

RIPM

Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program Southern Region

FY 2008 Request for Applications

APPLICATION DEADLINE: December 03, 2007



U.S. Department of Agriculture



Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service

**COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE;
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: Applications must be received by Grants.gov by close of business (COB) on December 3, 2007 (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 Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES), USDA 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, and Funds Management Staff; Office of Extramural Programs; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; USDA; STOP 2299; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2299; or via e-mail to: RFP-OEP@csrees.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 fiscal year (FY) 2008 Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program – Southern Region RFA.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: CSREES anticipates the availability of grant funds and requests applications for the Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program for FY 2008 to support the continuum of research and extension efforts needed to increase the implementation of integrated pest management (IPM) methods. The Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program supports projects that develop individual pest control tactics, integrate individual tactics into an IPM system, and develop and implement extension education programs. The program is administered by the land-grant university system's four Regional IPM Centers (North Central, Northeastern, Southern, Western) in partnership with CSREES. In FY

2008, CSREES anticipates that approximately \$827,000 will be available for support of the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program – Southern Region (referred to herein as the S-RIPM). Of this amount, approximately \$457,000 is expected to be available for Research projects, \$70,000 for Extension projects, \$200,000 for Joint Research-Extension projects and \$100,000 for an IPM evaluation project.

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. CSREES 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 11

 A. AVAILABLE FUNDING 11

 B. TYPES OF APPLICATIONS..... 11

PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION..... 11

 A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS 11

 B. COST SHARING OR MATCHING 12

PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION..... 12

 A. ADDRESS TO REQUEST APPLICATION PACKAGE..... 12

 B. CONTENT AND FORM OF APPLICATION SUBMISSION 13

 C. SUBMISSION DATES AND TIMES 17

 D. FUNDING RESTRICTIONS 17

 E. OTHER SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS..... 18

PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS 18

 A. GENERAL 18

 B. EVALUATION CRITERIA..... 19

 C. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY..... 21

 D. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION 21

PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION 21

 A. GENERAL 21

 B. AWARD NOTICE 22

 C. ADMINISTRATIVE AND NATIONAL POLICY REQUIREMENTS 22

 D. EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTPUTS AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS..... 23

PART VII—PROGRAM CONTACT..... 25

PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION 26

 A. ACCESS TO REVIEW INFORMATION 26

 B. USE OF FUNDS; CHANGES 26

 C. CONFIDENTIAL ASPECTS OF APPLICATIONS AND AWARDS..... 27

 D. REGULATORY INFORMATION 27

 E. DEFINITIONS..... 27

 CHECKLIST 29

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 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.

The Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program (RIPM) supports the continuum of research and extension efforts needed to increase the implementation of IPM methods. The RIPM program supports projects that develop individual pest control tactics, integrate individual tactics into an IPM system, and develop and implement extension and education programs. The program is administered by the land-grant university system's four regional IPM Centers (North Central, Northeastern, Southern, Western) in partnership with CSREES. Because the specific needs of each region vary, regional program priorities will vary.

B. Purpose and Priorities

For details about previously funded projects, please see the web page http://www.sripmc.org/ripm/rfa08/sripm_history.cfm

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

1. National IPM Goals

Proposals are evaluated for criteria in the “National IPM Goals” by the Technical Panel. The Technical Panel sees all materials submitted except the relevance statement (see Part IV.B.1.c. for more information on the relevance statement). The **goal** of the RIPM program is to provide knowledge and information needed for the implementation of IPM methods that:

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

In FY 2008, the S-RIPM is soliciting proposals that address the following priorities:

- 1) **Application of the IPM Road Map:** The Road Map for the National Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program (<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 at least one 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.

2) **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 risks.

3) **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.

4) **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 1 - 3 years of project completion.

5) **For IPM Evaluation project type only – Compatibility** with other IPM evaluation efforts is a priority: One 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 territories. Projects funded by S-RIPM must address pest management issues of importance to the region. The Relevance Panel evaluates proposals for criteria listed in this section. 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.

