

Biotechnology Risk Assessment Research Grants Program

FY 2010 Request for Applications

APPLICATION DEADLINE: March 17, 2010



**U.S. Department of Agriculture
National Institute of Food and Agriculture**

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

BIOTECHNOLOGY RISK ASSESSMENT RESEARCH GRANTS PROGRAM

INITIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE: This program is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under 10.219, Biotechnology Risk Assessment Research.

DATES: Applications must be received in Grants.gov by **Wednesday, March 17, 2010 (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 Branch; Office of Extramural Programs; National Institute of Food and Agriculture; USDA; STOP 2299; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2299; or via e-mail to: RFP-OEP@nifa.usda.gov. (This e-mail address is intended only for receiving comments regarding this RFA and not requesting information or forms.) In your comments, please state that you are responding to the Biotechnology Risk Assessment Research Grants Program RFA.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: NIFA and the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) announce the availability of grant funds and request applications for the Biotechnology Risk Assessment Research Grants Program (BRAG) for fiscal year (FY) 2010 to support environmental assessment research concerning the introduction of genetically engineered organisms into the environment. The amount available for support of this program in FY 2010 is approximately \$4.0 million.

This notice identifies the objectives for BRAG projects, the eligibility criteria for projects and applicants, and the application forms and associated instructions needed to apply for a BRAG

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	7
PART II—AWARD INFORMATION	13
A. Available Funding.....	13
B. Types of Applications	13
C. Project Types.....	14
PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION.....	15
A. Eligible Applicants.....	15
B. Cost Sharing or Matching.....	15
PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION.....	16
A. Electronic Application Package.....	16
B. Content and Form of Application Submission.....	17
E. Other Submission Requirements.....	20
PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS	22
A. General.....	22
B. Evaluation Criteria	22
C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality	23
D. Organizational Management Information	23
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 CONTACTS	29
PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION	30
A. Access to Review Information	30
B. Use of Funds; Changes	30
C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards	31
D. Regulatory Information	31
E. Definitions.....	31
Electronic Application Checklist.....	32

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Legislative Authority and Background

Authority for the BRAG program is contained in section 1668 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5921) and amended in section 7210 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7901) (Pub. L. 107-171). In accordance with the legislative authority in the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7901), the BRAG program supports research designed to identify and develop appropriate management practices to minimize physical and biological risks associated with genetically engineered animals, plants, and microorganisms. NIFA and ARS of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) jointly administer the BRAG program.

B. Purpose and Priorities

The purpose of the BRAG program is to assist Federal regulatory agencies in making science-based decisions about the effects of introducing into the environment genetically engineered organisms, including plants, microorganisms (including fungi, bacteria, and viruses), arthropods, fish, birds, mammals and other animals excluding humans. Investigations of effects on both managed and natural environments are relevant. The BRAG program accomplishes its purpose by providing Federal regulatory agencies with scientific information relevant to regulatory issues.

The BRAG program supports risk assessment research, which is defined as the science-based evaluation and interpretation of factual information in which a given hazard, if any, is identified, and the consequences associated with the hazard are explored. Research funded through this program will be relevant to environmental risk assessment and the federal regulatory process. When evaluating transgenic organisms, Federal regulators must answer the following four (4) general questions:

1. Is there a hazard? (Potential hazard identification.)
2. How likely is the hazard to occur? (Quantifying the probability of occurrence; identifying likely exposure scenarios.)
3. What is the severity and extent of the hazard if it occurs? (Quantifying the effects.); and
4. Is there an effect above and beyond what might occur with an unmodified organism or an organism that has similar traits, but was developed using other technologies?

The BRAG program will also support risk management research, which is defined to include either: (1) research aimed primarily at reducing effects of specific biotechnology-derived agents; or (2) a policy and decision-making process that uses risk assessment data in deciding how to avoid or mitigate the consequences identified in a risk assessment.

Although project directors (PDs) are not required to perform actual risk assessments as part of the research they propose, they should design studies that will provide information useful to

regulators for making science-based decisions in their assessments of genetically engineered organisms. Accordingly, applicants are encouraged to address the following questions in their applications:

- What is the relevance of this research to the evaluation of transgenic organisms?
- What information will be provided by this research to help regulators adequately assess transgenic organisms?
- How does this research provide information or methods or model exposures useful in identifying and/or characterizing hazards associated with introducing genetically engineered organisms into the environment?

