

Summary of Comments from EIPM Review Panel

March 23, 2009

Proposal Title: The Arizona Pest Management Center: Implementing IPM in Diverse Environments of Arizona

Ranking

The review panel grouped proposals into one of the relative categories below. The percentage indicates the final distribution of proposals in each category.

Recommended for Funding:

Outstanding %	17
High Priority %	51
Medium Priority %	26
Low Priority %	2
Some Merit %	4

Not Recommended for Funding:

Do Not Fund %	0
---------------	---

This proposal was placed in: High Priority

Extension Integrated Pest Management - Coordination - PANEL SUMMARY

Positive Aspects of the Proposal

This is a good proposal that describes a lot of activity. It is clear that a lot of good things have been accomplished in pest management in Arizona. The need is well documented and the design of the overall IPM effort is well structured. The writing itself is very good. The proposal is well organized and the language is very clear. The School IPM aspects are especially good, and we note that it is a strong point of the proposal.

The coordination through the APMC and interaction with stakeholders is very strong. The budget is very clearly laid out and the budget narrative provides more than sufficient detail on what is proposed and who is doing it.

Negative Aspects of the Proposal

Some parts of the proposal seemed very general. In the agronomic area, the proposal discusses assembling a team and then they will figure out what to do. This should have been done before the proposal was written. Moreover, it is not clear that \$26K is needed to accomplish whatever the team will determine needs to be done. In HV crops, the description is very general. We would like to have seen more specifics. The good work that is being done in this program didn't come across. More detail appears in the supplementary information than in the proposal itself, which made it difficult to read. For the diagnostic lab the proposal describes a goal of quicker turn around. This is not an IPM activity. The proposal appears to be reactivation rather than support for ongoing activities.

The Recreational lands IPM aspect is focused on golf courses, which generally does not serve the whole community, and is already well supported by industry. One reviewer objects to using these funds to support the turf/golf industry.

Outreach was perhaps the weakest component. Lots of material will be produced, but not carried to outreach or evaluation.

The budget is far above previous formula funds. This is about 5 times the formula funds. A lot of funds are allocated to creating new jobs and the budget is heavy in new salaries. If personnel are not in place, it will take too long to get the programs activated, which is not good for a 1-yr proposal.

Synthesis Comments

This is a very well organized and highly successful IPM program with excellent regional connections and exceptional in-state clientele support. The IPM program appears to be well connected to stakeholders through the APMC, which serves an advisory function. The large state with large counties and influx of people into urban/suburban areas represent significant challenges. In general, this is a very good proposal, but extension outreach and evaluation are relatively weak. Much material and information is proposed, but not much emphasis on delivery.

The secondary evaluation of the program for appropriateness of budget was rated as follows:

Coordination - 5

Collaboration - 5

Agronomic Crop IPM – 3

High Value Crop IPM – 3

Diagnostic Facilities – 2

School IPM – 0

Recreational Lands IPM – 4

Consumer/Urban IPM – 4

The budget for FY2009 was adjusted accordingly. In some cases a program rated as strong was reduced due to the one year nature of this year's competition.

Scores from Individual Reviewers

Reviewer #1:

Relevance and Demonstration

- a) Documented need: thorough and complete--10 pts
- b) Stakeholder involvement: a lot and involved in all aspects--10 pts
- c) Outreach quality: considerable measuring described, but not always associated with grant calendar year--9 pts
- d) IPM understanding: excellent--10 pts
- e) Trans-disciplinary program: no specific mention of reduction of health and environmental risks in agronomic and high value crop areas: 9 pts

Quality

- a) Conceptual adequacy: 3 emphasis areas' success hinges on competent new hires--8 pts

- b) Design: Appropriate--10 pts
- c) Expertise: too much may be again hinging on the new hires--9 pts
- d) Experience: Excellent--5 pts
- e) Budget: seems on high side for trying to get some new programs activated or restored--5 pts
- f) Success Feasibility: high-8 pts due to risks associated with getting the new programs effectively up and running

This is an excellent proposal, however too much explanation appeared in the appendices that should have been in the approach.

Total Points 93

Reviewer #2:

Relevance and Demonstration

- a) Documented need: Function and purpose of the Arizona Pest Management Center would be greatly enhanced by implementation of this IPM program. (10)
- b) Stakeholders are identified and documentation was provided for their involvement (10)
- c) This is an excellent proposal, but extension outreach is the weakest component of the proposal. Much material and information is produced, but not much emphasis on delivery. (6)
- d) IPM understanding: A broad understanding of IPM principles was evident in the proposal. (10)
- e) Trans-disciplinary program: The varied disciplines are brought together in this proposal. Weed control is mentioned but not further developed. Human health aspects of IPM are evident in the IPM in schools program, but no specifics of implementation of this program is detailed. (8)

Quality

- a) Conceptual adequacy: Objectives are attainable, but will be difficult to complete within the time frame of the proposal. (9)
- b) Design: Methodology is appropriate, but analytical approach is not as strong (9)
- c) Expertise: Expertise is more than adequate, collaborations are excellent, potential success of the program will depend upon hiring of an IPM program research specialist. (9)
- d) Experience: Key program personnel are well experienced. (5)
- e) Budget: Budget for the proposal is appropriate for projects described. (5)
- f) Success Feasibility: This is an extensive and challenging program requiring rapid growth during the first year. It is likely that not all objectives will be met the first year, but could be very effective in following years. (9)

Total score 90