Item 6.0　　　　　NRSP Review Committee
Presenter:　　　　Lee Sommers and Mike Harrington
Background Information:

The NRSP Review Committee met on June 6, 2007 in Kansas City. Committee members present were Lee Sommers (CO), chair and W rep; Marshall Martin (IN), NC rep; Bill Vinson (WV), NE rep; Craig Nessler (VA), S rep; Al Parks (Prairie View A&M), ARD rep; Larry Miller, CSREES rep; Eric Young, S Executive Director; Mike Harrington, W Executive Director and; Don Latham (IA), stakeholder rep.

Following discussion of the NRSP budget proposals submitted to the Committee, the following recommendations will be presented to the Experiment Station Section at the annual meeting.

Budget Requests
NRSP-1. Research Planning Using the Current Research Information System (CRIS). The amount requested for FY08 was $337,574. It was noted that the FY08 budget reflects the obligation of the SAES to fund 25% of the cost of CRIS as well as an increase in funding since the SAES now funds 75% of the cost of NIMSS through the CRIS budget. Motion by Martin to accept budget request. Second by Parks. Motion passed.

NRSP-3. National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP). The budget proposal of $61,000 for FY08 was consistent with the prior recommendations of the Committee to implement a phased reduction in funding. Motion by Latham to accept budget request. Second by Nessler. Motion passed.

NRSP-4. National Agricultural Program to Clear Pest Control Agents for Minor Uses. The amount requested for FY08 was $481,182. This request is consistent with prior recommendations of the Committee. Motion by Martin to accept budget request. Second by Parks. Motion passed.

NRSP-5. Develop and Distribute Deciduous Fruit Tree Clones Free of Viruses and Virus-like Agents. The amount requested for FY08 was $145,919. This request restores funding for the project to the level existing in FY06. The Committee supports this level of funding based on input from the National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee as well as feedback from each of the regional associations. Motion by Martin to accept budget request. Second by Nessler. Motion passed.

NRSP-6. Inter-Regional Potato Introduction Project. The amount requested for FY08 was $110,000. This project is an essential component of the National Plant Germplasm system and the funding request is consistent with maintaining ongoing support from the SAES for the project. Motion by Nessler to accept budget request. Second by Latham. Motion passed.

NRSP-7. Minor Use Animal Drugs. The amount requested for FY08 was $542,700.
This project has not requested funds in past fiscal years because the funding has been
provided via a special grant originating in the USDA budget. Due to the uncertain status
of special grants in the USDA budget, the project submitted a request for off-the-top
funding to the Committee. The Committee concluded that funding via the President's
budget request for USDA was likely. Motion by Latham to reject the budget request.
Second by Nessler. Motion passed.

NRSP-8. National Animal Genome Program. The amount requested for FY08 was
$400,000. This request is consistent with prior recommendations of the Committee.
Motion by Latham to accept budget request. Second by Parks. Motion passed.

NRSP Project Reviews
Based on the NRSP guidelines, each project should conduct an external review if a
proposal for renewal will be submitted. In FY08, NRSP-3, NRSP-5, and NRSP-8 will be
in their 5th year and should conduct an external review if renewal is contemplated. The
Administrative Advisers for these projects should coordinate the review process with the
CSREES NPL assigned to the project. The NRSP Review Committee will utilize the
external review documentation to assess the need for ongoing off-the-top funding.

NRSP Guidelines
The Committee reviewed the guidelines and is proposing the following changes for
consideration by the ESS.
1. Change from 2/3 vote to simple majority for overturning recommendation
2. Change of term for regional association committee members
The Committee also noted the change in leadership within ECOP. The chair will contact
ECOP about their preference for membership on the Committee.

It was also noted that the current guidelines do not contain a section detailing the process
for their revision. A proposed process will be submitted to the ESS.

Committee Membership
We are recommending that the terms increase from 3 to 4 years to facilitate rotation of
Committee leadership among the ESS regions. The S and NE need to have the terms of
their reps extended for 1 year to synchronize terms. We also encourage similar terms for
all members. If a member of the Committee resigns/retires, the regional association is
asked to appoint a rep to complete the term in order to maintain the staggering of reps
from the four regions.

The current guidelines specify that the chair will rotate between the regions in a specific
order. Our discussions concluded that the guidelines should not specify the rotation,
rather the committee should internally adopt an appropriate structure for sharing
leadership responsibilities.

