

**SOUTHERN REGION IPM CENTER
IPM ENHANCEMENT GRANTS PROGRAM: PART 1
(STATE CONTACT PROJECTS, IPM DOCUMENTS
AND IPM WORKING GROUPS)
Request for Applications - FY 2009**

Summary

This Request for Applications (RFA) solicits proposals for projects that will enhance the development and implementation of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in the southern region of the United States. The three project types for which we are seeking applications for funding are described in this RFA. They are: State Contact Projects; IPM Documents (i.e., Crop Profiles, Pest Management Strategic Plans, IPM Elements, and IPM Priorities); and IPM Working Groups.

A separate RFA (IPM Enhancement Grants Program: Part 2) will request applications for Special Projects (IPM Seed and Capstone Grants). They will not be considered under Part 1.

Proposals **must** be submitted in electronic format through the following web page: <http://www.sripmc.org/pmcprojects/ListRFAs.cfm>. The online submission must be completed no later than **5:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on Friday, February 13, 2009**.

The Proposal Cover Page (form SR SF424 (R&R)) must be completed and submitted electronically through our web page: <http://www.sripmc.org/pmcprojects/ListRFAs.cfm>. In addition, a paper copy of form SR SF424 (R&R) must be signed by the authorized representative of the submitting organization and faxed to the Southern Region IPM Center office at 919-513-1114 (attention Steve Toth) no later than **5:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on Friday, February 13, 2009**. **(Please fax only the signed form SR SF424 (R&R), not the entire proposal.)**

Proposals may request funding for a maximum of one year.

I. General Information

In FY 2003, the Southern Region Integrated Pest Management 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 Southern Region IPM Center (see <http://www.sripmc.org/>). Geographically, the Center covers the following states and territories: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, the U. S. Virgin Islands and Virginia.

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* (see http://www.csrees.usda.gov/nea/pest/pdfs/ipm_roadmap_5-3-04.pdf), while maintaining the regional (site-specific) nature required for effective IPM programs.

The Center provides leadership and coordination for the identification of priority IPM needs and issues through multi-state and multi-organization collaboration in the southern 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 including the Pesticide Safety Education Program; with existing regional pest management programs such as the multi-state IPM technical committee (SERA003-IPM), Sustainable Agricultural Research and Extension, IR-4, Southern Plant Diagnostic Network; and with USDA/CSREES programs such as Crops at Risk, the Pest Management Alternatives Program, and the Risk Avoidance and Mitigation Program.

The Center structure is designed to accommodate diverse pest management programs and perspectives, connect all stakeholders, and effectively deal with pest management issues. An important role of the Center is to facilitate effective communication among government agencies, colleges and universities, the agricultural community, and other interested stakeholders. Participating stakeholders serve a dual communications role: to represent their own group to other Center partners and to represent the work of the Center and its partners to their own group.

To increase effectiveness and to encourage a broader range of stakeholders, the Southern Region IPM Center outsources 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 Southern Region IPM Center understands stakeholders' needs and priorities. Shared ownership also serves to amplify the Center's resources, allowing it to draw from a richer pool of expertise and address a broader range of issues. The synergistic benefits afforded by this approach ultimately enhance the Center's ability to fulfill the information needs of a diverse clientele facing real-world IPM challenges.

This RFA for the Center's IPM Enhancement Grants Program solicits proposals for projects that will enhance development and implementation of IPM in our region. The three project types for which we are seeking applications for funding are described in this RFA. They are: State Contact Projects; IPM Documents (i.e., Crop Profiles, Pest Management Strategic Plans, IPM Elements, and IPM Priorities); and IPM Working Groups.

II. Eligibility

Eligible applicants include private individuals and institutions, faculty of four-year universities, businesses, commodity organizations, and governmental and non-governmental organizations. The primary Project Director must be from within the Southern Region (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, the U. S. Virgin Islands and Virginia); however, collaboration with individuals outside the region is acceptable.

Successful applicants will be funded via a subcontract from North Carolina State University. Cooperation among potential participants is encouraged. It is our desire, where possible, to issue only one subcontract per institution in order to minimize overall indirect cost charges to the Southern Region IPM Center. Project Directors of successful proposals will be contacted to work out the funding mechanism. USDA budgetary guidelines (see pages 36-44 in *CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide*, available at http://www.sripmc.org/pmcprojects/electronic_app_guide.pdf) apply to projects funded through this program.

