

DRRW Phase II Proposal Development Calendar			
	Input to Cornell or BMGF		Response from Cornell/BMGF
Step	Primary Originator	Date Due	Due Date
Concept Notes (brief intro, logframes including key outputs and responsible partners for each activity, general work plan, indicative budgets for proposed activities, and evidenced based rationale for choice of partners)	<u>Team Leaders</u>	May 4	May 15
Draft Single Objective Narratives (effectively subproposals; including budgets; details on cooperating institutions; preliminary letters of intent from collaborators)	<u>Team Leaders</u>	June 15	July 10
Cross-Objective logframe/milestone/budget draft	Cornell	June 27	mid-july and ongoing
Revised Single Objective Narratives	<u>Team Leaders</u>	Asap after July 10	mid-july and ongoing
Global Access Strategy process begins (details to be determined)	Cornell/BMGF/collaborating institutions	July	iterative
Review-ready final proposal with Single Objective Narratives as Appendixes	Cornell	July 31	September 14
Final Phase II Proposal (with formal letters of commitment including agreement to Global Access (ideally) from authorized representatives of collaborating institutions)	Cornell	Mid-November	

DRRW Phase II Proposal Structure				
Objective ID	Full Title	Short Title	Phase I Obj #	Leader
21	Improved Testing, Multiplication, and adoption of replacement varieties.	Seed	n/a	R Tripp and DRRW management
22	Increased levels of global investments and coordination in stem rust research and development.	Advocacy	Part of #2	DRRW management
23	Stem rust populations tracked and monitored.	Surveillance	#3	R. Park
24	World-class stem rust response phenotyping facilities in East Africa.	Critical Facilities	#4	Davinder Singh
25	Durably resistant, high yielding wheat varieties.	Breeding	#5	HJ Braun
26	High breeding value wheat lines with two or more marker-selectable stem rust resistance genes.	Pre-Breeding	#6+7+8	M. Pumphrey
27	Optimized Wheat Improvement System in Ethiopia.	Ethiopia	n/a	G Bedada
28	Project Management, communication, and coordination.	Management	Part of #2 + #10	DRRW Management

Memorandum

To: DRRW Objective Team Leaders

From: R. Ward

Re: DRRW Phase II Proposal Development

Date: April 9, 2009

DRRW Phase II Proposal: Background and General Principles

DRRW Phase I, contingent on continued performance, extends into the first quarter of 2011. We are now in Year 2 of DRRW Phase I, and pending favorable review of the Year 2 Technical and Financial Progress Report (due in October of this year), Year 3 would be funded through the life of the original grant. The hoped-for DRRW Phase II will be designed as a five year grant with Year 1 overlapping with Year 3 of Phase I.

Our primary focus continues to be on stem rust Ug99 and its derivatives. It is recognized, however, that resistances to other biotic threats (including leaf and yellow rust), higher grain yield, appropriate grain quality, and other traits must be bundled with stem rust resistance for replacement varieties to have impact.

If we are successful in securing a Phase II grant, it will be a separate grant to Cornell requiring a new set of subcontracts, task orders, etc. We do not anticipate that a successful DRRW Phase II proposal will include a large budget for Year 1. It is, however, logical and necessary that we incorporate into our work plans any lessons learned and relevant developments since Phase I began. That said, the manner in which Year 3 of DRRW Phase I, and Year 1 of DRRW Phase II will be interwoven will only become clear as we proceed with the Phase II development process.

A fundamental principle of both Phase I and the development and implementation of the hoped-for Phase II is reliance on the Project's Objective Team Leaders for scientific leadership. Cornell relies on the Objective Team Leaders to assemble the best teams and propose the best science for mitigating the threat Ug99 and other rust threats pose to resource poor farmers in the developing world. We are often admonished to propose what is needed, not what we think our Donor wants to hear. On the other hand, resources are, in the end, limited and we cannot expect this single Donor to be the answer to all needs. In fact, it is very important that we thoroughly catalog and present all plans and successes in mobilizing resources from other sources.

The DRRW Phase II proposal development process will be highly iterative, with the main actors being the Project's Program Officer, Cornell's DRRW management, and the Team Leaders of each Objective. There will be three fundamental stages in this process. First, Concept notes will be developed, then Objective-specific proposal documents will be developed, and finally, a comprehensive cross-Objective proposal will be developed. The last two stages will, to some extent, be concurrent. Logframes, milestones, and budgets from the Objective-specific documents will be

integrated into the full proposal; and the complete Objective specific narratives will be appendixes in the final, full proposal. The final stages of the full proposal development will be informed by input from external reviewers.

Midway in this process we will initiate a set of actions that lead to agreement on principles and practice of a Global Access Strategy that commits all partners to ensuring maximum impact in the shortest amount of time.