Applications to the BRAG program must address one (1) of the following program areas or seek partial funding for a conference that addresses science-based risk assessment or risk management of genetically engineered organisms released into the environment (Part I, C. for more detailed descriptions):

1. Research designed to identify and develop appropriate management practices to minimize physical and biological risks to the environment associated with genetically engineered animals, plants, and microorganisms;
2. Research designed to develop methods to monitor the dispersal of genetically engineered animals, plants, and microorganisms;
3. Research designed to further existing knowledge with respect to the characteristics, rates, and methods of gene transfer that may occur between genetically engineered animals, plants, and microorganisms, and related wild and agricultural organisms;
4. Environmental assessment research designed to provide analysis which compares the relative impacts of animals, plants, and microorganisms modified through genetic engineering to other types of production systems; or
5. Other areas of research designed to further the purposes of the BRAG program.

Awards will not be made for food safety risk assessment or risk management, human or domestic food animal health risk assessment or risk management, social or economic research, methods for seed storage, clinical trials, commercial product development, product marketing strategies, product stewardship, or other research deemed inappropriate to risk assessment or risk management relative to the environment.

C. Program Area Description

NIFA and ARS will competitively award research grants to support science-based biotechnology regulation, thereby helping to address concerns about the effects of introducing genetically engineered organisms into the environment and helping regulators to develop policies regarding such introduction. In addition, the BRAG program is accepting proposals seeking partial funding for a conference that addresses science-based risk assessment or risk management of genetically engineered organisms released into the environment.

Research Proposals

Proposals that address issues related to new and emerging genetically engineered organisms (e.g., trees and other perennials, including biofuel crops) are especially sought. Research proposals must address one (1) of the following five (5) program areas:

1. Research designed to identify and develop appropriate management practices to minimize physical and biological risks to the environment associated with genetically engineered animals, plants, and microorganisms. Potential areas of research include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Development of technology, or new deployment methods, to reduce the undesired spread of genetically engineered organisms into natural and managed environments, and to study the stability and efficacy of such methods in field environments;
- (b) Evaluation of confinement and monitoring methodologies for field trials of genetically engineered organisms;
- (c) Development, assessment, and validation of management methodologies that facilitate co-existence of genetically engineered and non-genetically engineered crops;
- (d) Assessing the potential for environmental exposure from genetically engineered imports for food, feed or processing;
- (e) Assessing the effects and effectiveness of reproductive or breeding containment strategies such as sterilization or mono-sexing transgenic animals;
- (f) Mitigation measures to limit gene introgression when transgenic animals are released or escape into the environment, physical containment fails, and biological containment is unavailable;
- (g) Modeling of assessment and management strategies, including models that identify parameters that influence gene dispersal and the consequences of transgene or transgenic organism escape into the environment. Model development should include validation and testing of the model's robustness and predicted outcomes over large temporal-spatial scales and different genetic backgrounds.

2. Research designed to develop methods to monitor the dispersal of genetically engineered animals, plants, and microorganisms. Potential areas of research include, but are not limited to:

(a) Assessing the effects of transgene(s) in engineered animal species that may easily spread such as birds, aquatic species, arthropods and other invertebrates. This area includes studies of transgene stability over multiple generations; comparative mating competence or reproductive studies; juvenile and adult viability studies; and comparative behavior and biology studies, including studies addressing whether engineering alters host range or ecological interactions;

(b) Survivability profiles and/or fitness of transgenic organisms in the wild; and

(c) Strategies for large-scale deployment or field studies of genetically engineered organisms with special reference to those considerations that may not be revealed through small-scale evaluations and tests.

3. Research designed to further existing knowledge with respect to the characteristics, rates, and methods of gene transfer that may occur between genetically engineered animals, plants, and microorganisms, and related wild and agricultural organisms. Potential areas of research include, but are not limited to:

(a) Impacts of gene flow from transgenic crops, insects, animals, or microorganisms to related organisms, communities, or ecosystems. Gene flow research should be directed to organisms with a high potential for outcrossing to sexually compatible crop species, gene flow to feral or wild relatives, or for gene introgression (e.g., those species with high rates of outcrossing) and to genes that have a high potential for altering the fitness of the recipient organism for its environment. With regard to plants, preference will be given to studies with species that have sexually compatible wild relatives in the United States;

(b) Fate and stability (persistence) of transgenes that have been introduced by outcrossing into populations of non-transgenic organisms, and the degree to which they confer a selective advantage or disadvantage upon the carriers, especially with regard to transgenes that confer enhanced growth or abiotic stress tolerance;

(c) Measuring impact of transgene placement (nuclear or cytoplasmic) on the transfer and introgression of transgenes into wild and feral plants, animals, or fungi especially as a means of confinement;

(d) Development of effective genetic containment strategies, and evaluation of the efficacy of genetic techniques, to prevent gene transfer or outcrossing; and

(e) Assessing the influence of genetic background on the expression of and phenotypes conferred by regulatory genes.

