**Report Type: Final Report**

**Part I:**

**To be completed mid-year only for those active proposals that were identified as concern through Portfolio monitoring (status “Red” or “Yellow”) and for all proposals at completion date.**

# Sub/Contractor Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Principal Investigator Name: | Jennifer Jones |
| Organization: | SmithBucklin |

# Proposal Information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposal Number: | | 1820-172-0119 |
| Proposal Title: | | Research Coordination |
| Primary Contractor: | | SmithBucklin |
| Proposal Manager’s Name: | | Jennifer Jones |
| Start Date: | | 10/1/2017 |
| Completion Date | | 9/30/2018 |
| Proposal Summary (demonstrating Business Case): Insert the Proposal Summary from the USB Proposal | | |
| 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 research plan across the checkoff family. Many of these activities are directly linked to opportunities that leverage checkoff funding with public or private industry funding. Included in this effort is support for administration of four regional checkoff programs and a database that summarizes all checkoff-supported research. A survey of the impact of soybean diseases and insects will provide direction for research. In addition support is included for adding a quality contest to ten existing state yield contests. | | |
| Approved Budget: | $553,863 | |
| Billed to Date: | $258,673.78 | |

# ProPOSAL PrOgress Assessment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Report progress toward the situation described in the proposal summary: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Research coordination activities occurred throughout the year. Program staff and USB funded soybean researcher team met to discuss results and experimental plans. Program staff worked with the teams to ensure research is aligned with the LRSP and coordinates with other research programs. Efforts surrounding the unified coordinated research plan in SCN and composition were conducted. Support was provided for regional checkoff programs and the checkoff database. The insect and soybean diseases surveys were conducted and the results are being prepared for publication. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | |
|  | |  |  | | |  | | |  | |
| A structure for collaborative strategic planning among USB, QSSBs, regional checkoff programs and commercial companies is developed and implemented by June 2018. | |  |  | | | X | | |  | |
| By October 2018 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-funded research teams in all key research focus areas meet during 2018 to ensure a unified research approach that addresses all key issues. | |  |  | | | X | | |  | |
| USB and QSSB research staff develop a unified research strategy by October 2018 | |  | 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 | | |  | | |  | |
| All 2017 checkoff-funded research projects are entered into the Checkoff Research Database by the end of March 2018 and accessed by half of the QSSBs to assess research gaps and overlaps. | |  |  | | | X | | |  | |
| Soybean research results are shared among public researchers in symposia held during 2018. A survey will measure knowledge gain, and intent to utilize past results for future soybean innovations. | |  | X | | |  | | |  | |
| A crop quality contest is coordinated in ten states to recognize the production of top quality soybeans by the end of December 2018 and farmers are informed of key soybean quality attributes that contribute to value. | | X |  | | |  | | |  | |
| A survey of the impact of key disease and insect pests on soybean production is completed for the 2017 growing season and summarized by the end of April 2018 and provides direction to research aimed at managing soybean biotic stresses | |  |  | | | X | | |  | |
|  | | | | |  | | | | | | | |
| KPI Accomplishments: On reflection, did the proposal KPIs | | | | | Check Box | | | | | | | |
| *(Respond to this question for both progress and final reports)* | | | | | YES | | | NO | | | | |
| 1. Address the relevant program audience(s)? | | | | | X | | |  | | | | |
| 1. Address the proposal business case? | | | | | X | | |  | | | | |
| 1. Prove measurable? | | | | | X | | |  | | | | |
| How were the KPIs measured? *(Summarize in a few sentences)*  Meetings held to develop strategic approaches moving forward.  Strategic plans shared with checkoff partners.  Checkoff funded and other soybean research is coordinated to facilitate information sharing and progress forward.  Research results and other important data is made publically available so researchers can make informed research decisions for the future, other funding agencies have transparency with respect to what different entities are supporting and so growers understand how checkoff dollars are spent in research programs. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elaborate on the key circumstances that impacted achieving, or not achieving the KPI(s) listed in question 3.3 *(For progress reports elaborate on any circumstances that might prevent or promote achievement of the KPIs*)Key external circumstances (e.g. changing market conditions, leveraged partner funding) Key internal circumstances (e.g. staff continuity, actual versus budget variances) With Rich Joost’s passing and staff changes at USB, future priorities surrounding the unified research strategic plan were unclear and the vision that Rich had for implementation were also not clear. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are there proposal recommendations considering KPI progress and key circumstances noted (i.e., stop, adjust scope, change track, etc.)? Quality contest is not continued in 2019. Though coordination remains a goal, the approach of a unified research plan is unclear. 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. 5. Soybean quality contests conducted in ten states using a consistent sampling approach and analysis methodology. 6. National survey of soybean disease and insect impact completed to provide direction for future investment in disease and insect resistance and management.   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, including key disease and insect pests to address. 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. 6. Development of a framework for establishing and coordinating state soybean quality contests to promote the production of quality value soybeans. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Were all proposal deliverables supplied or on schedule? | [Check one] | | | No deliverables due yet | | | YES | | | NO | |
|  |  | | |  | | |  | | | X | |
| If NO, then why: See above-changes in USB structure and leadership and the passing away of Rich Joost | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| How is the impact of this proposal best characterized? | |
| --- | --- |
|  | Check all that apply |
| 1. This proposal has resulted in an identified product/technology/research outcome that is commercialized and will lead to benefit to soybean farmers. |  |
| 1. 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 |  |
| 1. This proposal has contributed to increasing the value and preference for U. S. soy | X |
| 1. 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 |  |
| 1. This proposal has resulted in positive changes in the audience’ behavior |  |
| 1. This proposal has resulted in changes in the audiences’ awareness and attitudes that will potentially lead to positive changes in behavior | X |
| 1. US soy farmers understand how check-off funds are being invested and how this work brings value to them; they continue to support the check-off | X |
| 1. This proposal is unlikely to contribute to farmers’ understanding and support of the check-off |  |
| 1. This proposal has addressed the business case and the outputs/deliverables and contributed to meeting USB’s strategic objectives |  |
| 1. 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. | X |
| 1. Larger (25% or more) than the current level of investment in further work is required. |  |
| 1. There should be no further investment in this proposal because the results are unlikely to lead to contribute to maximizing value for U.S. soybean farmers and increasing the value and preference for U.S. soy. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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. This work provides resources to help the checkoff family and soybean researchers to communicate research plans and results. |
| 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.* |
| This work should be continued and will evolve as needed to address current research opportunities and problems. |
| Open ended commentary of contractor performance *Describe the success or failure realized by the contractor and their qualifications for continued consideration by USB not previously considered on this form; for example key individual’s performance, completed on time, completed within original line-item budget.* |
| N/A |
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