite at least one (1) source to demonstrate that this project addresses such a priority. NOTE: The Relevance Panel will see only the three (3) page Relevance Statement and the Project Summary. You are encouraged to cite, quote from, or otherwise refer to appropriate documents, any documentation you attach as an appendix will NOT be provided to this panel; and
- Discuss why the IPM issue addressed by this project is important to the Southern Region by virtue of measures such as acreage, pesticide use, people affected, etc.

Letters of Support (optional)

- Should be attached here in pdf format.

4. R&R Senior/Key Person Profile (Expanded)

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 5. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

Also, **you must attach** ‘Current and Pending Support’ information (see NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide p. 31 & 32, item 5.3, for guidelines and a suggested format) for each senior/key person identified above. **Note: Even if no other funding is currently reported under the ‘Active’ section of this attachment, you must still list information for this grant application under the ‘Pending’ section of this attachment for each senior/key person identified above.**

5. R&R Personal Data – As noted in Part V, 6. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide, the submission of this information is voluntary and is not a precondition of award. If completing the information, **do not enter any data in the field requesting the social security number.**

6. R&R Budget

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 7. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

NOTE: If funding is being requested for multiple years, provide a budget for each year, as well as a cumulative budget for the entire project period.

Budget Justification (Field K on the form; attach as PDF)

Note: Joint Research-Extension projects must provide a budget for each project requested from the Act of August 4, 1965 (P.L. 89-106) Research funds and Smith-Lever Extension funds for each year of funding being requested. **Include a breakdown of costs for each year, as well as cumulative project costs over all years, by cost category and funding source (Research and/or Extension).** An example of a form that may be used and attached for this purpose is available at

http://www.sripmc.org/RIPM/rfa10/grants_ripm_extras.cfm.

7. Supplemental Information Form

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part VI, 1. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

a. Field 2. Program Code. Enter the program code name “**Southern RIPM**” and the program code “**QQ.S**”.

b. Field 8. Conflict of Interest List. A conflict of interest list is required under this program.

C. Submission Dates and Times

Instructions for submitting an application are included in Part IV, Section 1.9 of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

Applications must be received by Grants.gov by COB on **December 17, 2009 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time)**. Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding.

Correspondence regarding submitted applications will be sent using e-mail. Therefore, applicants are strongly encouraged to provide accurate e-mail addresses, where designated, on the SF-424 R&R Application for Federal Assistance.

If the AR has not received correspondence **from NIFA** regarding a submitted application within 30 days of submission of the application, please contact the Program Contact identified in Part VII of the applicable RFA and request the proposal number assigned to the application. **Failure to do so may result in the application not being considered for funding by the peer review panel. Once the application has been assigned a proposal number, this number should be cited on all future correspondence.**

D. Funding Restrictions

NIFA has determined that grant funds awarded under this authority may not be used for the renovation or refurbishment of research, education, or extension space; the purchase or installation of fixed equipment in such space; or the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of buildings or facilities.

Pursuant to Section 1473 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1997 (91 Stat. 981), indirect costs and tuition remission (sometimes called tuition/fees) are unallowable costs under Section 2(c)(1)(B) (research projects) and Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act (extension projects), and no funds will be approved for this purpose. Costs that are a part of the institution’s indirect cost pool may not be reclassified as direct costs for the purpose of making them allowable.

E. Other Submission Requirements

The applicant should follow the submission requirements noted in the document entitled “A Guide for Preparation and Submission of NIFA Applications via Grants.gov.”

PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

A. General

Subsection (c)(5) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)), as amended by Section 212 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)(5)) requires grantees to arrange for scientific peer review of their proposed research activities and merit review of their proposed activities in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary prior to the Secretary making a grant award under this authority. Each application will be evaluated in a three (3)-part process. First, each application will be screened by NIFA to ensure that it meets the administrative requirements as set forth in this RFA. Applications that meet these requirements will be evaluated at the regional level by two (2) panels, one (1) for relevancy and one (1) for technical merit.

1. Relevance Review

The Regional Relevance Review is conducted by a panel of eight to ten stakeholder representatives. Panelists are usually growers, consultants, environmental advocates, consumer advocates, and government employees with appropriate expertise, IPM administrators, researchers, and extension educators. The Relevance Panel does not see the entire proposal; panelists read only the Relevance Statement and the Project Summary.