Representative	Individual	Final FY for Term and Notes
W	Sommers(chair in FY07)	2007 – new rep for '08; 4 year term
NC	Martin	2008 – new rep for '09; 4 year term
S	Nessler (chair in FY08)	2009 – extend 1 year; new rep for '10
NE	Vinson (chair in FY09)	2010- extend 1 year; new rep '11
ARD	Parks	ARD option and appoints
CSREES	Miller (retiring July 2007)	R. Otto will appoint replacement
ECOP	Wade	ESCOP appoints with ECOP input
Exec Director	Harrington & Young	ESCOP option
Stakeholder	Latham	ESCOP option

Committee Discussion
The committee discussed several items of interest to activities of the ESS.
- Specialty crops – A critical component of many specialty crop research and extension programs is the incorporation of new species and evaluation on alternative crops. The National Plant Germplasm System plays a major role in providing the germplasm used by plant breeders in developing new and alternative crops. The NPGCC should consider how to contribute to the emerging efforts in the Farm Bill on specialty crops.
- National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee – There will be likely be an ongoing discussion about the most appropriate mechanism for funding NRSP projects contributing to the National Plant Germplasm System. The NPGCC is encouraged to further evaluate alternative funding approaches for the ESS components of the system.
- New NRSP projects – The Committee did not receive any suggestions or formal proposals for new projects.

Action Requested: Final Association recommendations on NRSP budgets
Action Taken: Approved that the NRSP Review Committee recommendations be approved and forwarded to the ESS in September for ESS approval.

THE EXPERIMENT STATION SECTION

GUIDELINES FOR NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS (NRSPs)

ADOPTED December 13, 2002
REVISED September 27, 2004
REVISED September XX. 2007

Table of Contents

I. MISSION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS

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.

II. GENERAL

National Research Support Projects are created to conduct activities that enable other important research efforts. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies.

All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. All projects must pass scientific scrutiny as well as be an issue that has national significance. Where appropriate, linkages to similar international activities are encouraged.

Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and meet one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP. General consideration will be given to assuring that the portfolio of NRSP projects has sufficient diversity so as to make best use of limited funds.

NRSP are initiated by use of Hatch funds drawn from the total federal allocation prior to the formula distribution to state agricultural experiment stations (SAESs). This funding process is called "off-the-top" and in total represents about 1% of the federal formula funds to SAES.

The National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS) is the official repository for NRSP project information. NIMSS is a web application for management of the Multistate Research Activities in a paperless environment. It is an information technology tool that facilitates the submission of proposals, reports and reviews online. NIMSS also serves as the central repository of records pertaining to multistate research projects and activities since September 2003. Information can be accessed anywhere, anytime at www.nimss.umd.edu.

Refer to Appendix B for more information on "Criteria for Establishing or Renewing an NRSP."

III. ORGANIZATION: NRSP REVIEW COMMITTEE
A. General

Since the dissolution of the Committee of Nine, there has been no single SAES entity with the general oversight responsibility for National Research Support Projects. An NRSP Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the committee) with broad oversight responsibility for the NRSP portfolio has been established and charged with providing general oversight, consistency in review and approval processes, and a national perspective relative to research support needs. The committee does not have the responsibility to micromanage individual projects.

While playing a gatekeeper function for the SAES system, it is also important that the committee's role is clearly advisory to the system. It makes recommendations to the Experiment Station Section (ESS) concerning existing and new projects. A key component of their role is to oversee implementation of sunset clauses whereby an NRSP reduces or eliminates its dependence on off-the-top funding. The committee brings its recommendations to the annual ESS meeting, currently held in September. It reports on the final project proposals and projected budgets, as well as their final recommendation. The SAES Directors vote (one vote per institution contributing off-the-top funding) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A simple majority vote is required to overturn the NRSP Review Committee recommendation.

One of the specific charges to the committee is to use the national priorities and needs as a basis for the review and evaluation of existing and new NRSP projects. It is responsible for assuring that the NRSP portfolio is monitored and is responsive to needs. The committee will identify specific areas of research support needs or at least utilize input from an established ESCOP mechanism such as the Planning Committee because of their focus on emerging issues and needs. The committee has the authority to proactively identify research support needs. The committee has access to resources available to seed the creation of new NRSPs responsive to emerging needs.