4. Environmental assessment research designed to provide analysis which compares the relative impacts of animals, plants, and microorganisms modified through genetic engineering to other types of production systems. Potential areas of research include, but are not limited to:

(a) Elucidation of the influence of genetically-engineered crops on ecosystem function including bioenergy crops and other crops engineered for pharmaceutical/industrial production, agronomic trait enhancement, pest resistance, herbicide tolerance, etc.;

(b) Landscape level studies of the environmental impacts of land use changes enabled by genetic engineering of biofuel crops;

(c) Assessment of the relative impacts of agricultural or forest management systems, using transgenic versus non-transgenic organisms, on community structures of agro- or forest ecosystems; (Important focus areas are the presence and function of various types of beneficial organisms; defining the magnitude of changes in indicator species or communities that should trigger concerns regarding ecosystem impacts; and how the biology and ecology of indicator taxa are influenced by geography, seasonal fluctuations, crop species, etc.);

(d) Documentation of significant off-site community or ecosystem effects that are not revealed by studies on small plots (including both beneficial and detrimental effects), such as altered land use practices or other aspects of human ecology, species displacement, soil erosion, effects on water quality, or other geographically dispersed events. The intent is to learn how the introduction of transgenic organisms alters the impact of agriculture on the rural environment. There is a need to identify appropriate sample size, plot size, study duration, and positive and negative controls, (including consideration of specific pesticides in conventional agronomic practices, untreated control plots, or organic production systems);

(e) Comparative management techniques and resources required for maintenance of non-transgenic animals versus transgenic animals (e.g., changes in land use or manure management practices required for transgenic animals engineered to utilize feed more efficiently);

(f) Comparative assessment of environmental and economic costs and benefits of agricultural production systems involving plant, animal or microbial biotechnology. Appropriate parameters or metrics are to include, but are not limited to: community structure; fertilizer, pesticide and soil amendment inputs; non-target impacts; reduction in toxicants and pesticide residues; prevalence and distribution of herbicide tolerant weeds; soil health; and land use related to yield and productivity. Comparisons to production systems using conventional or organic production methods must be part of the proposed study;

(g) Assessment of the impacts of genetic engineering or plant-pest interactions, including impacts on the crops themselves and on plant pest populations; and

(h) Development and/or evaluation of tools for assessing weediness or invasiveness of genetically engineered plants relative to unmodified parent organisms.

5. Other areas of research designed to further the purposes of the BRAG Program. Potential areas of research include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Comparative assessment of the effects of genetically engineered plants with single vs. stacked or pyramided resistance genes or multiple genes that confer broad resistance to insects or diseases. Research focus areas include: the impact of gene stacking on non-target species; the effects of stacked genes on pest populations; and ecological significance and practices needed to address weedy hosts with pest complexes sufficiently variable as to require broad resistance or stacked genes for their control. Proposals on pest resistance management are not excluded from the program, but any such proposals submitted should describe a clear and significant connection with biotechnology risk assessment/management:
- (b) Development of environmental risk assessment methodologies for genetically engineered organisms when there is little baseline data on the unmodified parent organism;
- (c) Assessment of the potential for non-target effects of RNA interference transgenes; and
- (d) Studies on the basic biology and ecology of perennial species, including biofuel crops, that are the subject of genetic engineering efforts, including, e.g., persistence, dormancy, and other fitness characteristics; gene flow; ecosystem interactions and potential ecosystem changes when grown in new settings; and ecological effects of technologies for reducing the undesired spread of genetically engineered organisms.

