

Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program Western Region

FY 2012 Request for Applications

APPLICATION DEADLINE: February 29, 2012



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 - WESTERN 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: Applications must be received by close of business (COB) on **February 29, 2012 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time)**. Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding. 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 and Oversight Division; Office of Grants and Financial Management; National Institute of Food and Agriculture; USDA; STOP 2299; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2299; or via e-mail to: Policy@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 - Western Region RFA.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: NIFA announces the availability of grant funds and requests applications for the Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program - Western Region (W-RIPM) for fiscal year (FY) 2012 to help achieve national integrated pest management (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 2012 is approximately \$650,000.

This notice identifies the objectives for W-RIPM projects, the eligibility criteria for projects and applicants, and the application forms and associated instructions needed to apply for a W-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.....	19
D. Funding Restrictions.....	20
E. Other Submission Requirements.....	20
PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS	211
A. General.....	211
B. Evaluation Criteria.....	22
C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality	23
D. Organizational Management Information	24
PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION	25
A. General.....	25
B. Award Notice	25
C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements	26
D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements.....	27
PART VII—AGENCY CONTACT.....	28
PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION.....	29
A. Access to Review Information	29
B. Use of Funds; Changes	29
C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards	30
D. Regulatory Information	30
E. Definitions	30

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 3(d) funds.

B. Purpose and Priorities

The purpose of the RIPM program is to provide knowledge and information needed for the implementation of IPM methods that:

- improve the economic benefits related to the adoption of IPM practices;
- reduce potential human health risks from pests and the use of pest management practices; and
- reduce unreasonable adverse environmental effects from pests and the use of pest management practices.

The RIPM program fulfills this purpose by increasing the supply of and dissemination of IPM knowledge and by enhancing collaboration among stakeholders.

The Western Region (which includes: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming and the following Pacific Islands (Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau) is characterized by a diversity of cropping systems and large urban centers in close proximity to vulnerable ecosystems and natural resources. Public concerns about water use and quality, worker safety, and public health as it relates to pesticide use provide impetus to develop and implement regional IPM strategies.

The goals of the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program – Western Region (W-RIPM) support the National Road Map for Integrated Pest Management (www.ipmcenters.org/IPMRoadMap.pdf) including development of long-term sustainable, profitable, and environmentally sound pest management systems for agriculture; promotion of reduced risk pest management practices for either agricultural or non agricultural situations (urban and natural systems); and protection and conservation of ecosystem quality and diversity. The W-RIPM program will support and promote projects that significantly enhance and protect environmental quality, reduce the risk of health problems and other problems associated with pest management, and/or promote biological diversity in pest management systems and the integration of multiple pest management tactics.

In FY 2012, W-RIPM will support three types of projects: Research, Extension, and Joint Research-Extension (see Part II, C., Project Types, for more information). Priority areas have been identified for W-RIPM research projects and extension projects through stakeholders' input to the Western IPM Center Steering Committee. Applications must involve one of the priorities or a combination of them, as appropriate. All of the priorities have equal importance.

1. Stakeholder Involvement

The Western Region is committed to addressing the pest management needs expressed by diverse stakeholders. Applications must include explicit citations or other documentation that stakeholder-identified needs are being addressed by the proposed project. Sources of stakeholder-identified needs include, but are not limited to:

- a. Needs identified in Pest Management Strategic Plans that can be accessed at www.ipmcenters.org/pmsp/index.cfm;
- b. Recommendations or reports from program advisory committees;
- c. Recommendations from stakeholder groups;
- d. Pest management needs and issues from Western Sustainable Agriculture Research and Extension (WSARE) sub-regional conferences (<http://wsare.usu.edu/conf/>); and
- e. Other documented needs assessment evaluations.

Explicitly citing such sources demonstrates both that a project is important, and that the Project Directors (PDs) are engaged with the community.

2. Non-Pesticidal Tactics

The W-RIPM program encourages projects that develop, promote or implement non-pesticidal tactics.

3. Multi-State/Territory Involvement

A goal of the W-RIPM program is to encourage collaborations among states/territories for purposes of efficiency, economy, and synergy. To fulfill this goal, applications must project benefits to more than one state/territory. Projects involving multi-state/territory collaboration are preferred, but those undertaken by PDs in a single state/territory that will benefit other states in the region are also encouraged (see Part III, A., Eligible Applicants). Applicants must address multi-state/territory relevancy in their proposals.