The committee is directly responsible for the annual review of progress and budget for existing NRSPs. It has the authority to ensure that the criteria contained in these guidelines are satisfactorily met by NRSPs.

Relative to the evaluation of revised and new projects, the committee oversees review by peer and merit panels. It develops criteria for the reviews, selects reviewers, assists in establishing protocols for review, and prepares the specific charge to the panels. Utilizing the results of the reviews and the committee's understanding of national research support needs, the committee makes recommendations concerning revised and proposed projects to the ESS.

A final role for the committee is one of broad advocacy for the NRSP system.
It insures the documentation of system and individual project impacts. It serves as the point entity for marketing the system and bringing it to national level prominence.

B. The NRSP Review Committee shall consist of:

1. One representative from each of the four SAES regions (1862 experiment stations) who is a current or past member of an MRC, and one from the ARD region (1890 research directors), appointed by the regional association chair. Each unit represented on the NRSP Review Committee will also designate an alternate to insure representation.   For the geographical regional associations, a logical alternate would be the regional MRC chair.

2. One representative from Extension appointed by the ESCOP Chair following the recommendation of the ECOP Chair.

3. One representative from CSREES, preferably a National Program leader, recommended by the CSREES Administrator and appointed by the ESCOP Chair.

4. One stakeholder representative, possibly a CARET representative, appointed by the ESCOP Chair.

5. Two regional executive directors appointed by the ESCOP Chair. One of the executive directors should be from the same region as the chair of the committee and will serve as the Executive Vice Chair, administratively supporting the committee. These two appointed executive directors will be voting members of the Committee. The other three regional executive directors (both SAES and/or ARD) not assigned to the Committee may attend meetings as ex officio, non-voting members.

6. Officers will include a chair and chair-elect chosen by the committee from the representatives' four SAES regions. The position of chair will rotate among the four geographical regions NC, W, S, and NE.

C. NRSP Review Committee Operations
1. Term of appointment to the committee will be three years. Terms of the four SAES regions' representatives will be staggered so as to provide continuity to deliberations.

2. The committee will meet face-to-face once per year prior to the September ESS meeting. Other business of the committee will be conducted electronically through conference calls and e-mails. All expenses will be borne by member's respective institutions except for the stakeholder representative. Travel funds for the stakeholder representative will be provided by ESS/ESCOP.

3. The committee will coordinate peer reviews of new and revised NRSP proposals and associated five-year budgets.

4. The committee and CSREES jointly arrange for review of NRSPs at the beginning of year 5.

5. The committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on new or revised NRSP project proposals and five-year budgets and makes a recommendation for approval or rejection.

6. The committee reviews annual reports and budgets of active NRSPs and approves annual budget if no increase is requested from initial five-year budget. If a budget increase is requested, the committee reports and makes a recommendation for approval or disapproval at the ESS Fall meeting.

IV. ESTABLISHING NEW NRSPs
(Also refer to Appendix B for the NRSP criteria; Appendix C for the NRSP proposal format; and Appendix D for the NRSP Review Forms.)

In addition to addressing the criteria described in the General section above, a proposal for a new NRSP must contain the following elements:

A. Relevance
The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, review and/or management plan. The proposal must indicate how the project meets stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship with the research to be supported. (The real stakeholders are the researchers and the funding agencies that will use the information or services generated.) The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs.

B. Management and Business Plan
Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project.

All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds.

In general, NRSPs should expect a finite period of off-the-top funding. This is not a reflection of the quality of work being conducted or the research being supported by the project. Rather, this allows the SAES system to continually assess needs and develop new projects as necessary. For this reason, the business plan of project renewals must include a transition plan and provisions for developing alternative funding or reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level.

C. Objectives and Projected Outcomes
Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes and how these assessments will be used in program planning.

D. Integration

Where applicable, projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders.

E. Outreach, communications and assessment

All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:

1. Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)

2. Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.

3. Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.

4. Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.

5. Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES is preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.

F. Budget: The NRSP team must present an annual budget for each of the five years (See Appendix F). The budget must take into account all sources of funds (Multistate Research Funds, industry, federal agencies, grants and contracts, and SAESs). There are two tables in Appendix F, one for MRF and one for Other Sources. For the SAESs, the project should estimate the in-cash and in-kind contributions. The budget narrative should provide an estimate of the per cent contribution from each funding source.