Priority Area Proposals

The BRAG program will consider the award of a single grant in biotechnology risk assessment research not to exceed \$1 million. Such a project would apply trans-disciplinary and, where appropriate, multi-state and multi-institutional approaches to provide viable solutions to the highest priority issues in biotechnology risk assessment research. An aim of a priority award under the BRAG program is to encourage maximum flexibility in biotechnology risk assessment and risk management. The research team for a priority grant should be comprised of members working in discovery and learning to conduct trans-disciplinary research in an emerging or priority area in biotechnology risk assessment research.

Areas of interest to the BRAG program for a priority grant are the following:

- 1) There is ongoing debate concerning whether a) transformation-associated mutagenesis (including both insertion site specific and non-insertion site specific mutagenesis) is comparable to mutagenesis that occurs with other modern plant breeding techniques, and b) whether the selection methods used in genetic engineering to eliminate undesired traits that could cause environmental harm are comparable to those used in other modern plant breeding approaches. Experimental research projects that generate comparative data which directly addresses this debate are desired. Funded research projects must be conducted in a commercially significant crop species, and must be designed to obtain, analyze, and compare data concerning the types, frequencies, distribution, origins, and

types of genomic and phenotypic impacts caused by mutations generated by a) one (1) or more widely used genetic engineering techniques, and b) one (1) or more other mutation-generating plant breeding techniques (e.g., irradiation or chemical mutagenesis, somatic cell culture and clonal propagation, ploidy alterations, wide interspecies crosses, induced chromosomal translocation). Funded research must also identify, examine, and compare breeding approaches used in genetic engineering to those used in other modern plant breeding techniques in terms of their effectiveness in eliminating unintended mutations and undesired phenotypes. Experimental design must include molecular characterization and must be adequate to generate statistically significant results.

2) Identification and experimental assessment of potential environmental impacts of large scale growth of genetically engineered plants, with emphasis on perennial species (e.g., a tree or grass), to support the development of a risk assessment framework. Project must address multiple BRAG topic areas, preferentially chosen from among the following:

- Weediness or invasiveness of the genetically engineered (GE) organism
- Strategies for conducting large scale field studies
- Impacts on ecosystem function and services
- Landscape level studies of impacts of land use changes
- Assessment and documentation of significant community or ecosystem effects not revealed by studies on small plots, such as effects on community structure, species displacement, soil health, hydrology, water quality, fertilizer, pesticide, and soil amendment inputs, toxicant and pesticide residue levels
- Assessment of the likelihood and impact of gene flow to related organisms under various management strategies
- Basic biology and ecology of the species.

Conference Proposals

Applicants to the BRAG program may request partial funding to organize a conference that brings together scientists, regulators, and other stakeholders to review the science-based data relevant to science-based risk assessment or risk management of genetically engineered organisms released into the environment. To be eligible for funding, the steering committee for the proposed conference should include representatives from a variety of relevant scientific disciplines, such as ecology, population biology, pathology, production and resource management science, as well as educators, extension specialists and others, as appropriate.

BRAG conference applications should: 1) describe the relevance of the proposed conference to agricultural biotechnology risk assessment and/or risk management in the United States, 2) explain the uniqueness and timeliness of the conference, 3) outline the qualifications of the organizing committee and the appropriateness of the invited speakers to the topic areas to be covered, 4) state clearly the goals of the conference and the likely outcomes, 5) explain the need for the various elements of the budget, and 6) describe the means by which the organizers will

make up the total costs of the conference from other sources.

The goals for the conference should include sharing of scientific information and identification of gaps in knowledge, and/or public education and outreach, among others. Publication of the proceedings will be required. **In FY 2010, the BRAG program will fund a maximum of two (2) awards for conferences. Each conference award will be limited to a maximum of \$20,000 (total costs).**

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 \$4.0 million is available to fund applications in FY 2010.

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 http://www.nifa.usda.gov/business/method_of_payment.html.

B. Types of Applications

In FY 2010, applications may be submitted to the BRAG Program as one (1) of the following four (4) types of requests:

- 1. New application.** This is a project application that has not been previously submitted to the BRAG 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.
- 3. Resubmitted application.** This is an application that had previously been submitted to the BRAG Program but not funded. Project Directors (PDs) must respond to the previous review panel summary (see Response to Previous Review, Part IV). Resubmitted 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.
- 4. Resubmitted renewal application.** This is a project application that requests additional funding for a project beyond the period that was approved in the original award. In addition, this is an application that had previously been submitted for renewal to the BRAG Program but not funded. Therefore, PDs must provide a Progress Report as required under the Project Narrative, Part IV, and must respond to the previous review panel summary as required under Response to Previous Review, Part IV. Resubmitted renewal applications must be received by the relevant due dates, will be evaluated in competition with other pending applications in appropriate areas to which they are assigned, and will be reviewed according to the same evaluation criteria as new applications.

