


## Summary of Review Process for the 2018 Collaborative Science Catalyst RFP



Decision Point & Emphasis	Inputs and Criteria	Who is Involved
<b>1. Letter of Intent is Accepted</b> <i>Does the LOI include the required information and was it submitted by the deadline?</i>	Letter of Intent requirements as stated in the 2018 Collaborative Science Catalyst Request for Proposals (RFP)	Science Collaborative Team
<b>2. Proposal is Accepted</b> <i>Does the proposal comply with the RFP requirements?</i>	Proposal requirements as stated in the RFP	Science Collaborative Team
<b>3. Written Technical Review</b> <i>How well does each proposal meet the evaluation criteria?</i>	Evaluation criteria as stated in the RFP	Technical Experts (written review)
<b>4. Panel Review</b> <i>How should proposals be prioritized and ranked for funding?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation criteria as stated in the RFP</li> <li>Reserve manager assessments</li> <li>Written technical reviews</li> </ul>	Review Panel
<b>5. Proposal is Selected for Funding</b> <i>Is there justification for selecting any of the recommended projects from step 4 out of rank order based upon one or more of the selection factors as articulated in the RFP requirements?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Panel recommendations</li> <li>Selection factors as stated in the RFP</li> <li>Available funds</li> </ul>	Science Collaborative Team  NOAA Program Manager

**Note:** See below for an explanation of the role and composition of each group involved.

## 2018 Collaborative Science Catalyst Proposal Review Process: Summary of Participants

The following table summarizes the roles of each of the major groups contributing to the review process:

<b>NERRS Science Collaborative Team</b> <i>In consultation with the NOAA Program Manager, the NERRS Science Collaborative Team accepts proposals, conducts the minimum requirements review, manages the review process, and works with the NOAA program manager to make funding recommendations based on panel rankings and selection criteria.</i>
<b>Technical Experts (written review)</b> <i>Technical experts from the specific content area of the proposed work and collaboration practitioners with experience working on natural resource issues, complete written reviews of proposals based on the evaluation criteria listed in the RFP.</i>
<b>Review Panel</b> <i>The review panel convenes to discuss proposals and the written reviews conducted by the technical experts. The panel ranks proposals and develops summaries of its discussion of each proposal. The panel review is distinct from the written review and there is no overlap in membership.</i>
<b>NOAA Program Manager</b> <i>The NOAA Program Manager advises the Science Collaborative Team on the review process, observes the panel meeting and discussions to ensure a fair and impartial process is maintained, and facilitates NOAA approval of funding.</i>

### Who are the panelists and technical experts? What are their qualifications?

The Science Collaborative invites a balanced set of estuarine and collaboration experts, including scientists, program leaders, practitioners, and consultants to participate in the panel and technical expert review processes. Prior to participating in the review process, panelists participate in a panel preparation webinar, during which the unique characteristics of the NERR System and the goals and objectives of the Science Collaborative and the RFP are discussed. Panelists with conflicts of interest related to a specific proposal do not participate in the review, discussion, or ranking process for that proposal, nor do they have access to the proposal's review documents.

In order to preserve their impartiality, we do not disclose the names of individual panelists or reviewers. Generally, panelists and technical experts are:

- Credentialed practitioners from partner organizations and agencies, typically with experience conducting collaborative research, e.g., NEP, Sea Grant, IOOS, NOAA, USGS, USFWS, The Nature Conservancy, etc.
- Academic experts in estuarine science and/or collaboration, typically from applied research programs and institutes
- Geographically diverse, i.e., all reserve regions are represented on the review panel