

North Central Integrated Pest Management Center IPM Enhancement Grants Program

2006 Request for Applications

Due Dates:

Letter of Intent: February 3, 2006

Application: March 3, 2006

DATES: Letters of intent to submit a proposal must be submitted by February 3, 2006 electronically to <http://www.ncipmc.org/egrants>. Full proposals of no more than twenty pages in length double spaced must be received by March 3, 2006 electronically at the address above and the original and two hard copies with all the proper signatures by Dr. Olsen at the address below by March 10, 2006. Any proposal received after these deadlines will not be considered for funding. Hard copies should be submitted to:

**Dr. Larry Olsen
North Central Integrated Pest Management Center
B-18 Food Safety and Toxicology Bldg.
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824**

**Email: olsenL@msu.edu
Telephone: 517-355-3459**

North Central Integrated Pest Management Center IPM Enhancement Grants Program

Summary

This Request for Applications (RFA) solicits proposals for projects that will enhance the development and implementation of integrated pest management (IPM) in the North Central Region of the United States. The three project types for which we are seeking applications for funding are described in this RFA: (1) IPM Implementation; (2) Working Groups and (3) IPM Documents.

Proposals **must** be submitted **both** electronically and in print formats. Electronic submission is through the web page <http://www.ncipmc.org/egrants> . Online submission must be completed no later than **5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 3, 2006**. Receipt of the proposal will be acknowledged.

The original and two hard copies with all required signatures must be received no later than **5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 10, 2006**. Facsimile copies are not acceptable.

I. General Information

In FY 2003, the North Central Region Integrated Pest Management Center (NC IPM Center) received funding for four years via a grant from the USDA/CSREES's Integrated Research, Education and Extension Competitive Grants Program - Integrated Pest Management. Section 406 of the Agricultural Research, Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998 (AREERA) authorized the establishment of the program that funded the NC IPM Center. Geographically, the Center includes the following states: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin.

The Center coordinates, enhances and facilitates the flow of resources and information in integrated pest management on a regional basis, including grants management, data acquisition and sharing, infrastructure development, and the documentation needed to provide accountability for resources used. The Center focuses its efforts on meeting the goals described in the *National Roadmap for Integrated Pest Management*, while maintaining the regional (site-specific) nature required for effective IPM programs. The Roadmap goals are:

1. Improve cost benefit analyses of adopting IPM Practices

Improving the overall benefits resulting from the adoption of IPM practices is a critical component of the National IPM Program. Conducting a "cost benefit" analysis of proposed IPM strategies is not based solely on the monetary costs. It is based on four main parameters: monetary, environmental/ecological health and function, aesthetic benefits, and human health. While there may be many benefits from adoption of IPM practices, if new IPM programs do not appear to be as economically beneficial as

practices already in place they are not likely to be adopted. Risks and benefits need to be determined. A major factor in the adoption of IPM programs is whether the benefit to humans and the broader natural systems outweighs the cost in implementing an IPM practice. Evaluation of the short and long term risks and benefits is needed.

2. Reduce potential human health risks from pests and related management strategies.

IPM plays a major role in human health. Public health is dependent upon a continual supply of affordable, high quality food. IPM protects human health through its contribution to food security by reducing potential health risks and enhancing worker safety. Success in reducing the health risks from pest management practices themselves were measured in the past by tracking changes in the annual amount of pesticides used in the United States. While pesticide use information is relatively easy to collect, when used alone it is a poor indicator of human health risk, and more advanced systems of measurement are required.

3. Minimize adverse environmental effects from pests and related management strategies.

IPM programs are designed to protect agricultural, urban and natural resource environments from the encroachment of native and non-native pest species while minimizing unreasonable adverse effects on soil, water, air and beneficial organisms. For example, in agriculture, IPM practices promote a healthy within crop environment, and conserve organisms that are beneficial to agricultural systems, including pollinators and natural enemies. By reducing off-target impacts, IPM also helps to maximize the positive contributions that agricultural land use can make to watershed health and function.

The Center provides leadership and coordination for the identification of priority IPM needs and issues through multi-state and multi-organization collaboration in the north central region. The Center provides the infrastructure for the development and sharing of current and new pest management technologies among federal and state agencies, impacted organizations, and pest managers. The Center coordinates its programs with state-based extension IPM implementation programs located at land-grant universities in each state.