C. Project Types

Regular research proposals submitted to the BRAG program should be limited to a total budget of \$400,000 (including indirect costs) for 2-5 years of support. Proposals on the priority areas of transformation-associated mutagenesis or environmental impacts of large-scale planting submitted to the BRAG program should not exceed \$1 million. Proposals requesting more than \$400,000 for a regular proposal and more than \$1million for a priority proposal will be at risk of being excluded from NIFA review. Funds awarded will not exceed \$400,000 for regular research proposals or \$1 million for priority proposals. Project periods cannot exceed five (5) years, the statutory time limit. Conference proposal requests should be limited to a total budget of \$20,000.

The BRAG program will not support applications for Postdoctoral Fellowships.

PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

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

B. Cost Sharing or Matching

NIFA does not require matching support for this program. Applications shall be peer reviewed and selected for funding without regard to matching resources.

PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. Electronic Application Package

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

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

The steps to access application materials are as follows:

1. In order to access, complete and submit applications, applicants must download and install a version of Adobe Reader compatible with Grants.gov. This software is essential to apply for NIFA Federal assistance awards. For basic system requirements and download instructions, please see http://www.grants.gov/help/download_software.jsp. To verify that you have a compatible version of Adobe Reader, Grants.gov established a test package that will assist you in making that determination. Grants.gov Adobe Versioning Test Package: <http://www.grants.gov/applicants/AdobeVersioningTestOnly.jsp>.
2. The application package must be obtained via Grants.gov, go to <http://www.grants.gov>, click on “Apply for Grants” in the left-hand column, click on “**Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package and Instructions,**” enter the funding opportunity number **USDA-NIFA-BRAP-002896** in the appropriate box and click “Download Package.” From the search results, click “Download” to access the application package.

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

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

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

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

B. Content and Form of Application Submission

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

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

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

1. SF 424 R&R Cover Sheet

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

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

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

3. R&R Other Project Information Form

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

- a. Field 7. Project Summary/Abstract. The summary should also include the relevance of the project to the goals of the BRAG program.
- b. Field 8. Project Narrative.

PLEASE NOTE: The Project Narrative shall not exceed eighteen (18) pages of written text including figures and tables regardless of whether it is single or double spaced. Use an easily readable font face (e.g., Geneva, Helvetica, Times New Roman). This maximum has been established to ensure fair and equitable competition. The Project Narrative must include all of the following:

- (1) Introduction. A clear statement of the long-term goals and supporting objectives of the proposed project should preface the project description. The most significant published work in

the field under consideration, including the work of key project personnel on the current application, should be reviewed. The current status of research in the particular scientific field also should be described.

(2) Progress report. Renewal applications and resubmitted renewal applications (as described in Part II, B.) should include a clearly marked performance report describing results to date from the previous award. This section should contain the following information: (1) a comparison of actual accomplishments with the goals established for the previous award; (2) the reasons established goals were not met, if applicable; and (3) a listing of any publications resulting from the previous award. Copies of reprints or preprints may be included in the Appendices to Project Narrative (see item 3.d. of this section) portion of the submission.

(3) Rationale and significance. Present concisely the rationale for the proposed project. The project's specific relationship and relevance to the program area in which an application is submitted (see Part I, C.) and its specific relationship and relevance to potential regulatory issues of United States biotechnology research should be shown clearly. Any novel ideas or contributions that the proposed project offers should also be discussed in this section.

(4) Experimental plan. The hypotheses or questions being asked and the methodology to be applied to the proposed project should be stated explicitly. Specifically, this section must include: (1) a description of the investigations and/or experiments proposed and the sequence in which the investigations or experiments are to be performed; (2) techniques to be used in carrying out the proposed project, including the feasibility of the techniques; (3) results expected; (4) means by which experimental data will be analyzed or interpreted; (5) pitfalls that may be encountered; (6) limitations to proposed procedures; and (7) tentative schedule for conducting major steps involved in these investigations and/or experiments.