Successful proposals from the previous year: The Southern Region IPM Center presented a similar grants program during 2008. That program funded 8 State Contact Projects (ranging from \$24,000 for a single state project to \$40,000 for a multi-state project) and 4 IPM Documents projects (ranging from \$8,191 to \$25,000). The 12 projects were funded for a total of \$272,220. Examples of similar projects funded by the Southern Region IPM Center from 2004 through 2008 are available on the Center's web site at <http://www.sripmc.org/ipmenhancement/fundedproj.cfm>.

III. Program Priorities

Projects funded by this program are expected to use available funding for:

- A. State Contact Projects: support the communications network of the Southern Region IPM Center.
- B. IPM Documents: promote the development of IPM documents (i.e., Crop Profiles, Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSPs), IPM Elements, and IPM Priorities).
- C. IPM Working Groups: identify and address IPM priorities for important settings in the southern region through public/private, multi-state and multi-institutional collaboration.

State Contact Projects are important to the operation of the Southern Region IPM Center's communications network and should cover as many of the state and territories in the region as possible. Only one State Contact Project will be funded per state or territory. A State Contact Project may include a single state or territory or multiple states and territories, as long as the project addresses the elements of a State Contact Project listed in Section IV. 1.

Priority for the funding of the development of IPM documents will be: 1) the absence of current and up-to-date documents for the same IPM setting (i.e., crops, sites); 2) importance (as indicated by measures such as acres, economic value, etc.) of the IPM setting in the state and/or region; and 3) timely prioritization by the Southern Region IPM Center and/or its stakeholder groups (e.g., EPA, USDA, grower groups).

The transfer of IPM Working Group projects into this RFA represents a new emphasis on working group activities by the Southern Region IPM Center. The Center expects to fund one or more IPM Working Groups for up to \$25,000 each to establish a network of Extension and research scientists and stakeholders to identify and/or address IPM priorities for a particular IPM setting or issue for multiple states and territories in the southern region.

Proposals for Special Projects (IPM Seed and Capstone Grants) **must** be submitted under Enhancement Grants Part 2. They will not be considered under Part 1.

IV. Project Types

1. State Contact Projects (SCPs)

Funding is available to support the communications network of the Southern Region IPM Center. Only one SCP per state or territory will be funded, but one project may address more than one state or territory. The maximum award for a project addressing a single state or territory is \$25,000. Additional funding may be awarded to Project Directors who coordinate and manage multi-state projects that combine SCP functions across state boundaries to improve efficiency and productivity. Explicit justification for each budgeted expense is strongly recommended. Funding is on an annual, competitive basis. Projects funded in a particular funding cycle must submit a renewal proposal, which will be evaluated in part using progress reports submitted separately to the Center. State Contacts will:

- Serve as the primary contact for regulatory questions related to pest management and pesticides. Outputs will be the number of information requests and responses, and the quality of those responses. These are monitored by an online system developed by the Center and used by the State Contacts to receive and reply to requests. The system will also include a follow-up on the final EPA disposition, where possible, in conjunction with the USDA's Office of Pest Management Policy. Expected results will be the responses to the EPA and reporting on the number and complexity of requests/answers.
- Document activities related to pesticide and pest management inquiries from entities other than the Center, USDA and EPA. These may include, for instance, state regulatory agencies and non-governmental stakeholder groups, if such occur.

