

Section Score	Section	Element(s)	Guidance/Instructions	Component Criteria	Scoring Criteria	Score /67
20 points	<b>Relevance and Significance</b>	<b>Overview</b> (9 points)	All proposals must have a short and concise summary of the project and include goals, objectives and deliverables fitting to the project.	<p>Goal = Purpose toward a long term affect or direction, not necessarily measurable. (e.g., Contribute to the long term quality of spawning escapement)</p> <p>The overview should detail how the project contributes to the achievement of the stated goal.</p>	<p><i>Goal</i></p> <p>0=missing or completely inadequate 1=missing major concepts 2=missing minor concepts 3=clearly articulated, fitting to the project</p>	/3
				Objective = Short term, measurable and tangible. (e.g., Sample spawning population for age, sex, length)	<p><i>Objective</i></p> <p>0=missing or completely inadequate 1=missing major concepts 2=missing minor concepts 3=clearly articulated, fitting to the project</p>	/3
				Deliverable = Quantifiable goods or services that will be provided upon the completion of a project. Deliverables can be tangible or intangible parts. (e.g., reports, data, presentations, etc.)	<p><i>Deliverables</i></p> <p>0=missing or completely inadequate 1=missing major elements 2=adequate or missing minor elements 3=above expectations</p>	/3
		<b>Relevance and Significance</b> (11 points)  <b>(Critical Element: minimum 5 pts required)</b>	Proposals should explain specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interdependencies with current programs, policies and/or other projects; and</li> <li>• R&amp;E Fund objectives as outlined in Near-Term priorities of the Yukon River Panel and/or the envelopes as outlined in the Yukon River Salmon Agreement</li> </ul>	Demonstrates interdependencies with current programs, polices, and/or projects. Programs, policies and projects can be of agency or non-agency origin but should be linked to the interests of the JTC and YRP.	<p><i>Interdependencies</i></p> <p>0=has no connectivity to other programs, policies or projects 1=minimal connectivity 2=significant connectivity 3=integral to other projects, programs, and/or policies</p>	/3
				R&E Objectives: Near Term Priorities, guided by the current <i>Budget Priorities Framework</i> document for the R&E Fund.	<p><i>Near Term Priorities</i></p> <p>0=Activity not identified in Budget Framework or ≤ 5. 1=Need identified as priority level 4 in Budget Framework 2=Need identified as priority level 3 in Budget Framework 3=Need identified as priority level 2 in Budget Framework 4=Need identified as priority level 1 in Budget Framework</p>	/4

Section Score	Section	Element(s)	Guidance/Instructions	Component Criteria	Scoring Criteria			Score /67
				<p>R&amp;E Objectives: As outlined in the Yukon River Salmon Agreement:</p> <p>Research or Management activities directed at restoration, conservation, or enhancement; or</p> <p>Stewardship of habitat and resources related to salmon or habitat impacts; or</p> <p>Maintaining viable salmon fisheries</p> <p><b>NOTE: Can only acquire a score in ONE of the THREE categories (category should relate to the Near-Term Priority).</b></p>	<p><i>Research/Mgmt</i></p> <p>0=Not a research or management activity directed at Restoration, Conservation, or Enhancement.</p> <p>1=Enhancement: Wild Stocks</p> <p>2=Enhancement: Habitat</p> <p>3=Conservation: Habitat/Wild stocks</p> <p>4=Restoration: Habitat/Wild stocks</p>	<p><i>Stewardship</i></p> <p>0=no stewardship benefit</p> <p>1=reaches small group (&lt;5), minimal impact</p> <p>2=reaches small audience (&lt;5), potential for lasting impact</p> <p>3=reaches moderate sized (5-10 people) audience</p> <p>4=reaches a large audience (&gt;10) and has potential legacy</p>	<p><i>Viable Fisheries in Canada</i></p> <p>0=no impact on the long term success of the fishery.</p> <p>1=minimal impact (e.g. on an individual basis) on the long term success of the fishery</p> <p>2=moderate impact (e.g. more than an individual)on the long term success of the fishery</p> <p>3=allows the fishery to achieve added value in the harvest contributing to the long term success of the fishery</p> <p>4=allows the fishery, as a whole, to adapt to a significantly changing environment or regime</p>	/4
18 points	<b>Technical Merit</b>	<p><b>Approach</b></p> <p>(13 points)</p> <p><b>(Critical Element: minimum 7 pts required)</b></p>	<p>The answer to this question is a “critical element” in the review process.</p> <p>Content of this section will vary depending on the project envelope. However, for all envelopes and all projects, the technical merit section requires a</p>	<p>Does the proposal include a detailed description of methodology appropriate to address the overall goal or question, and each specific objective, for the proposed project?</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>0=Nothing was provided, content was totally off topic or major inconsistencies or flaws in reasoning/approach.</p> <p>1=Section had minimal explanation, minor inconsistencies or lacking overall understanding/concepts.</p> <p>2=Section was completed with sound explanations/reasoning.</p> <p>3=Section was beyond expectations for score of 2; methods were not only clear and appropriate but go beyond common/obvious approaches.</p>			/3