2. National Relevance and Technical Review

A technical panel will review, evaluate, score, and rank all the applications for national relevance and technical merit. Reviewers will be selected based upon training and experience in relevant scientific, extension, or education fields, taking into account the following factors: (a) The level of relevant formal scientific, technical education, or extension experience of the individual, as well as the extent to which an individual is engaged in relevant research, education, or extension activities; (b) the need to include as reviewers experts from various areas of specialization within relevant scientific, education, or extension fields; (c) the need to include as reviewers other experts (e.g., producers, range or forest managers/operators, and consumers) who can assess relevance of the applications to targeted audiences and to program needs; (d) the need to include as reviewers experts from a variety of organizational types (e.g., colleges, universities, industry, state and Federal agencies, private profit and non-profit organizations); (e) the need to maintain a balanced composition of reviewers with regard to minority and female representation and an equitable age distribution; and (f) the need to include reviewers who can judge the effective usefulness to producers and the general public of each application.

B. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria below will be used in reviewing applications submitted in response to this RFA **Criteria common to evaluation of all project types:**

Evaluation of all projects will include compliance with explicit format and content requirements of this RFA, quality of the project design and methodology, appropriateness of the budget, extent to which National Road Map for IPM priorities are addressed, extent to which the project is innovative and might produce new tools and/or approaches, and extent to which the problem is important to the Southern Region.

Project teams should be composed to ably address the issues entailed in the project. For instance, if the project includes a strong economic component, commensurate economic expertise should be represented in the project team.

Criteria for Research, Extension, and Joint Research-Extension Project Types:

Research, Extension, and joint Research-Extension projects will all be evaluated on potential for eventual broad adoption and application of results by practitioners in the field. The extent to which a proposal addresses issues identified as priorities by stakeholder groups and potential to have positive impact in multiple states and territories will also be evaluated.

Criteria for IPM Evaluation Project Type:

In addition to other evaluation criteria, IPM Evaluation project types will be judged by the extent to which methods and/or outcomes are compatible with other IPM Evaluation efforts across the nation. Methods developed by the project should ideally be easily translatable to other locations and IPM settings. Evaluation data that results from the project should ideally be readily aggregated with data from other projects to enable more broadly applicable conclusions.

For Research, Extension, and Joint Research-Extension Project Types:

Criteria **Scoring weight**

Southern Region Importance (rated by Relevance Panel)

Multi-state partnerships: The project involves two or more collaborators (either formal or informal) from two or more states or territories in the Southern Region.	10%
Integrated approaches: The project enhances the integration of appropriate tactics in a sustainable IPM system.	10%
Stakeholder-identified priorities: The project addresses issues that are explicitly identified by stakeholders in the Southern Region as being of high priority.	10%
Regional importance: The project addresses issues that are important to the Southern Region by virtue of measures such as acreage, pesticide use, people affected, etc.	10%

Technical Merit (rated by Technical Panel)

Compliance with content and format requirements as specified by this RFA	5%
Quality of project design and methodology, including both experimental design and feasibility	15%
Quality of plans to evaluate the impact of this project	5%
Prospects for near-term implementation	5%
Composition and competence of project team	5%
Budget appropriate to the project	5%

National Goals (rated by Technical Panel)

Explicitly addresses National Road Map for IPM priorities Proposal articulates where the project fits within the IPM road map matrix of Focus Areas and Future Directions	5%
Has strong potential to improve risk avoidance or mitigation	10%
Project is innovative	5%

For IPM Evaluation Project Type (evaluated only by the Technical Panel):

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Scoring weight</u>
------------------------	------------------------------

Technical Merit

Compliance with content and format requirements as specified by this RFA	5%
Quality of project design and methodology	20%
Composition and competence of project team	10%
Budget appropriate to the project	5%

National Goals

Explicitly addresses National Road Map for IPM priorities Proposal articulates where the project fits within the IPM road map matrix of Focus Areas and Future Directions	5%
Has strong potential to improve the understanding of the relationship between IPM adoption and risk	20%
Compatibility with other IPM Evaluation projects	10%
Innovative: Potential to produce new evaluation tools and/or new, useful ways of documenting IPM impacts on societal risk	15%

Southern Region Importance

Addresses evaluation of IPM in settings and pest issues important to the Southern Region	10%
---	-----

C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality

During the peer evaluation process, extreme care will be taken to prevent any actual or perceived conflicts of interest that may impact review or evaluation. For the purpose of determining conflicts of interest, the academic and administrative autonomy of an institution shall be determined by reference to the current Higher Education Directory, published by Higher Education Publications, Inc., 6400 Arlington Boulevard, Suite 648, Falls Church, Virginia 22042. Phone: (703) 532-2300. Web site: <http://www.hepinc.com>.

Names of submitting institutions and individuals, as well as application content and peer evaluations, will be kept confidential, except to those involved in the review process, to the extent permitted by law. In addition, the identities of peer reviewers will remain confidential throughout the entire review process. Therefore, the names of the reviewers will not be released to applicants.