V. RENEWAL OF AN NRSP
(Also refer to Appendix B for the NRSP criteria; Appendix C for the NRSP proposal format; and Appendix D for the NRSP Review Forms.)

Prior to renewal, each NRSP must undergo a review according to the schedule presented in the timelines section. Each NRSP seeking renewal must meet/address all of the criteria for a new NRSP described in the previous section. In addition, renewal requests must address the following:

A. General

NRSPs should expect a finite period of significant levels of off the top funding. This allows "the system" to undertake new initiatives and address new priorities. For this reason the business plans of applications for renewals will be carefully scrutinized. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The proposal

should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs. The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.

B. Relevance
Proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity,

C. Assessment of Outcomes
The proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments.

The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs

D. Objectives
The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which project has been on task, on time and within budget for the previous funding period.

E. Management and Business Plan
In general, NRSPs should expect a finite period of off-the-top funding. This is not a reflection of the quality of work being conducted or the research being supported by the project. Rather, this allows the SAES system to continually assess needs and develop new projects as necessary. For this reason, the business plan of project renewals must include a transition plan and provisions for developing alternative funding or reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Included would be an assessment of transition options, and alternative funding sources.

However, not all projects may be shifted to other funding sources. Projects seeking to continue with significant amount of off the top funding should fully justify the request.

The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.

Note. Not all projects can be transitioned to other funding sources and, if the project meets an ESCOP priority, the project may continue with off-the-top funding.

F. Integration and Documentation of Research Support
The business plan must indicate the diversity of partners involved in the project as well as the multiple sources of funding. The proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which full team is engaged in project planning and implementation and discuss plans to complement any weaknesses that may have been identified.

The proposal should contain a description of how research activities nationwide will be supported by the project.

G. Outreach and Communications
The proposal should assess the success of the project's outreach and communications plan and indicate any steps to be taken to improve effectiveness. A clear description of impacts resulting from the project is required.

H. Budget: The NRSP team must present an annual budget for each of the five years (See Appendix F). The budget must take into account all sources of funds (Multistate Research Funds, industry, federal agencies, grants and contracts, and SAESs). There are two tables in Appendix F, one for MRF and one for Other Sources. For the SAESs, the project should estimate the in-cash and in-kind contributions. The budget narrative should provide an estimate of the per cent contribution from each funding source.

VI. REVIEW AND APPROVAL TIMELINES FOR NEW NRSPs OR RENEWAL OF AN EXISTING NRSP (Also, refer to Appendix A)

A. New NRSP Development

Anytime
Sponsoring Director(s) submits request to establish an NRSP writing committee to the sponsoring regional association's Executive Director following that region's standard process for initiating new multistate activities.

Sponsoring regional association assigns lead Administrative Advisor and solicits names of Co-advisors from other Executive Directors. Sponsoring regional association follows the normal process for approving the establishment of a writing committee and solicit additional participants.

NRSP writing committee membership, in consultation with Administrative Advisors, prepares initial project proposal, including projected five-year budget.
Administrative Advisors submit the project proposal and projected five-year budget, along with names of several qualified peer reviewers, to the NRSP Review Committee. The NRSP Review Committee solicits peer reviews by scientists familiar with the area and transmits review results along with Committee comments to Administrative Advisors. NRSP writing committee revises proposal and budget based on review.

Not later than Oct 1
Administrative Advisors submit revised proposal and five-year budget, along with peer review comments, to NRSP Review Committee and Executive Directors (transmission of materials to Executive Directors throughout this process implies subsequent transmission to members of corresponding regional associations).

Oct-Feb
NRSP Review Committee reviews proposal and budget and sends comments with initial recommendation to Executive Directors. Appropriate regional committees review the project proposal and projected five-year budget and report to association at their Spring meeting.

Feb-Mar
Regional associations discuss project proposal and projected five-year budget, along with NRSP Review Committee recommendation, at their Spring meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns to the Administrative Advisors and NRSP Review Committee.

Apr-June
NRSP Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns through further project and/or budget revisions and/or separate responses.

July 1
Final project proposal, projected five-year budget, and any additional responses are transmitted to the NRSP Review Committee and the Executive Directors.

July-Aug
Regional associations discuss the final proposal and budget at their summer meetings, or the appropriate regional committee reviews the proposal and budget, and Executive Directors transmit comments to the NRSP Review Committee.

