

NRSP Peer / Proposal Review

The following statement defines the mission of the National Research Support Projects (NRSP's):

"The activity of an NRSP focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research."

Based on this mission statement, please rate the proposed NRSP using the following criteria:

	Circle One
Mission:	
Consistency with the mission of an NRSP	Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Relevance	
Addresses and supports a high priority national issue	Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Demonstrates clear/tangible benefits to the scientific community as a whole	Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Clearly identified sponsoring "stakeholders" / beneficiaries	Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
"Stakeholder" involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans	Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Technical Merit	
Overall technical merit (sound scientific approach, achievable objectives, appropriate scope of activity)	Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Potential for significant outputs (products) and outcomes and/or impacts	Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable

Implementation Plan		
Benchmarks for success clearly identified		Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Management structure that adequately coordinates efforts of multiple participants		Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Well developed business plan that links multiple sources of funding and leverages limited off the top research funds		Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Funding plan that develops alternative funding sources to reduce off-the-top funding in future years		Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Efforts integrated with extension and/or academic programs		Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Outreach, communication and assessment plan that communicates the program goals, accomplishment and outcomes/impacts.		Excellent - Good - Fair - Unacceptable
Comments	Well written and presented report. This is a much needed committee that is addressing important needs for advancing animal nutrition in the future. Documentation of how data is being used and the extent of its use was well done and important. Grand Challenge 2 ...”costly mitigation strategies” – eludes to need for economic consideration. I did not see that addressed and perhaps outside scope – but important when addressing mitigation strategies. Goals rely heavily on a highly functioning web presence. Some glitches were found when reviewing and consideration of how to keep a current site for the long term and keep it funded is essential and would seem to be a challenge. Unique and	
Recommendation	Approve – Approve with Revision – Disapprove	

Unique and valuable modeling database for future research.

Long term goals 4: expand composition data base. I was disappointed to see only 102 feedstuffs in the database. I was expecting many, many more. I understand that with comprehensive data provided that can be a challenge and an expense – but it seems that if it to be useful to the stakeholders it needs to be much larger.

Long term goal 5: - suggest increasing use of societal meetings.

Proposal objective 4: expand multi-level training. Suggest to pursue a way to offer graduate credit modeling course on line?

Table 1. After reading 2.7 million samples and a value of \$82M - to have a data base of 102 feed ingredients seems unreasonable. I realize that some have hundreds of observations per feed ingredient (e.g. barley – 257) and that there are many components. I also realize that these are leveraged dollars – but at that rate – how can this be sustainable for the long term and develop into a complete enough database to be useful to the masses. Suggest consider addressing this in report.