D. Organizational Management Information

Specific management information relating to an applicant shall be submitted on a one (1) time basis, with updates on an as needed basis, as part of the responsibility determination prior to the award of a grant identified under this RFA, if such information has not been provided previously under this or another NIFA program. NIFA will provide copies of forms recommended for use in fulfilling these requirements as part of the preaward process. Although an applicant may be eligible based on its status as one (1) of these entities, there are factors which may exclude an applicant from receiving Federal financial and nonfinancial assistance and benefits under this program (e.g., debarment or suspension of an individual involved or a determination that an applicant is not responsible based on submitted organizational management information).

PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION

A. General

Within the limit of funds available for such purpose, the awarding official of NIFA shall make grants to those responsible, eligible applicants whose applications are judged most meritorious under the procedures set forth in this RFA. The date specified by the awarding official of NIFA as the effective date of the grant shall be no later than September 30 of the Federal fiscal year in which the project is approved for support and funds are appropriated for such purpose, unless otherwise permitted by law. It should be noted that the project need not be initiated on the grant effective date, but as soon thereafter as practical so that project goals may be attained within the funded project period. All funds granted by NIFA under this RFA shall be expended solely for the purpose for which the funds are granted in accordance with the approved application and budget, the regulations, the terms and conditions of the award, the applicable Federal cost principles, and the Department's assistance regulations (parts 3015 and 3019 of 7 CFR).

B. Award Notice

The award document will provide pertinent instructions and information including, at a minimum, the following:

- (1) Legal name and address of performing organization or institution to whom the **Director** has issued an award under the terms of this request for applications;
- (2) Title of project;
- (3) Name(s) and institution(s) of PDs chosen to direct and control approved activities;
- (4) Identifying award number assigned by the Department;
- (5) Project period, specifying the amount of time the Department intends to support the project without requiring recompetition for funds;
- (6) Total amount of Departmental financial assistance approved by the **Director** during the project period;
- (7) Legal authority(ies) under which the award is issued;
- (8) Appropriate Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number;
- (9) Applicable award terms and conditions (see <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/business/awards/awardterms.html> to view NIFA award terms and conditions);
- (10) Approved budget plan for categorizing allocable project funds to accomplish the stated purpose of the award; and

(11) Other information or provisions deemed necessary by NIFA to carry out its respective awarding activities or to accomplish the purpose of a particular award.

C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Several Federal statutes and regulations apply to grant applications considered for review and to project grants awarded under this program. These include, but are not limited to:

2 CFR Part 215—USDA implementation of OMB Circular A-110, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Other Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations.

7 CFR Part 1, subpart A—USDA implementation of the Freedom of Information Act.

7 CFR Part 3—USDA implementation of OMB Circular No. A-129 regarding debt collection.

7 CFR Part 15, subpart A—USDA implementation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended.

7 CFR Part 331 and 9 CFR Part 121—USDA implementation of the Agricultural Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2002.

7 CFR Part 3015—USDA Uniform Federal Assistance Regulations, implementing OMB directives (i.e., OMB Circular Nos. A-21 and A-122, now codified at 2 CFR Parts 220 and 230) and incorporating provisions of 31 U.S.C. 6301-6308 (formerly the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977, Pub. L. No. 95-224), as well as general policy requirements applicable to recipients of Departmental financial assistance.

7 CFR Part 3017—USDA implementation of Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and 7 CFR Part 3021—Governmentwide Requirements for Drug Free Workplace (Grants).

7 CFR Part 3018—USDA implementation of Restrictions on Lobbying. Imposes prohibitions and requirements for disclosure and certification related to lobbying on recipients of Federal contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, and loans.

7 CFR Part 3052—USDA implementation of OMB Circular No. A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-profit Organizations.

7 CFR Part 3407—NIFA procedures to implement the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

7 CFR Part 3430 – NIFA Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-Formula Federal Assistance Programs—General Award Administrative Provisions

29 U.S.C. 794 (section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973) and 7 CFR Part 15b (USDA implementation of statute) —prohibiting discrimination based upon physical or mental handicap in Federally assisted programs.

35 U.S.C. 200 et seq. —Bayh-Dole Act, controlling allocation of rights to inventions made by employees of small business firms and domestic nonprofit organizations, including universities, in Federally assisted programs (implementing regulations are contained in 37 CFR Part 401).

