

**SOUTHERN REGION IPM CENTER
IPM ENHANCEMENT GRANTS PROGRAM: PART II
(Special Projects)
Request for Applications - FY 2006**

This document is available as [MS Word](#), [HTML](#), or [PDF](#)

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. We are seeking applications for funding for Special Projects described in this RFA.

We will consider funding two types of special projects. "IPM Seed Grants" will support projects to plan, initiate or catalyze important new IPM efforts and initiatives. "IPM Capstone Grants" will support outreach and/or educational projects that serve as capstones to previously existing research and Extension IPM initiatives.

Proposals **must** be submitted in **both** printed and electronic formats. Electronic submission is through the following web page: http://www.sripmc.org/ElectronicSubmission/index06_1.cfm . Online submission must be completed no later than **5:00 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time) on Friday, June 23, 2006.**

One printed original with appropriate signatures and one printed copy, both corresponding to the electronic version, must be received at the Southern Region IPM Center by **5:00 Eastern Daylight Time Wednesday, June 28, 2006.** Facsimile copies are not acceptable.

Projects are limited to no more than 12 months duration and no more than \$25,000. Total funds available for this program are approximately \$100,000.

I. 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 encouraged.

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 (available on our web page at <http://www.sripmc.org/IPMenhancement/>) apply to projects funded through this program.

Successful proposals from the previous year: Please note the “Special Projects” category has changed significantly from previous years, so previously funded projects may not prove useful as models for proposals this year. Descriptions of projects funded previously can be found online at <http://www.sripmc.org/IPMEnhancement/2005projects.cfm> ,

II. Program Priorities

Projects funded by this program are expected to use available funding to help initiate new IPM efforts (IPM Seed Grants) or to help implement IPM methods and strategies (IPM Capstone Grants). Projects must address important IPM issues for the Southern Region of the United States, Preference will be shown to projects that include appropriate levels of stakeholder engagement, and to projects that either build on previous work (IPM Capstone Grants) or lead to future work (IPM Seed Grants).

At present no single comprehensive list of IPM priorities for the Southern Region exists. Proposals should include convincing evidence that the problem is of sufficient priority to merit funding in a competitive environment. Reference to existing, publicly available documentation showing the importance of the issue is strongly encouraged.

Project directors are encouraged to consider the discussion “Addressing Stakeholder-Identified Priorities”, found online at <http://www.sripmc.org/fund/sripm/stakeholders.cfm> .

Single-state projects will be considered for funding. Proposals that offer benefits to two or more states in the region or that entail multistate collaboration are preferred.

III. Project Types

This RFA solicits proposals for only one project type, “Special Projects”. Within that type, we will consider proposals for IPM Seed Grants and IPM Capstone Grants. All projects should have easily-identified short term outcomes and/or deliverables that can reasonably be expected to be completed within the project period.

IPM Seed Grants: IPM Seed Grants support projects to plan, initiate or catalyze important new IPM efforts and initiatives. Examples of fundable projects include but are not limited to issue-oriented work groups, planning workshops, and surveys. Potential functions of IPM Seed Grants projects include but are not limited to:

- Develop IPM practice lists for use in NRCS programs.
- Develop IPM guidelines, management guides or pest alerts.
- Compile or update a set of IPM definitions for program areas.
- Conduct surveys to determine level of IPM adoption.
- Develop long-term research and/or educational approaches to important IPM issues. Outputs might include grant proposals to other funding sources such as USDA's Crops at Risk (CAR), Risk Avoidance and Mitigation Program (RAMP) or Southern Region IPM Grants Program (S-RIPM).
- Plan a conference or workshop of regional interest.

IPM Capstone Grants: IPM Capstone Grants support projects intended to facilitate new or expanded implementation of proven IPM methods and strategies. Presumably necessary research and most developmental work have been completed previously, and these projects will address final steps to encourage adoption and implementation of new methods and strategies.

Examples of fundable projects include but are not limited to:

- On-site demonstrations of important IPM techniques and strategies
- Publications (fact sheets, web pages, bulletins, etc.) that teach IPM users about pest biology, monitoring and management, or IPM techniques and strategies.
- Evaluation of the economics or level of adoption of a particular IPM practice.
- Explaining or promoting IPM to the public via media outlets
- Packaging and marketing IPM products to consumers

IV. Matching Funds

Matching funds are not required.

V. 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/IPMenhancement/>.

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 single-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.

Page Limits: The page limit for the narrative portion of the proposals (items D through I below) is eight (8) pages.

A. Proposal Cover Page

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

B. 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 Proposal Cover Page and contain page number references for each component of the proposal.

C. 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.

D. Background and justification

Explain the current situation, any pertinent history, challenges to and/or opportunities for IPM implementation, and how this project will address those challenges and/or opportunities. An exhaustive literature review is not required, but useful references should be made as appropriate.

E. Objectives and Procedures

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. Procedures should be arranged immediately under the appropriate objectives. For example:

Objective 1: To build a better mousetrap

Procedures for objective 1:

- a. Sketch out a design
- b. Build a prototype
- c. Test the prototype
- d. etc.