Multi-State/Territory proposals must describe the role of each collaborating partner in sufficient detail so as to convince reviewers that the multi-state collaboration is meaningful.

4. Multi-Disciplinary, Systems-Oriented Projects

The W-RIPM program will support projects that promote cooperative efforts across appropriate disciplines, with linkages between research and extension efforts and components of existing or emerging pest management systems. The proposal should describe the role of each member of the multi-disciplinary team and their responsibilities to the project.

5. W-RIPM Competitive Grants Program Goals

Overall goal: (all projects must address this goal)

Environmental stewardship and risk management: The W-RIPM program will support and promote projects that significantly enhance and protect environmental quality, reduce the risk of health problems and other problems associated with pest management, and/or promote biological diversity in pest management systems and the integration of multiple pest management tactics.

For details about previously funded projects, please see the [NIFA Integrated Pest Management](#) webpage for more information.

In FY 2012, the Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program – Western Region (W-RIPM) is soliciting proposals that address the following Research and Extension objectives.

Research Project Priority Areas: (projects must address one or more of these priorities)

- (a) Documenting (measuring) the impacts of IPM adoption;
- (b) Developing an effective tactic for a plant or animal production management system for a pest problem that currently limits production efficiency and is recognized by the user community as a key priority;
- (c) Addressing multiple cycles of pests over seasons, and/or multiple species and complexes at the landscape level or ecosystem (crops, natural systems, urban). The interactions of the entire community should be considered;
- (d) Promoting biological diversity in pest management systems and the integration of multiple pest management tactics;
- (e) Identifying constraints to greater adoption of IPM strategies and developing approaches to overcome these constraints;
- (f) Promoting an interdisciplinary, IPM systems approach; and
- (g) Developing effective pest management tactics for invasive pests (arthropods, nematodes, vertebrates, diseases, or weeds) in cropping systems, natural and urban areas.

Extension Projects Priority Areas: (projects must address one or more of these priorities)

- (a) Providing IPM training and education to individuals involved with the production, processing, storage, transporting, and marketing of food and agricultural commodities;
- (b) Developing educational materials and information delivery systems that provide IPM personnel in the public and private sectors with timely, state-of-the-art information about effective IPM strategies;
- (c) Providing outreach on endangered species protection related to IPM; and
- (d) Urban and natural systems IPM, including IPM as related to human health issues.

Other Information

Project Director’s Presentation: The RIPM Program requires award recipients to present the results of their project at an appropriate professional conference (such as a society annual meeting), a regional coordinating group meeting, or project director’s workshop sponsored by NIFA (if offered) once during the duration of the grant.

Each proposal must include an evaluation and measurement component, such as logic models or other established methods, to determine the impact of the project. For more information on logic models, please consult the following websites:

www.ipm.gov/LogicModels/index.cfm,
www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html, and
www.nifa.usda.gov/about/strat_plan_logic_models.html.

C. Program Area Description

W-RIPM encourages projects that develop content and programs suitable for delivery through the Cooperative Extension System’s eXtension Initiative. Funds may be used to contribute to existing Communities of Practice (CoP) or to form a new CoP focused on a key pest or pest management system. If proposals are to directly contribute to existing CoPs or to form new CoPs within the eXtension framework projects must align with the eXtension vision, mission, and values. A letter of acknowledgement from eXtension is required, and a letter of support may be required from one or more of the Communities of Practice. For detailed guidance on how to partner with eXtension, go to <http://create.extension.org/node/2057>.

PART II—AWARD INFORMATION

A. Available Funding

There is no commitment by USDA to fund any particular application or to make a specific number of awards. Approximately \$650,000 is available to fund W-RIPM grant applications in FY 2012. Of this amount, approximately \$390,000 is expected to be available for Research projects, \$80,000 for Extension projects and \$180,000 for Joint Research-Extension projects. Project duration and size of award depend on the project type and the degree of collaboration among states/territories in the Western region (see Part II, C., Project Types, for more information).

Awards issued as a result of this RFA will have designated the Automated Standard Applications for Payment System (ASAP), operated by the Department of Treasury's Financial Management Service, as the payment system for funds. For more information see www.nifa.usda.gov/business/method_of_payment.html.

