

Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program

FY 2012 Request for Applications

APPLICATION DEADLINE: June 26, 2012

The only modification to this request for applications is to extend the due date of the application submission.

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

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

**EXTENSION INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT COORDINATION AND
SUPPORT PROGRAM**

INITIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE: This program is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under **10.500**.

DATES: Applications must be received by close of business (COB) on **June 26, 2012 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time)**. Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding. Comments regarding this request for applications (RFA) are requested within six months from the issuance of this notice. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

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

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

In addition, four formal stakeholder input sessions are scheduled between March 29, 2012 and May 1, 2012. These opportunities for input will include both face-to-face sessions and webinar/conference call formats. Face-to-face sessions have been scheduled to be held March 29 in Memphis, TN and April 16 in Washington, DC. Webinar teleconferences will be held on April 11 and May 1, 2012. The comments gathered at these sessions and from written comments will provide direction for the RFA or RFAs associated with the newly proposed Crop Protection program which will encompass the functions of this program as well as several other Integrated Pest Management (IPM) related programs offered by NIFA. Listening session details are posted on the NIFA website.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: NIFA anticipates the availability of approximately \$330,000 to be awarded through this RFA for the EIPM-CS program in fiscal year (FY) 2012. The remaining \$8.5 million from the appropriation will be awarded through continuation awards for projects that competed in FY 2010 and FY 2011. Any institution that received a new or continuation award in FY 2011 is not eligible for a new *COORDINATION* award from EIPM-CS in FY 2012 (52 institutions received awards in FY 2011). Successful proposals will demonstrate effective efforts by extension educators and implementation of IPM practices by end users, and will provide measurements of those successes. This program provides funding for two components of extension integrated pest management, *COORDINATION* and *SUPPORT*. Each of the funding opportunities within the EIPM-CS program assist state and local contributions in advancing the goals of the National Roadmap for Integrated Pest Management (IPM) (www.nifa.usda.gov/nea/pest/in_focus/ipm_if_roadmap.html) by addressing priority needs associated with the coordination, design, development, implementation, and evaluation of extension IPM programs. *SUPPORT* projects should also advance regional issues of shared importance. The available \$330,000 will be distributed among the highest ranked EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* and *SUPPORT* projects.

Through training, EIPM-CS projects help pest managers gain confidence in alternative pest management practices. All EIPM-CS efforts are intended to contribute to the achievement of national IPM goals through the demonstration and evaluation of IPM practices in production agriculture and other settings. Awards are intended to provide funding for programs that strengthen the ability of NIFA and its partner institutions to actively address local, state, and national IPM needs delivered through the Cooperative Extension Service and rapidly respond to new issues and opportunities.

In FY 2012, eligibility for *COORDINATION* awards is limited to the 1890 land-grant institutions (except for Florida A&M University, which received a continuation award in FY 2011) and the U.S. territories (except for the University of Puerto Rico, which received a new award in FY 2011). New *COORDINATION* awards will only be of the development type in 2012 and will be limited to one year project duration.

In FY 2012, *SUPPORT* projects within EIPM – CS will advance the goals of the National Roadmap for IPM (nifa.usda.gov/nea/pest/in_focus/ipm_if_roadmap.html) by funding the development of extension multi-state IPM working groups addressing issues relevant to small farms or underserved audiences; and development of Extension responses to critical IPM issues (fully defined Part I.C.). In FY 2012, NIFA anticipates making one extension multi-state IPM working group award and up to four critical IPM issue awards.

This notice identifies the objectives for EIPM-CS proposals, the eligibility criteria for programs and applicants, and the application forms and associated instructions needed to apply for an EIPM-CS award.

Table of Contents

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION..... 5
A. Legislative Authority and Background..... 5
B. Purpose and Priorities 5
C. Project Types..... 7

PART II—AWARD INFORMATION 13
A. Available Funding..... 13
B. Types of Applications 13
C. Project Types..... 13

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
c. Submission Dates and Times..... 21
D. Funding Restrictions..... 21
E. Other Submission Requirements..... 21

PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS 22
A. General..... 22
B. Evaluation Criteria 22
C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality..... 25
D. Organizational Management Information..... 25

PART VI—AWARD ADMINISTRATION..... 27
A. General..... 27
B. Award Notice 27
C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements..... 28
D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements 29

PART VII—AGENCY CONTACT 30

PART VIII—OTHER INFORMATION..... 31
A. Access to Review Information..... 31
B. Use of Funds; Changes 31
C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards..... 32
D. Regulatory Information..... 32
E. Definitions..... 32

PART I—FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Legislative Authority and Background

Section 7403 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246) (FCEA) amended Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(d) to provide the opportunity for 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, and the University of the District of Columbia to compete for and receive these funds. The Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program (EIPM – CS) is among the extension programs funded under this authority.

Background – Stakeholder Input

Since the initiation of this competitive program in FY 2009, stakeholders have been consulted and their guidance has been incorporated into the design and structure of the program. The current RFA incorporates elements of stakeholder feedback from listening sessions that were held in October 2008 and March 2009. Additionally, written comments were submitted and have been considered in the development of the program to this point. We continue to accept input in this evolving program.