D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements

Grantees are required to submit initial project information and annual and summary reports to NIFA's Current Research Information System (CRIS). The CRIS database contains narrative project information, progress/impact statements, and final technical reports that are made available to the public. For applications recommended for funding, instructions on preparation and submission of project documentation will be provided to the applicant by the agency contact. Documentation must be submitted to CRIS before NIFA funds will be released. Project reports will be requested by the CRIS office when required. For more information about CRIS, visit <http://cris.nifa.usda.gov>.

PART VII—AGENCY CONTACT

Applicants and other interested parties are encouraged to contact:

James R. VanKirk
Grants Manager, S-RIPM
Southern Region IPM Center
North Carolina State University
1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 110
Raleigh, NC 27606-2194
Telephone: 919-513-8179
Fax: 919-513-1114
E-mail: jim@sripmc.org

PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION

A. Access to Review Information

Copies of reviews, not including the identity of reviewers, and a summary of the panel comments will be sent to the applicant PD after the review process has been completed.

B. Use of Funds; Changes

1. Delegation of Fiscal Responsibility

Unless the terms and conditions of the award state otherwise, the awardee may not in whole or in part delegate or transfer to another person, institution, or organization the responsibility for use or expenditure of award funds.

2. Changes in Project Plans

a. The permissible changes by the awardee, PD(s), or other key project personnel in the approved project shall be limited to changes in methodology, techniques, or other similar aspects of the project to expedite achievement of the project's approved goals. If the awardee or the PD(s) is uncertain as to whether a change complies with this provision, the question must be referred to the Authorized Departmental Officer (ADO) for a final determination. The ADO is the signatory of the award document, not the program contact.

b. Changes in approved goals or objectives shall be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such changes. In no event shall requests for such changes be approved which are outside the scope of the original approved project.

c. Changes in approved project leadership or the replacement or reassignment of other key project personnel shall be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such changes.

d. Transfers of actual performance of the substantive programmatic work in whole or in part and provisions for payment of funds, whether or not Federal funds are involved, shall be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to effecting such transfers, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of the award.

e. The project period may be extended by NIFA without additional financial support, for such additional period(s) as the ADO determines may be necessary to complete or fulfill the purposes of an approved project, but in no case shall the total project period exceed five years. Any extension of time shall be conditioned upon prior request by the awardee and approval in writing by the ADO, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of award.

f. Changes in Approved Budget: Unless stated otherwise in the terms and conditions of award, changes in an approved budget must be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to instituting such changes if the revision will involve transfers or expenditures of

amounts requiring prior approval as set forth in the applicable Federal cost principles, Departmental regulations, or award.

C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards

When an application results in an award, it becomes a part of the record of NIFA transactions, available to the public upon specific request. Information that the Secretary determines to be of a confidential, privileged, or proprietary nature will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Therefore, any information that the applicant wishes to have considered as confidential, privileged, or proprietary should be clearly marked within the application. The original copy of an application that does not result in an award will be retained by the Agency for a period of three (3) years. Other copies will be destroyed. Such an application will be released only with the consent of the applicant or to the extent required by law. An application may be withdrawn at any time prior to the final action thereon.

D. Regulatory Information

For the reasons set forth in the final Rule related Notice to 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V (48 FR 29114, June 24, 1983), this program is excluded from the scope of the Executive Order 12372 which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the collection of information requirements contained in this Notice have been approved under OMB Document No. 0524-0039.

E. Definitions

Please refer to 7 CFR 3430, Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-Formula Federal Assistance Programs--General Award Administrative Provisions, for the applicable definitions for this NIFA grant program.

In addition, the following definition applies specifically to this RFA:

Director means the Director of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) and any other officer or employee of the NIFA to whom the authority involved is delegated.

Electronic Application Checklist

(Disclaimer Note: This checklist is included for the sole purpose of assisting the applicant in the self review process prior to submission. Applicant should use the RFA as the instrument of instruction and the Application Guide to complete the application process. This checklist is NOT an official portion of the RFA and should in no way be considered a replacement for the Application Guide or instructions contained within the RFA.)

Only electronic applications may be submitted to NIFA via Grants.gov unless indicated otherwise in the specific program Request for Applications (RFA). All applications submitted to NIFA must contain the applicable elements outlined in these guidelines. The following checklist has been prepared to assist in ensuring that the application is complete prior to submission:

- Are you eligible to apply for the funding offered in the RFA?**
Eligibility information for each funding opportunity is stated in Part III, Eligibility Information, of each RFA.
- Has your institution properly registered with Grants.gov to enable you to submit an application?**
Those who wish to submit an application to NIFA should first contact their Authorized Representative (AR) to determine if the organization is prepared to submit applications through Grants.gov. See http://www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp for steps to preparing to submit applications through Grants.gov.
- Are you applying to the correct funding opportunity associated with the RFA?**
Field 1 of the NIFA Supplemental Information Form will pre-populate to indicate the program to which you are applying.
- Have you followed the guidelines for filling out your electronic application provided in the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide, which is posted along with the SF 424 R&R application package on Grants.gov?**
Electronic applications should be prepared according to this guide and the specific program RFA. This guide is part of the corresponding electronic application package for the specific program to which you are applying.
- Have all attachments been submitted in the portable document format (PDF)?**
NIFA will only accept PDF attachments. See Part III of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.
- Do all submitted PDF documents have one (1) -inch margins and are typed or word processed using no type smaller than 12 point? Are all PDF documents numbered sequentially on each page of the attachment? Are all page limitations for a given attachment followed?**
Submitted proposals that do not meet these requirements for PDF attachments will not be reviewed.

- Did you use the “Check Package for Errors” feature (see section 1.8 of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide)?**
- Have all required components of the SF 424 Research and Related (R&R) Application Package posted under the funding opportunity on Grants.gov been completed?**
 - Mandatory Forms?
 - Optional Forms?

SF 424 R&R Cover Sheet

- Have all required fields (highlighted in yellow) been completed?

SF 424 R&R Project/Performance Site Location(s)

- Have all required fields (highlighted in yellow) been completed?

R&R Other Project Information

- Have the fields describing project potential or actual environmental impact been properly completed?

Project Summary/Abstract

- Has the Project Summary PDF been attached to this form in Field 6?
- Are the names and affiliated organizations of all Project Directors listed at the top of the page in addition to the title of the project?
- Has the project type: Research, Extension, Joint Research-Extension, or IPM Evaluation been listed?
- Does this section adhere to the format and page limitations?
- Did you use the suggested Project Summary/Abstract Template found at: http://www.nifa.usda.gov/home/faq_apply.html#abstract?

Project Narrative

- Has the Project Narrative PDF been attached to this form in Field 7?
- Was a progress report included, if submitting a renewal?
- Is the project fully described?
- Does this section adhere to the format and page limitations?

Bibliography & References Cited

- Has the Bibliography & References Cited PDF been attached to this form in Field 8?
- Are all references cited and are all citations referenced?
- Do all citations contain a title, the names of all authors, and are they in accepted journal format?

Facilities & Other Resources

- Has the Facilities & Other Resources PDF been attached to this form in Field 9?
- Has a description of your facilities, sufficient to indicate that you will be able to carry out this project, been given?

Equipment

- Has the Equipment PDF been attached to this form in Field 10?
- Is the description of your equipment sufficient to indicate that you will be able to carry out this project?

Relevance Statement

- Has the Relevance Statement been attached to this form in Field 11?
Maximum length three pages. Name the file "RELEVANCE [PD last name].pdf."

Appendices to Project Description

- Has the Appendices to Project Description PDF been attached to this form in Field 11?

Collaborative Arrangements

- Has the Collaborative Arrangements PDF been attached to this form in Field 11?

Scientific Peer Review Certification

- For Research or Joint Research/Extension projects – has a certification letter, signed by the AR, been attached in Field 11?

R&R Senior/Key Person Profile

Biographical Sketch

- Has the biographical sketch (vitae) PDF for the PD and each co-PD, senior associate, and other professional personnel been attached?

Current and Pending Support

- Has the current and pending support PDF for key personnel been attached?
- Have all current and pending projects been listed and summarized, **including this proposal**?
- Did you use the suggested Current and Pending Support Template found at: http://www.nifa.usda.gov/home/faq_apply.html#current?

R&R Personal Data (voluntary)

- Have all fields been completed, except social security number?

R&R Budget

- Have all fields been completed for each PD and co-PD(s)?
- Are annual and summary budgets included? For multi-institution applications, has a subaward budget been included for each institution involved?

Budget Justification

- Has the Budget Justification PDF been attached to this form in Field K?
- Are budget items individually justified?

- For multi-institutional applications, has a subaward budget justification been included for each institution involved?
- For Joint Research-Extension projects, is the budget broken down for the research and extension funds using the suggested form from the Regional IPM Center website?

NIFA Supplemental Information Form

- Has Field 1 been pre-populated?
- Does Field 2 indicate the Program Code Name and Program Code to which you are applying?

Conflict of Interest List

- Has the Conflict of Interest List PDF been attached to this form in Field 8?
- Has a Conflict of Interest List been provided for all individuals who have submitted a Biographical Sketch?
- Did you use the suggested Conflict of Interest Template found at:
http://www.nifa.usda.gov/home/faq_apply.html#coi?
- Does the Conflict of Interest list include the four categories as appropriate?