B. Types of Applications

In FY 2012, applications may be submitted to the W-RIPM Program as one of the following two types of requests:

(1) **New application**. This is a project application that has not been previously submitted to the W-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 (see Project Narrative, Part IV). 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

Three types of project proposals can be submitted to the W-RIPM program in FY 2012: Research, Extension, or Joint Research-Extension. **Please be aware that there are different eligibility requirements for research and extension projects. Institutions submitting joint research-extension applications must meet the eligibility requirements for both research and extension (see Part III.A.). Applicants must indicate the type of project they are proposing on the Relevance Statement and on the Project Summary.**

1. Research Projects

This funding category develops the research base needed for the construction of comprehensive pest management systems that have a strong likelihood of contributing to on-going IPM

implementation efforts. Research may be proposed to develop individual tactics needed for pest management systems (e.g., biocontrol, cultural control, host resistance, particularly novel uses of chemicals, monitoring methods or decision support) or to increase the understanding of how interactions among tactics alter the effectiveness of pest management within agricultural, recreational, suburban, and urban ecosystems. The experimental approach should emphasize field-scale experiments over multiple seasons and/or locations, where appropriate. Practices should be designed to reduce initial pest populations, lower the carrying capacity of the ecosystem for pests, increase tolerance of hosts to pest injury, and/or provide tools for making management decisions such as monitoring methods and action thresholds. Long-term fundamental research is not appropriate for funding in this category. Novel, cutting-edge methods, for which there exist data to support likelihood of successful pest management and adoption, are encouraged. Research involving chemical pesticides should be designed to reduce the amount applied, frequency of applications and increase the selectivity of a pesticide. The project should be designed to minimize adverse impacts on beneficial organisms and to limit buildup of pest populations that are resistant to pesticides. Applications should clearly demonstrate how the tactic or IPM system, once developed, can be incorporated into an existing production or management system. Projects funded in this category should demonstrate economic, social, and environmental benefits of IPM strategies, and identify constraints to greater adoption of IPM systems by users.

Research applications from single or multiple institutions in only one state/territory in the Western Region may be submitted with a maximum total project budget of \$100,000; applications with meaningful involvement from more than one state/territory in the Western Region or from more than one Western Region state/territory with meaningful involvement with an institution outside the Western Region may be submitted with a maximum total project budget of \$180,000. Research applications may be submitted for project periods of up to three years. Please note that one or two year Research projects may be eligible for no-cost extensions after years one and two, but that no carryover or extension is permitted for these projects beyond three years. Any unexpended funds will be returned to the Treasury.

2. Extension Projects

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

Extension applications from single or multiple institutions in only one state/territory may be submitted with a maximum total project budget of \$60,000; applications with meaningful involvement from more than one state/territory in the Western Region or applications from more than one Western Region state/territory with meaningful

involvement with an institution outside the Western Region may be submitted with a maximum total project budget of \$80,000. Extension projects may last up to three years.

3. Joint Research-Extension Projects

This funding category combines research and extension activities (as described in sections C.1. and C.2., above). Joint Research-Extension projects validate pest management systems, introduce new pest management tactics into local production, urban or natural systems, and deliver these systems to producers or managers and their advisers through IPM education and training programs.

Joint Research-Extension applications from single or multiple institutions in only one state/territory in the Western Region may be submitted with a maximum total project budget of \$100,000; applications with meaningful involvement from more than one state/territory in the Western Region or applications from more than one Western Region state/territory that are involved with an institution outside the Western Region may be submitted with a maximum total project budget of \$180,000. Joint Research-Extension project applications may be submitted for project periods of up to three years. Please note that one or two year Joint Research-Extension projects may be eligible for no-cost extensions after years one and two, but that no carryover or extension is permitted for these projects beyond three years. Any unexpended funds will be returned to the Treasury.

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 a 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 research or joint research-extension project shall have undergone a review arranged by the grantee. Such review must be a scientific peer review conducted in accordance with 7 CFR 3400.21. It must be credible, independent, and arranged by the grantee. It should provide 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. Often this review is conducted by faculty peers. It may include USDA employees, but should not be conducted solely by USDA employees. Although evidence of a scientific peer review is not required until an award is ready to be finalized, peer reviews can improve the quality of a proposal. We thus encourage applicants to have proposals peer reviewed before submission.

