**Part I:**

**To be completed for all proposals at mid-year and at completion date.**

# Sub/Contractor Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Principal Investigator Name: | Richard Joost |
| Organization: | SmithBucklin |

# Proposal Information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposal Number: | | 1720-172-0119 - Final |
| Proposal Title: | | Research Coordination |
| Primary Contractor: | | SmithBucklin |
| Proposal Manager’s Name: | | Richard Joost |
| Start Date: | | 10/1/2016 |
| Completion Date | | 9/30/2017 |
| Proposal Summary: | | |
| Checkoff research activities require a significant amount of coordination to ensure that investments are well-aligned, avoid duplication, and realize their full potential. This project provides program staff with the capability of responding quickly to develop and implement short-term coordination activities that arise throughout the year. It also focuses on the development of a unified coordinated strategic plan across the checkoff family. Many of these activities are directly linked to opportunities that leverage checkoff funding with public or private industry funding. | | |
| Approved Budget: | $200,026 | |
| Billed to Date: | $66,060.58 | |

# PrOgress Assessment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Report progress toward the situation you described in the proposal summary: | | | | | | |
| Two strategic planning meetings have been conducted that resulted in the development of draft strategic plans developed by the SCN and protein research groups. These strategic plans have been used to identify gaps and research needs in each of these program areas. These strategic reports will be presented at the State National Checkoff Staff Meeting in Lexington KY on April 18. In addition several soybean disease research team meetings have been held as well as a soybean composition workshop to coordinate research activities of research teams funded by USB. | | | | | | |
| Progress Against Budget, Timeline & Scope Describe any issues related to progress against budget, timeline or scope. If none, enter N/A. | | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | |
| Did this proposal meet the intended KPIs? | | |  | | | |
| List KPIs below and for each KPI check one  For final reports | KPI not met - little or no progress | KPI not met - significant progress | | KPI met | | KPI exceeded | |
| *For midterm reports* | *KPI will probably not be met* | *KPI is on track* | | *KPI will probably be exceeded* | |  | |
| A structure for collaborative strategic planning among USB, QSSBs, regional checkoff programs and commercial companies is developed by May 2017. |  |  | | x | |  | |
| By October 2017 a master plan for checkoff-funded soybean research is developed that provides direction to the type of research each entity conducts, who conducts that research and the amount of replication that is required. |  | x | |  | |  | |
| USB collaborates with USDA-ARS to impact national strategic planning for soybean research to ensure appropriate research infrastructure is in place at the national level. |  |  | | x | |  | |
| USB and QSSB research staff develop a unified research strategy by October 2017. |  | x | |  | |  | |
| USB-funded research teams in all key research focus areas meet during 2017 to ensure a unified research approach that addresses all key issues. |  |  | | x | |  | |
| Soybean research results are shared among public researchers in symposia held during 2017. A survey will measure knowledge gain, and intent to utilize past results for future soybean innovations. |  |  | | x | |  | |
|  | | |  | | | |
| KPI Accomplishments: On reflection, did the proposal KPIs | | | Check Box | | | |
| *(Respond to this question for both midterm and final reports)* | | | YES | | NO | |
| 1. Address the relevant program audience(s)? | | | X | |  | |
| 1. Address the proposal objective(s)? | | | X | |  | |
| 1. Prove measurable? | | | x | |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| How were the KPIs measured? *(Summarize in a few sentences)*  *(If this is a midterm report, describe how the KPI will be measured)* | | | | | | |
| Meetings held to develop strategic approaches moving forward.  Strategic plans developed  Strategic plans shared with checkoff partners  Research teams identify key steps forward and implement those plans. | | | | | | |
| Elaborate on the circumstances that played a role in (a) achieving, or (b) not achieving the KPI(s) above, in question 3.3: *(For midterm reports elaborate on any circumstances that might prevent or promote achievement of the KPIs*) | | | | | |
| Achieving the KPIs:Strategic plans developed for checkoff-funded SCN and protein research needs to meet USB-identified goals in these areas. Strategic plans and goals/needs shared with checkoff partners at three meetings during FY17  All major research teams have met to plan for 2017 activities. | | | | | |
| Expected Outputs/Deliverables: | | | | | |
| 1. Better coordination of research activities with QSSBs, regional checkoff research programs and development of joint strategies to address key soybean research issues. 2. Reduction of redundancy across checkoff research programs through better communication and coordination of activities. 3. Good working relationships are established between USB, QSSBs, public research entities, and commercial companies. 4. USB provides technical expertise to ASA.   Key deliverables for this project include:  1. Identification of the key components and operating structure for a soybean production research virtual center of excellence.  2. Identification of key soybean production research targets.  3. Development of a structure for coordinating research activities among USB, QSSBs, regional research programs, and commercial seed and technology companies, including an approach for coordinated strategic planning and division of effort among these entities.  4. A master plan for checkoff funded research is developed that outlines the mix of basic vs. applied research, division of efforts among the participant entities, and the amount of replication required.  5. A plan for technology transfer that ensures that checkoff funded research results are available to U.S. soybean farmers and presented in a manner that encourages adoption of newly developed products and practices. | | | | | |
| Were all proposal deliverables supplied or on schedule? | [Check one] | No deliverables due yet | YES | NO |
|  |  |  | x |  |
| **If NO, then why:** | | | | |
|  | | | | |

