

Summary of the Review of an FHB Management (MGMT) Coordinated Project (CP) Pre-Proposal - 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 FY14 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.**

The MGMT-CP committee will complete one of the following forms for each of the PRPs based on their assigned recommended funding category:

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

I. Recommended for inclusion in MGMT-CP Pre-Proposal within the working cap <i>(Circle priority level and fill in CPC's recommended amount)</i>					
Priority	1	2	3	4	5
	Lower				Higher
				CPC's Recommended Funding Amount for PRP for FY14	\$ _____
				CPC's Recommended Funding Amount for PRP for FY15	\$ _____
Project Title: <i>(80-character Maximum)</i>					
PI:				Inst.:	
CP Committee's Comments/Feedback:					

II. Recommended for inclusion in MGMT-CP Pre-Proposal, but outside of working cap <i>(Fill in Ranking number and CPC's recommended amount for PRP)</i>		
Rank _____ <i>(no two Category II PRPs should have the same rank)</i>	CPC's Recommended Funding Amount for FY14	\$ _____
	CPC's Recommended Funding Amount for FY15	\$ _____
Project Title: <i>(80-character Maximum)</i>		
PI:		Inst.:
CP Committee's Comments/Feedback:		

III. Not Recommended for inclusion in MGMT-CP Pre-Proposal.		
Project Title: <i>(80-character Maximum)</i>		
PI:		Inst.:
CP Committee's Comments/Feedback:		

Step 3: Review of Pre-Proposal by the Networking & Facilitation Office (NFO) for conformance to instructions provided in the FY14 Request for Pre-Proposals.

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 develop as quickly as possible effective control measures that minimize the threat of Fusarium head blight (scab), including the reduction of mycotoxins, to the producers, processors, and consumers of 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.