September
The NRSP Review Committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per institution contributing off-the-top funding) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A two-thirds majority vote is required to overturn the NRSP Review Committee recommendation.

October 1
Approved NRSP starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved.

B. During Project Term (years 2-4)

January
NRSP Committee submits annual report (see below) and detailed budget for subsequent fiscal year to the NRSP Review Committee and Executive Directors by January 15.

The NRSP Review Committee reviews annual report and budget and transmits any comments to Administrative Advisors and Executive Directors. If there is no change in total annual budget from approved five-year budget, Executive Directors transmit report and budget to regional associations for their information.

If a change in the annual budget from the approved five-year budget is requested, a detailed justification must be submitted to the NRSP Review Committee and Executive Directors, and change request is reviewed through the following process.

Feb-Mar
Regional associations review budget change request during Spring meetings and transmit comments to the NRSP Review Committee.

Apr- Sep
The NRSP Review Committee interacts with CSREES and NRSP Administrative Advisors to determine and approve any budget changes for the next year.

C. Renewal of an Existing NRSP

Year 4
NRSP committee decides to renew project as NRSP and notifies the NRSP Review Committee and CSREES.NRSP committee drafts initial renewal proposal and five-year budget.

CSREES and the NRSP Review Committee jointly arrange for review of NRSP that is due to terminate at the end of year 5. Review organizer consults with the NRSP Review Committee and NRSP Administrative Advisors regarding review protocol, charge, etc.

Not later than Sep 1
Administrative Advisors submit renewal proposal and five-year budget to the NRSP Review Committee and Executive Directors.

Year 5

Sep-Nov
Review team conducts review of past four years progress and renewal proposal and transmits report to the NRSP Review Committee and Administrative Advisors.

Oct-Feb
Appropriate regional committees review report and renewal proposal with five-year budget and report to association at Spring meetings. The NRSP Review Committee reviews proposal and budget and Sends comments with initial recommendation on renewal to Executive Directors.

Feb-Mar
Regional associations discuss renewal proposal and budget along with the NRSP Review Committee recommendation, at their Spring meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns to the Administrative Advisors and the NRSP Review Committee.

Apr-June
NRSP Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns through renewal proposal and/or budget revisions and/or separate responses.

July 1
Final renewal proposal, five-year budget, and any additional responses are transmitted to the NRSP Review Committee and the Executive Directors.

July-Aug
Regional associations discuss the final renewal proposal and budget at their summer meetings, or the appropriate regional committee reviews the proposal and budget, and Executive Directors transmit comments to the NRSP Review Committee.

September
The NRSP Review Committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per contributing institution) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A two-thirds majority vote is required to overturn the NRSP Review Committee recommendation.

October 1
NRSP approved for renewal starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved. NRSP not approved for renewal receives one-year extension (with budget equal to 5th-year budget) to transition off NRSP funding to other sources or downsize project.

VII. ANNUAL REPORT OF AN NRSP
Annually each NRSP will prepare a State Agricultural Experiment Station 422
Report (SAES-422) and include the following information:

1. Stakeholders: A description of the interaction and engagement with the stakeholders during the past year and brief description of plans for next year.

2. Activities, Accomplishments, and Impacts: A description of the activities
(ie. meetings, etc.), accomplishments (ie. publications, information sharing, etc.), and impacts (ie. demonstration of adoption of new techniques, advancement in sharing information, change is stakeholders' techniques, knowledge, or action, etc.) for the past year and a brief description of plans for next year.

3. Communication Plan: A description of the implementation of the Communication Plan as stated in the proposal and a brief description of plans for next year.

4. Research Support activities: Describe how project contributes to and supports related research programs nationwide.

VIII. Revision of Guidelines

These guidelines will be modified using the following process:

1. Periodically, the guidelines will be reviewed by the NRSP Review Committee. Proposed changes will be drafted by the Committee and incorporated into this document.
2. The proposed changes will be submitted to ESCOP for review, editing, and approval.
3. Changes will be presented to the ESS for approval by a simple majority vote at the annual meeting.

