

# **Review Summary for Proposed Research Projects submitted to a Commodity-based or VHDR-Uniform Nursery Coordinated Project (CP) – Category 1: 5-step process**

## **OVERVIEW OF STEPS:**

- Step 1:** Submitted Letters of Intent (LOIs) are reviewed for acceptance into the CP.
- Step 2:** Proposed Research Projects (PRP) accepted into the CP are reviewed by the CP committee.
- Step 3:** Review of CP Pre-Proposal by the Networking & Facilitation Office (NFO) for conformance to instructions provided in the FY16-17 Request for Pre-Proposals.
- Step 4:** Review of CP Pre-Proposal by Review Panel (RP)
- Step 5:** Review of CP Pre-Proposal by Executive Committee (EC)

## **SUMMARY OF EACH STEP IN REVIEW PROCESS:**

### **Step 1: Submitted Letters of Intent (LOIs) are reviewed for acceptance into the CP.**

CP Committee reviews submitted LOIs for acceptance into the Coordinated Project. Review is based on how well the proposed research fits within the goals, objectives and research priorities of the CP.

### **Step 2: PRPs accepted into the CP are reviewed by the CP committee.**

Each Coordinated Project is assigned a funding working cap set by the Steering Committee. Once the CP committee has reviewed each submitted Proposed Research Project (PRP) for conformance to its corresponding Letters of Intent, the committee must assign each PRP to one of the following recommended funding categories:

- 1. Category I - Recommended for inclusion in CP Pre-Proposal within the working cap.**  
These are the PRPs recommended for inclusion in the final CP Pre-Proposal whose combined recommended budget **does not** exceed the working cap for their coordinated project.
- 2. Category II - Recommended for inclusion in CP Pre-Proposal, but outside of the working cap:**  
These are the remaining proposed research projects recommended for inclusion in the final CP Pre-Proposal but not included in Category I. Each PRP in this category should be assigned a unique **priority rank** from 1 to n\*, with no duplication of rank. Include the recommended funding level on the recommendation form.
- 3. Category III - Not recommended for inclusion in CP Pre-Proposal.**

---

\* 'n' = the number of Category II PRPs.

**Step 3: Review of Pre-Proposal by the Networking & Facilitation Office (NFO) for conformance to instructions provided in the FY16-17 Request for Pre-Proposals.**

All components (individual PRPs and CP committee documents) of the Pre-Proposal are carefully reviewed by the NFO for conformance to the RFP guidelines. The NFO may return, without review, any PRP that is not consistent with the instructions detailed in the RFP.

**Step 4: Review of CP Pre-Proposal by Review Panel.**

The review panel comprises stakeholders and scientists whose interest and expertise is related to the CP. The focus of the panel's review is on the cohesiveness and integration of the CP, rather than on the details of each individual PRP.

- 1) Does the CP address the overall mission of the USWBSI?  
USWBSI's Mission: The goal of the U.S. Wheat and Barley Scab Initiative (USWBSI) is to enhance food safety and supply by reducing the impact of Fusarium Head Blight (scab) on wheat and barley.
- 2) Is the CP strong in its integration of research activities, coordination among scientists, and sharing/leveraging of resources?
- 3) Are there holes or gaps in the CP's overall plan that could be addressed to improve integration? If yes, please describe.
- 4) Are the more applied research activities taking advantage of and informed by the more basic research activities?
- 5) Are the more basic research activities taking advantage of and informed by the more applied research activities?
- 6) Does the CP have an effective plan for sharing information among co-PIs, with the broader scientific community, and relevant stakeholders?

**Step 5: Review of Coordinated Project by Executive Committee (EC).**

The EC is responsible for reviewing every component of the CP Pre-Proposal, including the individual PRPs. The EC will follow the same process as the CP Committees and Review Panels for reviewing the individual proposed research projects and the CP Pre-Proposal respectively. The EC will regard the recommendations of the CP Committees and Review Panels as advisory and retains the ability to:

- Increase or decrease the actual amounts recommended for individual PRPs; and
- Change the CP Committee's recommended funding category for any given PRP.

The small percentage that is held back from the 'working caps' will be allocated by the EC in a manner aimed at achieving overall balance in the final plan. Any changes made to the CPC's funding recommendation will be based on the EC's own reading of the PRPs, the advice from the Review Panels, and any other factors which influence the soundness of the final comprehensive research plan submitted for recommendation to USDA-ARS.