Stakeholders commented most frequently that there is great value in having a network of IPM programs across the U.S. states and territories and that funding for coordination and infrastructure is critical to maintaining broad program function and utility. Stakeholders and partners acknowledged that stakeholder involvement is important to program development and implementation by end users of the technology. As such, it was suggested that the program require enhanced stakeholder involvement and revised methods for peer review of proposals, giving additional consideration to the importance of stakeholder involvement. Furthermore, stakeholders acknowledged the value of collaboration. Stakeholders and partners encourage either a prioritization or requirement for collaboration between/among institutions. Stakeholders also made clear that base IPM program funding in the states is needed to leverage additional external funding. Continuity of IPM extension programs from one year to the next is a broad concern.

This FY 2012 RFA allows one *COORDINATION* development project application from each eligible institution that did NOT receive a new or continuation award in FY 2011. This RFA continues to encourage collaborations within and across state boundaries. *SUPPORT* program applications will be accepted from any eligible institution.

B. Purpose and Priorities

The primary elements of state extension IPM programs are to provide:

- A focal point for IPM team building, communication and stakeholder participation to build community and shared vision of the advantages of IPM implementation;

- Applied research and demonstration as a tool to grow knowledge, modify behavior, and change the mindset of IPM end users;
- Development, validation and implementation of predictive models and information management systems to provide decision support;
- Preparation of manuals and fact sheets delivered across multiple media to build knowledge for a broad and diverse audience;
- Training programs for agents, consultants, scouts, growers, and others to enhance understanding of pest management tactics and strategies;
- Technical assistance and trouble-shooting to build understanding in the moment when clients are most receptive to instruction; and
- Inventory of program outputs and evaluation of the impacts/outcomes in the early mid and long-term to advance the principles of IPM and its adoption.

EIPM-CS awards help agricultural producers and other pest managers gain confidence in alternative pest management practices through training, demonstration, and evaluation of methods and strategies. These efforts will contribute to the achievement of national IPM goals. A strong NIFA/land-grant university partnership will enable EIPM–CS to address pest management challenges on an appropriate scale – from county level to multi-state production regions. Within that framework, *COORDINATION* projects teach/train more broadly and encourage implementation of IPM principles while *SUPPORT* projects respond to specific, often emerging, needs or may develop/adapt new tools for use in IPM implementation programs.

Applications should describe how the requested program funds will be used for a range of state-based extension activities that reinforce national IPM goals. The EIPM–CS Program assures that IPM is a component of Cooperative Extension programs at as many eligible institutions as possible, provided the peer review panel ranks the proposal in a fundable category. IPM has been promoted for many years, but there is an ongoing need to keep its varied and evolving practices in front of potential users to increase the likelihood of building sustainable pest management systems as stated in the National Road Map for IPM (www.nifa.usda.gov/nea/pest/in_focus/ipm_if_roadmap.html). The IPM road map was developed by several federal agencies in collaboration with partners in the public and private sectors to provide a strategic plan for federal investments in IPM programs. This document, created in 2004, serves as the guide for IPM implementation nationwide. The IPM road map establishes the future direction for IPM within the context of:

1. Improving cost benefit analyses through the adoption of IPM practices;
2. Reducing potential human health risks from pests and related pest management practices; and
3. Minimizing adverse environmental effects from pests and related pest management practices.

While the road map identifies three focus areas for IPM implementation (production agriculture, natural resources and recreational environments, and residential and public areas), the authors acknowledge that IPM is useful and desirable in other situations. This RFA uses broader areas of programming emphasis within the basic structure provided in the road map. To simplify, the principles of IPM assure that neither the pest nor the management practices for that pest detract from our quality of life. IPM is an approach that encompasses many disciplines in the

management of vertebrate and arthropod pests, plant diseases, and weeds in all environments and in all pest related disciplines. All applicants to EIPM-CS must recognize that this is a Cooperative Extension program and as such does not directly create knowledge through foundational research, but disseminates knowledge to users beyond the traditional classroom through both classical and creative delivery methods and assesses program outcomes in a trans-disciplinary (see definitions, Part VIII, E.) manner.

Applicants for EIPM-CS grants, both *COORDINATION* and *SUPPORT*, must describe how the project will fit an overall IPM program. Tools should address specific needs, emerging problems, new focus areas, underserved audiences, and other new needs. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the new product or program should be a part of the plan.

The EIPM-CS program strongly encourages applicants to develop partnerships that include collaboration with: (1) small- or mid-sized, accredited colleges and universities; and/or (2) 1994 land-grant institutions, Hispanic-serving institutions, and/or other institutions that serve high-risk, under-served, or hard-to-reach audiences or international partnerships, linkages, and exchanges that contribute to solving alternative pest management practices through training, demonstration, and evaluation of methods and strategies in the United States.

C. Project Types

In this FY 2012 EIPM-CS RFA, NIFA announces two distinct project types (funding opportunities):

1. ***COORDINATION*** proposals should focus on the creation/enhancement of a program of extension IPM activities that will identify stakeholder needs, providing the basis for defining needs for possible coordination activities and competitiveness in future IPM grant programs.
2. ***SUPPORT*** proposals should address a specific need identified in section two of this subpart.

