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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:*

This proposal was difficult to follow. BMPs for oyster aquaculture are old and need replaced. Thus, the team proposed to update them and then disseminate to the industry. The premise that updated production and gear BMPs, if adopted, would increase the profitability and efficiency of oyster farms is sound. However, the assumption that they are going to develop BMPs for being a good neighbor and help with community engagement is not as strong; there is no discussion with the affected stakeholders (the adjacent landowners and other users of the waters around the aquaculture site). The evaluation metrics are adequate.

*Rating: Maximum score = 30*

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

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

Good (numerical value = 24) \_\_\_\_\_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 are increased productivity and profitability. Not seeing the BMPs, it is not clear if they can be adopted in a timely manner; likely some yes and some no. The proposed work has many interactions with farmers and others in the industry. As noted above, it lacks engagement with those opposing the farms, so not sure how adopting these will change their views.

*Rating: Maximum score = 30*

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

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

Good (numerical value = 24) \_\_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 work identifies the key stakeholders, but fails to engage with a major group, those opposed to the farms. From a production and gear perspective, I think this work will serve to bring together various practices throughout the industry into a single framework, which is good. While the project could extend the knowledge to all stakeholders, not engaging with all stakeholders could lead to minimal acceptance of the BMPs as proof that the farms are a good thing and should be socially acceptable. The budget looks adequate.

*Rating: Maximum score = 20*

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

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

Good (numerical value = 16) \_\_\_18\_\_\_\_

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:*

All acceptable on this item.

*Rating: Maximum score = 10*

Excellent (numerical value = 10) \_\_\_10\_\_\_\_

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:*

The team looks strong. The PI is early in their career and wisely chose a team that can offer support.

*Rating: Maximum score = 10*

Excellent (numerical value = 10) \_\_\_10\_\_\_\_

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: \_\_\_86\_\_\_\_**

**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”?

* Strong team with lots of experience in the industry
* Mostly good premise – create an updated BMP guide for the industry

**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?

* Not including opposing stakeholders
* Difficult to follow proposal