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**Reviews-** (not necessarily in order of the reviewers listed above)

**NRSP Proposal Peer Review Form**

**NRSP Mission:** National Research Support Projects (NRSPs) focus on the development of enabling and critical technologies (e.g., databases, cyberinfrastructure, on-line toolkits, reagents), support activities (e.g., collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, data, resources or information) or the sharing of facilities (e.g., analytical equipment, lab, field) needed to accomplish high priority research.

**Based on this mission, please rate the proposed NRSP using the following criteria.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Satisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Mission** | | |
| Consistency with the NRSP mission | xx |  |
| **Relevance** | | |
| Addresses and supports a high priority national issue | xx |  |
| Demonstrates clear and tangible benefits to the scientific  community as a whole | xx |  |
| Clearly identified sponsoring beneficiary stakeholders | xx |  |
| Stakeholder involvement in project development, project  activities, review, and/or management plans | xx |  |
| **Technical Merit** | | |
| Overall technical merit (sound scientific approach,  achievable objectives, review, and/or management plans | xx |  |
| Potential for significant outputs (products) and outcomes with impacts | xx |  |
| **Implementation Plan** | | |
| Benchmarks for success clearly identified | xx |  |
| Management structure that adequately coordinates efforts of  multiple participants | xx |  |
| Well-developed business plan that captures multiple sources of funding and leverages OTT MRF | xx |  |
| Funding plan that develops alternative funding sources to  reduce OTT MRF in future years | xx |  |
| Efforts integrated with Extension, academic, or international programs | xx |  |
| Outreach, communications and assessment plan that communicates the program goals, accomplishments, and outcomes, and impacts | xx |  |

**Comments (Please add general and specific comments on strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, including specific revisions that would improve the proposal):**

IR’s framework reflects their commitment to food access and food safety for the U.S. It demonstrates an accessible and transparent connection to stakeholder needs and is grounded in outcomes that can be measured. Resources devoted to IR-4 clearly benefit the U.S. economy and directly support broad public access to safe food.



**Overall Recommendation: Approve xxx Approve with revision Disapprove**

**NRSP Proposal Peer Review Form**

**NRSP Mission:** National Research Support Projects (NRSPs) focus on the development of enabling and critical technologies (e.g., databases, cyberinfrastructure, on-line toolkits, reagents), support activities (e.g., collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, data, resources or information) or the sharing of facilities (e.g., analytical equipment, lab, field) needed to accomplish high priority research.

**Based on this mission, please rate the proposed NRSP using the following criteria.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Satisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Mission** | | |
| Consistency with the NRSP mission |  |  |
| **Relevance** | | |
| Addresses and supports a high priority national issue |  |  |
| Demonstrates clear and tangible benefits to the scientific  community as a whole |  |  |
| Clearly identified sponsoring beneficiary stakeholders |  |  |
| Stakeholder involvement in project development, project  activities, review, and/or management plans |  |  |
| **Technical Merit** | | |
| Overall technical merit (sound scientific approach,  achievable objectives, review, and/or management plans |  |  |
| Potential for significant outputs (products) and outcomes with impacts |  |  |
| **Implementation Plan** | | |
| Benchmarks for success clearly identified |  |  |
| Management structure that adequately coordinates efforts of  multiple participants |  |  |
| Well-developed business plan that captures multiple sources of funding and leverages OTT MRF |  |  |
| Funding plan that develops alternative funding sources to  reduce OTT MRF in future years |  |  |
| Efforts integrated with Extension, academic, or international programs |  |  |
| Outreach, communications and assessment plan that communicates the program goals, accomplishments, and outcomes, and impacts |  |  |

**Comments (Please add general and specific comments on strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, including specific revisions that would improve the proposal):**

This comprehensive proposal was well written in defining the problems and identifying solutions for addressing the needs of the agricultural community and consumers. Because the impact for each dollar invested is so immense, convincing argument was presented that any decrease in funding would assuredly result in an enormous decrease in impact. Missing from Table 1 are the names of the other ARS sites where Environmental Horticulture research is done. On page 12, apparently, the intent was “42% of the total” instead of “42%the total”.