PLEASE NOTE: IN FY 2012, EACH ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION MAY SUBMIT ONLY ONE COORDINATION APPLICATION. HOWEVER, MULTIPLE SUPPORT APPLICATIONS WILL BE ACCEPTED FROM ANY ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.

1. **EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* PROGRAMS – Administer basic functions of institutional extension IPM programs.**

Program Code – QQIPM

Proposed Budget Requests –

- Standard Grants (see Part II, B. Types of Applications) for *COORDINATION* development must not exceed \$50,000 per year with a 12-month duration. NIFA anticipates making two to four awards in FY 2012.
- Only *COORDINATION* development applications will be accepted in FY 2012.
- Requests exceeding the budgetary guidelines of \$50,000 for one year will not be reviewed.

Each application must include a letter from the Extension Director/Extension Administrator authorizing the application as the official application of the institution, or the application must be submitted directly by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator. Applications that do not comply with this requirement will not be considered for funding. Submission of multiple *COORDINATION* applications by a single institution may result in the disqualification of all applications submitted by that institution.

COORDINATION programs are overarching programs that link multiple specific IPM projects at the institution. Coordination development awards give institutions that do not currently have a coordination program an opportunity to design a program that encompasses an appropriate scope of coordination activities (see below) most suited to the capacity of the institution to address identified stakeholder needs. A *COORDINATION* development application should consider how the elements of a *COORDINATION* program would benefit their audience. The application should define the needs of targeted stakeholder communities. *COORDINATION* development applications must designate an Extension IPM coordinator(s) and communicate an understanding of extension IPM and how involving all appropriate disciplines will ultimately result in more effective IPM.

IPM *COORDINATION* Program Development Awards. *COORDINATION* development awards will be made to eligible institutions that are in the early stages of IPM program development or redevelopment. Applications will only be accepted from eligible institutions that did not receive EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* funding in FY 2011. Successful applications must propose a development plan that could lead to a robust coordination program in the future. This type of award allows the institution to plan how an IPM coordination program would work at their institution and provides an opportunity to initiate some of the functions that characterize coordination programs at land-grant institutions. The successful applicant will use this award to define the components of the program for full implementation if funded in a future coordination program. During the one year development period, award recipients will engage with stakeholder panels, conduct an assessment of IPM needs, gather preliminary data, and define appropriate coordination activities and activities for a future IPM coordination program.

Coordination development awards will run for one year and provide institutions an opportunity to develop program goals and identify institutional strengths, placing them in a stronger position to launch a full IPM program. **Please Note:** Recipients of IPM *COORDINATION* development awards in FY 2013 will not be considered for awards in the development category in the future. However, recipients of development awards will be better positioned to apply for funding for coordination in other IPM programs upon expiration of this award. *Applicants are encouraged to contact the program director if they have questions about appropriateness of activities planned in development grants for future IPM program awards.*

In preparation for future IPM coordination opportunities, applicants should consider the need and content of future projects. Applications for a coordination program award might include the following components:

- a. Program Coordination/Administration.
- b. Primary coordination activities might include major program emphases in areas such as IPM implementation in agronomic crops, animal agriculture, communities and urban settings or in specialty crops.
- c. Secondary coordination activities might include, among other things, working toward IPM inclusion with conservation districts and agencies and on recreational lands, supporting pest diagnostics, implementing IPM in housing and schools, enhancing IPM understanding among pesticide applicators, addressing public health concerns related to transmissible diseases, and in monitoring pests across large geographic areas where sharing observations could be beneficial.

Additional considerations:

Collaboration: *COORDINATION* development projects should consider logical advantages of coordinating with programs at other institutions where the pests under consideration are contiguous across political boundaries. Fostering such relationships could produce synergy in program outcomes by crossing geographical or political boundaries within agroecosystems/ecozones or within areas where similar production practices or pest problems may prevail. IPM collaborations are desirable as a means of minimizing duplication of effort and providing continuity across geographic areas with common problems, production practices or pest management practices. These collaborations may cross state borders if common program elements exist and the collaboration advances the goals of IPM.

National Roadmap for IPM: All proposals must describe the stakeholders who will be served, the type of program coordination and activities proposed, the economic and social impact of proposed activities, the level of collaboration and partnership with stakeholders, etc. Proposals should reflect the principles of IPM described in the National Roadmap for IPM (nifa.usda.gov/nea/pest/in_focus/ipm_if_roadmap.html) and offer appropriate solutions to pest issues through the delivery of education and coordination of programs directed to end users (e.g., producers, homeowners and IPM practitioners).

Evaluation: *COORDINATION* development projects should focus a single logic model on how the project will gather stakeholder information, assess perceptions of need and plan how the program would respond to the defined problems in future grant applications. While not the only acceptable method to plan a program and assess outcomes, a logic model is suggested as a good option for planning and evaluation in the *COORDINATION* program (see www.nifa.usda.gov/about/strat_plan_logic_models.html for more information with some specific IPM examples available at www.ipm.gov/LogicModels/index.cfm). Other implementation and evaluation plans are acceptable as long as they provide detail similar to a logic model, such as outputs and expected outcomes over the short, medium, and long term. The logic model/plan may be included as an attachment to the application. The same requirement applies to the *SUPPORT* program.