Section Score	Section	Element(s)	Guidance/Instructions	Component Criteria	Scoring Criteria	Score /67
			<p>clear description of <b>proposed activities which address specific, measurable project objectives</b>. Be sure to provide a sound rationale that supports each method proposed.</p> <p>Location maps are strongly recommended for all field projects, especially when multiple field locations are discussed in the proposal.</p> <p>Diagrams, technical drawings, photographs, etc., are all acceptable in so far as they support the description of the approach.</p> <p>Proposals involving quantitative or statistical methods should include a brief mathematical presentation of the proposed approach and formulas to be used. References to published methods are also acceptable.</p>	<p>Are details of the proposed methodology clearly presented and adequate to understand how each objective will be fulfilled? This should include project locations, dates, tools, equipment, techniques, specialized personnel, target audiences, etc. and how project methods will meet objectives. (e.g., For sampling or quantitative projects, are the potential biases recognised and addressed such as assumptions, sample sizes, sample design, etc.? For other types of projects, are the necessary plans/techniques thoroughly described to meet the objectives such as project scheduling, availability of personnel, resources etc.) (4 points)</p>	<p>0=Nothing was provided, content was totally off topic or major inconsistencies or flaws in reasoning/approach.</p> <p>1=Method descriptions were incomplete, inadequate, inconsistent with objectives, or inappropriate for project.2=Method descriptions were included but did not provide adequate detail to understand how approach will work, or were not completely appropriate or consistent with objectives.</p> <p>3=Method descriptions were detailed and complete with sound reasoning and consistent with project objectives.</p> <p>4=Beyond expectations for score of 3; provided detailed, clear, logical, and appropriate description of all proposed activities; used best available techniques/knowledge in the appropriate fields or disciplines</p>	/4
			<p><b>For stewardship and communications projects</b>, this section should address measurable objectives and include details such as the participants or target audience, who will lead, activities planned, who and how many people will be involved, intended outcomes, and how outcomes will be assessed.</p> <p><b>Assessment</b> is a key part of a successful project. The details of how an assessment will be conducted and reported should</p>	<p>Are details of the assessment methods to be used clearly described and are they applicable to the project objectives? (3 points)</p>	<p>0=Nothing was provided regarding assessment methods or was not applicable to the project objectives.</p> <p>1=Minimal explanation or information provided to understand how assessment would be completed and reported.</p> <p>2=Method descriptions were detailed and complete with sound reasoning and consistent with project objectives.</p> <p>3=Section meets criterion of a '2' and goes beyond expectations.</p>	/3
			<p><b>Assessment</b> is a key part of a successful project. The details of how an assessment will be conducted and reported should</p>	<p>Is the background and source of proposed approach and methodology documented in the proposal? If the proposed methodology is novel, is there clear justification/explanation of how this new methodology will work? <b>OR</b></p>	<p>0=No background or reference sources were provided, or were off-topic or irrelevant to the proposed approach.</p> <p>1=Background and/or reference sources were minimal or inadequate to show how the proposed methodology will work.</p> <p>2=Adequate background and/or reference sources to justify the explanations/reasoning of how the proposed methodology will work.</p> <p>3=Beyond expectations for score of 2; background and reference sources demonstrate careful research and planning or extensive knowledge and experience to apply the proposed methodology.</p>	/3