To increase effectiveness and to encourage a broader range of stakeholders, the North Central Region IPM Center out sources certain functions, activities and processes through a multi-faceted Grant Program. This program provides stakeholders with an opportunity to influence decisions more fully by enabling them to win support for and lead worthwhile efforts, such as the development of IPM publications and projects that address critical issues. Sharing responsibilities in this way helps to ensure that the North Central Region IPM Center understands stakeholders' needs and priorities.

Applications from private individuals and institutions, businesses, commodity organizations, and governmental and non-governmental organizations are invited. Collaboration with individuals outside the region is allowed, but the primary project director must be from within the North

Central Region. In such cases, one proposal and budget should be submitted and the proposal should clearly identify all collaborators and the role of each. Applicants should clearly indicate the lead institution and the plans for coordinating the project during the implementation phase.

Successful applicants will be funded through a subcontract from Michigan State University. Cooperation among potential participants is encouraged. Project directors of successful proposals will be contacted to work out the funding mechanism. USDA budgetary guidelines (available on the web [page http://www.ncipmc.org/egrants](http://www.ncipmc.org/egrants)) apply to projects funded through this program.

Project directors must fully justify their projects based on relevance and importance to the North Central Region, and successful projects must demonstrate stakeholder involvement in project planning. Stakeholder input may be documented by reference to priorities listed in Pest Management Strategic Plans (<http://www.ncipmc.org/pmsp/index.cfm>) or other relevant databases, or by letters of support from growers/industry, commodity groups and/or nongovernmental organizations.

II. Project Types

This year, the North Central Region IPM Center has approximately \$585,000 available to fund projects in the region that address issues defined in this RFA. For each of the project types described below we have indicated a range in the amount of funding we expect to provide. These ranges are shown only to indicate the relative importance of the project type as identified by the Steering Committee of the North Central Region IPM Center. The Project Review Panel reserves the right to recommend shifting funds among project types in order to fund the highest priority and best quality projects.

1. Implementation Grants

This year, up to \$300,000 is available for projects that enhance Center programs by supporting the continuum of IPM demonstration and implementation projects or measurement of adoption of new IPM tactics and systems.

These projects will enhance efforts that support the wide-scale implementation of IPM methods and maximize opportunities to build strategic alliances with industry and user groups to expand their active participation in increasing the adoption of IPM methods. Projects may be proposed to develop educational materials and information delivery systems, conduct demonstrations, or deliver IPM education and training. A research component is not a required element of extension applications, but the research base should be documented. The total budget for a project shall not exceed \$85,000 over a two year time frame.

Renewal applications must be received by the application due date, will be evaluated in competition with the pending applications, and will be reviewed according to the same evaluation criteria as new applications. Renewal applications should include a two page

progress report emphasizing accomplishments in year one, and include the renewal application up to 12 pages in length double spaced.

Applications should address one or more of the following areas of emphasis, all of which have equal priority. Applications should describe how the project will be evaluated to determine if the proposed work helps advance IPM and implementation of the IPM Roadmap.

1. Economics/Risk Assessment for IPM Systems

Key decisions about using IPM involve questions of economical, biological, and ecological benefits, time requirements, and production risks. Extension and demonstration projects should quantify their contribution to improved economic viability of the production system and/or to the reduction of risk to users, consumers, farm operations, or the environment.

2. Alternatives to Pesticides in Pest Management Systems

Many pest management systems remain dependent on particular pesticides. It is important to identify how alternative strategies could fit into systems. A multi-tactic and/or multi-disciplinary approach should be considered to enhance the development of comprehensive pest management systems to reduce reliance on pesticides. Applications that focus solely on the development and/or evaluation of chemical pesticides or vaccine development will not be considered for funding.

3. Alternative Production Systems

Projects should emphasize implications of alternatives to conventional production systems. There is a need to demonstrate and implement IPM systems where alternative approaches are important to the overall profitability, risk reduction, and environmental impacts.

4. Decision and Diagnostic Tools

Innovative decision and diagnostic tools for pest management are urgently needed that are easily used, yet generate reliable decisions.