More Information: More information on the structure and function of the various components of previous coordination programs can be found by referencing previous RFAs on the More

Information page for EIPM-CS (www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/eipm/eipm.html). The details of future programs may differ.

2. EIPM-CS SUPPORT PROJECTS – Address Critical Regional or National IPM Extension Program Needs.

Program Code – QQ.E

Proposed Budget Requests –

- Standard Grants (see PART II. B. Types of Applications) must not exceed \$50,000 per year. Small Farms/Underserved Audiences projects may have two year duration. Critical Issues projects are limited to one year duration. Program anticipates making 2-4 awards in FY 2012.
- Must describe the focus of the request per RFA guidance.
- Requests exceeding the budgetary guidelines will not be reviewed.

In FY 2012, *SUPPORT* projects within EIPM-CS will advance the goals of the National Roadmap for IPM (nifa.usda.gov/nea/pest/in_focus/ipm_if_roadmap.html) by supporting projects that: a) Develop extension multi-state IPM working groups addressing small farms or underserved audiences; and b) Develop extension programming to address critical IPM issues.

IPM Support projects in these two areas will strengthen the likelihood that national IPM goals will be reached by enabling collaboration and enhancing the ability of project directors to report mission critical impacts across institutional boundaries. In FY 2012, NIFA anticipates making one award for an IPM working group for small farms or underserved audiences and up to three awards to develop extension programming to address critical IPM issues. Projects that have been identified through a stakeholder process such as a Pest Management Strategic Plan (PMSP) or Crop Profile will be strong candidates for funding in the critical issues category, but it is understood that important issues may have emerged after the development of existing PMSPs and Crop Profiles.

SUPPORT proposals submitted to the EIPM-CS program should be relevant to program development for small farms on a national scale OR to extension development for critical IPM issues. Each qualifying application must be accompanied by a letter from the institution's Extension Director/Extension Administrator or be submitted directly by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator. Other submissions from an institution without endorsement by the Extension Director/Extension Administrator will be excluded from review.

An individual institution may apply as the primary applicant to the following two support project types:

a. Development of Multi-State Small Farms or Underserved Audience IPM Working Groups: Extension IPM programs have not fully served the needs of the small producers who may be part-time farmers or be under-served for various other reasons. USDA defines small farms as any farming operation with total receipts of less than \$250,000 per year (see www.extension.org/pages/USDA_Small_Farm_Definitions). This project type should link

programs at multiple eligible institutions that address small farms or specifically address IPM issues for under-served audiences and build strength in IPM disciplines through collaborative efforts to reach this new and growing audience.

All applications must include a budget and budget narrative for each year of the proposed project in the application. **Applications may request a maximum of \$100,000 for a project period not to exceed two years in duration.**

b. Development of Extension Education Programs for Critical IPM Issues: High consequence and threatening pests and diseases are posing an increasing risk to American agriculture. The following are recognized critical and emerging issues that are eligible for EIPM-CS funding in FY 2012. Where phytosanitary regulatory concerns apply, coordination with USDA-APHIS-PPQ programs is encouraged to minimize duplicative efforts and coordinated communication.

1. Emergent citrus pests and diseases.
2. Bagrada bug (*Bagrada hilaris*).
3. Boxwood blight (*Cylindrocladium pseudonaviculatum*).
4. Other new or resurgent arthropod pests or pathogens. Applicants must explain why that pest should be considered for funding.
5. The development of “push” technologies and applications for handheld devices to reach clientele with pest decision support information in a real-time framework. These new tools should have application beyond the borders of the state where the applicant institution is located. There should be multi-state involvement and endorsement.
6. New educational materials/demonstrations for wide area IPM projects addressing high consequence pests across multi-state areas. Linkages to identified needs from such programs as the National Plant Disease Recovery System (NPDRS) and Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSP) (www.ipmcenters.org/pmsp/index.cfm), or auxiliary programs such as National Plant Diagnostic Network (NPDN) (npdn.org), Protect U.S. (protectingUSnow.com), or other such programs is encouraged. **Please Note:** materials or demonstrations proposed to meet this objective should be designed for traditional extension work addressing new issues (e.g., Pest Alert flyers/media, conferences, and outreach or demonstration projects, including 21st century delivery mechanisms for traditional extension) as opposed to providing funds to supplement previously existing program/system materials.

Projects should develop extension education products/materials and/or demonstration and applied research targeted at an extension audience. Extension IPM applications on critical issues should help prepare producers for the arrival of pests of high consequence or management of these pests after have they become established. **Applications may request a maximum of \$50,000 for a one year project period.**

Submissions to the EIPM-CS *SUPPORT* program must include a timeline for development and implementation of the project and a logic model that defines the evaluation plan. Other implementation and evaluation plans are acceptable as long as they provide details similar to a

logic model, such as outputs and expected outcomes over the short, medium, and long term. The logic model/plan may be included as an attachment to the application, but a logic model or alternate plan is expected for each component/emphasis area of the application.

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. NIFA anticipates approximately \$330,000 will be available to fund EIPM-CS applications in FY 2012 through this RFA. It is anticipated that approximately \$150,000 of the total will be awarded for *COORDINATION* Development programs and up to \$180,000 will be awarded for *SUPPORT* projects. The statutory limit of program funding is five years; however, see Part II., C., below for specific project periods.