APPENDIX A
NRSP Calendar
For New/Renewal/Existing NRSP Projects

2 years prior to approval for new projects **4th year for renewals**
New Project: 　• Regional association or NRSPRC recommends development of new project as NRSP and notifies CSREES (as well as NRSPRC if they are not already aware). 　• Potential NRSP committee assigns potential lead Administrative Advisors and project leaders who then draft the initial proposal and five-year budget. 　• CSREES and the NRSPRC jointly arrange for review of new NRSP proposal. Review organizer consults with the NRSPRC and potential NRSP Administrative Advisors regarding review protocol, charge, etc.
Renewal: 　• NRSP committee decides to renew project as NRSP and notifies the NRSPRC and CSREES. NRSP committee drafts initial renewal proposal and five-year budget. 　• CSREES and the NRSPRC jointly arrange for review of NRSP that is due to terminate at the end of year 5. Review organizer c 　• review protocol, charge, etc.

September **(2 years prior to approval for new projects; 4th year for renewals)** **ESS meeting**
• Not later than Sep 1: Adm 　the NRSPRC and Executive Directors.

(1 year prior to approval for new projects; 5th year for renewals)
• CSREES reviews take plac 　**Existing Projects:**
• NRSPRC sends 　communicated to the NRSPRC by January 15.

November

New and Renewal Projects:
    • By November 15: CSREES Review team conducts review of new proposal and transmits report to the NRSPRC and Administrative Advisors.

December

New and Renewal Projects:
    • Continue to revise proposals for January 15 deadline.

January

New Project:
    • By January 15, Potential NRSP project team revises the proposal in response to the CSREES review team report and sends the revised proposal to the regional association offices and NRSPRC

Renewal:
    • By January 15, NRSP project team revises the proposal in response to the CSREES review team report and sends the revised proposal to the regional association offices and NRSPRC.

Existing Projects:
    • By January 15, all budget changes should be sent to the NRSPRC for regional distribution. Each region will examine the budgets at their Spring Meetings.

February

New and Renewal Projects:
    • Regional associations gather material for initial project reviews.

March Regional Spring Meetings

New and Renewal Projects:
    • By March 30, regional associations discuss new/renewal proposals and budget at their Spring Meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns to the lead Administrative Advisor and the NRSPRC.

Existing Projects:
    • Regional associations discuss existing project budgets at their Spring Meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns to the lead Administrative Advisor and the NRSPRC.

April

New/Renewal/Existing Projects:
    • Prepare response to regional comments/concerns.

May

New/Renewal/Existing Projects:
     • Prepare response to regional comments/concerns for June 15 deadline.

June

NRSP Review Committee:
     • **By June 1,** NRSPRC notifies CSREES of tentative budgets on all NRSPs (new/renewal/existing).

New/Renewal/Existing Project:
     • **By June 15,** Potential/Renewal NRSP Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns through (1) a revised proposal and/or (2) a budget revision and/or (3) a separate response. These comments are sent to executive director offices and NRSPRC.

July
Regional Summer Meetings

August

New/Renewal Projects:
     • **By August 1,** regional associations or an appropriate regional committee discuss the final proposal and budget at their summer meeting.   The Executive Director transmits comments to the NRSPRC and the lead AA.
     • **By August 31,** the final revision of the proposal will be sent from the NRSP project team to NRSPRC.

September (5th Year)
Regional Fall Meetings at ESS Meeting

New and Renewal Projects:
     • **By September 15,** the NRSPRC prepares its report for the ESS Fall meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per contributing institution) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A two-thirds majority vote is required to overturn the NRSPRC recommendation.

NRSP Review Committee:
     • **By September 30,** the NRSPRC submits final notification to CSREES of approvals.

October (Project Approved)

New Project:
     • **October 1** New NRSP approved; starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved.

Renewal:
     • October 1 NRSP approved for renewal starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved. NRSP not approved for renewal receives one-year extension (with budget equal to 5th-year budget) to transition off NRSP funding to other sources or downsize project.

CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING OR RENEWING A NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECT
Established September 22, 2003

These criteria are based on the NRSP Guidelines adopted by the Experiment Station Section in January 2003. The Experiment Station Section adopted these specific criteria on September 22, 2003.

The following statement defines the mission of the NRSP program:

"MISSION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS
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. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies."

Based on the mission of NRSPs, all proposals (new and renewals) will be evaluated using the following criteria (renewal of an NRSP must meet all of the criteria for a new NRSP in addition to the specific criteria identified for a renewal):

A. Prerequisite criteria for NRSPs
   1. Mission: All NRSPs must be consistent with the mission of an NRSP.
  2. National Issue:
        a. All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. The proposal should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs.
        b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.