5. Pest Detection, Identification, and/or Monitoring

Innovative approaches for pest detection, identification, and monitoring are needed for better site-specific management programs. The ultimate goal is implementation of assessment and monitoring techniques that are both practical at the field level and cost effective.

6. Measurement of IPM Adoption

Evaluating IPM implementation and adoption has not kept pace with development of IPM tactics and strategies. Measurement of IPM implementation and adoption must include measurement of economic and social constraints to IPM adoption. A relevant question is, "What can be done to enhance adoption?" There is a need to identify points in users' decisions where education, social dynamics, incentives, and regulation could encourage IPM adoption.

The proposal must describe how the project outcomes will be measured and evaluated. The use of the Logic Model is strongly encouraged. For information on the Logic Model you may visit the University of Wisconsin web site at: <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html>. An annual progress report will be required for multiple year projects, and a final report for one year projects. This information will be used to prepare regional reports regarding IPM priorities, program implementation, and the impact of IPM adoption. Successes will be highlighted through electronic and print media.

IPM Coordinators, Working Group leaders and others were asked to submit priorities for each of the areas identified in this RFA. Priorities submitted for Implementation Grants included: Landscape/Nursery weed control using herbicide treated mulches; Periurban Agriculture; Polyculture/Multiple Cropping Systems; Soybean Cyst Nematode management; Soybean disease management; Soybean insect management such as soybean aphid and bean leaf beetle; and Soybean weed control and management.

2. Working Groups

This year, up to \$225,000 is available to support new or existing Working Groups. Each Working Group may receive up to \$30,000 from this grant program each year for a maximum of two years (awarded annually based on attainment of goals as established in the plan of work). Working Group renewal proposals will be for two years to accommodate the parent grant end date.

Working Groups will serve as the basis for many of the Center's core functions. Commodity or issue-based Working Groups will be established to address human health, environmental health, and water quality impacts as well as IPM needs. They will also address the issue of economic benefit of IPM adoption. They will be multi-state, multi-discipline and self selected with 10-25 members that are comprised of stakeholders, researchers, extension specialists, and government agency representatives. The roles of the Working Group are to identify and prioritize regional IPM issues, build partnerships with key stakeholders, increase communication between group members, and address the goals of the National Roadmap for IPM and the NC IPM Center mission and goals.

All Working Groups will address the following:

- Identify and prioritize regional IPM issues for commodities or specific issues. These issues can be used as funding priorities for other NC IPM Center and USDA grant programs.
- Link objectives to the goals of the National IPM Roadmap including evaluation of IPM Successes.

In addition, below are examples of potential goals/strategies for Working Groups:

- Conduct outreach programs and develop IPM related educational materials.
- Develop IPM practice lists for use in NRCS programs.

- Compile or update a set of IPM definitions for program areas associated with their mission.
- Conduct surveys to determine level of IPM adoption.
- Incorporate economic benefits into their implementation programs and establish an economic index to allow stakeholders to evaluate the economic impact of alternative management practices.
- Develop or revise crop profiles or pest management strategic plans.
- Develop IPM guidelines, management guides or pest alerts.
- Have a strong outcome focus on program.

Working Groups will meet to write a “Plan of Work” with objectives and milestones that will address how they will address the research, education and implementation needs as outlined in the National IPM Roadmap. The Working Group Chair will submit an annual budget request to assist in programmatic efforts as outlined in the Plan of Work. The Working Groups will interact with regional research/Extension committees and complement their efforts by dissemination of research data through Extension-based programs. Annual accomplishments reports will be submitted to the Center.

Expected outcomes include the development of IPM programmatic materials and annual progress reports. This information will be used to prepare regional reports regarding IPM priorities, program implementation, and the impact of IPM adoption. Working Group successes will be highlighted through electronic and print media. Working Groups will be eligible to compete for additional NC IPM Center funding to meet their objectives.

Renewal applications must be received by the application due date, will be evaluated in competition with the pending applications, and will be reviewed according to the same evaluation criteria as new applications. Renewal applications should include a two page progress report emphasizing accomplishments last year, and include the renewal application up to 4 pages in length double spaced.