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

B. Types of Applications

In FY 2012, applications may be submitted to the **EIPM-CS** program as one of two types of requests:

- EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* Program development – New applications only.
- EIPM-CS *SUPPORT* –New or Resubmitted applications (see definitions below).

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

(2) Resubmitted application. This is an application previously submitted to the **EIPM-CS** *SUPPORT* 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.

In FY 2012, EIPM *COORDINATION* and EIPM *SUPPORT* awards will be made as standard grants, which are instruments by which NIFA agrees to support a specified level of effort for a predetermined project period without any statement of intention to provide additional support at a future date.

C. Project Types

EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* program development award funding: A minimal number of awards are expected in this category due to the limited funds; however, as many as 22 institutions are eligible for this program in FY 2012. NIFA anticipates up to four projects will be funded.

The highest ranking projects will be considered for funding at a maximum of \$50,000 per award. The project period for awards made in FY 2012 will be for one year in duration.

EIPM-CS SUPPORT program funding for the **development of multi-state small farms or underserved audiences IPM working groups**: It is anticipated that one project will be awarded funding. For FY 2012, applications may request up to a total of \$100,000 for a project period of up to two years in duration. Funding may be used for other project types if no acceptable applications are submitted in this category.

EIPM-CS SUPPORT program funding for **Extension development for critical IPM issues**: It is anticipated that up to four projects will be funded in FY 2012. Applications may request a maximum of \$50,000 for project periods of up to one year in duration.

PART III—ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

Only 1862 and 1890 land-grant universities and colleges, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, and the University of the District of Columbia that did **NOT** receive any Smith-Lever 3(d) IPM funding for an EIPM-CS coordination program in FY 2011 are eligible to apply for IPM COORDINATION grants in FY 2012. All 1862 and 1890 land-grant universities and colleges, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, and the University of the District of Columbia are eligible to apply for IPM SUPPORT grants in FY 2012.

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

B. Cost Sharing or Matching

There is no matching requirement for EIPM-CS applications and matching resources will not be factored into the review process as evaluation criteria.

PART IV—APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. Electronic Application Package

Only electronic applications may be submitted via Grants.gov to NIFA in response to this RFA. **Applicants are advised to submit early to the Grants.gov system.**

New Users of Grants.gov

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

Steps to Obtain Application Package Materials

The steps to access application materials are as follows:

1. In order to access, complete and submit applications, applicants must download and install a version of Adobe Reader compatible with Grants.gov. This software is essential to apply for NIFA Federal assistance awards. For basic system requirements and download instructions, please see 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-SLBCD-003743** in the appropriate box and click “Download Package.” From the search results, click “Download” to access the application package.

Contained within the application package is the “NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for Preparation and Submission of NIFA Applications via Grants.gov.” This Guide contains an introduction and general Grants.gov instructions, information about

how to use a Grant Application Package in Grants.gov, and instructions on how to complete the application forms.

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

Grants.gov customer support

1-800-518-4726 Toll-Free or 606-545-5035

Business Hours: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Closed on [Federal Holidays](#).

Email: support@grants.gov

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

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

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

See http://grants.gov/applicants/app_help_reso.jsp or <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 Parts V and VI of the document entitled “A Guide for Preparation and Submission of NIFA Applications via Grants.gov.” This guide is part of the corresponding application package (see Section A. of this Part). The following is **additional information** needed in order to prepare an application in response to this RFA. **If there is discrepancy between the two documents, the information contained in this RFA is overriding.**

Note the attachment requirements (e.g., portable document format) in Part III section 3. of the Guide. ANY PROPOSALS THAT ARE NON-COMPLIANT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS (i.e., content format, pdf file format, file name restrictions, and no password protected files) WILL BE AT RISK OF BEING EXCLUDED FROM NIFA REVIEW. Partial applications will be excluded from NIFA review. With documented prior approval, subsequent submissions of an application will be accepted until close of business on the closing date in the RFA.

If you do not own PDF-generating software, Grants.gov provides online tools to assist applicants. Users will find a link to “Convert Documents to PDF” on http://grants.gov/help/download_software.jsp#pdf_conversion_programs.

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

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

1. SF 424 R&R Cover Sheet

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

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

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

3. R&R Other Project Information Form

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

a. Field 7. Project Summary/Abstract. The Project Summary may not exceed **250 words** on one page, and should clearly indicate the appropriate EIPM-CS program (*COORDINATION* or *SUPPORT*). For EIPM-CS *COORDINATION* proposals, identify the program and administrative lead(s) and list the stakeholder groups that will be engaged that will be supported through stakeholder engagement and collaborations with eligible entities included in the proposal. For EIPM-CS *SUPPORT* proposals, include the project type proposed. The summary should also include the program functions proposed, program goals, and relevance of the project to the goals of EIPM-CS. The importance of a concise, informative Project Summary cannot be overemphasized. See Part V.4.7 of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide for further instructions and a link to a suggested template.

b. Field 8 - Project Narrative. PLEASE NOTE: the Project Narrative section may not exceed a total of 25 single- or double-spaced pages, including figures and tables. The Introduction may not exceed 5 pages, and the rest of the Project Narrative may not exceed 20 pages total. These EIPM-CS page limitations apply regardless of whether figures or tables are included. All pages, including those with figures and tables, should be numbered sequentially. Applications exceeding the applicable page limitation will be at risk of being excluded from review. These maximums have been established to ensure fair and equitable competition. However, if logic models are prepared to illustrate the program, the models can be attached as an Appendix in Field 12 (see c. below) and will not count against the narrative page total.