(2) 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 12. 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. The notice should state “In accordance with 7 CFR 3400.21 this memo is to certify that this project [title] has undergone a scientific peer review.” If this notification is included within the application, a signature is not necessary. If, however, it is submitted to NIFA after the application is submitted through [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov), the memo must be on the institution’s letterhead and signed by the Authorized Representative.

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 Western 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 may result in the application being excluded from consideration 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. **Applicants are advised to submit early to the Grants.gov system.**

New Users of Grants.gov

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 Grants.gov. If the organization is not prepared (e.g., the institution/organization is new to the electronic grant application process through Grants.gov), then the one-time registration process must be completed PRIOR to submitting an application. It can take as much as two weeks to complete the registration process so it is critical to begin as soon as possible. In such situations the AR should go to **“Get Registered” on the Grants.gov left navigation bar (or go to www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp) for information on registering the institution/organization with Grants.gov. A quick reference guide listing the steps is available as a 4-page PDF document at the following website: www.grants.gov/assets/Grants.govRegistrationBrochure.pdf.** Item 2. below mentions the “NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.” Part II.1. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide contains additional explanatory language regarding the registration process.

Steps to Obtain Application Package Materials

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 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: www.grants.gov/applicants/AdobeVersioningTestOnly.jsp.
2. The application package must be obtained via Grants.gov, go to 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-003627**” 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), **or submitting the application** then refer to resources available on the Grants.gov Web site first (www.grants.gov/). Grants.gov assistance is also available as follows:

Grants.gov customer support
1-800-518-4726 Toll Free or 606-545-5035
Business Hours: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Closed on [Federal Holidays](#).
Email: support@grants.gov

Grants.gov iPortal: Top 10 requested help topics (FAQs), Searchable knowledge base, self service ticketing and ticket status, and live web chat (available 7:00 A.M. - 9:00 P.M. ET). Get help now!

Please have the following information available when contacting Grants.gov, to help expedite your inquiry:

- Funding Opportunity Number (FON)
- Name of Agency You Are Applying To
- Specific Area of Concern

See http://grants.gov/applicants/app_help_reso.jsp or 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 Parts 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 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 THAT ARE NON-COMPLIANT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS (i.e., content format, pdf file format, file name restrictions, and no password protected files) WILL BE AT RISK OF BEING EXCLUDED FROM NIFA REVIEW. Partial applications will be excluded from NIFA review. With documented prior approval, subsequent submissions of an application 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/help/download_software.jsp#pdf_conversion_programs.

For any questions related to the preparation of an application please review the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide and the applicable request for applications. If assistance is still needed for preparing application forms content, contact:

- Email: electronic@nifa.usda.gov
- Phone: 202-401-5048
- Business hours: Monday through Friday, 7:00 am – 5:00 pm Eastern Time, excluding Federal holidays.

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 7. Project Summary/Abstract. See Part V. 4.7 of NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide for further instructions and a link to a suggested template. The summary should include the following:

(i) Project Type (choose one): Research; Extension; Joint Research-Extension.

(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 3(d) funds are for extension activities, the 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 goals and supporting objectives; plans to accomplish project goals; and relevance of the project to the purposes and priorities of the W-RIPM program (see Part I, B.).

b. Field 8. Project Narrative.

PLEASE NOTE: The Project Narrative shall not exceed **21** pages of written text double spaced, with one-inch margins on all sides, font size no smaller than 12 point, and up to **five** additional pages for figures and tables. This maximum (**26** pages) has been established to ensure fair and equitable competition. Subsections (i) through (iv) of the Project Narrative should not exceed fifteen double-spaced pages in total. Subsection (v), ‘Implementation and Evaluation Plans’ shall not exceed three pages of written text in total. For renewal applications, requirements in

subsection (vi) 'Progress Reports', shall not exceed three pages of written text in total. **Any proposals exceeding the page limit will not be reviewed.**

The Project Narrative must include all of the following:

(i) **Problem, Background and Justification.** Describe why current technologies and practices are inadequate and how the proposed approach will help to improve or implement the pest management system and address the specific needs identified by growers and other stakeholders in the Western Region. Address the specific needs identified in this solicitation and identify the relative importance of the strategies to an improved pest management system in the region/area, and the potential applicability of the proposed approach to other production regions. Cite documentation from your Relevance Statement that describes the relevance of the project to W-RIPM priorities (see Part I, B.). Review ongoing or completed work (local/ regional/ national) that is relevant and include references. Describe how previous work funded by the W-RIPM program or other sources will contribute to the proposed project.