**Part II: To be completed for all proposals, at completion date only.**

| How is the impact of this proposal best characterized? | |
| --- | --- |
|  | Check all that apply |
| * This proposal has resulted in an identified product/technology/research outcome that is commercialized and will lead to benefit to soybean farmers. |  |
| * This proposal has resulted in specific prospects for commercialization; the potential benefits are clear but an industrial partner needs to be identified in order to realize benefits |  |
| * This proposal has contributed to building a foundation and knowledge base that may lead to benefits for future generations of soybean farmers | x |
| * The results of this proposal are unlikely to lead to commercially viable benefits or to changes in attitudes and behavior in favor of soy farmer and industry interests |  |
| * This proposal has resulted in positive changes in the targets’ behavior |  |
| * This proposal has resulted in changes in the targets’ awareness and attitudes that will potentially lead to positive changes in behavior |  |
| * The results of this proposal are unlikely to lead to commercially viable benefits or to changes in attitudes and behavior in favor of soy farmer and industry interests |  |
| * US soy farmers understand how check-off funds are being invested and how this work will benefit them; they continue to support the check-off |  |
| * This proposal is unlikely to contribute to farmers’ understanding and support of the check-off |  |
| * This proposal has met its objectives and the outcomes and will contribute to meeting USB’s strategic objectives |  |
| * This proposal has not developed according to plan and expectations |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Is any further investment required for this proposal to realize its intended benefits for US soybean farmers? | CHECK ONE |
| 1. No further investment is required benefits, have been realized |  |
| 1. Smaller (75% or less) than the current level of investment is required to realize benefits. |  |
| 1. Maintain approximately the current level of investment. |  |
| 1. Larger (25% or more) than the current level of investment in further work is required. | x |
| 1. There should be no further investment in this proposal because the results are unlikely to lead to contribute to soybean farmers and industry well-being. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Over what period of time will the expected benefits to US farmers be realized? | CHECK ONE |
| 1. Immediate to near future | x |
| 1. 3 - 5 years |  |
| 1. More than 5 years |  |
| 1. N/A, proposal is not showing potential to realize benefits or this has been a one-off Special Proposal |  |

# Learning and next steps

|  |
| --- |
| What proposal(s) should be considered next to continue advancing this program? Attach Program Maturity Roadmap, if applicable. |
| The research coordination effort continues to benefit soybean farmers and has resulted in improved efficiency and value for checkoff fund investment by improving coordination of research, identification of research gaps and redundancies. For FY18 all efforts related to coordination of research activities among USB, QSSBs and regional checkoff programs were incorporated into this project. This approach seems to be working very well and would be recommended for the future. |
| What, if any, follow-on steps are required to capture benefits for all US soybean farmers? *Describe in a few sentences how the results of this proposal will be used, whether the USB should invest in similar work in the future and how such a proposal will differ from the current one, why. For proposals in progress, do you recommend continuation, continuation with modification, or cancellation? Explain why.* |
| **Combine all research coordination efforts into one project including administrative costs for checkoff research database/website and all regional checkoff programs as this has resulted in administrative and cost efficiencies.** |