- Establish and maintain a stakeholder network to consult, advise and otherwise participate in the activities of the State Contact Project. The network is not required to involve an advisory committee, *per se*, but projects without an advisory committee will have a stronger burden of demonstrating effective stakeholder engagement. It is expected that the stakeholder network will include the state's key individuals and programs involved in IPM, such as the IPM Coordinator, Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) Coordinator, IR-4 representative, 1890s university IPM programs, state departments of agriculture and environmental conservation, commodity groups, etc. Contact with the stakeholder network may include scheduled meetings, conference calls, e-mail listservs, or other effective means of communication. The expected result will be a publicly available (online) list of individuals and groups participating in the stakeholder network and evidence of their involvement in project activities (e.g., minutes of stakeholder meetings or conference calls, records of stakeholder recommendations, lists of stakeholder priorities for IPM).
- Provide coordination and oversight of Crop Profiles, Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSPs), and stakeholder-identified IPM priorities developed in the state. See <http://www.sripmc.org/CropProfiles/index.cfm> for guidelines in preparing Crop Profiles and PMSPs. One expected result will be maintaining access to these products for the state through the project web site (see below) and Southern Region IPM Center web site. Another expected result is an explanation of this coordination and oversight (detailing the numbers and criteria used) in the State Contact Project final report.
- Provide an annual assessment prioritizing Crop Profiles and PMSPs for each state and territory covered by the project. This assessment will indicate which existing Crop Profiles and PMSPs are sufficiently up-to-date and which are in need of updating. The production of new documents and updating of existing documents must be prioritized by their need. The methods used to determine these priorities must be explained. This assessment must be completed no later than November 1, 2008 to facilitate its use with subsequent Requests for Applications. We expect to require an annual update of this document in future projects.
- Provide a list containing the names of the IPM-related experts for research and Extension for all the important commodities and settings pertinent to the state or territory. This list should include at least all experts of the land-grant institutions in the state or territory. This list must be updated at least once annually. Individuals will be listed by crop (or setting), discipline (entomology, plant pathology, weed science, etc.), and responsibility (Extension, research, etc.). (Note that only Extension contacts will be made available to the public.)

- Maintain a project web site. Required attributes of the web site can be found online at <http://www.sripmc.org/webstandards.cfm>. The expected result will be the current and maintained web site.
- Attend an annual State Contact meeting arranged by the Center in consultation with the Project Directors. The expected result will be participation in the meeting. Travel funds for one or more Project Directors to attend this meeting should be included in the project budget.
- For maximum funding, additional activities can be included. Examples are (but are not limited to) surveying IPM practices, publishing newsletters (printed, e-mail or web), and conducting studies of useful IPM metrics.

2. IPM Documents

Crop Profiles and Pest Management Strategic Plans: Funding is available to support the development of Crop Profiles and Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSPs) for important IPM settings in the southern region. The level of funding provided for a Crop Profile or PMSP will be dependent on the work proposed in the project. Explicit justification for each budgeted expense is strongly recommended. Examples of similar projects funded by the Southern Region IPM Center from 2004 through 2008 are available on the Center's web site at <http://www.sripmc.org/ipmenhancement/fundedproj.cfm>. Criteria for funding these projects include:

- Absence of current and up-to-date documents for the same IPM setting (i.e., crops, sites).
- Importance (as indicated by measures such as acres, economic value, etc.) of the IPM setting in the state and/or region.
- Timely prioritization by the Southern Region IPM Center and/or its stakeholder groups (e.g., EPA, USDA, grower groups). Documentation of stakeholder priorities is required and can include original letters, annual reports, minutes from meetings, etc. EPA's Office of Pesticide Program's Biologic and Economic Analysis Division has provided a prioritization list, which is available at http://www.sripmc.org/CropProfiles/EPA_Priorities.cfm.

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 on the web at <http://www.ipmcenters.org/CropProfiles/index.cfm> and <http://www.ipmcenters.org/pmsp/index.cfm>, respectively. Documents are not considered complete until they have been approved by Southern Region IPM Center leadership and are included in the National IPM Centers' database. The outcome will be the completed and approved documents.

IPM Elements: IPM elements, guidelines and protocols are concise lists of IPM practices for a given setting. These are generally crop (or setting) and region-specific, and offer efficient resources for determining which IPM practices are recommended by land-grant university scientists for a given commodity. They can include lists of IPM practices for use in NRCS programs. Examples of IPM elements, guidelines and protocols are available on the IPM Institute of America, Inc. web site at http://www.ipminstitute.org/Fed_Agency_Resources/IPM_elements_guidelines.htm. The effort and expense required for preparation of these documents is expected to fall between that required for a Crop Profile and a PMSP.

IPM Priorities: The IPM Enhancement Grants Program will consider funding projects designed to produce or update stakeholder-identified priorities for IPM research, education and regulation in a particular IPM setting. Funds for each project of this type are expected to be between \$1,000 and \$2,000. New priority lists might be appropriate either when no such priority list for an IPM setting exists or when priority lists included in PMSPs or other sources are outdated.

Criteria for funding these projects include:

- Absence of up-to-date priority lists for the same setting.
- Importance (as indicated by measures such as acres, economic value, etc.) of the IPM setting in the state and/or region.
- Appropriateness of the proposed methods for setting priorities, including number and diversity of stakeholders involved.