(ii) **Objectives.** Provide clear, concise, complete, and logically arranged statements of the specific aims or hypotheses that will be addressed by the proposed effort. In Joint Research-Extension applications, the research and extension objectives should be delineated separately.

(iii) **Methods, Procedures and Timetable.** Describe how each of the stated objectives will be addressed. Include appropriate experimental design and experimental units, reference methods to be used, and describe appropriate statistical analyses. 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 and the roles of research and extension collaborators.

(iv) **Cooperation and Institutional Units Involved.** When appropriate, the project should be coordinated with the efforts of other states/territories and/or national programs. Identify each institutional unit contributing to the project. Identify each state/territory in a multiple-state/territory application and designate the lead state. The degree of collaboration should be specifically addressed where the project involves multi-state/territory collaboration, and/or is submitted as multi-disciplinary or multi-organizational. Clearly describe the roles of all collaborating participants in the project.

(v) **Implementation and Evaluation Plans.** Each proposal must include an implementation and evaluation (measurement) component. The Implementation and Evaluation Plans portion of the application should not exceed three pages in length.

(1) Research Projects: Applications must describe how the tactic or system, once developed, might be incorporated into an existing crop management program or other pest management situation on a large scale.

(2) Extension Projects and Joint Research-Extension Projects: Applications must provide detailed plans for evaluation of the project, such as logic models or other established methods. The evaluation plan should include specific evaluation objectives and measurement indicators (e.g., adoption rate, number of acres impacted, pesticide use, risk reduction, profitability) that will be used to measure impacts and outcomes resulting from the project. Evaluation plans that include surveys should indicate survey expertise of investigators and/or describe the survey methodology that will be used.

(vi) **Progress Report**. For renewal applications (as defined in Part II, B.), a progress report must be included, not to exceed three pages of the written text in total.

c. Field 12. Other Attachments.

Relevance Statement

The Relevance Statement is the only part of the submission that will be viewed by the Relevance (Merit) Review Panel. Conversely, the Relevance Statement is the only part of the submission that the Technical Review Panel will not view. It is a separate required document.

The Relevance Statement must be submitted with the full application but as a separately attached PDF file under Field number 12. Name the file “RELEVANCE [PDs last name].pdf”. Applications without a separate Relevance Statement will not be reviewed. The Relevance Statement must be no longer than three double spaced pages. Formatting requirements (font, spacing, margins) for the Relevance Statement are the same as those for the application.

The Relevance Statement should contain the following information:

- (1) Names and institutions of PDs and major cooperators;
- (2) Project title;
- (3) Project summary (see Part IV, B.3.a.);
- (4) Project objectives; and
- (5) Description of the problem, background and justification, particularly addressing potential for the project to address the Western Region’s priorities (see Part I, B.); outreach; appropriate multi-state/territory involvement within the Western Region; level of non-pesticidal focus; and source of documented level of stakeholder identification as a priority.

Scientific Peer Review Certification for Research and Joint Research-Extension Projects.

Notice that the scientific peer review has been completed should be included in the application (see Part II. D.).

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. Part V, 5. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide includes information about the individuals for which a Senior/Key Person Profile must be completed, and details about the Biographical Sketch and the Current and Pending Support including a link to a suggested template for the Current and Pending Support. **You must attach** ‘Current and

Pending Support' information 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.

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: Include funding to attend and present your results at a professional conference, a regional coordinating group meeting, or project directors' workshop (see Part I.B.) 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. If submitting a Joint Research-Extension project an additional budget form split out by Research (P.L. 89-106) funds and Extension (Smith-Lever 3(d)) funds should be attached in Field K with the Budget Justification. An example of a form that may be used and attached for this purpose is available at www.wripmc.org/Research/index.html.

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

Note: For Joint Research-Extension projects the budget justification should also be split out by Research and Extension following the cost categories on the budget form.

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 to which you are applying.** Enter the program code name "Western RIPM" and the program code "QQ.W".
- b. Field 8. Conflict of Interest List.** Conflict of interest information is required for each senior/key person included in the R&R Senior/Key Person Profile. See Part VI, 1.6 of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide for further instructions and a link to a suggested template.