The procedure statement should show that the proposed work has the potential of providing data and information that will accomplish the objectives.

F. 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.

G. Probable Duration

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

H. 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.

I. 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.

J. Budget

Each proposal must include a detailed budget form (CSREES-2004) summarizing total project costs for the duration of the project. If the project entails multiple contracts, include separate budget forms and budget narratives for each institution. USDA/CSREES budgetary guidelines 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.

K. Budget Narrative

A detailed budget narrative must be included. The budget narrative should explicitly provide the computations that lead to the numbers presented on the budget form (CSREES-2004). Headings should match those of the budget form (CSREES-2004). If consulting, collaborative, or sub contractual arrangements are included in the proposal, these arrangements should be fully explained. 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.

L. Current and Pending Support Form

Attach a completed form CSREES-2005 (Current and Pending Support) for the Project Director and co-Project Directors (if any).

M. National Environmental Policy Act Exclusions Form

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

N. Assurance Statement(s)

CSREES-2008 (Assurance Statement(s)) is required if the question in box 20 of CSREES-2002 is answered "Yes."

O. Assurance Statement(s)

A brief vitae (two pages maximum) of each project director or co-project director should be attached.

P. Appendices

Documents that help to justify the need for the project or that provide evidence of its prospects for success may be added as appendices. Project Directors are strongly cautioned not to abuse this provision in an attempt to circumvent page limits.

VI. Evaluation and Selection Criteria

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

Importance of this issue to the Southern Region: (30%)

Criteria that will be used in this part of the evaluation include:

- The proposal presents evidence that the IPM issue addressed is of important economic, environmental, and/or human health concern to the Southern Region.

- The proposal presents evidence that the IPM issue addressed is important to stakeholders in the Southern Region.

Potential for success: (30%)

Projects funded by this program are not expected to solve major IPM issues, but they are expected to contribute significantly to the implementation of IPM by initiating solutions to problems (IPM Seed Grants) or providing important finishing touches to existing problem-solving efforts (IPM Capstone Grants). Criteria that will be used in this part of the evaluation include:

- Work plans appropriately address objectives.
- Procedures are appropriate to accomplish objectives.
- The proposal includes clear evidence of participation by appropriate diversity and number of stakeholders.

Multi-state: (5%)

Single-state projects will be considered for funding. Proposals that offer benefits to two or more states in the region or that entail multistate collaboration are preferred.

Resource leveraging: (15%)

Although not a requirement of this RFA, leveraging other types of program resources, past, present, or future, is strongly encouraged.

- Proposals for IPM Capstone projects should provide evidence that the project builds on research and or Extension work that has already been accomplished.
- Proposals for IPM Seed projects should provide evidence that the project may, with reasonable hope of success, catalyze or facilitate collaboration and/or allotment of future resources to address the issue. These could include (but are not limited to) human resources through future collaboration and funding resources through submissions to other funding agencies.
- All projects are encouraged to leverage other resources as part of the project. Use of human resources through collaboration with stakeholders on the project is strongly encouraged. Leveraging of funds from other sources is not required but will be favorably considered. Appropriate use of other types of resources will be favorably considered.

Quality of proposal preparation: (10%)

A proposal's adherence to formatting guidelines eases the review panel's workload and enhances the panel's ability to evaluate the project as part of the grants competition. Moreover, the willingness and ability of the Project Director to meet these requirements may be viewed as predictor of the projects ultimate success.

- The proposal is properly assembled, with all components included in the correct order and with all format requirements met.
- The proposal language is clear and concise.

Budget: (10%)

- The budget is well defined within the guidelines provided in this RFA and by USDA/CSREES.
- The budget corresponds with the complexity and size of the project.
- The value of the project is high – i.e., the projected outcomes and impacts of the project come at a reasonable cost.

VI. Reports

Successful applicants will be required to submit 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.

VII. Submission of Proposals

Proposals must be submitted in both printed and electronic formats.

Electronic submission is through the following web page: Electronic submission is through the following web page: http://www.sripmc.org/ElectronicSubmission/index06_1.cfm . Online submission must be completed no later than **5:00 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time) on Friday, June 23, 2006.**

One printed original with appropriate signatures and one printed copy, both corresponding to the electronic version, must be received at the Southern Region IPM Center by **5:00 Eastern Daylight Time Wednesday, June 28, 2006.** Facsimile copies are not acceptable.

Send proposals to:

Jim VanKirk, Director
Southern Region IPM Center
1730 Varsity Dr., Suite 110
Raleigh, NC 27606-2194

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

For questions, contact:

(Content) Jim VanKirk, Director (telephone: 919-513-8179; e-mail: http://www.sripmc.org/ipm_feedback.cfm?&ID=383&site=www.sripmc.org/

or

(Technical) Jeanne Bacheler (telephone: 919-513-8181; e-mail:
http://www.sripmc.org/ipm_feedback.cfm?&ID=320&site=www.sripmc.org/).