3. IPM Working Groups

Funding is available to support the work of one or more IPM Working Groups to a maximum of \$25,000 per project. Explicit justification for each budgeted expense is strongly recommended. Projects should be designed to complete stated objectives within one year. An IPM Working Group is eligible to compete for additional funding of new initiatives in future years if the original objectives are accomplished.

IPM Working Groups projects should focus on a specific issue or issues of importance to IPM in the Southern Region. The issue may be associated with a particular crop or setting or it may be a crosscutting issue. Projects should be multi-disciplinary and involve cooperators from more than one state or territory in the Southern Region.

The core function of an IPM Working Group is to: a) create a collaborative team of stakeholders that addresses an IPM-related issue of importance to the Southern Region; b) undertake a needs assessment to address the focus issue; c) establish priorities for addressing the identified needs; and d) write an action plan for future efforts of the Working Group to address the prioritized needs.

Working Group projects should involve 10-15 members (selected by Project Directors) representing an appropriately diverse array of perspectives. In addition to extension and research representatives, projects are strongly encouraged to include IPM practitioners (growers, managers, and/or their IPM advisors) and others interested in or who will be affected by the project outcomes (community groups, environmental groups, government agencies). Project funds may be used to sponsor and pay the travel of working group members to a multi-state meeting or workshop to accomplish the project objectives.

Completion of the core functions must be documented in a progress report provided to the Southern Region IPM Center no later than 30 days after the project termination date.

Funds may be granted up to the maximum if additional objectives beyond the core function are included in the project. Examples of these include but are not limited to: a) preparing and submitting a multi-state proposal to a granting agency to obtain funding to address a prioritized need(s); b) development and distribution of educational materials; c) stakeholder surveys to determine IPM practices, priorities, or other key information; and d) demonstrations, workshops, presentations, etc.

V. Matching Funds

Matching funds are not required.

VI. Proposal Format

Proposals must be submitted in the following format. All forms required can be obtained on our web page at <http://www.sripmc.org/pmcprojects/ListRFAs.cfm>. Most of these forms are **similar but not identical** to application forms used in the Grants.gov electronic submission process. Applicants to the IPM Enhancement program **must** use the forms provided on the web page. Proposals must be submitted in electronic format.

Each proposal, written in English, must be in letter format (8.5" x 11"), all pages must be numbered, and text must be single-spaced with one-inch margins using a font no smaller than 12 point.

Multiple Project Types: Project Directors with proposals that include multiple project types (State Contact Projects, IPM Documents and IPM Working Groups) must submit them together as a single proposal. In the proposal, distinction between project types should be clearly made and the project summary should clearly describe each project type. Each project type in a proposal must entail objectives and corresponding procedures that are distinct from those of the other project type. The budget narrative must clearly delineate the funding intended for each project type.

Page Limits:

Single project type: Limits for the narrative portion of the proposals (section C below) entailing only one project type are:

- State Contact Projects: eight (8) pages
- IPM Documents: eight (8) pages
- IPM Working Groups: eight (8) pages

Multiple project types: The page limit for the narrative portion of the proposals (section C below) entailing two project types is twelve (12) pages and three project types is sixteen (16) pages.

A. Proposal Cover Page

One copy of the Proposal Cover Page (form SR SF424 (R&R)) must contain the signature(s) of the ~~Project Director and co-Project Directors~~ **Authorized Representative**. ~~Appropriate institutional representatives must also sign.~~ The title should be no longer than 100 characters (letters, punctuation and spaces between words). **State Contact Projects MUST have the title “State Contact and IPM Documents for [State]” even if there are no plans for IPM documents or IPM Working Groups this year.** Please download the copy of form SR SF424 (R&R) from our website.

The SR SF424 (R&R) form must be completed and submitted electronically through our web page: <http://www.sripmc.org/pmcprojects/ListRFAs.cfm>. In addition, a paper copy of form SR SF424 (R&R) must be signed by the authorized representative of the submitting organization and faxed to the Southern Region IPM Center office at 919-513-1114 no later than **5:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on Friday, February 13, 2009.** (Please fax only the signed form SR SF424 (R&R), not the entire proposal.)

B. Project Summary

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.