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 **February 29, 2012 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time)**. Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding.

Applicants who have problems with the submission of an application to Grants.gov are encouraged to FIRST contact the Grants.gov Help Desk to resolve any problems. Keep a record of any such correspondence. See Part IV. A. for Grants.gov contact information.

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 the established deadline, 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

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.

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.

E. Other Submission Requirements

The applicant should follow the submission requirements noted in Part IV, section 1.9 in the document entitled “NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.”

For information about the **status of a submitted application**, see Part III., section 6. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.

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 applicants to arrange for a scientific peer review of their proposed research activities and joint research-extension activities in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary prior to the Secretary making a grant award under this authority (see Part II. D.).

Each application will be evaluated in a three-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 panels, one for relevance and one for technical merit.

1. Relevance Review

The Relevance Review is conducted by a panel of five to ten stakeholder representatives. Panelists are usually growers, consultants, environmental advocates, consumer advocates, 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.

2. Technical Review

A multidisciplinary technical panel with members selected from outside the Western Region will review, evaluate, score, and rank all the applications for technical merit. (They do not see the Relevance Statement.) 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) and geographic locations; (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:

1. The criteria used for the Relevance Review to evaluate Research, Extension, and Joint Research-Extension projects, including Multi-state/Territory and Multi-region Projects (as described in Part II, C. 1-3) are:

Evaluation Criteria – Relevance Review		Possible Points													
a. <u>Project addresses the Western Region’s priorities</u> (see Part I, B.5 for more detail). <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><u>Maximum Score</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Environmental stewardship and risk management</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Potential for implementation and measurable impact</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Importance and value of the crop system or non-agricultural site(s) to the Region</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Importance of the pest to the crop system, or non-agricultural situation</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interdisciplinary collaborations</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dissemination Plan</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Maximum Score</u>	Environmental stewardship and risk management	10	Potential for implementation and measurable impact	10	Importance and value of the crop system or non-agricultural site(s) to the Region	10	Importance of the pest to the crop system, or non-agricultural situation	10	Interdisciplinary collaborations	10	Dissemination Plan	10	60
	<u>Maximum Score</u>														
Environmental stewardship and risk management	10														
Potential for implementation and measurable impact	10														
Importance and value of the crop system or non-agricultural site(s) to the Region	10														
Importance of the pest to the crop system, or non-agricultural situation	10														
Interdisciplinary collaborations	10														
Dissemination Plan	10														
Explicit link to stakeholder-identified need. <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><u>Maximum Score</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>b. <u>Level of stakeholder identification as a priority</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No mention of stakeholders in setting the priority</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mention of stakeholders but no documentation</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clearly documented as priority of an important stakeholder group</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clearly documented as an important priority by multiple stakeholder groups</td> <td style="text-align: right;">15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Maximum Score</u>	b. <u>Level of stakeholder identification as a priority</u>		No mention of stakeholders in setting the priority	0	Mention of stakeholders but no documentation	5	Clearly documented as priority of an important stakeholder group	10	Clearly documented as an important priority by multiple stakeholder groups	15	15		
	<u>Maximum Score</u>														
b. <u>Level of stakeholder identification as a priority</u>															
No mention of stakeholders in setting the priority	0														
Mention of stakeholders but no documentation	5														
Clearly documented as priority of an important stakeholder group	10														
Clearly documented as an important priority by multiple stakeholder groups	15														
Focus of the project on development, promotion, or implementation of non-pesticidal tactics. <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><u>Maximum Score</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>c. <u>Level of non-pesticidal focus</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Will not impact risk in any way</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has pesticide management focus and could significantly reduce or improve risk</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Focused on non-pesticidal tactics and could significantly reduce or improve risk</td> <td style="text-align: right;">15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Maximum Score</u>	c. <u>Level of non-pesticidal focus</u>		Will not impact risk in any way	0	Has pesticide management focus and could significantly reduce or improve risk	8	Focused on non-pesticidal tactics and could significantly reduce or improve risk	15	15				
	<u>Maximum Score</u>														
c. <u>Level of non-pesticidal focus</u>															
Will not impact risk in any way	0														
Has pesticide management focus and could significantly reduce or improve risk	8														
Focused on non-pesticidal tactics and could significantly reduce or improve risk	15														
d. <u>Appropriate multi-state/territory involvement within the Western Region.</u> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><u>Maximum Score</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Only one state/territory involved and 1 would benefit</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Only one state/territory involved, but clear case presented that several states would benefit</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Only one state/territory involved, but clear case presented that the crop or non-agricultural problem is unique and critical to the state/territory and will provide a model for systems elsewhere</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>More than one state/territory involved and several would benefit</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Maximum Score</u>	Only one state/territory involved and 1 would benefit	0	Only one state/territory involved, but clear case presented that several states would benefit	5	Only one state/territory involved, but clear case presented that the crop or non-agricultural problem is unique and critical to the state/territory and will provide a model for systems elsewhere	5	More than one state/territory involved and several would benefit	10	10				
	<u>Maximum Score</u>														
Only one state/territory involved and 1 would benefit	0														
Only one state/territory involved, but clear case presented that several states would benefit	5														
Only one state/territory involved, but clear case presented that the crop or non-agricultural problem is unique and critical to the state/territory and will provide a model for systems elsewhere	5														
More than one state/territory involved and several would benefit	10														
Total possible points for Relevance Review:	100														