B. These are the criteria addressing the rationale for the NRSP.
   1. (20 points) Priority Established by ESCOP/ESS: Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and support one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP (see ESCOP Science and Technology Committee and Science Roadmap)
   2. (20 points) Relevance to Stakeholders:
        a. The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans. The proposal must indicate how the project meets primary and secondary stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship of the stakeholders with the research to be supported. The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs. Identify project outcomes that aide in development of or contribute to the discussion of public policy.
        b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity.

C. Criteria for implementing the NRSP proposal

1. **(15 points) Management and Business Plan:**
    a. Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. The plan should demonstrate that alternative funding sources have been explored. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project. All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds.
    b. The business plan for project renewals must include a funding plan including development of alternative funding for reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which the project has been on task, had an impact, on time and within budget for the previous funding period. The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.

2. **(15 points) Objectives and Projected Outcomes:**
    a. Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes including stakeholder use and how these assessments will be used in program planning.
    b. For renewals, the proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments. The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs. The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs.

3. **(15 points) Integration and Documentation of Research Support:**
    a. Projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders.
    b. For renewals, the proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which the full team is engaged in project planning and implementation. Discuss plans to correct any weaknesses that may have been identified.
    c. Proposals should indicate specifically how the project will support research activities nationwide.

4. **(15 points) Outreach, Communications and Assessment:**
    a. All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:
        i. Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)

ii. Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.
iii. Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project and effectiveness of the communication plan. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.
iv. Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.
v. Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES is preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.

b. For renewals, the proposal should assess the success of the project's outreach and communications plan and indicate any steps to be taken to improve effectiveness. A clear description of impacts resulting from the project is required.

Project Title: (140 characters)
Requested Duration:
Administrative Advisor:
CSREES Representative:

STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND JUSTIFICATION:

Prerequisite Criteria:

1. How is the NRSP consistent with the mission? (8,000 characters)
   a. Mission: 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. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research, as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies."

2. How does this NRSP pertain as a national issue? (10,000 characters)
   a. All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. The proposal should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs.
   b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.

 Rationale:

1. Priority Established by ESCOP/ESS: Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and support one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP (see ESCOP Science and Technology Committee and Science Roadmap) (8,000 characters)
2. Relevance to stakeholders: (8,000 characters)
   a. The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans. The proposal must indicate how the project meets primary and secondary stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship of the stakeholders with the research to be supported. The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs. Identify project outcomes that aide in development of or contribute to the discussion of public policy.
   b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Objectives and Projected Outcomes: (4,000 characters)
>   a. Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes including stakeholder use and how these assessments will be used in program planning.
>   b. For renewals, the proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments. The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs. The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs.

2. Management, Budget, and Business Plan: (16,000 characters)
>   a. Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. The plan should demonstrate that alternative funding sources have been explored. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project. All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds.
>   b. The business plan for project renewals must include a funding plan including development of alternative funding for reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which the project has been on task, had an impact, on time and within budget for the previous funding period. The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.

3. Integration and Documentation of Research Support: (5,000 characters)
>   a. Projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders.
>   b. For renewals, the proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which the full team is engaged in project planning and implementation. Discuss plans to correct any weaknesses that may have been identified.
>   c. Proposals should indicate specifically how the project will support research activities nationwide.

4. Outreach, Communications and Assessment: (15,000 characters)
>   a. All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:

i. Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)

ii. Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.

iii. Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project and effectiveness of the communication plan. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.

iv. Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.

v. Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES is preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.

PROJECT PARTICIPATION: Appendix E

LITERATURE CITED:

BUDGET: The NRSP must present an annual budget for each of five years (See Appendix F). Information should be provided on funding from MRF and funding from other sources (i.e. industry, federal agencies, grants and contracts, and SAESs). **(Refer to Appendix F)**

NRSP Proposals Review Form

The following statement defines the mission of the NRSP program:

MISSION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS
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. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies."

Based on the mission of NRSPs, all proposals will be evaluated using the following criteria:

A. Prerequisite criteria for NRSPs:		Circle One:
1. Mission: Is the NRSP consistent with the mission of an NRSP?		**Yes / No**
2. National Issue:		
	1. All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. The proposal should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs.	**Yes / No**
	2. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.	**Yes / No**
Comments:		

B. These are the criteria addressing the rationale for the NRSP:		Total Points:
a. **(20 points) Priority Established by ESCOP/ESS:** Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and support one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP (see ESCOP Science and Technology Committee and Science Roadmap)		__ / 20
2. (20 points) Relevance to Stakeholders:		__ / 20
	a. The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans. The proposal must indicate how the project meets primary and secondary stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship of the stakeholders with the research to be supported. The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs. Identify project outcomes that aide in development of or contribute to the discussion of public policy. **b.** For renewals, proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity.	

