



Proposals submitted to AKCA's Project KHV and their dispensation As of January 2007

There have been 12 proposals made to Project KHV requesting funding of over \$344,000 in aggregate, 6 of which were unsolicited, three were approved and totaled ~ \$30K, eight rejected and one withdrawn. See: <http://www.akcprojectkhv.org/index.htm>

Details

Solicited proposals:

1. In early 2006, Project KHV issued its first RFP (Request For Proposals) for a Phase 1 KHV (koi herpesvirus) education program to inform hobbyists about KHV. That RFP resulted in three proposals. One was chosen for funding at slightly over \$13K, the announcement and details for which have appeared in KOI USA in the last three issues of 2006.
2. In the fall of 2006 a proposal was received in response to the Phase 2 RFP that sought proposals for a Koi Dealer Best Health Practices Certification program. That proposal was later withdrawn.
3. In late 2006, the Steering Committee concluded that the parameters of the Phase 2 RFP needed better definition. Proposals for market research were requested; two were received. The Committee chose a \$3K proposal and that work is ongoing and producing good results.

Unsolicited proposals:

1. In early 2005 NC State Univ., College of Vet. Med. submitted a ~\$14K proposal to pursue two KHV DNA vaccines. The proposal was approved in mid-2005 and a first portion of the funding was sent. The NC State group subsequently received a much larger government grant, a portion of which duplicated the Project KHV funding. They returned the Project KHV money but the work continues and vaccines are awaiting efficacy testing.
2. In late 2005 a proposal was submitted for the development of a combined SVC and KHV vaccine. The proposal was evaluated by experts outside of Project KHV and was not funded as the review concluded that the proposal was technically risky.
3. In early 2006 a proposal for a killed-virus vaccine program was received. The program was reviewed and rejected as the principal investigator was unable to provide any necessary commitments or visibility with regard to activities or reporting.
4. In early 2006 a proposal to study the manipulation of a single water parameter to inactivate waterborne KHV (with fish in the system) was received. The proposal was reviewed and rejected for a variety of reasons, one of which was that the window of apparent opportunity to manipulate the parameter was so small (where it inactivated the virus but did not kill the fish) and required such precision that it was beyond the capability of virtually all hobbyists and dealers. Plus, there was a strong possibility of damaging the fish within that window.

5. In the fall of 2006 a proposal was received for hobbyists to create a Koi Dealer Best Health Practices Certification program. While the program had merit, it was ultimately rejected for two major reasons: 1) The AKCA would never approve of being party to an effort to actively control commercial aspects of the hobby, and 2) the koi dealers have a long history of being strongly against direct hobby intervention in the conduct of their business.
6. In the fall of 2006 a proposal was submitted to determine where KHV is “hiding” when it’s not causing disease. This proposal was met with significant interest as this is a question that is key to understanding and controlling the virus. However when reviewed by the newly formed Proposal Review Panel, they found it to be unsuitable for funding as the study was judged to be inadequately described and the virus to be studied was a modified version of the wild-type with insufficient studies done or included to show that results would be applicable to the wild-type.