2. The criteria used for Technical Review to evaluate Research, Extension, and Joint Research-Extension projects, including Multi-state/Territory and Multi-region Projects (as described in Part II, C. 1 - 3) are:

Evaluation Criteria – Technical Review	Possible Points
Does the proposal meaningfully address Western Region priorities (see Part I.B.5)?	10
Appropriate objectives, design, and methodology. Considerations include: Overall scientific value Will the planned research make a significant contribution to new knowledge or provide a better understanding of existing knowledge? Is the problem clearly presented and literature review adequate? Do the objectives address the problem presented? What is the probability of success? Does the project, as proposed, duplicate on-going projects at other institutions?	30
Are the methods appropriate and sufficient to accomplish the stated objectives? Can the objectives be accomplished in the stated time frame?	20
Degree of interdisciplinary collaboration, including collaboration among research, extension, private consultants, industry, and the user community. The feasibility of increasing IPM implementation as a result of the project.	20
Evaluation and Implementation Plans <u>Research Applications:</u> Implementation plan: Description for method of technology transfer from research project to field applications. --or-- <u>Extension and Joint Research-Extension Applications:</u> Implementation plan: Description for method of technology transfer from research project to field applications. Evaluation plan (required): Detailed description of an appropriate strategy/process to evaluate the success of the project.	10
Professional competence of the project team	5
Appropriate budget	5
Total possible points for Technical Review:	100

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., 1801 Robert Fulton Drive, Suite 340, Reston, Virginia 20191. Phone: (888) 349-7715. Web site: 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 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 their status as one 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 which 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 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 220 – Cost Principles for Educational Institutions (OMB Circular A-21).

2 CFR Part 225 – Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments (OMB Circular A-87).

2 CFR Part 230 – Cost Principles for Non-profit Organizations (OMB Circular A-122).

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, A-87, and A-122 (now codified at 2 CFR Parts 220, 225, 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 3016 – USDA Implementation of Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments.

7 CFR Part 3017—USDA implementation of Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement).

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 3019—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 (2 CFR Part 215).

7 CFR Part 3021—USDA Implementation of Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants).

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

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

7 CFR Part 3430—Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-formula Grant Programs--General Grant 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 to submit initial project information and annual and summary reports to NIFA's electronic, Web-based inventory system that facilitates both grantee submissions of project outcomes and public access to information on Federally-funded projects. The details of these reporting requirements are included in the award terms and conditions. Details of annual and final technical reporting requirements also are included in the award terms and conditions.

PART VII—AGENCY CONTACT

Applicants and other interested parties are encouraged to contact:

Dr. Frank G. Zalom
Grants Panel Manager, W-RIPM
Department of Entomology
University of California
374 Briggs Hall
Davis, CA 95616
Telephone: (530) 752-3687
Fax: (530) 752-1537
E-mail: fgzalom@ucdavis.edu

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 any applicable statutory limit or expiring appropriation limitation. 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 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 Part 3430, Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-formula Grant Programs-General Grant Administrative Provisions](#) (beginning on page 431), for applicable definitions for this NIFA grant program.

For the purpose of this program, the following additional definition is applicable:

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.