- a. **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 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 like subcontracts with other states are not necessarily required to indicate a positive multi-state aspect, but explicit documentation of informal relationships is encouraged.
- b. **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 tactic are acceptable if the work will contribute to strengthening the suite of tactics and approaches available for the system involved. Projects that promote single tactics are not encouraged.
- c. **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);
 - 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 CSREES 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>

- d. **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**”

Four types of project proposals can be submitted to the S-RIPM program in FY 2008: Research, Extension, Joint Research-Extension, or IPM Evaluation. Applicants must indicate the type of project they are proposing on the Relevance Statement and on the Project Summary.

1. 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. You may develop individual tactics needed for pest management systems (e.g., biocontrol, cultural control, host resistance) or help increase our 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 involving chemical pesticides should be designed to reduce the amount and frequency and to increase the selectivity of a pesticide application in order to minimize adverse impacts on beneficial organisms and 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 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.

The budget limit for research is defined only by the amount of funds available for this project type, expected to be approximately \$457,000. 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/rfa08/sripm_history.cfm.

Research projects may have a duration of up to three years. Please note that one- or two-year 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 are lost.

2. **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. You 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. 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/rfa07/sripm_history.cfm.

Extension projects may have a duration of up to three years.

3. **Joint Research-Extension**

This funding category combines research and extension activities (as described in Parts I.C.1 and 2, 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. 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/rfa07/sripm_history.cfm.

Joint research-extension projects may have a duration 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 are lost.

4. **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 like “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.

This program will fund no more than one IPM Evaluation project. **The budget limit for the IPM evaluation project is \$100,000.**

IPM Evaluation projects may have a duration of up to three years. Please note that one- or two-year IPM Evaluation 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 are lost.

The RIPM program encourages projects that develop content suitable for delivery through eXtension (http://about.extension.org/mediawiki/files/5/51/EXECUTIVE_SUMMARY_-_March_14%2C_2006_-_YEAR_2.pdf). This content is for end users, as opposed to staff development, and must align with the eXtension Implementation Plan (available at <http://about.extension.org/wiki/Planning>). Funds may be used to contribute to existing Communities of Practice (COPs) (http://about.extension.org/wiki/Glossary_of_eXtension_Terms#Community_of_Practice_.28Co_P.29;) or form new COPs that focus on integrated pest management (for examples of developing COPs and guidance on forming COPs, see http://cop.extension.org/wiki/Main_Page).

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. In FY 2008, approximately \$827,000 is expected to be available to fund applications to the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program – Southern Region (S-RIPM). Of this amount, approximately \$457,000 is expected to be 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 and size of awards depend on the project type and the degree of collaboration among states/territories in the Southern region

B. Types of Applications

In FY 2008, applications may be submitted to the S-RIPM program as one 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 (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 the appropriate area to which they are assigned, and will be reviewed according to the same evaluation criteria as new applications.

PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

Organizations eligible to receive Research awards are: state agricultural experiment stations, 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 U.S.C. 582a *et seq.*), and accredited schools or colleges of veterinary medicine. For Research awards 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities are eligible, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, and 1994 land-grant institutions are also eligible for research awards. Eligibility for Extension awards is limited to 1862 land-grant colleges and universities. 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 CSREES returning the application without review or, even though an application may be reviewed, will preclude CSREES from making an award.

Research and Extension personnel from other USDA/IPM regions (North Central, Northeastern, or Western) and other state/territory and federal organizations can participate as members of project teams, but they cannot serve as sole Project Directors (PDs) on a proposal submitted to the S-RIPM program; i.e., the primary institution must be from a state/territory in the Southern Region.