Pursuant to our goals of enhancing web-based collaborative work, we are posting critical documents to your Traction workspace as described in emails you received earlier this week from John Bakum and Sarah Davidson. As detailed below, the Concept Note template/instructions, overall Phase II calendar, and Phase II structure files are posted to your traction workspace. The corresponding Phase I budget is attached to the same email that this memo was attached to.

DRRW Phase II Proposal Structure

A word file named “DRRW Phase II structure V1 090409.doc” was posted to each Objective’s planning workspace within Traction. That file contains a table showing the Objective IDs, full titles, short titles, relationships to Phase I Objectives, and the name of the Objective Team Leaders. Contact Sarah Davidson (snd2@cornell.edu) or others in the Cornell team if you have difficulty accessing that or other files detailed here. To distinguish Phase I Objectives from Phase II objectives we’ve numbered the Phase II objectives 21-28. Titles can be adjusted as warranted.

DRRW Phase II Proposal Development Calendar

A Word file named “DRRW Phase II Development Calendar V2 090409.doc”, was posted to each Objective’s planning workspace (in the Traction software). This file has a table that has a row for each major step we envision in this process. The first deliverables are Objective specific Concept Notes due May 4. They will contain:

- brief introductions;
- combined logframes and budget tables (see below for instructions);
- general work plans with sufficient detail to understand the workflow (e.g., breeding strategies); and
- evidenced based rationale for choice of partners (including current and potential leveraging of funds outside this Project)

A template for the Concept note for your Objective is being posted to your Traction workspace. Note that it is acceptable for there to be variance among the exact structure of the Concept Notes.

The purpose of the Concept Notes is to enable the Foundation to provide input that informs our decision on what elements of the combined proposed work we should include in the next deliverables, i.e., the 1st Draft Single Objective Narratives, which are effectively sub-proposals. Feedback from the Foundation on review of the Concept Notes will also inform our decisions on budget envelopes for each element of the Phase II Proposal.

Combined Logframe and Budget Tables

A key element of each Objective's Concept Note will be the combined Logframe and Budget Table. An XLS file titled "Logframe for CN....090409.xls" has been posted to each Objective's Phase II planning Traction workspace. The left most two tabs in that file are examples, while the third tab (worksheet) from the left contains a blank, combined logframe and budget table for that Objective. The left most columns are traditional logframe columns, while the the last six columns are for estimated annual budgets on an Activity basis (the last column is an across years sum) for Phase II.

New Logframe hierarchy

When you look at the left most tab, you will note that we have added a third category ("Component") in the structure of the logframe. Accordingly, we now recognize the following logframe categories: Objectives, Components within Objectives, and Activities within Components.

Use of Component category is, however, optional. The first logframe (left most tab, titled "Example w Components used") is a mock-up of Objective 21 (Seed). It uses the Component category to allow grouping and independent numbering of Activities for each of the three countries addressed in this hypothetical Logframe ("a. Kenya", "b. Ethiopia", etc.)

Components, when used, will be have a lower case letter designator starting with 'a' followed by a brief descriptive phrase (e.g., "a. Kenya"). In the second tab from the left (titled "Example- Components not used") there is a mockup logframe for Objective 22 (Advocacy). In that instance, there is no rationale for use of the Component category and all activities fall under the placeholder Component "a. All".

Mike Pumphrey's Phase II objective (#26), is a likely candidate for use of the Component category. The work formerly under Phase I Objective's 6-8 might logically become three components (a-c), each with its own activities. Activity numbering restarts with the number "1" for each Objective, and for each different Component within an Objective. Again, use of the Component category is optional.

Logframes and Budget Table Columns

- Components are groups of Activities within an Objective.
- Activities are brief descriptions of work to be done.
- For Key Outputs/Deliverables, we are looking for the most important products or services to be generated by the corresponding activity. We anticipate in most cases there would five or fewer Key Outputs/Deliverables, but leave that to your discretion.
- The Primary Responsible Scientist/Institution column should include a name and that person's institution (and unit if applicable; e.g., P Njau, KARI-Njoro). Elsewhere in the Concept Note you'll provide information on why you think the indicated person(s)/institutions are appropriate choices.

- The right-most six columns provide space for projected annual costs per activity. You are encouraged to provide budget details in a separate worksheet. Along with this document, you should receive receive the Phase I budget worksheets that correspond to the Phase II Objective for which you are leading proposal development. This is provided both as a potential template and to inform you of the current budget. We ask that you consider the Phase I budget information you receive as confidential for your use only.

Closing Remarks

As indicated, a template for the Concept Notes will be posted to Traction shortly. Likewise, a draft template for the Objective-Specific Narratives (sub proposals) will be shared soon. We are engaged in a very fluid process and we at Cornell commit to flexibility and responsiveness that makes this as easy as possible for you as Team Leaders. As discussed in Obregon, we will initiate regular conference calls involving all Team Leaders. We are relying on you to point out where we can do better, and we thank you for your efforts to date and those required in the coming months.