The Project Narrative must include all of the following:

(i) Introduction. Include the following:

1. List of Program Staff – include name, title, affiliation, address, and e-mail for PD(s), CoPD(s) and Key Personnel (*defined as all individuals who contribute in a substantive, measurable way to the scientific development or execution of the project whether or not salaries are requested*). For *COORDINATION* applications: the IPM Coordinator(s) and administrative contact(s) must be identified.
2. A clear statement of the goal(s) and critical need(s) of IPM being addressed and supporting extension outreach objectives.
3. Description of how stakeholders will be engaged in setting extension IPM program direction on an on-going basis.
4. Summary of the body of knowledge or other past activities that substantiate the need for the proposed project/program.
5. Description of ongoing or recently completed significant activities related to the proposed project/program including the work of key project/program personnel. Applications should also demonstrate how duplication of effort with similar activities by others will be avoided.
6. Preliminary data/information pertinent to the proposed work should be included in this section. All works cited should be referenced and attached at Field 9 of this Form, Bibliography & Reference Cited. Refer to Part V, 4.9 of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide. The Bibliography attachment has no page limit and will not be counted against the Narrative page total.

(ii) Rationale and Significance. Concisely present the rationale behind the proposed extension activities. The specific relationship of the project/program's objectives to specific issues related one or more IPM coordination activities should be clearly shown, if known. Examples of coordination activities are described under Part I., C., Project Types.

(iii) Approach. For each component of requested funding in the IPM *COORDINATION* proposal, clearly state the activities proposed or problems being addressed and clearly describe the approaches being applied. *SUPPORT* program proposals should also provide sufficient detail to describe proposed activities. Specifically, this section must include:

1. A description of the activities proposed, key personnel or institution roles in those activities, and the sequence in which the activities are to be performed;
2. Outputs and expected deliverables to be developed for the program;
3. Expected outcomes, including how the project/program expects to address overarching goals of the National Road Map for IPM: profitability, reducing potential human health risks from pests and related pest management practices, and minimizing adverse environmental impact;
4. How results or products will be used;
5. Means by which results will be assessed or evaluated; and
6. Pitfalls that may be encountered.

c. Field 12 - Other Attachments – PDF

Appendices to Project Description Appendices to the Project Description are allowed if they are directly germane to the proposed project/program. The addition of appendices should not be used to circumvent the text and/or figures and tables page limitations. For IPM *COORDINATION* program proposals please include a PDF attachment listing collaborations with eligible institutions, supporting documentation and a description of the roles to be performed by each institution. If IPM collaborations are described in this program, letters of collaboration **must** be attached in Field 12 as PDF attachments as part of the application from all applicants participating in the collaboration.

Letter of Support from Extension Director/Extension Administrator If the Extension Director/Extension Administrator did not submit the application, attach their letter of support in Field 12 as a PDF. Name the document “Extension Letter of Support”.

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

Information related to the questions on this form is dealt with in detail in Part V, 5. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide. Part V, 5. of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide includes information about the individuals for which a Senior/Key Person Profile must be completed, and details about the Biographical Sketch and the Current and Pending Support including a link to a suggested template for the Current and Pending Support.

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. Reasonable travel costs to report outcomes at regional, national or international meetings are allowable in the budget.

If SUPPORT application funding is being requested for multiple years, include a budget and narrative for each year, as well as a cumulative budget.

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. **a. Field 2. Program Code** Enter the program code name “**Extension Integrated Pest Management – Coordination and Support**” and the program code “**QQIPM**” for applications submitted for *COORDINATION* funding or “**QQ.E**” for applications submitted for *SUPPORT* funding.
- b. **Field 8. Conflict of Interest List.** See Part VI, 1.6 of the NIFA Grants.gov Application Guide for further instructions and a link to a suggested template.

c. Submission Dates and Times

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

Applications must be received by Grants.gov by COB on **June 26, 2012 (5:00 p.m. Eastern Time)**. Applications received after this deadline will normally not be considered for funding.

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

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

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

D. Funding Restrictions

Pursuant to Section 1473 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (91 Stat. 981), indirect costs are unallowable costs under this program, and no funds will be approved for this purpose. Costs that are a part of an institution's indirect cost pool may not be reclassified as direct costs for the purpose of making them allowable.

In addition, tuition remission is prohibited by Section 1473 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3319).