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. Address to Request Application Package

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

Prior to preparing an application, it is suggested that the PD first contact an Authorized Representative (AR) 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. Download and install PureEdge Viewer, a small, free program that provides access to the grant application. See http://www.grants.gov/resources/download_software.jsp#pureedge.
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-CSREES-RIPM-001071** 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 “[CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for Preparation and Submission of CSREES 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 PureEdge forms, using PureEdge with a Macintosh computer), 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: M-F 7:00 am – 9 pm Eastern Standard Time
Email: support@grants.gov

See <http://www.csrees.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 CSREES 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 CONTAINING NON-PDF DOCUMENTS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED. Partial applications will not be accepted. With documented prior approval, resubmitted applications will be accepted until close of business on the closing date in the RFA.

1. R&R Cover Sheet

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

2. R&R Other Project Information Form

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

a. Project Summary/Abstract (Field 6. on the Form).

(i) Project Type (choose one): 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, 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. Project Narrative (Field 7. on the Form).

PLEASE NOTE: The Project Narrative shall not exceed 15 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 15 pages has been established to ensure fair and equitable competition. The Project Narrative must include all of the following:

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**

- **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 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 Roadmap, 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.
 - (1) **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.
 - (2) **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.
 - (3) **IPM Evaluation Projects:** Evaluation plans are not required for IPM Evaluation Projects.

c. Relevance Statement (Field 11 on the form)

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 [PD’s 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”. The Relevance Statement is the only document seen by the Relevance Panel. No other documents from any proposal (e.g., letters

of support) will be viewed by 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:

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

(b) Project title;

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

(d) Project summary (see Part IV.B.1a above); this may be copied directly from the application; it should not exceed one page in length; and

(e) Description of the problem, background, and justification; and you may copy this section from the application, as long you do not exceed the total 3-page limit for the entire Relevance Statement. Be sure to address all four types of priorities (a-d) outlined in Part I.B.2 “Southern Region Priorities” of this RFA):

- Discuss the level of multi-state involvement in the project and potential multi-state impacts resulting from the project;
- Indicate how the project enhances the integration of appropriate tactics in a sustainable IPM System;
- Indicate how your project addresses stakeholder-identified priorities; cite at least one source (see Part I.B.2(c)); demonstrate that you are engaged with constituents, on some level, in regard to their priorities; and
- Discuss why the IPM issue addressed by this project is important to the Southern Region.

(f) Project objectives and anticipated outcomes. Provide clear, concise, and logically numbered statements of the specific aims of the proposed effort. Describe the anticipated impacts that could be associated with the fulfillment of your objectives (you may do this in table format). Both your objectives and your impacts should connect to the goals of the National IPM Roadmap, 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.

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

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

4. R&R Personal Data – As noted in Part V, 5., 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, 6. of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide. Note: Joint Research-Extension projects must show the proposed breakdown of amounts requested from P.L. 89-106 funds (Research) and Smith-Lever funds (Extension) for each year of funding being requested. **Include cumulative project costs over all years, by cost category and funding source (Research and/or Extension) in the budget justification (Field K on the form).**

7 Supplemental Information Form

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

- a. Program Code (Field 2. on the Form). Enter the program code name “**Southern RIPM**” and the program code “**QQ.S**”
- b. Conflict of Interest List (Field 8. on the Form). 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 CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide.

Applications must be received by Grants.gov by COB on **December 3, 2007 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time)**. Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding.

The receipt of all applications will be acknowledged by e-mail. Therefore, applicants are strongly encouraged to provide accurate e-mail addresses, where designated, on the 424 R&R Application for Federal Assistance.

If the Authorized Representative (AR) has not received a confirmation message from CSREES within 30 days of submission of the application, please contact the Program Contact identified in Part VII of the applicable RFA and provide them the Grants.gov Tracking Number assigned to the application. **Failure to do so may result in the application not being considered for funding by the peer review panel.**

D. Funding Restrictions

CSREES 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 are unallowable costs under Section 2(c)(1)(B) projects and Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act, 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 CSREES Applications via Grants.gov."

See the end of this RFA for a checklist.