Priorities submitted from Working Groups were:

- Continue to support the important role that minor crops play in crop rotations throughout the North Central Region.
- Support identification of pest management priorities to assist in maintaining/expanding pesticide registrations in minor crops. This directly affects the national IPM Roadmap goal of reducing the impact of pests on production of these commodities.
- Improve communication between university specialists, industry and producers to provide information on a multi-state level.

3. IPM Documents

Crop Profiles, Pest Management Strategic Plans, IPM Guidelines, Management Guides and Pest Alerts: This year up to \$60,000 is available to support the development of Crop Profiles (CPs), Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSPs), IPM Guidelines,

Management Guides and Pest Alerts. These funds are limited to one year. Proposals should not exceed 4 pages in length. Criteria for funding these projects include:

- Lack of current and up-to-date documents.
- Prioritization by EPA, regional technical committees, Land Grant University researchers and extension specialists, grower groups, Working Groups and other entities.
- Priority for the Crop Profiles will be given to the following crops taken from the updated EPA/BEAD Crop Profile Priorities List (Taking into account Crop Profiles already completed since list was compiled) : Indiana (blueberries), Iowa (breeding hogs, all hogs, oats), Michigan (peppers, sweet cherry, Concord grapes, prunes and plums, radishes), Minnesota (oats, sugar beets, turkeys), Nebraska (cattle on feed), North Dakota (canola, flaxseed, mustard see, oats, sugar beets), Ohio (escarole/endive), South Dakota (flaxseed, sorghum for silage, sunflower seed), Wisconsin (processed beets, ginseng, oats, snap beans (processing)). The full EPA OPP/BEAD prioritization list for Crop Profiles can be found at <http://cipm.ncsu.edu/CP-EPA/index.cfm?org=USDARegion>.
- Priority will also be given to proposals that update Crop Profiles that were written in 2000 or before.
- Importance (as indicated by measures such as acres, economic value, etc.) of the IPM setting in the state and/or region.

A proposal to develop Crop Profiles or PMSPs not on the EPA priority list must be documented as a priority by stakeholder groups.

Funded Crop Profiles and PMSPs must conform to the Center's standards for content, format and distribution. Instructions regarding Crop Profiles and PMSPs can be found at <http://cipm.ncsu.edu/cropprofiles/instructions.html> and http://www.ncipmc.org/pmsp/pmsp_checklist.pdf. Documents are not considered complete until they are approved by North Central Region IPM Center leadership and are included in the National IPM Center's database. Crop Profiles and PMSPs are to be sent to Lynnae Jess at B18 Food Safety and Toxicology Building, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, e-mail jess@msu.edu for approval.

Funded Pest Alerts must conform to the Centers' standards for content, format and distribution. To view existing Pest Alerts, visit the North Central IPM Center Web site at <http://www.ncipmc.org/alerts/index.cfm>. They are to be sent Susan Ratcliffe at S-316 Turner Hall, 1102 S. Goodwin Ave, University of Illinois, Urbana IL 61801, e-mail sratclif@uiuc.edu for approval and publishing.

Priorities submitted include: Development of crop profiles for pulse crops (dry field pea, lentil and chickpea) in North Central states where they are not currently available. Update the PMSP for wheat.

III. Proposal Format

Proposals must be submitted in the following format. All forms required can be obtained from our web page <http://www.ncipmc.org/egrants>. Proposals **must** be submitted in **both** printed and electronic form. Format limits for electronic submission correspond with those for printed submission.

Each proposal, written in English, must be typed on 8.5" x 11" white paper; all pages must be numbered; text must be double-spaced on one side of the page with one-inch margins using a font no smaller than 12 point. Staple each copy of the proposal in the upper left-hand corner.

Multiple Project Types Accepted: Proposals that include two or more project types will be accepted as long as the distinction between project types is clearly made. The project summary should clearly describe all project types. Each project type in a proposal must entail objectives and corresponding procedures that are distinct from those of other project types. The budget narrative must clearly delineate the funding intended for each project type. The decision to write a combined proposal or separate proposals for each project type is entirely optional, and will not result in any competitive advantage or disadvantage.

Page limits for the narrative portion of the proposals (items D through K below) is 12 pages double spaced for Implementation grants, 4 pages for Working Groups, and 4 pages for IPM Documents. Inclusion of more multiple project types in one proposal is optional.