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

E. Other Submission Requirements

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

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

PART V—APPLICATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

A. General

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 below will be used in reviewing applications submitted in response to this RFA:

Criteria for EIPM-CS: *COORDINATION* Program Development Proposals

1. Proposal Relevance and Demonstration of Need (50 points):

- (a) Documented need. Application includes documentation substantiating that the program is directed to current or likely future problems/challenges in IPM regardless of discipline. Concerns might include the value of the anticipated program coordination activities and the impacts of pests in those areas. How will the program address or anticipate national, regional or locally relevant IPM issues and desired outcomes described in the RFA (10 points);
- (b) Clearly defined plans to involve stakeholders. Application includes information on how stakeholders will be involved in defining the program and how their input will be solicited and incorporated or how stakeholder input was used to determine program goals. (20 points);
- (c) Quality of extension program development plan. Application describes a detailed plan addressing how the needs (see (a) above) map to the principles of the National Roadmap

for IPM, defining **anticipated** risks and program benefits. The plan might define how people (inputs) will be developed through activities (outputs) into working relationships/partnerships (outcomes), which might be inputs for future efforts. It will further define impacts to be measured, including the likelihood of program success in attaining measurable benefits to producers and consumers, augmenting and supporting extension field staff activities in IPM. The plan should communicate how this development program will execute a transdisciplinary plan to gather and assess/evaluate the data collected (10 points);

- (d) Demonstrated understanding of IPM coordination activities are addressed, building effective teams involving appropriate cooperators and disciplines, and networking with other regional programs (5 points); and
- (e) Documented trans-disciplinary approach is planned that addresses economic, environmental and human health aspects of IPM. Proposal addresses appropriateness to all applicable pest groups and disciplines (5 points).

2. Proposal Quality (50 points):

- (a) Conceptual adequacy. Objectives are potentially attainable within the one year program time, scope and budget (10 points);
- (b) Design. Plans for how to solicit input, how the data will be analyzed and where the information will be reported back to clientele and colleagues. How the data will be used to recruit a team with expertise that is appropriate to the need (10 points);
- (c) Involvement of appropriate, relevant expertise, including quality of collaborations and analysis and evaluation personnel (10 points);
- (d) Experience of senior/key project/program personnel (5 points);
- (e) Appropriateness of budget (5 points); and
- (f) Feasibility, probability of success (including the likelihood that the program will contribute to the overall sustainability of an IPM system), and ability to meet timelines defined in the RFA and result in a quality, competitive, full *COORDINATION* application in FY 2013 (10 points).

Determining Awards for the Highest Ranking *COORDINATION* Proposals:

Representation of under-served audiences and the expansion of programs to newly eligible institutions will be considered. The peer review panel will evaluate the quality of program functions as a package/program relative to the proposed activities.

For the proposals ranked high enough to be considered for funding, the panel may consider the following factors:

- a. Integration of programming with existing programs.
- b. Involvement of institutions in program delivery.
- c. Collaborative programming.
- d. Justification for program components (strong, average, weak).

Budgets may be adjusted by NIFA based on the panel scores and comments.

Criteria for EIPM – CS: *SUPPORT* Program proposals

1. Proposal Relevance and Demonstration of Need (50 points):

- (a) Documented need. Application includes documentation substantiating that the project/program is directed to current or likely future problems/challenges in IPM with real impacts that map to IPM Road Map goals. The proposal should address relevant IPM issues and desired outcomes described in the RFA (5 points);
- (b) Clearly demonstrates the institution's ability to fulfill the proposed activities (5 points);
- (c) Stakeholder involvement. Application includes information on how stakeholders will be involved in the project/program and how their input will be or has been solicited and incorporated (10 points);
- (d) Extension outreach plan. Application includes a detailed outreach plan that includes project benefits and a description of how impacts will be measured, including the likelihood that the project/program will provide solutions that lead to measurable benefits to producers and consumers, and will facilitate information dissemination. Value of plan to evaluate how well the information technology need is being met (10 points);
- (e) Demonstrated understanding of small farms or underserved audiences IPM issues or emerging pest systems (per objective being addressed) within the greater IPM system concept (10 points); and
- (f) Documented trans-disciplinary approach that addresses economic, environmental and human health aspects of IPM. Proposal addresses appropriateness to all applicable pest groups and disciplines (10 points).

2. Proposal Quality (50 points):

- (a) Conceptual adequacy. Objectives are potentially attainable within project/program time, scope and budget (10 points);
- (b) Design. Methodology and analytical approach are appropriate to project/program objectives (15 points);
- (c) Involvement of appropriate, relevant expertise (5 points);
- (d) Experience of senior/key project personnel (5 points);
- (e) Appropriateness of budget (5 points);
- (f) Feasibility, probability of success (including the likelihood that the project/program will contribute to the overall sustainability of an IPM system), and ability to meet timelines defined in the RFA (5 points); and
- (g) Adherence to RFA guidelines (5 points).

C. Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality

During the peer evaluation process, extreme care will be taken to prevent any actual or perceived conflicts of interest that may impact review or evaluation. For the purpose of determining conflicts of interest, the academic and administrative autonomy of an institution shall be determined by reference to the current Higher Education Directory, published by Higher Education Publications, Inc., 1801 Robert Fulton Drive, Suite 340, Reston, Virginia 20191. Phone: (888) 349-7715. Web site: www.hepinc.com.

