NERACOOS 2015 Proposal Submission Review Criteria

1. Technical Merit of project - is it achievable?

What is the technical feasibility of the project? Are the project goals achievable within the time period? Does it demonstrate the ability to integrate quality information into the regional observing system in an appropriate time frame?

0 (FAIL)	
1 (UNSATISFACTORY)	Project is potentially unfeasible and/or will result in little to no project deliverables during the timeframe which can benefit NERACOOS and its users.
2 (FAIR)	
3 (GOOD)	Project is technically feasible within the timeframe, demonstrates an ability to be fully integrated into the observing system, and will directly benefit NERACOOS and its users.
4 (VERY GOOD)	
5 (EXCELLENT)	Project has excellent feasibility, effectively builds on existing or well understood technology and/or capacity, clearly demonstrates the ability to be integrated into the observing system, and will result in a high and measureable benefit to NERACOOS and its users.

2. Budget reasonableness & ability to leverage

How reasonable is the proposed budget, in terms of: the operational scope of the project, the products that would result, and the cost to NERACOOS? Does the proposed activities leverage existing activities, research funding, and/or capacities of the proposer, existing users, or institutions?

0 (FAIL)	
1 (UNSATISFACTORY)	A budget is provided, but it does not fully address the scope of work and/or has serious deficiencies.
2 (FAIR)	
3 (GOOD)	The project budget is reasonable for the scope of work and well justified, however no leveraged funds or partnerships exist for the activity and/or the cost to NERACOOS might be significant.
4 (VERY GOOD)	
5 (EXCELLENT)	The project budget and costs are well justified and, via the leveraging of non-NERACOOS supported activities, funding, or capacity, will carry out the proposed activities/project deliverables at a significant, documented, cost savings to NERACOOS.

3. Team qualifications and capabilities

How qualified is the project team to carry out the proposed activities? Do they have the resources, prior experience, and/or knowledge necessary to lead to a successful result on behalf of NERACOOS?

0 (FAIL)	
1 (UNSATISFACTORY)	The project team is unqualified for the proposed task and/or lacks expertise in key areas, and/or access to the equipment or resources necessary to successfully complete the proposed tasks.
2 (FAIR)	
3 (GOOD)	Project team is qualified and has resources necessary to perform work.
4 (VERY GOOD)	
5 (EXCELLENT)	The project team represents the experts of the field and have all the resources necessary to perform the proposed work.

4. Contributes to strategic priorities

How does the proposed activities support the stated NERACOOS mission and strategic priorities? Does the product represent the observation/simulation of a key parameter in a critical area and/or continue long-term monitoring? Do the integration or communication activities logically fulfill NERACOOS priorities?

0 (FAIL)	
1 (UNSATISFACTORY)	Project contributes weakly to a stated priority via choice of location, sensor/platform, or activity focus. Integration into existing data management system would be difficult and/or consume significant project resources. Communication activities are not appropriate or do not fulfill NERACOOS priorities.
2 (FAIR)	
3 (GOOD)	Project activity contributes to a stated priority. Product represents observation/simulation of key parameter(s) and/or continues existing long term monitoring. Product integration into existing data management systems is possible with additional efforts. Integration or communication activities are well reasoned and logical to achieve stated priorities.
4 (VERY GOOD)	
5 (EXCELLENT)	Project activity fulfills or contributes significantly to a stated priority. Product represents observation/simulation of key parameter(s) in critical area(s) and/or continues existing long term monitoring of key parameter/area. Integration into existing data management system is straightforward. Integration or communication activities represent core actions necessary to support NERACOOS' mission and goals.

5. Value to key stakeholders

Does the project describe or identify the stakeholders or stakeholder groups effected by the proposed activity? Will the proposed work achieve a tangible benefit/product to NERACOOS and/or fulfill the needs of key regional stakeholders?

0 (FAIL)	
1 (UNSATISFACTORY)	Stakeholders and/or stakeholder groups are poorly identified and/or stakeholder needs are not significantly fulfilled by the proposed activity.
2 (FAIR)	
3 (GOOD)	Stakeholders and/or stakeholder groups are identified clearly and accurately, and the proposed work would at least partially meet needs, but either not fully address NERACOOS/stakeholder needs or the stakeholders addressed are not deemed key to NERACOOS.
4 (VERY GOOD)	
5 (EXCELLENT)	Stakeholders and/or stakeholder groups are clearly and accurately identified and results of the proposed activities would meet needs of existing stakeholders or expand to serve new stakeholders.

6. Theme Areas

Does the project actively address a theme area issue as defined in the Regional Build-out Plan (2011)? Does the project meet specific theme areas of the 2015 IOOS FFO?

0 (FAIL)	
1 (UNSATISFACTORY)	Project does not clearly address NERACOOS/IOOS theme area issue(s).
2 (FAIR)	
3 (GOOD)	Project addresses at least one NERACOOS/IOOS theme area issue.
4 (VERY GOOD)	
5 (EXCELLENT)	Project fully supports and makes significant progress towards addressing NERACOOS/IOOS theme area issues.