(a) The contents of the proposal should be assembled in the following order (the application kit is available at the following link: <http://csrees.usda.gov/funding/forms.html>)

- A. Proposal Cover Page (Form CSREES-2002)
- B. Project Summary (Form CSREES-2003)
- C. Table of Contents
- D. Background
- E. Objectives
- F. Approach and Methodology
- G. Literature Cited
- H. Probable Duration
- I. Relevancy Statement
- J. Evaluation Plans
- K. Cooperation and Institutional Units Involved
- L. Key Personnel
- M. Collaborative Arrangements (including letters of support)
- N. Budget Form (CSREES-2004)
- O. Budget Narrative
- P. Current and Pending Support (Form CSREES-2005)
- Q. Assurance Statements (Form CSREES-2002)
- R. Conflict of Interest List
- S. Page B, Proposal Cover Page (Form CSREES-2002), Personal Data on Project Director.

A. Proposal Cover Page

One copy of the Proposal Cover Page (form CSRESS-2002) must contain pen-and-ink signature(s) of the project director and co-project directors. Appropriate institutional representatives must also sign. The title should be no longer than 100 characters (letters, punctuation and spaces between words).

B. Project Summary (use form CSREES-2003)

The summary should provide a brief description of the problem or opportunity, project objectives and a description of the effort in simple terms that can be understood by a diverse audience, including: the general public, university personnel, various public and private organizations, and budget staff. Please indicate which project type is being proposed. Place this form immediately following the Proposal Cover Page and do not number. In addition to printing the Project Summary on form CSREES-2003, applicants should submit these summaries electronically to the North Central IPM Center director along with narrative portions of the proposal.

C. Table of Contents

For ease in locating information, each proposal must contain a detailed Table of Contents. The Table of Contents should be placed after the Project Summary Form and contain page number references for each component of the proposal.

D. Background

Describe how the proposed approach will improve the integrated pest management system. Identify the importance of the pest challenges in economic, stakeholder, user, or environmental terms.

E. Objectives

Provide a clear, complete, logically arranged and numbered set of project objectives and specific planned accomplishments. The objectives of the project must each be clearly defined and measurable. The proposal will be rated higher if there is a strong connection with the National IPM Roadmap objectives which can be found at: <http://www.ipmcenters.org/Policy/index.cfm>.

F. Approach and Methodology

Identify the design, methods, analytical approach and how the outcomes will be measured for the project. Describe how the project will be managed, particularly how coordination between the components of the project will be achieved. A numbered procedure statement should correspond with each numbered objective. These statements should outline the essential work plans and methods that will be employed in attaining each objective. The procedure statement should show that the proposed work has the potential of providing data and information that will permit accomplishing the objectives.

G. Literature Cited

Applicants should list only publications cited in the proposal. There is no limit on the number of publications cited, but a maximum of ten (10) would be assumed reasonable.

H. Probable Duration

The planned duration of proposed projects should be consistent with the duration described under each project type.

I. Relevancy Statement

Discuss the feasibility of improving IPM implementation and integration into a pest management system. Describe why this project is necessary by answering the “So *what?*” question. Providing evidence of stakeholder involvement in the proposal is strongly encouraged. The procedures used to generate stakeholder involvement may be described in the relevancy statement. Letters of support also can be added as attachments to the overall application.

J. Evaluation Plans

A brief discussion of plans to evaluate progress must be included. A time-line showing expected progress and expected outcomes would be helpful and could be used as a part of the progress report to demonstrate satisfactory progress.

K. Cooperation and Institutional Units Involved

When appropriate, projects should be coordinated with the efforts of other state and national personnel and programs. Proposals should clearly define the role and responsibility of each person. Indicate the involvement of relevant disciplines, agencies, and organizations, including research, extension, consultants, private sector, and producers. Collaboration with private-sector groups and organizations is encouraged.

L. Key Personnel

The following should be included:

- (a) The roles and responsibilities of the PD and each collaborator should be clearly described;
- (b) Current curriculum vitae of the PD and each co-PD, senior associate, and other professional personnel who are expected to work on the project should be included, whether or not IPM funds are sought for their support. Each vitae should be limited to two pages in length.