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

D. Organizational Management Information

Specific management information relating to an applicant shall be submitted on a one time basis, with updates on an as needed basis, as part of the responsibility determination prior to the award of a grant identified under this RFA, if such information has not been provided previously under this or another NIFA program. NIFA will provide copies of forms recommended for use in fulfilling these requirements as part of the preaward process. Although an applicant may be eligible based on 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 NIFA shall make grants to those responsible, eligible applicants whose applications are judged most meritorious under the procedures set forth in this RFA. The date specified by the awarding official of NIFA as the effective date of the grant shall be no later than September 30 of the Federal fiscal year in which the project is approved for support and funds are appropriated for such purpose, unless otherwise permitted by law. It should be noted that the project need not be initiated on the grant effective date, but as soon thereafter as practical so that project goals may be attained within the funded project period. All funds granted by NIFA under this RFA shall be expended solely for the purpose for which the funds are granted in accordance with the approved application and budget, the regulations, the terms and conditions of the award, the applicable Federal cost principles, and the Department's assistance regulations (parts 3015 and 3019 of 7 CFR).

B. Award Notice

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

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

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

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

C. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

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

2 CFR Part 220 – Cost Principles for Educational Institutions (OMB Circular A-21).

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 CFR Part 3015—USDA Uniform Federal Assistance Regulations, implementing OMB directives (i.e., OMB Circular Nos. A-21, A-87, and A-122, now codified at 2 CFR Parts 220, 225 and 230), and incorporating provisions of 31 U.S.C. 6301-6308 (formerly the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977, Pub. L. No. 95-224)), as well as general policy requirements applicable to recipients of Departmental financial assistance.

7 CFR Part 3016 – USDA Implementation of Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments.

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

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

7 CFR Part 3019—USDA implementation of OMB Circular A-110, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Other Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations (2 CFR Part 215).

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

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

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

7 CFR 3430—Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-formula Grant Programs--General Grant Administrative Provisions.

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

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

D. Expected Program Outputs and Reporting Requirements

Grantees are to submit initial project information and annual and summary reports to NIFA's electronic, Web-based inventory system that facilitates both grantee submissions of project outcomes and public access to information on Federally-funded projects. The details of these reporting requirements are included in the award terms and conditions. Details of annual and final technical reporting requirements also are included in the award terms and conditions.

Reasonable travel costs to report outcomes at regional, national or international meetings are allowable in the budget.

PART VII—AGENCY CONTACT

Applicants and other interested parties are encouraged to contact Dr. Martin Draper; National Program Leader for Plant Pathology; Institute of Food Production and Sustainability; National Institute of Food and Agriculture; U.S. Department of Agriculture; STOP 2240; 1400 Independence Avenue, SW; Washington, DC 20250-2220; telephone: (202) 401-1990; fax: (202) 401-4888; e-mail: mdraper@nifa.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 any applicable statutory limit or expiring appropriation limitation. Any extension of time shall be conditioned upon prior request by the awardee and approval in writing by the ADO, unless prescribed otherwise in the terms and conditions of award.

f. Changes in Approved Budget: Unless stated otherwise in the terms and conditions of award, changes in an approved budget must be requested by the awardee and approved in writing by the ADO prior to instituting such changes, if the revision will involve transfers or expenditures of amounts requiring prior approval as set forth in the applicable Federal cost principles, Departmental regulations, or award.

C. Confidential Aspects of Applications and Awards

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

D. Regulatory Information

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

E. Definitions

Please refer to 7 CFR 3430, Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-formula Grant Programs-- General Grant Administrative Provisions, for applicable definitions for this NIFA grant program.

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

IPM Collaboration(s) refer to a section of a program proposal that contains a component of collaboration with another institution: (1) in which an applicant institution includes a cooperative element with at least one other entity that is not legally affiliated with the applicant institution; and (2) where the applicant institution and each cooperating entity will assume a significant role in the implementation of the proposed collaborative program component. Funds need not be subcontracted in all cases, and may be administered by the applicant institution. Only the applicant institution must meet the definition of an eligible institution as specified in this RFA.

IPM Coordinator(s) refers to the individual(s) with programmatic lead responsibilities at institutions with IPM programs. Programs may exist with or without funding from this program,

but in reference to this program, the term is used to identify the individual responsible for executing the institutional IPM program funded through EIPM-CS Coordination Program.

Interdisciplinary approaches gather multiple academic fields together into a single discipline, crossing traditional boundaries between schools of thought and blending the disciplines into one. Interdisciplinary projects are composed of representatives from multiple disciplines who engage together to create and apply new knowledge as equal stakeholders to address a shared goal.

Multidisciplinary teams may be composed of representatives from diverse disciplines working together to addressing a common goal, but they divide the project into separate projects, failing to implement a systems approach. Therefore it is more like multiple disciplines examining a specific problem separately or a compilation of problems examined by one discipline each.

Transdisciplinary is often mistaken as a synonym for interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary. Yet these terms are distinct, differing in scale and scope. Transdisciplinary applies well to Extension IPM because it addresses strategic approaches that span the boundaries of many disciplines in a holistic or systems approach. Importantly, IPM must also consider the human element of social and economic issues in decision making, expanding the disciplinary boundaries beyond what might ordinarily be considered in scientific study. A transdisciplinary approach also considers the effects of one action on another dynamic, such as the effect of reduced tillage on both weed growth and diversity and its implications on pest and disease risks as well as the economics of control.