



Summary of the Review Process for the 2021 Collaborative Research RFP

Review Stage & Emphasis	Inputs and Criteria	Who is Involved
1. Minimum requirements assessment <i>Does the pre-proposal comply with the RFP requirements? Does the full proposal comply with the full proposal guidance?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-proposal requirements as stated in the 2021 Collaborative Research Request for Pre-proposals Full proposal requirements as outlined in the 2021 Full Proposal Guidance 	Science Collaborative Team
2. Pre-proposal review		
2a. Pre-proposal written review <i>How well does each pre-proposal meet the evaluation criteria, with emphasis on the management relevance, collaborative approach, and potential application?</i>	Pre-proposal evaluation criteria	Review Panel
2b. Pre-proposal panel review <i>How should pre-proposals be prioritized for invitation to full proposal?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-proposal evaluation criteria Review Panel written reviews 	Review Panel
2c. Invitations to submit a full proposal <i>Is there justification for selecting any of the recommended projects out of rank order based upon one or more of the secondary selection factors in the RFP?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Panel discussions and rank ordering of pre-proposals Manager pre-proposal assessments Secondary selection factors as stated in the RFP 	Science Collaborative Team NOAA Program Officer

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

Review Stage & Emphasis	Inputs and Criteria	Who is Involved
3. Full proposal review		
3a. Written technical review <i>How well does each proposal respond to the evaluation criteria in the full proposal requirements, with emphasis on the proposed methods and potential impact?</i>	Full proposal evaluation criteria	Review Panel and Additional Technical Experts
3b. Applicant response to reviews <i>After reviewing their written technical reviews, how can applicants clarify aspects of their proposed project to inform the review panel's discussion of full proposals?</i>	Written technical reviews	Project Leads & Teams
3c. Full proposal panel review <i>How should proposals be prioritized for funding?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full proposal evaluation criteria • Written technical reviews • Applicant responses to technical reviews 	Review Panel
3d. Recommendations for funding <i>Is there justification for selecting any of the recommended projects out of rank order based upon one or more of the secondary selection factors in the RFP requirements?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Panel discussion and rank ordering of full proposals • Manager assessments of full proposals • Secondary selection factors as stated in the RFP 	Science Collaborative Team NOAA Program Manager

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

2021 Collaborative Research Proposal Review Process: Summary of Participants

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

<p style="text-align: center;">NERRS Science Collaborative Team</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>In consultation with the NOAA Program Officer, the NERRS Science Collaborative Team accepts proposals, conducts the minimum requirements review, manages the review process, and develops funding recommendations for NOAA.</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Review Panel</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The review panel is engaged throughout the entire review process, including both the pre- and full proposal stages. The review panel conducts written reviews at the pre-proposal and full proposal stage. At both stages of the competition, the panel convenes to discuss and rank proposals, and develops summaries of their discussion of each proposal.</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Technical Experts</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Review panel members as well as additional technical experts complete written reviews of the full proposals which inform the panel review process.</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">NOAA Program Officer</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The NOAA Program Officer actively advises the Science Collaborative Team on the review process, observes all panel meetings and discussions to ensure a fair and impartial process is maintained, and facilitates NOAA approval of funding.</i></p>

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

The Science Collaborative invites a balanced set of estuarine science 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 with collaborative research and/or coastal management, 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.