M. Collaborative Arrangements

If it will be necessary to enter into formal consulting, collaborative, or subcontractual arrangements with others, such arrangements should be fully explained and justified. If the consultant(s) or collaborator(s) are known at the time of application, a vitae or resume 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 will be required to provide information on the consultants and collaborators in the budget and budget narrative portion of the application.

N. Budget Form (CSREES-2004)

Each proposal must include a detailed Budget Form CSREES –2004 for each year of requested support and a budget form that summarizes total costs. The budget instructions included in the CSREES Application Forms Package is applicable. The budget form may be reproduced as needed. Funds may be requested under any of the categories listed on the form, provided that the item or service for which support is requested is allowable under the authorizing legislation; and the applicable statutes, regulations, and Federal cost principles can be justified as necessary for the successful conduct of the proposed project. Graduate assistantships are not allowed. An Excel format version of this form is available at the following link: <http://csrees.usda.gov/funding/forms.html>. Please be sure to save this form to your computer's local drive before entering data.

(a) Indirect Costs

Pursuant to Section 1462 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (NARETPA), as amended (7 U.S.C. 3310), indirect costs for this program are limited to 20 percent of the total Federal funds. Therefore, the recovery of indirect costs under this program may not exceed the lesser of the institution's official negotiated indirect cost rate or the equivalent of 20 percent of total Federal funds awarded. Another method of calculating the maximum allowable is 25 percent of the total direct costs. This limitation also applies to the recovery of indirect costs by any subawardee or subcontractor, and should be reflected in the subrecipients' budgets.

(b) Cost Sharing or Matching

There are no matching requirements for the NC-IPM Center IPM Implementation grants awarded under this authority and matching resources will not be factored into the review process as evaluation criteria.

O. Budget Narrative

A detailed budget narrative must be included with each proposal. All budget categories, with the exception of Indirect Costs, for which support is requested, must be individually listed (with costs) in the same order as the budget and justified on a separate sheet of paper and placed immediately behind the Budget Form. If consulting, collaborative arrangements, or

subcontractual arrangements are included in the application, these arrangements should be fully explained and justified. The rate of pay for any consultant must be included, if known at the time of application. A proposed statement of work, vitae, and a budget for each arrangement involving the transfer of substantive programmatic work or the provision of financial assistance to a third party must be supplied. In multi-state applications, a budget and budget narrative must be included for each state involved. The lead state and each participating state must be identified.

P. Current and Pending Support (Form CSREES-2005)

All applications must contain Form CSREES-2005 listing other current public or private support (including in-house support) to which personnel identified in the proposal have committed portions of their time, whether or not salary support for person(s) involved is included in the budget. Please follow the instructions provided on this form. Please note that the project being proposed should be included in the 'pending section' of the form.

Q. Assurance Statements

Note that by signing Form CSREES-2002 the applicant is providing the certifications required by 7 CFR Part 3017, regarding Debarment and Suspension and Drug-Free Workplace, and CFR Part 3018, regarding Lobbying. The certification forms are included in the application package for informational purposes only. These forms should not be submitted with the proposal since by signing Form CSREES-2002 your organization is providing the required certifications. If the project will involve a subcontractor or consultant, the subcontractor/consultant should submit a Form AD-1048, Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transactions, to the grantee organization for retention in their records.

R. Conflict of Interest

A Conflict of Interest List, Form CSREES-2007, must be provided for all individuals who have submitted vitae. Each form should list alphabetically, by the last names, the full names of the individuals in the following categories: (a) all co-authors on publications within the past four years, including pending publications and submissions; (b) all collaborators on projects within the past four years, including current and planned collaborations; (c) all thesis or postdoctoral advisees/advisors within the past four years; and (d) all persons in your field with whom you have had a consulting or financial arrangement within the past our year, who stand to gain by seeing the project funded. This form is necessary to assist program staff in excluding from application review those individuals who have conflicts of interest with the personnel in the grant application. The program contact must be informed of any additional conflict of interest that arise after the application is submitted.

S. Proposal Cover page B

Proposal Cover Page (Form CSREES-2002 – Page B) Personal Data on Project Director Page B should be submitted only with the original signature copy of the application and should be placed

as the last page of the original copy of the proposal. This page contains personal data on the PD(s). The NC-IPM Center requests this information in order to monitor the operation of its review and awards processes. This page will not be duplicated or used during the review process. Please note that failure to submit this information will in no way affect consideration of your application.