# **Review Summary for Proposed Research Projects submitted to the FHB Management (MGMT) Integrated Management Coordinated Project (IM-CP) – Category 2: 5-step process**

## **OVERVIEW OF STEPS:**

- Step 1:** Submitted Letters of Intent (LOIs) are reviewed for acceptance into the MGMT-CP.
- Step 2:** Proposed Research Projects (PRP) accepted into the MGMT-CP are reviewed by the CP committee.
- Step 3:** Review of MGMT-CP Pre-Proposal by the Networking & Facilitation Office (NFO) for conformance to instructions provided in the FY16-17 Request for Pre-Proposals.
- Step 4:** Review of MGMT-CP Pre-Proposal by Review Panel (RP).
- Step 5:** Review of MGMT Coordinated Project Pre-Proposal by Executive Committee (EC).

## **SUMMARY OF EACH STEP IN REVIEW PROCESS:**

### **Step 1: Submitted Letters of Intent (LOIs) are reviewed for acceptance into the MGMT-CP.**

MGMT-CP Committee reviews submitted LOIs for acceptance into the MGMT Coordinated Project. Review is based on how well the proposed research fits within the goals, objectives and research priorities of the CP.

### **Step 2: PRPs accepted into the MGMT-CP are reviewed by the CP committee.**

Each Coordinated Project is assigned a funding working cap. Once the MGMT-CP committee has reviewed each submitted Proposed Research Project (PRP) for conformance to its corresponding Letters of Intent, the committee must assign each PRP to one of the following recommended funding categories:

- 1. Category I - Recommended for inclusion in CP Pre-Proposal within the working cap.**  
These are the PRPs recommended for inclusion in the final CP Pre-Proposal whose combined recommended budget **does not** exceed the working cap for their coordinated project.
- 2. Category II - Recommended for inclusion in CP Pre-Proposal, but outside of the working cap:**  
These are the remaining proposed research projects recommended for inclusion in the final CP Pre-Proposal but not included in Category I. Each PRP in this category should be assigned a unique **priority rank** from 1 to n\*, with no duplication of rank. Include the recommended funding level on the recommendation form.
- 3. Category III - Not recommended for inclusion in CP Pre-Proposal.**

### **Step 3: Review of Pre-Proposal by the Networking & Facilitation Office (NFO) for conformance to instructions provided in the FY16-17 Request for Pre-Proposals.**

---

\* 'n' = the number of Category II PRPs.

All components (individual PRPs and MGMT-CP committee documents) of the pre-proposal are carefully reviewed by the NFO for conformance to the RFP guidelines. The NFO may return, without review, any PRP that is not consistent with the instructions detailed in the RFP.

#### **Step 4: Review of MGMT-CP Pre-Proposal by Review Panel**

The focus of the panel's review is on the cohesiveness and integration of the CP, rather than on the details of each individual PRP.

- 1) Does the CP address the overall mission of the USWBSI?  
USWBSI's Mission: The goal of the U.S. Wheat and Barley Scab Initiative (USWBSI) is to enhance food safety and supply by reducing the impact of Fusarium Head Blight (scab) on wheat and barley.
- 2) Is the CP strong in its integration of research activities, coordination among scientists, and sharing/leveraging of resources?
- 3) Are there holes or gaps in the CP's overall plan that could be addressed to improve integration? If yes, please describe.
- 4) Are the more applied research activities taking advantage of and informed by the more basic research activities?
- 5) Are the more basic research activities taking advantage of and informed by the more applied research activities?
- 6) Does the CP have an effective plan for sharing information among co-PIs, with the broader scientific community, and relevant stakeholders?

#### **Step 5: Review of Coordinated Project by Executive Committee (EC)**

The EC is responsible for reviewing every component of the MGMT-CP Pre-Proposal, including the individual PRPs. The EC will follow the same process as the MGMT-CP Committees and Review Panels for reviewing the individual proposed research projects and the MGMT-CP pre-proposal respectively. The EC will regard the recommendations of the MGMT-CP Committees and review panels as advisory and retains the ability to:

- Increase or decrease the actual amounts recommended for individual PRPs; and
- Change the MGMT-CP Committee's recommended funding category for any given PRP.