C. Project Narrative

1. Previous Work, Related Experience and Justification

For State Contact Projects, the Project Director should use this section to provide a brief summary of pertinent experience with information networking, Crop Profiles and PMSPs. Applicants should describe the current need for additional

networking, surveys, Crop Profiles, and PMSPs in the state or multi-state project area, and should indicate how the proposed project will address these needs. For IPM Documents projects (Crop Profiles, Pest Management Strategic Plans, IPM Elements and IPM Priorities), a typical introduction to the problem, including an appropriate review of the literature, should be included in this section.

For IPM Working Groups, this section should be used to describe the importance of the IPM setting or issue to the respective states and territories in the southern region and how the proposed working group will address IPM for the setting or issue. Also, Project Directors should provide a brief summary of their related experience and previous work with the setting or issue and the experience and previous work of other members of the working group.

2. Objectives

There should be a concise, complete, logically arranged and numbered series of statements defining the objectives of the project. Project Directors should feel free to group objectives in a way that seems most logical for the proposed project.

3. Procedures

A numbered procedure statement should correspond with each numbered objective. These statements should outline the essential working 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 accomplish the objectives.

4. 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 fifteen (15) would be assumed reasonable.

5. Probable Duration

The planned duration of proposed projects should be consistent with the duration described under each project type (see Section IV). Proposals may request funding for a maximum of one year.

6. Evaluation Plans

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

7. Cooperation of Key Personnel and Institutional Units Involved

Identify key personnel and each institutional unit contributing to the project. In multiple-institutional proposals, each institution should be identified and the lead institution designated. Applicants should clearly define the roles and responsibilities of each person and institutional unit of the project team, if applicable.

If the project includes consulting, collaborative or sub-contractual arrangements, such arrangements should be fully explained and justified in the budget narrative and budget. In addition, evidence should be provided here that the collaborators involved have agreed to render these services. Acceptable documentation for this purpose includes letters of intent or statements of work from the individual or organization. Copies of either letters or email messages from the collaborators will suffice for this purpose.

Project Directors, co-Project Directors, and any collaborators who will receive a portion of the budget must provide current vitae (two pages maximum) including a listing of the most relevant publications.

D. Budget

Each proposal must include a detailed budget form (available on our web page at <http://www.sripmc.org/pmcprojects/ListRFAs.cfm>) for each year of requested support and a budget form that summarizes total project costs for the duration of the project. For State Contact Projects, the project budget should include expenses for one or more Project Directors to attend an annual meeting of the projects funded as a part of the information network. USDA budgetary guidelines (see pages 36-44 in *CSREES Grants.gov Application Guide*, available at http://www.sripmc.org/pmcprojects/electronic_app_guide.pdf) must be followed. Indirect costs of up to 20 percent of the total funds awarded (equivalent to 25 percent of total direct costs) can be requested. A proposal that includes both project types must include a separate budget for each project type and a separate combined budget.

Each proposal budget must be within the budgetary limits defined by this RFA. Review panelists will be instructed to deduct 15 points (15%) from proposals that exceed budgetary limits.

E. Budget Narrative

A detailed budget narrative must be included. If consulting, collaborative, or sub-contractual arrangements are included in the proposal, these arrangements should be fully explained and justified. Letters of intent or other evidence should be provided to show that collaborators involved have agreed to render these services. A proposed statement of work and a budget for each arrangement involving the transfer of substantive programmatic work or the providing of financial assistance to a third party must be

provided. A proposal that includes both project types must include a separate budget narrative for each project type.

F. Current and Pending Support Form

Submit the Current and Pending Support form for the Project Director and co-Project Directors (if any).

G. Conflict of Interest Form

Submit the Conflict of Interest form for the Project Director and co-Project Directors (if any).

H. National Environmental Policy Act Exclusions Form

CSREES-2006 (National Environmental Policy Act Exclusions Form) must be included for each Project Director.

I. Assurance Statement(s)

CSREES-2008 (Assurance Statement(s)) is required.

J. Appendices

Additional items such as reprints or reports may be included as appendices submitted in pdf format. Project Directors are strongly cautioned not to abuse this provision in an attempt to circumvent page limits.

VII. Evaluation and Selection Criteria

All proposals received will be acknowledged. The Southern Region IPM Center Scientific Review Panel will judge the merits and technical quality of the proposal based on the following criteria:

Relevance (35%)

Relevance is measured differently for different project types.

