

credentials, *e.g.*, educational, employment and professional history, and honors and awards. Unless pertinent to the project, it should not include meetings attended, seminars given, or personal data such as birth date, marital status, or community activities; and

(iii) Publication List(s). A chronological list of all publications in refereed journals during the past five years, including those in press, must be provided for each professional project member for whom a curriculum vitae is provided. Also list other non-refereed technical publications that have relevance to the proposed project. Authors should be listed in the same order as they appear on each paper cited, along with the title and complete reference as these usually appear in journals.

§§ 4285.59–4285.68 [Reserved]

**§ 4285.69 Evaluation and disposition of applications.**

(a) *Evaluation.* (1) All proposals received from eligible applicants and postmarked in accordance with deadlines established in the annual program solicitation shall be evaluated by the Assistant Administrator for Cooperative Services through an RDA or its successor agency staff panel. The Assistant Administrator for Cooperative Services will select the evaluation panel from staff determined to be highly qualified in the subject matter areas that were emphasized in the current year's solicitation and from those with no potential conflict of interest with the applicants.

(2) Prior to technical examination, a preliminary review will be made for responsiveness to the program solicitation (*e.g.*, relationship of proposal to research topic(s) listed in solicitation). Proposals that do not fall within the guidelines as stated in the program solicitation will be eliminated from competition and will be returned to the applicant.

(3) Proposals will be ranked based on evaluation criteria established in § 4285.70 of this subpart, and financial support levels will be recommended to the Assistant Administrator for Cooperative Services by the panel within the limitation of the total funding

available in the fiscal year. The purpose of these evaluations is to provide information upon which the Assistant Administrator for Cooperative Services may make informed judgments in selecting proposals. Such recommendations are advisory only and are not binding on the awarding official of RDA or its successor agency. To ensure a comprehensive evaluation, all applications should be written with the care and thoroughness accorded papers for publication.

(b) *Disposition.* (1) On the basis of the Assistant Administrator for Cooperative Services's evaluation of an application in accordance with paragraph (a) of this section, the Assistant Administrator for Cooperative Services will either:

(i) Approve support using currently available funds;

(ii) Defer support due to lack of funds or need for further evaluation; or

(iii) Disapprove support for the proposed project in whole or in part.

(2) With respect to any approved project, the Assistant Administrator for Cooperative Services will determine the project period during which the project may be funded.

(3) Any deferral or disapproval of an application will not preclude its reconsideration or reapplication during subsequent fiscal years. However, applicants must reapply if reconsideration is desired.

(4) The Assistant Administrator for Cooperative Services will not make a cooperative agreement funding award, based upon an application covered by this part, unless the application has been properly reviewed in accordance with the provisions of this part and unless said reviewers have made recommendations concerning the scientific merit and relevance to the program of such application.

**§ 4285.70 Evaluation criteria.**

(a) In evaluating the proposal, the RDA or its successor agency staff review panel and the awarding official will take into account the degree to which the proposal demonstrates the following:

(1) Focus on a practical solution to a significant problem involving one or more of the following on a cooperative