The small percentage that is held back from the 'working caps' will be allocated by the EC in a manner aimed at achieving overall balance in the final plan. Any changes made to the CPC's funding recommendation will be based on the EC's own reading of the PRPs, the advice from the Review Panels, and any other factors which influence the soundness of the final comprehensive research plan submitted for recommendation to USDA-ARS.

# **Review Summary for Individual Pre-Proposals submitted to a Research Area - Category 3: 3-step process**

## **OVERVIEW OF STEPS:**

- Step 1:** Review of Individual Research Area Pre-Proposals by the Networking & Facilitation Office (NFO) for conformance to instructions provided in the FY16-17 Request for Pre-Proposals.
- Step 2:** Review of Individual Research Area Pre-Proposals by Review Panels (RP).
- Step 3:** Review of Individual Research Area Pre-proposals by the Executive Committee (EC).

## **SUMMARY OF EACH STEP IN REVIEW PROCESS:**

### **Step 1: Review of Pre-Proposal by the Networking & Facilitation Office (NFO) for conformance to instructions provided in the FY16-17 Request for Pre-Proposals.**

All components of the pre-proposal are carefully reviewed by the NFO for conformance to the RFP guidelines. The NFO may return, without review, any pre-proposal that is not consistent with the instructions detailed in the RFP. All accepted individual RA pre-proposals are assigned to one or more review panels based on the focus of the proposed research.

### **Step 2: Review of Pre-Proposals by Review Panels.**

The review panels comprise research area committee members and if warranted, external reviewers (i.e. scientists not funded through the USWBSI) whose interest and expertise is related to the research area. Each pre-proposal assigned to a review panel is first reviewed individually by each RP member addressing the following by assigning a numerical score of 1-5 (5=best):

- i) Do the stated objectives of this pre-proposal address the current scientific needs of this research area within the overall goals of the U.S. Wheat and Barley Scab Initiative?
- ii) Are the proposed objectives and methods appropriate?
- iii) Likelihood of success within the funding period.
- iv) Investigator's qualifications.
- v) Progress made within previous funding cycles.
- vi) Reasonableness of the budget.

Each Research Area is assigned a funding working cap set by the Steering Committee. Following the completion of review by individual panel members, each review panel then convenes to reach a consensus and classifies each pre-proposal into one of the following funding categories:

#### **1. Recommended for Funding Group I (i.e. Category I-within Working Cap):**

This category is for pre-proposals recommended for funding. The combined budgets of all pre-proposals in this category shall not exceed the working cap for the research area. Note that the Review Panel chairs will be provided spreadsheets and instructions for their use in facilitating the submission of the committee's recommendation.

#### **2. Recommended for Funding Group II (i.e. Category II-outside Working Cap):**

This category is for any remaining pre-proposals recommended for funding but not within the 'working cap'. The overall review summaries for this subset should be assigned a

**priority rank** from 1 to n\*, with no duplication of rank. Those ‘Overall Consensus Summary’ forms should also include the recommended funding level (i.e. amount) for each project.

**3. Not recommended for Funding (i.e. Category III).**

**Step 3: Review of Individual Research Area Pre-proposals by the Executive Committee (EC).**

The EC is responsible for reviewing all individual pre-proposals following the same guidelines as individual review panel members:

- i) Do the stated objectives of this pre-proposal address the current scientific needs of this research area within the overall goals of the U.S. Wheat and Barley Scab Initiative?
- ii) Are the proposed objectives and methods appropriate?
- iii) Likelihood of success within the funding period.
- iv) Investigator’s qualifications.
- v) Progress made within previous funding cycles.
- vi) Reasonableness of the budget.

The EC will regard the recommendations of the review panels as advisory and retains the ability to:

- Increase or decrease the actual amounts recommended for individual pre-proposal; and
- Change the Review Panel’s recommended funding category for any given individual pre-proposal.

The small percentage that is held back from the ‘working caps’ will be allocated by the EC in a manner aimed at achieving overall balance in the final plan. Any changes made to the CPC’s funding recommendation will be based on the EC’s own reading of the individual pre-proposals, the advice from the Review Panels, and any other factors which influence the soundness of the final comprehensive research plan submitted for recommendation to USDA-ARS.

---

\* ‘n’ = the number of Category II pre-proposals.