- **State Contact Projects:** A State Contact Project is defined by this RFA as having relevance to the Southern Region IPM Center when it addresses **all** of the objectives outlined for a State Contact Project in Section IV. 1.
 - Serve as the primary contact for regulatory questions related to pest management and pesticides.
 - Document activities related to pesticide and pest management inquiries from entities other than the Center, USDA and EPA.
 - Establish and maintain a stakeholder network to consult, advise and otherwise participate in the activities of the State Contact Project.

- Provide coordination and oversight of Crop Profiles, Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSPs), and stakeholder-identified IPM priorities developed in the state.
 - Provide an annual assessment prioritizing Crop Profiles and PMSPs for each state and territory covered by the project.
 - Provide a list containing the names of the IPM-related experts for research and Extension for all the important commodities and settings pertinent to the state or territory.
 - Maintain a project web site.
 - Attend an annual State Contact meeting arranged by the Center.
- **IPM Documents (all types):** Relevance of IPM documents to the Southern Region IPM Center is determined by the following:
 - Absence of current and up-to-date documents for the same IPM setting (i.e., crops, sites).
 - Importance (as indicated by measures such as acres, economic value, etc.) of the IPM setting in the state and/or region.
 - Timely prioritization by the Southern Region IPM Center and/or its stakeholder groups (e.g., EPA, USDA, grower groups). Documentation of stakeholder priorities is required.
 - **IPM Working Groups:** An IPM Working Group is defined by this RFA as having relevance to the Southern Region IPM Center when it addresses at a minimum objectives a, b, c and d below. Other objectives, such as e, f, g and h, are optional, but encouraged for maximum or continued funding.
 - a. Create a collaborative team of stakeholders that addresses an IPM-related issue of importance to the Southern Region. The issue may be associated with a particular crop or setting or it may be a crosscutting issue. Projects should be multi-disciplinary and involve cooperators from more than one state or territory in the region.
 - b. Undertake a needs assessment to address the focus issue.
 - c. Establish priorities for addressing the identified needs.
 - d. Write an action plan for future efforts of Working Group to address the identified and prioritized needs.
 - e. Prepare and submit a multi-state proposal to a granting agency to obtain funding to address a prioritized need(s).
 - f. Develop and distribute educational materials.
 - g. Conduct stakeholder surveys to determine IPM practices, priorities, or other key information.
 - h. Perform demonstrations, workshops, presentations, etc.

Project Design (35%)

- Work plans appropriately address objectives
- Procedures are adequate to insure the success of the project
- Clear evidence of links to both traditional and non-traditional participants (i.e., grower/commodity organizations, other colleges and universities, USDA, EPA, etc.)

Quality of proposal preparation (15%)

- Adequately assembled, all components included
- Clarity and style of presentation

Budget (15%)

- Well-defined within the guidelines (including budgetary limits) in the RFA and USDA
- Reasonable with proposed program and complexity/size of the project

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 Scientific Review Panel may recommend utilizing funds to support other project types or may recommend carrying over the funds into the next year.

VIII. Reports

State Contact Projects will be required to submit an annual project report at a date to be determined by the Southern Region IPM Center. IPM Documents projects will require the submission of a final report within sixty (60) days after the termination date of the subcontract. Report formats and instructions for submitting will be provided by the Center.

IX. Submission of Proposals

Proposals must be submitted in electronic format through our web page: <http://www.sripmc.org/pmcprojects/ListRFAs.cfm>. The online submission using must be completed no later than **5:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on Friday, February 13, 2009.**

The Proposal Cover Page (form SR SF424 (R&R)) must be completed and submitted electronically through our web page: <http://www.sripmc.org/pmcprojects/ListRFAs.cfm>. In addition, a paper copy of form SR SF424 (R&R) must be signed by the authorized representative of the submitting organization and faxed to the Southern Region IPM Center office at 919-513-1114 no later than **5:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on Friday, February 13, 2009. (Please fax only the signed form SR SF424 (R&R), not the entire proposal.)**

E-mail acknowledgement of receipt will be made when possible.

For questions regarding the Request for Applications or submission of a proposal, contact Steve Toth, Associate Director (telephone: 919-513-8189; e-mail: Steve_Toth@ncsu.edu) or Jim VanKirk, Director (telephone: 919-513-8179; e-mail: jim@sripmc.org).

For technical questions regarding submission of a proposal, contact Rosemary Hallberg (telephone: 919-513-8182; e-mail: rhallberg@sripmc.org).