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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 project is led by extremely successful investigators, who has vast knowledge of shellfish diseases and hatchery problems. The design is clear and outlines specific analysis for determining problems among many hatcheries. They outlined utilizing extension and training and sample collection but have not specifically developed the complete extension team.*

*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: The benefits and impacts to the industry could be substantial. Usable results would be rapidly adopted by the industry. The information would be rapidly turned over to hatcheries for utilization and reducing periods of poor production. My one concern will be identifying individual parameters which causes problems or is it a combination of parameters which lead to reduced hatchery success.*

*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. **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 project is integrated with Extension, and Extension has a role in training hatchery personnel, collecting samples and disseminating information later. The Extension team is not completely developed at this time. hatchery work is extremely complex and disease issues can be even more complex. Many times it is difficult for untrained Extension personnel to extend disease and husbandry information in a hatchery environment. A poor analogy is a layman delivering a premature baby which has a disease issue.*

*Rating: Maximum score = 20*

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

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

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

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

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

**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: The research team are internationally known in the field and are excellent researchers with appropriate laboratory facilities and equipment.*

*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) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**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: Investigators and the team have an extremely successful track record and house had excellent industry adoption. although expensive research, the investigators have an excellent track record and the project seeks to improve a problem area for the major aquaculture industry in the region and the East Coast.*

*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) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

**6*.* Total score: \_\_\_89\_\_\_\_**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**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”?

*Major strengths of the proposal are the excellent team of researchers, inclusion of many states in the region, the major aquaculture industry in the region and an identified problem that could improve production and farm gate value, if the project is successful.*

**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?

*Disease and hatchery projects are difficult for Extension personnel to conduct programs, unless they are trained in these programs. It is truly a specialized arm of aquaculture and should be recognized as such.*