Section Score	Section	Element(s)	Guidance/Instructions	Component Criteria	Scoring Criteria			Score /67
			be clear and applicable to the project objectives.	If the proposed methodology is standard or proven, is it referenced with appropriate citations documenting when/how the methodology has been used before? (3 points)				
		<b>Schedule</b> (2 points)	A tabular or Gantt chart format is recommended in answering this question.	Provide a reasonable and realistic timetable of logical steps leading to the achievement of the projects objectives and delivery of a final report.  Show that key activities, milestones and timelines are appropriate and achievable.	0=Nothing was provided. Major components missing. 1=Section had minimal tasks listed, minor inconsistencies or sequencing issues. 2=Section was completed and sound, all tasks listed and appropriate.			/2
		<b>Assumptions and Risks</b> (3 points)	Clearly identify any assumptions or risks and describe the contingency plan.	Describe any assumptions or risks which must be taken into account that might affect the timeline, budget, leadership or the ultimate success of your proposal.  Describe your contingency plan for potential problems	0=Nothing was provided, content was totally off topic or major inconsistencies or flaws in reasoning/approach. 1=Section had minimal explanation, minor inconsistencies or lacking overall understanding/concepts. 2=Section was completed with sound explanations/reasoning. 3=Section meets criterion of a ‘2’ and goes beyond expectations.			/3
8 points	<b>Capacity to Deliver</b>	<b>Key Personnel</b>  (Critical Element: minimum 2 pts required)	Clearly identify the Project Leader and the roles of ALL the Principal Project Participants.	Brief (half-page maximum) resumes are recommended for all of the project’s Principal Participants, describing the credentials of the proposed Project Leader and key staff or consultants.  Identify the nature and extent of the role of key project personnel in implementation.  If any component of the proposal will be provided by others, identify these persons, the nature of their involvement, and their relevant qualifications.	<i>Conservation, Restoration or Enhancement</i>  0=Key personnel does not have the capacity  1=Key personnel has limited experience (i.e., Technician who have some experience)  2=Key personnel has some experience (i.e., Biologist who has some experience	<i>Stewardship</i>  0=Key personnel does not have educational or stewardship experience  1=Key personnel has limited educational or stewardship experience (i.e., New Steward/Educator)  2=Key personnel has some educational or stewardship experience (i.e.,	<i>Viable Fisheries</i>  0=Key personnel does not have experience/knowledge  1=Key personnel has limited experience/knowledge (<2 years)  2=Key personnel has some experience/knowledge (2-5 years)  3=Key personnel has adequate	/5

Section Score	Section	Element(s)	Guidance/Instructions	Component Criteria	Scoring Criteria			Score /67
					<p>or Technician with experience and no Biologist oversight)</p> <p>3=Key personnel has experience (i.e., Biologist with experience or a Technician with extensive experience and no Biologist oversight)</p> <p>4=Key personnel has plenty of relevant experience (i.e., Biologist with plenty of experience or Technician with experienced Biologist oversight)</p> <p>5=Key personnel has extensive, relevant experience (i.e., Senior Biologist or retiree)</p>	<p>Steward/Educator with 1-3 years of experience)</p> <p>3=Key personnel has educational or stewardship experience (i.e., Stewart/Educator has 4 – 10 years of experience)</p> <p>4=Key personnel has plenty of educational or stewardship experience (i.e., Stewart or Educator with 11+ years of experience or Technician/ Stewart/Educator with 4- 10 years of experience and participation of an experienced Educator or Biologist)</p> <p>5=Key personnel has extensive educational or stewardship experience (i.e., Educator with extensive educational experience and with either biologist experience or Biologist oversight)</p>	<p>experience/ knowledge (6-10 years)</p> <p>4=Key personnel has plenty of experience/ knowledge (11-20 years)</p> <p>5=Key personnel has extensive experience/ knowledge (&gt;20 years)</p>	