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 extension and education activities in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary prior to the Secretary making a grant award under this authority. **The application review process conducted by the S-RIPM program fulfills the scientific peer review and merit review requirements.**

Each application will be evaluated in a three-part process. First, each application will be screened by CSREES 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 relevancy and one for technical merit.

1. Relevance Review

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

2. Technical Review

A technical panel will review, evaluate, score, and rank the applications for technical merit. (They do not see the Relevancy 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); (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 IPM Roadmap 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:

Criterion

Scoring weight

Technical merit (rated by Technical Panel)

Compliance with content and format requirements as specified by this RFA	5%
Quality of project design and methodology	10%
Project feasibility	10%
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 IPM Roadmap priorities	5%
Has strong potential to improve risk avoidance or mitigation	10%
Project is innovative	5%

Southern Region Importance (rated by Relevance Panel)

Multi-state Partnership: The project involves two or collaborators (either formal or informal) from two or more states or territories in the Southern Region.	10%
Integrated: The project enhances the integration of appropriate tactics in a sustainable IPM system	10%
Stakeholder links: 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%

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

<u>Criterion</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 IPM Roadmap issues	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 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 CSREES program. CSREES 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 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 CSREES 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 CSREES 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 CSREES 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 Administrator 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 Administrator 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.csrees.usda.gov/business/awards/awardterms.html> to view CSREES 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 CSREES 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:

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 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.

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—CSREES procedures to implement the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

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

In addition to the reporting requirements identified in applicable CSREES “Terms and Conditions” (which are provided to successful applicants as part of the award package),

successful applicants will be required to submit a yearly progress report and, upon completion of the project, a final technical report to the Southern Region IPM Center, as well.

The Southern Region IPM Center is instituting an online reporting system. PDs will be prompted via email for required reports at approximately one-year intervals from the grant starting date. Reports will be expected to demonstrate that progress has been made on the project; to highlight important findings and recommendations made as a result of the project progress to date; to fully describe changes in objectives, procedures, and the timetable for completion of the project; etc. Failure to submit a progress report will result in a recommendation to CSREES to reduce or terminate funding..

Final reports will be due 90 days after the project termination date. Final reports must be comprehensive and should include more data, figures, etc., than normally would occur in a typical refereed publication or extension publication.

PDs are required to acknowledge CSREES and the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program – Southern Region in all publications or other products that result from funds that are awarded. Reprints or copies of all publications are required.

Grantees are also required to submit initial project information and annual and summary reports to CSREES' 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 CSREES funds will be released. Project reports will be requested by the CRIS office when required. For more information about CRIS, visit <http://cris.csrees.usda.gov>.

PART VII—PROGRAM 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 CSREES 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 three years for Research projects; five years for Extension projects; and three years for Joint Research-Extension projects as indicated in the terms and conditions. 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. **Research and Joint Research-Extension projects (funded from P.L. 89-106) cannot be extended beyond the third year. Project periods should be sufficient to achieve objectives without exceeding three (3) years.**

PDs of three-year projects are advised to use available funds prior to the termination of the 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 CSREES 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

For the purpose of this program, the following definitions are applicable:

Administrator means the Administrator of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) and any other officer or employee of the Department to whom the authority involved is delegated.

Authorized departmental officer means the Secretary or any employee of the Department who has the authority to issue or modify grant instruments on behalf of the Secretary.

Authorized representative means the president, director, or chief executive officer or other designated official of the applicant organization who has the authority to commit the resources of the organization.

Budget period means the interval of time (usually 12 months) into which the project period is divided for budgetary and reporting purposes.

Department or USDA means the United States Department of Agriculture.

Extension activity means an act or process that delivers science-based knowledge and informal educational programs to people, enabling them to make practical decisions.

Grant means the award by the Secretary of funds to an eligible organization or individual to assist in meeting the costs of conducting, for the benefit of the public, an identified project which is intended and designed to accomplish the purpose of the program as identified in these guidelines.

Grantee means an organization designated in the grant award document as the responsible legal entity to which a grant is awarded.