In the experimental plan, the applicant must explain fully any materials, procedures, situations, or activities that may be hazardous to personnel (whether or not they are directly related to a particular phase of the proposed project), along with an outline of precautions to be exercised to avoid or mitigate the effects of such hazards.

c. Field 9. Bibliography & References Cited. All work cited, including that of key personnel, should be referenced in this section of the application.

d. Field 12. Other Attachments:

(1) Response to Previous Review. This requirement only applies to "Resubmitted Applications" and "Resubmitted Renewal Applications" as described in Part II, B. PDs must respond to the previous review panel summary on no more than one (1) page, titled "RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS REVIEW."

(2) Cooperation and Institutional Units Involved. Cooperative, multi-institutional and multidisciplinary applications are encouraged. Where applicable, identify each institutional unit

contributing to the project and designate the lead institution or institutional unit. Clearly define the programmatic roles, responsibilities and budget for each institutional partner.

(3) Appendices to Project Narrative. Appendices to the Project Narrative are allowed if they are directly germane to the proposed project. The addition of appendices should not be used to circumvent the text and/or figures and tables page limitations.

(4) Collaborative Arrangements. If it will be necessary to enter into formal consulting or collaborative arrangements with others, such arrangements should be fully explained and justified. If the consultants or collaborators are known at the time of application, a vitae or resume and Statement of Work (SOW) should be provided. In addition, evidence (e.g., letter of support) should be provided that the collaborators involved have agreed to render these services. The applicant also will be required to provide additional information on consultants and collaborators in the budget portion of the application.

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.

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.

Matching. NIFA does not require matching support for this program and matching resources will not be factored into the review process as evaluation criteria.

7. Supplemental Information Form

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

a. Field 2. Program Code. Enter the program code name “**Biotechnology Risk Assessment**” and the program code “**HX**”.

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 in Grants.gov by **Wednesday, March 17, 2010 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time)**. Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding.

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

If the AR has not received correspondence **from NIFA** regarding a submitted application within 15 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

The use of grant funds to plan, acquire, or construct a building or facility is not allowed under this program. With prior approval, and in accordance with the cost principles set forth in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-21, (codified at 2 CFR 220), some grant funds may be used for minor alterations, renovations, or repairs deemed necessary to retrofit existing teaching or research spaces in order to carry out a funded project. However, requests to use grant funds for such purposes must demonstrate that the alterations, renovations, or repairs are essential to achieving the major purpose of the project. Grant funds may not be used for endowment investing.

Section 7132 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, amended the National Agriculture Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3310(a)), limiting indirect costs to 22 percent of the total Federal funds provided under each award. Therefore, when preparing budgets, applicants should limit their requests for recovery of indirect costs to the lesser of their institution's official negotiated indirect cost rate or the equivalent of 22 percent of total Federal funds awarded.

E. Other Submission Requirements

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

Described below are the requirements for successful submission of an application. All of the following steps must be met for an application to be considered for peer review:

- 1) Meeting the deadline: To electronically send the application to Grants.gov the submit button is hit, which triggers a date and time stamp on the application. The date and time stamp is used to determine whether the application was received by Grants.gov before the deadline, which is prior to close of business (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time) on Wednesday, March 17, 2010. An application submitted or resubmitted after the deadline is late. Consideration of late applications is only given in extenuating circumstances (e.g., natural disasters, confirmed Grants.gov outage) with proper documentation and support of the

Agency Contact (see Part VII). The occurrence of one of these situations does not automatically ensure that a late application will be accepted. If an applicant wants a late application considered under an extenuating circumstance, the applicant should contact the Agency Contact accordingly.

- 2) Successful Grants.gov validation: The Grants.gov system performs a limited check of the application, and applicants are notified by Grants.gov of the outcome of the initial review. Applications meeting Grants.gov requirements are made available to the funding agency for further processing. Applications that fail Grants.gov validation may be resubmitted to Grants.gov if the original agency deadline has not passed. (Note that the Grants.gov system may allow applications to be submitted after the deadline has passed, but the application is considered late by NIFA.)
- 3) Successful Agency validation: NIFA staff perform precursory review of the application. The agency validation process includes, for example, meeting eligibility requirements and following agency application guidelines (e.g., formatting, page limitations, limits on budget requests). Applicants are notified by NIFA of the outcome of this review.

PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

A. General

Each application will be evaluated in a 2-part process. First, each application will be screened to ensure that it meets the administrative requirements as set forth in this RFA. Second, applications that meet these requirements will be technically evaluated by a review panel.

