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 Please provide the information requested below. Length and detail of responses may vary according to the nature of the proposal. We value your honest appraisal and the format allows you to be as expansive as you deem necessary (feel free to use a separate sheet if necessary). Your comments and scoring will be shared with the principal investigator but with complete anonymity.

1. **Science, Technology, and/or Extension Program Design (technical merit of all aspects of the project, 30%):** Does this proposal use top quality science and/or technology, or demonstrate extension scholarship? Is (are) the PI(s) familiar with relevant previous and contemporary investigations? Are the objectives and hypotheses explicit and clear? Is the experimental plan clear and the statistical design appropriate? Is the methodology described in the plan appropriate to meet the objectives for a research or extension project? Will this work advance understanding of the science and the contemporary problems that the industry faces? If this is an Extension-demonstration or education project do the PI(s) provide an adequate plan to evaluate the success of the effort? Are the proper metrics provided? Can the PI(s) properly assess the short-term, medium-term, long-term outcomes projected?

*Comments:*

The proposed work uses recognized methods with objectives of learning more about sea lice. For the comparison of healthy fish to sea-lice infested fish, how will lice be collected from healthy fish (or was this instead meant to be fish skin, not lice)? How common are lice in the fish being farmed at the site where fish will be taken from?

*Rating: Maximum score = 30*

 Excellent (numerical value = 30) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Very Good (numerical value = 27) \_\_\_X\_\_\_

 Good (numerical value = 24) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Fair (numerical value = 21) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Poor (numerical value = 18) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Industry Relevance and Probability of Success (30%):** Are the benefits and potential impacts related to industry utility such as increased farm-gate value or grower profitability? Will the project likely provide usable results that can be adopted by the industry in a timely manner? Alternatively, if it is a development effort toward a new technology, will this project’s results increase the team’s capacity to compete for external funds to support the next iteration of research and outreach needed to take the results to application? Will this project create an opportunity for information to be turned over to the industry for refinement and adoption that will eventually become self-sustaining?

*Comments:*

My concern here is that this work will increase knowledge but does not provide a clear path to application. Depending on the results, there may not be a solution that results from this work.

*Rating: Maximum score = 30*

 Excellent (numerical value = 30) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Very Good (numerical value = 27) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Good (numerical value = 24) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Fair (numerical value = 21) \_\_X\_\_\_\_

 Poor (numerical value = 18) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Integration with Extension (20%):** Does this work identify the key stakeholders? Stakeholders include those individuals (industries and agencies) not directly involved in the project. Is the extension plan appropriately designed to reach the targeted stakeholders? How will the results of this work address the needs of key stakeholders? Will this project extend our knowledge to all stakeholders? Are the expected outputs, outcomes, and impacts clearly described? Is the budget appropriate for effective integration?

*Comments:*

The proposal includes a mention of working with a local extension agent (Bartlett, who is fantastic) but there is no funding and no clear extension plan. The PI is well known in the field of sea lice, but the extension plan is not explicitly described in this proposal.

*Rating: Maximum score = 20*

 Excellent (numerical value = 20) \_\_\_\_\_\_

 Very Good (numerical value = 18) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Good (numerical value = 16) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Fair (numerical value = 14) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Poor (numerical value = 12) \_\_\_\_X\_\_

**4. Capacity (10%):** Is (are) the principal investigator(s) and specified members of the research (extension) team qualified to conduct the research (program)? Is there industry representation as part of the team? Have the investigators clearly articulated they have adequate facilities and equipment to complete the project. Is the overall budget appropriate given the scope of the project? Is there a reasonable chance the project will be completed on-time?

*Comments:*

This is a highly capable team but lacks (funded) extension capacity

*Rating: Maximum score = 10*

 Excellent (numerical value = 10) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Very Good (numerical value = 9) \_\_\_\_X\_\_

 Good (numerical value = 8) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Fair (numerical value = 7) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Poor (numerical value = 6) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**5. Accountability (10%):** Does the investigator and her/his team have a successful track record of previous NRAC funding being adopted by the industry? Have they leveraged NRAC funding for additional resources to solve bigger problems that can be funded by NRAC alone? Is there evidence that the investigator(s) has (have) an established record indicating a high probability of success on the proposed work? Does the PI(s) have an established record of completing projects on-time meeting the objectives laid out in previous projects? Can this project integrate or be leveraged with funding from other work of the investigator(s)? Does the investigator(s) have a track record that suggests this project will be a good investment for NRAC resources?

*Comments:*

The team is accountable and productive.

*Rating: Maximum score = 10*

 Excellent (numerical value = 10) \_\_X\_\_\_\_

 Very Good (numerical value = 9) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Good (numerical value = 8) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Fair (numerical value = 7) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Poor (numerical value = 6) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Non-Applicable – First Time Applicant \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**6*.* Total score: \_\_79\_\_**

 **Rating Excellent \_\_\_\_\_\_**

 **Very Good \_\_\_\_\_\_**

 **Good \_\_\_\_\_\_**

 **Fair \_\_X\_\_\_**

 **Poor \_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Final Recommendation: Must fund \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

 **Fund if resources are available \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

 **Encourage Resubmission next year \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

 **Do Not Fund \_\_\_X\_\_\_\_**

**7. Strengths:** What are the major strengths of this proposal? If you provided a rating of excellent for any of the categories above but did not comment, would you please share why you rated a particular category as “excellent”?

**8. Weaknesses:** Identify the weaknesses of this proposal. Are there any flaws (design, methodological, etc.) that might seriously compromise the scientific integrity, value and/or validity of the work? If you rated an evaluation area as fair or poor, how might that area of the proposal be improved?

For this call, there is a priority on application and stakeholder engagement. As proposed, this work does not appear to be likely to yield application in the short or mid-term, and does not have substantive stakeholder engagement.