

**§ 3400.15**

binding on program officers or on the awarding official.

**§ 3400.15 Review criteria.**

(a) Subject to the varying conditions and needs of States, Federal funded agricultural research supported under these provisions shall be designed to, among other things, accomplish one or more of the following purposes:

- (1) Continue to satisfy human food and fiber needs;
- (2) Enhance the long-term viability and competitiveness of the food production and agricultural system of the United States within the global economy;
- (3) Expand economic opportunities in rural America and enhance the quality of life for farmers, rural citizens, and society as a whole;
- (4) Improve the productivity of the American agricultural system and develop new agricultural crops and new uses for agricultural commodities;
- (5) Develop information and systems to enhance the environment and the natural resource base upon which a sustainable agricultural economy depends; or
- (6) Enhance human health.

In carrying out its review under §3400.14, the peer review group will use the following form upon which the evaluation criteria to be used are enumerated, unless pursuant to §3400.5(a), different evaluation criteria are specified in the annual solicitation of proposals for a particular program.

Peer Panel Scoring Form

Proposal Identification No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Institution and Project Title \_\_\_\_\_

I. Basic Requirement:

Proposal falls within guidelines? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No. If no, explain why proposal does not meet guidelines under comment section of this form.

II. Selection Criteria:

	Score 1-10	Weight factor	Score X weight factor	Comments
1. Overall scientific and technical quality of proposal .....	.....	10	.....	.....
2. Scientific and technical quality of the approach .....	.....	10	.....	.....

**7 CFR Ch. XXXIV (1-1-08 Edition)**

	Score 1-10	Weight factor	Score X weight factor	Comments
3. Relevance and importance of proposed research to solution of specific areas of inquiry .....	.....	6	.....	.....
4. Feasibility of attaining objectives; adequacy of professional training and experience, facilities and equipment ....	.....	5	.....	.....

Score \_\_\_\_\_  
 Summary Comments \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Proposals satisfactorily meeting the guidelines will be evaluated and scored by the peer review panel for each criterion utilizing a scale of 1 through 10. A score of one (1) will be considered low and a score of ten (10) will be considered high for each selection criterion. A weighted factor is used for each criterion.

**Subpart C—Peer and Merit Review Arranged by Grantees**

SOURCE: 64 FR 34104, June 24, 1999, unless otherwise noted.

**§ 3400.20 Grantee review prior to award.**

(a) *Review requirement.* Prior to the award of a standard or continuation grant by CSREES, any proposed project shall have undergone a review arranged by the grantee as specified in this subpart. For research projects, such review must be a scientific peer review conducted in accordance with §3400.21. For education and extension projects, such review must be a merit review conducted in accordance with §3400.22.

(b) *Credible and independent.* Review arranged by the grantee must provide for a credible and independent assessment of the proposed project. A credible review is one that provides an appraisal of technical quality and relevance sufficient for an organizational representative to make an informed judgment as to whether the proposal is appropriate for submission for Federal support. To provide for an independent review, such review may include USDA employees, but should not be conducted solely by USDA employees.