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 identified in [7 CFR 3415.15](#) (see below) will be used to review all applications submitted in response to this RFA except applications that seek funding for conferences.

Criteria for Evaluating Research Applications (including Priority Area Proposals):

1. Scientific merit of the proposal.

- Conceptual adequacy of hypothesis;
- Clarity and delineation of objectives;
- Adequacy of the description of the undertaking and suitability and feasibility of methodology;
- Demonstration of feasibility through preliminary data;
- Probability of success of project;
- Novelty, uniqueness and originality; and
- Appropriateness to regulation of biotechnology and risk assessment.

2. Qualifications of proposed project personnel and adequacy of facilities.

- Training and demonstrated awareness of previous and alternative approaches to the problem identified in the proposal, and performance record and/or potential for future accomplishments;
- Time allocated for systematic attainment of objectives;
- Institutional experience and competence in subject area; and
- Adequacy of available or obtainable support personnel, facilities, and instrumentation.

3. Relevance of project to solving biotechnology regulatory uncertainty for United States agriculture.

- Scientific contribution of research in leading to important discoveries or significant breakthroughs in announced program areas; and
- Relevance of the risk assessment research to agriculture and environmental regulations.

Criteria for Evaluating Scientific Research Conferences:

1. Relevance and timeliness of topics and selection of appropriate speakers;
2. General format of the conference, especially with regard to its appropriateness for fostering scientific exchange and/or public understanding;
3. Provisions for wide participation from the scientific and regulatory community and others, as appropriate;
4. Qualifications of the organizing committee;
5. Appropriateness of the budget requested; and
6. Qualifications of project personnel.

C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality

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

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

D. Organizational Management Information

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

benefits under this program (e.g., debarment or suspension of an individual involved or a determination that an applicant is not responsible based on submitted organizational management information).

PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION

A. General

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

B. Award Notice

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

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

(10) Approved budget plan for categorizing allocable project funds to accomplish the stated purpose of the award; and

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

C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

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

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 (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).

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—Governmentwide Requirements for Drug Free Workplace (Financial Assistance).

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

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

7 CFR 3415, Biotechnology Risk Assessment Research Grants Program.

7 CFR 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

1. Expected Program Outputs

Project Directors are expected to participate in a one (1)- to two (2)-day project directors conference in the metropolitan Washington, DC, area. An oral briefing for representatives of a regulatory agency may be scheduled during this time. Reasonable travel expenses may be claimed as part of the project budget.

2. Reporting Requirements

For informational purposes, the “Federal Financial Report,” Form SF-425, consolidated into a single report the former Financial Status Report (SF-269 and SF-269A) and the Federal Cash Transactions Report (SF-272 and SF-272A). The [NIFA Agency-specific Terms and Conditions](#) include the requirement that Form SF-425 is due on a **quarterly basis no later than 30 days following the end of each reporting period. A final “Federal Financial Report,” Form SF-425, is due 90 days after the expiration date of this award.**

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

Any additional reporting requirements will be identified in the terms and conditions of the award (see Part VI, B.9. for a link to view the NIFA award terms and conditions).

PART VII—AGENCY CONTACTS

Applicants and other interested parties are encouraged to contact the following individuals:

Dr. Shing F. Kwok, National Program Leader, National Institute of Food and Agriculture; U.S. Department of Agriculture; STOP 2241; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2241; telephone: (202) 401-6060; fax: (202) 401-6071 e-mail: skwok@nifa.usda.gov;

Dr. Mark Mirando, Program Leader, National Institute of Food and Agriculture; U.S. Department of Agriculture; STOP 2241; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2241; telephone: (202) 401-4336; fax: (202) 401-6071; e-mail mmirando@nifa.usda.gov;

or

Dr. Jack Okamuro; National Program Leader, Crop Production and Protection; Agricultural Research Service; U.S. Department of Agriculture; George Washington Carver Center, Room 4-2220; 5601 Sunnyside Avenue; Beltsville, MD 20705-5139; telephone: (301) 504-5912; mobile: (202) 285-9520; e-mail: jack.okamuro@ars.usda.gov.

PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION

A. Access to Review Information

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

B. Use of Funds; Changes

1. Delegation of Fiscal Responsibility

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

2. Changes in Project Plans

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

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

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

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

e. The project period may be extended by NIFA without additional financial support, for such additional period(s) as the ADO determines may be necessary to complete or fulfill the purposes of an approved project, but in no case shall the total project period exceed five (5) years. Any extension of time shall be conditioned upon prior request by the awardee and approval in writing by the ADO, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of award.

f. Changes in Approved Budget: Unless stated otherwise in the terms and conditions of award, changes in an approved budget must be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the

ADO prior to instituting such changes if the revision will involve transfers or expenditures of amounts requiring prior approval as set forth in the applicable Federal cost principles, Departmental regulations, or award.

C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards

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

D. Regulatory Information

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

E. Definitions

Please refer to [7 CFR 3415, Biotechnology Risk Assessment Research Grants Program](#), and [7 CFR 3430, Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-formula Grant Programs--General Grant Administrative Provisions](#), for the applicable definitions for this NIFA grant program. If a conflict exists between these regulations, the language in 7 CFR 3415 is overriding.

Electronic Application Checklist

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

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

- Are you eligible to apply for the funding offered in the RFA?**
Eligibility information for each funding opportunity is stated in Part III, Eligibility Information, of each RFA.
- Has your institution properly registered with Grants.gov to enable you to submit an application?**
Those who wish to submit an application to NIFA should first contact their Authorized Representative (AR) to determine if the organization is prepared to submit applications through Grants.gov. See http://www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp for steps to preparing to submit applications through Grants.gov.
- Are you applying to the correct funding opportunity associated with the RFA?**
Field 1 of the NIFA Supplemental Information Form will pre-populate to indicate the program to which you are applying.
- Have you followed the guidelines for filling out your electronic application provided in the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide, which is posted along with the SF 424 R&R application package on Grants.gov?**
Electronic applications should be prepared according to this guide and the specific program RFA. This guide is part of the corresponding electronic application package for the specific program to which you are applying.
- Have all attachments been submitted in the portable document format (PDF)?**
NIFA requires attachments to be in PDF. See Part III of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide.
- Do all submitted PDF documents have one (1)-inch margins and are typed or word processed using no type smaller than 12 point regardless of line spacing? 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 may not be reviewed.
- Did you use the “Check Package for Errors” feature (see Part IV section 1.8 of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide)?**
- Have all required components of the SF 424 Research and Related (R&R) Application Package posted under the funding opportunity on Grants.gov been completed?**

SF 424 R&R Cover Sheet

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

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

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

R&R Other Project Information

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

Project Summary/Abstract

- Has the Project Summary PDF been attached to this form in Field 7?
- 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?
- Does this section adhere to the format and page limitations?
- Did you use the suggested Project Summary/Abstract Template found at:
http://www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/templates/project_summary.doc?

Project Narrative

- Has the Project Narrative PDF been attached to this form in Field 8?
- Was a progress report included, if submitting a renewal, or resubmitted renewal?
- Is the project fully described?
- Does this section adhere to the format and page limitations?

Bibliography & References Cited

- Has the Bibliography & References Cited PDF been attached to this form in Field 9?
- 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 10?
- 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 11?
- Is the description of your equipment sufficient to indicate that you will be able to carry out this project?

Response to Previous Review (for resubmitted and resubmitted renewal applications)

- Has the Response to Previous Review PDF been included as indicated in the RFA?
- Has the application been clearly and meaningfully revised and are the revisions briefly described?
- Are comments from the previous review addressed?

Appendices to Project Description

- Has the Appendices to Project Description PDF been attached to this form in Field 12?

Collaborative Arrangements

- Has the Collaborative Arrangements PDF been attached to this form in Field 12?

R&R Senior/Key Person Profile

Biographical Sketch

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

Current and Pending Support

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

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

Budget Justification

- Has the Budget Justification PDF been attached to this form in Field K?
- Are budget items individually justified?
- For multi-institutional applications, has a subaward budget justification been included for each institution involved?
- Have you clearly indicated funds requested to attend a Project Director's Workshop?

NIFA Supplemental Information Form

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

Conflict of Interest List

- Has the Conflict of Interest List PDF been attached to this form in Field 8?
- Has a Conflict of Interest List been provided for all individuals who have submitted a Biographical Sketch?
- Did you use the suggested Conflict of Interest Template found at:
http://www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/templates/conflict_of_interest.doc?
- Does the Conflict of Interest list include the four (4) categories as appropriate?