IV. Funding Restrictions

CSREES has determined that grant funds awarded under this authority may not be used for the renovation or refurbishment of research, education, or extension space; the purchase or installation of fixed equipment in such space; or the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of buildings or facilities. Costs that are a part of the institution's indirect cost pool may not be reclassified as direct costs for the purpose of making them allowable. The applicable terms and conditions for awards made under this program (CSREES General Terms & Conditions – A) can be obtained from the following link:

<http://www.ree.usda.gov/crgam/oep/termsa.doc>. Any additional requirements will be included in subaward agreements for funded projects.

V. Other Submission Requirements

1. What to Submit

A letter of intent is due electronically by February 3, 2006 (5:00 pm EST). An application will not be accepted if a letter of intent was not submitted in accordance with instructions in the RFA. The electronic version of the proposal must be received by March 3, 2006 (5:00 pm EST). The original and two (2) copies of each proposal must be received by 5:00 p.m. on March 10, 2006. Facsimile copies are not acceptable.

2. Where to submit

Applicants must submit an electronic copy of the letter of intent and full proposal with all appropriate forms to the NC IPM Center web site at <http://www.ncipmc.org/egrants>.

Hard copies of the proposals should be sent by the U.S. Postal Service, express mail, or overnight courier service to Dr. Larry Olsen. The receipt of all proposals will be acknowledged by e-mail. If the applicant does not receive an acknowledgment within 14 days of the submission deadline, please contact Dr. Larry Olsen. Once the proposal has been assigned an application number, please cite that number on all future correspondence. The hard copies should be sent to:

Dr. Larry Olsen
North Central Integrated Pest Management Center
Michigan State University
B-18 Food Safety and Toxicology Bldg.
East Lansing, MI 48824

VI. Evaluation and Selection Criteria

The NC IPM Center Review Panel will judge the merits and technical quality of the proposal based on the following criteria:

1. Evidence of stakeholder justification of the need for the project to develop and/or demonstrate the IPM practices to improve economic benefits and to reduce potential human health and adverse environmental risks as stated in the IPM Roadmap. (weight: 20%)
2. Evidence of collaborative relationships of relevant disciplines, agencies, and organizations including research, extension, consultants, private sector, and producers to address the identified IPM needs. (weight: 10%)
3. Appropriateness and scientific and/or education merit of the objectives (objectives clearly state who will accomplish what and when, objectives are measurable. (weight: 20%)
4. Feasibility of attaining objectives during the project, appropriateness of budget, potential of success and for increasing IPM implementation and adoption. (weight: 20%)
5. The project's potential impact on increasing IPM implementation by clientele in the North Central Region. (weight: 20%)
6. Design and methodology (design is appropriate, methods are referenced). (weight: 5%)
7. Education and experience of the PDs. (weight: 5%)

Funding levels will be recommended within the limitation of total funds available. If there are not enough satisfactory proposals to utilize all of the funds allotted to a project type, the review panel may recommend utilizing funds to support other project types or may recommend carrying over the funds into the next funding cycle. The Steering Committee and Directors will make the final funding decisions.

VII. Reports

A brief (2 page) progress report is required for all renewal projects. These will be evaluated by the review panel to determine if continued funding will be recommended. A detailed final report must be submitted within 60 days after the termination date of the subcontract. They are to be submitted to Larry Olsen at the address above and Susan Ratcliffe at:

NC IPM Center Co-director
University of Illinois
Department of Crop Science
S- 316 Turner Hall
1102 S. Goodwin Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801

Final reports should be no longer than 10 pages (12-point type or larger, on-inch margins). In the report, the PD(s) will be expected to demonstrate what progress was made on the project and to highlight important findings and recommendations made as a result of the project. Failure to submit a final report will result in a recommendation to prevent eligibility for other grants. The NC IPM Center Director Larry Olsen will contact the PD(s) approximately two months prior to the end date to remind them the final report is due 60 days after the project termination date.

PD(s) are required to acknowledge CSREES and the NC IPM Center in all publications or other products that result from funds that are awarded. Reprints or copies of all publications would be appreciated.