

required detailing the requested support for the overall project period.

(6) *Organizational management information.* Each phase II awardee will be asked to submit an updated statement of financial condition (such as the latest audit report, financial statements or balance sheet).

(7) *Follow-on funding commitment.* If the proposer has obtained a contingent commitment for phase III follow-on funding, it should be forwarded with the phase II application.

(8) *Documentation of multiple phase II awards.* (i) An applicant that submits a proposal for a funding agreement for phase I and has received more than 15 phase II awards during the preceding 5 fiscal years, must document the extent to which it was able to secure phase III funding to develop concepts resulting from previous phase II awards. This documentation should include the name of the awarding agency, date of award, funding agreement number, topic or subtopic title, amount and date of phase II funding and commercialization status for each phase II award.

(ii) USDA shall collect and retain the information submitted under paragraph (a)(8)(i) of this section at least until the General Accounting Office submits the report required under section 106 of the Small Business Research and Development Enhancement Act of 1992.

(b) [Reserved]

§ 3403.9 Submission of proposals.

The program solicitation for phase I proposals and the letter requesting phase II proposals will provide the deadline date for submitting proposals, the number of copies to be submitted, and the address where proposals should be mailed or delivered.

Subpart D—Proposal Review and Evaluation

§ 3403.10 Proposal review.

(a) All research grant applications will be acknowledged.

(b) Phase I and phase II proposals will be judged competitively in a two-stage process, based primarily upon scientific or technical merit. First, each proposal will be screened by

USDA scientists to ensure that it is responsive to stated requirements contained in the program solicitation. Proposals found to be responsive will be technically evaluated by peer scientists knowledgeable in the appropriate scientific field using the criteria identified in the annual solicitation, as appropriate. Proposals found to be non-responsive will be returned to the proposing firm without review.

(c) Both internal and external peer reviewers may be used during the technical evaluation stage of this process. Selections will be made from among recognized specialists who are uniquely qualified by training and experience in their respective fields to render expert advice on the merit of proposals received. It is anticipated that such experts will include those located in universities, Government, and non-profit research organizations. If possible, USDA intends that peer review groups shall be balanced with minority and female representation and with an equitable age distribution.

(d) Technical reviewers will base their conclusions and recommendations on information contained in the phase I or phase II proposal. It cannot be assumed that reviewers are acquainted with any experiments referred to within a proposal, with key individuals, or with the firm itself. Therefore, the proposal should be self-contained and written with the care and thoroughness accorded papers for publication.

(e) Final decisions will be made by USDA based upon the ratings assigned by reviewers and consideration of other factors, including the potential commercial application, possible duplication of other research, any critical USDA requirements, and budget limitation. In addition, the follow-on funding commitment will be a consideration for phase II proposals. In the event that two or more phase II proposals are of approximately equal technical merit, the follow-on funding commitment for continued development in phase III will be an important consideration. The value of the commitment will depend upon the degree of commitment made by non-Federal investors, with the maximum value resulting