**Overall Recommendation: Approve Approve with revision**  **Disapprove**

**NRSP Proposal Peer Review Form – from Nancy Fitz, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Pesticide Programs. October 2, 2024.**

**NRSP Mission:** National Research Support Projects (NRSPs) focus on the development of enabling and critical technologies (e.g., databases, cyberinfrastructure, on-line toolkits, reagents), support activities (e.g., collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, data, resources or information) or the sharing of facilities (e.g., analytical equipment, lab, field) needed to accomplish high priority research.

**Based on this mission, please rate the proposed NRSP using the following criteria.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Satisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Mission** | | |
| Consistency with the NRSP mission |  |  |
| **Relevance** | | |
| Addresses and supports a high priority national issue |  |  |
| Demonstrates clear and tangible benefits to the scientific  community as a whole |  |  |
| Clearly identified sponsoring beneficiary stakeholders |  |  |
| Stakeholder involvement in project development, project  activities, review, and/or management plans |  |  |
| **Technical Merit** | | |
| Overall technical merit (sound scientific approach,  achievable objectives, review, and/or management plans |  |  |
| Potential for significant outputs (products) and outcomes with impacts |  |  |
| **Implementation Plan** | | |
| Benchmarks for success clearly identified |  |  |
| Management structure that adequately coordinates efforts of  multiple participants |  |  |
| Well-developed business plan that captures multiple sources of funding and leverages OTT MRF |  |  |
| Funding plan that develops alternative funding sources to  reduce OTT MRF in future years |  |  |
| Efforts integrated with Extension, academic, or international programs |  |  |
| Outreach, communications and assessment plan that communicates the program goals, accomplishments, and outcomes, and impacts |  |  |

**Comments (Please add general and specific comments on strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, including specific revisions that would improve the proposal):**

|  |
| --- |
| Thank you for the opportunity to review the National Research Support Project “Facilitating Registration of Pest Management Technology for Specialty Crops and Specialty Uses”. Our overall recommendation is to **approve** this project. The project description is a thorough and accurate description of the IR-4 Project and its work to facilitate the registration of pesticides (including biopesticides) for specialty crops. |



**Overall Recommendation: Approve**  **Approve with revision Disapprove**

**NRSP Proposal Peer Review Form**

**NRSP Mission:** National Research Support Projects (NRSPs) focus on the development of enabling and critical technologies (e.g., databases, cyberinfrastructure, on-line toolkits, reagents), support activities (e.g., collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, data, resources or information) or the sharing of facilities (e.g., analytical equipment, lab, field) needed to accomplish high priority research.

**Based on this mission, please rate the proposed NRSP using the following criteria.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Satisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Mission** | | |
| Consistency with the NRSP mission |  |  |
| **Relevance** | | |
| Addresses and supports a high priority national issue |  |  |
| Demonstrates clear and tangible benefits to the scientific  community as a whole | ✔ |  |
| Clearly identified sponsoring beneficiary stakeholders | ✔ |  |
| Stakeholder involvement in project development, project  activities, review, and/or management plans | ✔ |  |
| **Technical Merit** | | |
| Overall technical merit (sound scientific approach,  achievable objectives, review, and/or management plans | ✔ |  |
| Potential for significant outputs (products) and outcomes with impacts | ✔ |  |
| **Implementation Plan** | | |
| Benchmarks for success clearly identified | ✔ |  |
| Management structure that adequately coordinates efforts of  multiple participants | ✔ |  |
| Well-developed business plan that captures multiple sources of funding and leverages OTT MRF | ✔ |  |
| Funding plan that develops alternative funding sources to  reduce OTT MRF in future years | ✔ |  |
| Efforts integrated with Extension, academic, or international programs | ✔ |  |
| Outreach, communications and assessment plan that communicates the program goals, accomplishments, and outcomes, and impacts | ✔ |  |

**Comments (Please add general and specific comments on strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, including specific revisions that would improve the proposal):**

The proposal clearly sets out why specialty crop growers support IR-4 and its underlying systems – it’s systems effectively execute projects that allow growers to access the chemistries they need to safely and efficiently produce healthy fruits and vegetables. American specialty crop growers are under extreme pressure from rising input costs, escalating labor costs and increasing imports during their seasons. IR-4 and its underlying systems provide significant value for specialty crop growers as they work to address these other challenges.



**Overall Recommendation: Approve ✔ Approve with revision Disapprove**

