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.

(c) Notice of completion and retention of records. A notice of completion of review shall be conveyed in writing to NIFA either as part of the submitted proposal or prior to the issuance of an award, at the option of NIFA. The written notice constitutes certification by the applicant that a review in compliance with these regulations has occurred. Applicants are not required to submit results of the review to NIFA; however, proper documentation of the review process and results should be retained by the applicant.

(d) Renewal and supplemental grants. Review by the grantee is not automatically required for renewal or supplemental grants as defined in §3400.6. A subsequent grant award will require a new review if, according to NIFA, either the funded project has changed significantly, other scientific discoveries have affected the project, or the need for the project has changed. Note that a new review is necessary when applying for another standard or continuation grant after expiration of the grant term.

§ 3400.21 Scientific peer review for research activities.

Scientific peer review is an evaluation of a proposed project for technical quality and relevance to regional or national goals performed by experts with the scientific knowledge and technical skills to conduct the proposed research work. Peer reviewers may be selected from an applicant organization or from outside the organization, but shall not include principals, collaborators or others involved in the preparation of the application under review.

§ 3400.22 Merit review for education and extension activities.

Merit review is an evaluation of a proposed project or elements of a proposed program whereby the technical quality and relevance to regional or national goals are assessed. The merit review shall be performed by peers and other individuals with expertise appropriate to evaluate the proposed project. Merit reviewers may not include principals, collaborators or others involved in the preparation of the application under review.

Subpart D—Annual Reports

§ 3400.23 Annual reports.

(a) Reporting requirement. The recipient shall submit an annual report describing the results of the research, extension, or education activity and the merit of the results.

(b) Report type and content. Unless otherwise stipulated, grant recipients will have met the reporting requirement under this subpart by complying with the reporting requirements as set forth in the terms and conditions of the grant at the time of award.

[64 FR 34104, June 24, 1999]
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EDITORIAL NOTE: Nomenclature changes to part 3401 appear at 76 FR 4806, Jan. 27, 2011.