Comments:	

C. Criteria for implementing the NRSP proposal	Total Points:
1. (15 points) Management, Budget and Business Plan:	__ / 15
a. Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. The plan should demonstrate that alternative funding sources have been explored. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project. All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds. **b.** The business plan for project renewals must include a funding plan including development of alternative funding for reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which the project has been on task, had an impact, on time and within budget for the previous funding period. The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.	
2. (15 points) Objectives and Projected Outcomes:	__ / 15
a. Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes including stakeholder use and how these assessments will be used in program planning. **b.** For renewals, the proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments. The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs. The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs.	
3. (15 points) Integration and Documentation of Research Support:	__ / 15
a. Projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders. **b.** For renewals, the proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which the full team is engaged in project planning and implementation. Discuss plans to correct any weaknesses that may have been identified. c. Proposals should indicate specifically how the project will support research activities nationwide.	

	4. (15 points) Outreach, Communications and Assessment:	__ / 15
	a. All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:	
	i) Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)	**Yes / No**
	ii) Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.	**Yes / No**
	iii) Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project and effectiveness of the communication plan. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.	**Yes / No**
	iv) Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.	**Yes / No**
	v) Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES is preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.	**Yes / No**
	b. For renewals, the proposal should assess the success of the project's outreach and communications plan and indicate any steps to be taken to improve effectiveness. A clear description of impacts resulting from the project is required.	
Comments:		

Total Points:	___ / 100

APPENDIX E
Format for Reporting Projected Participation

For each participant in this activity, include his/her name and e-mail address, employing institution/agency, and department; plus, as applicable:

- For research commitment, indicate the CRIS classifications [Research Problem Area(s) (RPA), Subject(s) of Investigation (SOI), and Field(s) of Science (FOS)], and estimates of time commitment by Scientists Years (SY) (not less than 0.1 SY), Professional Years (PY), and Technical Years (TY);

- For extension commitment, indicate FTE and one or more of the seven extension programs (See http://www.reeusda.gov/1700/programs/baseprog.htm); and,

- Objective(s) under which the each participant will conduct their studies.

Project or Activity Designation and Number (if applicable): _____
Project or Activity Title: _____
Administrative Advisor: _____

Participant Name and E-Mail Address	Institution and Department	Research						Extension		Project Objectives				
		CRIS Codes			Personnel									
		RPA	SOI	FOS	SY	PY	TY	FTE	National Program	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F: NRSP BUDGET REQUESTS SUMMARY

Project Number and Title

<table>
<tr><td colspan="11" align="center">MRF FUNDING</td></tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">DESCRIPTION</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Proposed FY
(year 1)</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Proposed FY
(year 2)</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Proposed FY
(year 3)</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Proposed FY
(year 4)</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Proposed FY
(year 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars</td><td>FTE</td>
<td>Dollars</td><td>FTE</td>
<td>Dollars</td><td>FTE</td>
<td>Dollars</td><td>FTE</td>
<td>Dollars</td><td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr><td>SALARIES</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>FRINGE BENEFITS</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>WAGES</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TRAVEL</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>SUPPLIES</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>MAINTENANCE</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>EQUIPMENT/ CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TOTAL</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="11" align="center">OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING
Please check one of the following: Industry   Federal Agencies   Grants/Contracts   SAESs

Other (please list): _____</td></tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">DESCRIPTION</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Proposed FY
(year 1)</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Proposed FY
(year 2)</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Proposed FY
(year 3)</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Proposed FY
(year 4)</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Proposed FY
(year 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars</td><td>FTE</td>
<td>Dollars</td><td>FTE</td>
<td>Dollars</td><td>FTE</td>
<td>Dollars</td><td>FTE</td>
<td>Dollars</td><td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr><td>SALARIES</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>FRINGE BENEFITS</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>WAGES</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TRAVEL</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>SUPPLIES</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>MAINTENANCE</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>EQUIPMENT/ CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TOTAL</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>