Section Score	Section	Element(s)	Guidance/Instructions	Component Criteria	Scoring Criteria	Score /67
		<b>Coordination, Approvals, Consultation &amp; Partnerships</b>	<p>Describe the steps taken during project planning to collaborate and consult with others where appropriate and to gain their support where needed. Describe applicable regulatory requirements and how these will be addressed.</p> <p>Describe the extent to which the project may involve or foster partnerships with other agencies, organizations and/or other interested parties.</p>	<p>Show that you have the appropriate permits and authorizations or describe the degree of certainty that they can be obtained in time to implement the project.</p> <p>Show how the project coordinates with, and has the approval of, appropriate fishery management and research agencies.</p> <p>Describe your efforts to involve appropriate external partners in the project and with whom you will consult in the preparation and delivery of this project.</p> <p>Provide brief supportive letters when they are essential to confirm important claims of cooperation or partnerships. This is critical when claims of cooperation or partnership are with a government agency.</p>	<p>0=Required permits not listed, no coordination or partnerships where applicable.</p> <p>1=Some required permits not listed, major deficiencies in coordination, partnerships, or consultation. No letters of support.</p> <p>2=Has all required permits listed, minor deficiencies in coordination, partnerships, or consultation. Missing some support letters.</p> <p>3=Has all required permits listed, well coordinated, appropriate consultations and partners. Support letters provided.</p>	/3
9 points	<b>Benefits</b>	<p><b>Measures of Success</b></p> <p>(Note: this section should be included in the Final Report)</p>	<p>Indicate the metrics or key indicators you will use to measure the success of the project and who will evaluate them.</p>	<p>Describe any specific objective standards, quantifiable criteria and quality control measures that will be used to assess the actual performance of this proposal against expectations.</p>	<p>0=Nothing was provided or completely inappropriate measures of success</p> <p>1=Section missing significant measures of success.</p> <p>2=Measures of success mostly provided and effective.</p> <p>3=Measures of success effective, detailed, and provided for all appropriate aspects of project.</p>	/3
		<b>Monitoring and Assessment</b>	<p>Describe the expected duration of the benefits of the project, and how the tangible results of the project will be monitored, maintained and protected over the long-term.</p>	<p>Is there a monitoring and maintenance component?</p> <p>Are there likely to be long-term maintenance and service costs?</p> <p>Is there evidence of sufficient commitment to support future project requirements?</p>	<p>0=No consideration was given to long term monitoring and maintenance and benefits are minimal or non-existent.</p> <p>1=Minimal consideration was given to long term monitoring and maintenance and benefits are minimal.</p> <p>2=Adequate consideration was given to long term monitoring and maintenance and benefits are moderate.</p> <p>3=There is an extensive monitoring and maintenance plan considerate of costs with sufficient long term support and benefit.</p>	/3



Section Score	Section	Element(s)	Guidance/Instructions	Component Criteria	Scoring Criteria	Score /67
					<p align="center"><i>Project Costs</i> (subtract .5 mark for inadequate life cycle)</p> <p>0=Project costs excessive related to expected cost for the line item and inadequate life cycle</p> <p>1=Project costs more expensive related to expected cost for the line item</p> <p>2=Project costs are consistent with expected cost for the line item</p>	/2
		<b>Cost Sharing &amp; Efficiencies</b>	<p>Describe the sources and amounts of any additional sources of funding or in-kind contributions shown in your detailed Project Budget Form that are being relied upon to support this proposal. If none, please explain why.</p>	<p>Provide details of the other entities contributing to the costs of the proposal and/or supplementing it with in-kind contributions.</p> <p>If the proponent has existing infrastructure or materials that it is contributing to this project detail this as well.</p> <p>Proponents shall provide brief supportive letters from partnerships or other sources when they are essential to confirm claims of cost sharing.</p> <p>If the R&amp;E Fund is the sole financial supporter of this proposal, describe why.</p>	<p><i>With external partner(s) or funding*</i></p> <p>0=less than 5% cost sharing or no cost sharing/efficiency explained</p> <p>1=minimal cost sharing (5-25%) or cost sharing/efficiency gain is poorly explained or justified</p> <p>2=substantial cost sharing (26% or more) or clear evidence and explanation of cost sharing/efficiency gain</p> <p><b>* Claims of cost-sharing or efficiency gain provided by external partner(s) or funding source(s) must be substantiated with a brief supportive letter from the partner or source to earn points in this section.</b></p> <p><i>Only within proponent’s agency or organization*</i></p> <p>0=less than 5% cost sharing or no cost sharing/efficiency explained</p> <p>1=minimal cost sharing (5-25%) or cost sharing/efficiency gain is poorly explained or justified</p> <p>2=substantial cost sharing (26% or more) or clear evidence and explanation of cost sharing/efficiency gain</p> <p>* Letter of support is not required if all cost sharing or efficiency gain is coming from within proponent’s own organization or agency.</p>	/2
		<b>Duration of Funding Request</b>	<p>Describe the full period (years) for which this proposal will continue using R&amp;E Fund monies and the prognosis for obtaining funds from sources other than the R&amp;E Fund.</p>		<p>0=No period stated and no prognosis given.</p> <p>1=Period stated and prognosis given.</p>	/1
			<p>Explain how the duration of this project relates to achieving the identified long term project goal.</p>		<p>0=No explanation given.</p> <p>1=Explanation weak or not well linked to project goal.</p> <p>2=Explanation complete and relates well to project goal.</p>	/2