Matching means that portion of allowable project costs not borne by the Federal Government, including the value of in-kind contributions.

Peer review means an evaluation of a proposed project for scientific or technical quality and relevance performed by experts with the scientific knowledge and technical skills to conduct the proposed work or to give expert advice on the merits of a proposal. and management of the project.

Prior approval means written approval evidencing prior consent by an authorized departmental officer as defined above.

Project means the particular activity within the scope of the program supported by a grant award.

Project director means the single individual designated in the grant application and approved by the Secretary who is responsible for the direction and management of the project.

Project period means the period, as stated in the award document, during which Federal sponsorship begins and ends.

Research activity means a scientific investigation or inquiry that results in the generation of knowledge.

Secretary means the Secretary of Agriculture and any other officer or employee of the Department to whom the authority involved is delegated.

CHECKLIST

(Disclaimer: This checklist is for the 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 CSREES via Grants.gov in response to this RFA. All applications submitted under the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Program (RIPM) 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:

- ◆ Have all attachments been submitted in the portable document format (PDF)? CSREES will return proposals w/non-PDF attachments unread. See Part III of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide.
- ◆ Do all submitted PDF documents have one-inch margins and is the type no 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 be returned without review.
- ◆ Have all six components of the Application Package been completed? Did you use the “Check Package for Errors” feature of the PureEdge viewer (see section 1.8 of the CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide)?
 - R&R Cover Sheet
 - R&R Other Project Information
 - R&R Senior/Key Person Profile
 - R&R Personal Data
 - R&R Budget
 - Supplemental Information Form
- ◆ **R&R Cover Sheet**
 - Have all required fields been completed?
- ◆ **R&R Other Project Information**
 - Have the fields describing project potential or actual environmental impact been properly completed? Refer to CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide for instructions.
 - **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 a S-RIPM goal been identified in the Project Summary?
 - Does the Project Summary include research, and/or extension objectives, as appropriate?

Note: a project summary/abstract summary template is available at the following CSREES website: <http://www.csrees.usda.gov/funding/electronic.html>, but will need to be converted to a PDF file before attaching to application.

- Project Narrative
Has the Project Narrative PDF been attached to this form in Field 7?
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 PDF been attached to this form last in Field 11? Maximum length: 3 pages. Name the file “RELEVANCE [PD’s last name].pdf”.
- Appendices to Project Description
Has the Appendices to Project Description PDF been attached to this form in Field 11?
Are the reprints/preprints limited to 2 (as described in the instructions)?
- Collaborative Arrangements
Has the Collaborative Arrangements PDF been attached to this form 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 PD and co-PD(s) been attached?
Have all current and pending projects been listed and summarized, **including this proposal**?
Note: a current and pending support template is available at the following CSREES website: <http://www.csrees.usda.gov/funding/electronic.html>, but will need to be converted to a PDF file before attaching to application.

◆ **R&R Personal Data (Voluntary)**

- Have all fields been completed?

◆ **R&R Budget**

- Have all fields been completed for each PD and co-PD(s)?
- Are annual and summary budgets included?

- Budget Justification

Has the Budget Justification PDF been attached to this form in Field K?

Are budget items individually justified and in the same order as they appear on the budget forms?

For multi-institutional applications, has a budget justification been included for each institution involved?

◆ **Supplemental Information Form**

- Has Field 1 been pre-populated such that “Regional Integrated Pest Management Competitive Grants Program - Southern Region” appears under Funding Opportunity Name and “**USDA-CSREES-RIPM-001071**” for Funding Opportunity Number?
- Does Field 2 indicate the correct Program Code Name (Southern RIPM) and Program Code (QQ.S) to which you are applying?

- Conflict of Interest List

Has the Conflict of Interest List for all individuals who have submitted a Biographical Sketch been attached to this form in one PDF file in Field 8? Note: a conflict of interest list template is available at the following CSREES website:

<http://www.csrees.usda.gov/funding/electronic.html>.