



Oregon State  
University

# Document 3. IRST Request for Proposal (RFP) & Systematic Evaluation Process (DRAFT)

*For the 10 June 2025 IRST meeting*

Document sections:

1. Reviewer selection and guidelines
2. Conflict of interest statement for reviewers and technical panelists
3. Rules (step 4) for Requests for Proposals (RFPs)
4. Template for RFP
5. Rubric for Proposal Development

## 1. Reviewer Selection and Guidelines

### Reviewer General Criteria

- **Expertise and qualifications.**
  - Strong background in...
  - Academic or researcher in an agency of other research group
- **Research experience.**
  - Understand context and significance of research
  - Demonstrated ability to conduct high-quality research
- **Ability to provide constructive feedback.** Able to offer specific, clear, and helpful comments that address the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, avoiding personal attacks.
- **Objectivity.** Ability to offer impartial and unbiased evaluation, free from conflicts of interest and personal biases.
- **Promptness and timeliness.** Ability to respond to review requests promptly and meet deadlines.
- **Confidentiality and ethics.** Ability to maintain the confidentiality of the proposal and follow ethical guidelines regarding data and materials sharing.

### Guidelines for Reviewers

- *Be objective.* Reviewers must be able to judge a proposal impartially, or should not accept the invitation to review. Reviewers with any professional, personal, or financial affiliations that are or may be perceived as a conflict of interest in reviewing the proposal should not accept the invitation to review. If this conflict of interest is discovered after reviewing the full proposal materials, a reviewer should recuse immediately and fully inform INR. A reviewer should inform INR if there is an aspect of a proposal that a reviewer feels unqualified to evaluate.

- *Provide considerate and useful comments.* Reviews should be constructive and courteous, and the reviewer should respect the intellectual independence of the proposer(s). The reviewer should avoid personal comments. If something is unclear due to the proposal language, this should be noted in the review, however reviewers are not expected to edit/correct the grammar or language in the proposal. Review comments directed to the proposer(s) should be restricted to the scientific content.
- *Work promptly.* Reviewers should return reviews within the time period specified. If events will prevent a timely review, it is the reviewer's responsibility to inform INR at the time of the request.
- *Maintain anonymity.* The review process is conducted anonymously, however the names of those selected to do the reviews will be made public, as specified in [OAR 629-603-0400\(4\)d](#). However, reviewer names will not be attributed to a review or comment. The reviews will be shared only with the proposer, INR, the IRST, and possibly with other reviewers (anonymously).
- *Maintain confidentiality.* The submitted proposal is a privileged communication and must be treated as a confidential document. Reviewers should destroy all copies of the proposal after review and not share the proposal with any colleagues without the explicit permission of INR.
- *Know our reviewer policies.* Reviewers should be aware of INR's policies, on behalf of the IRST, regarding conflict of interest and materials sharing. To review these guidelines, please visit [the webpage](#).

## 2. Conflict of Interest Statement for Reviewers and Technical Panelists

### DATE

1. As a reviewer or technical panelist, you have been asked to review proposals funded by the Oregon Department of Forestry's Adaptive Management Program through the Independent Research and Science Team (IRST). Your designation as a reviewer or panelist requires that you be aware of actual or potential conflicts of interest, and promptly and openly disclose any conflicts of interest when reviewing proposals.
2. A conflict of interest exists when a reviewer's outside or private interests affect, or can be perceived to affect, their professional responsibilities and judgment in reviewing proposals. A conflict of interest increases the potential for bias; however, the mere existence of a conflict of interest does not necessarily indicate that an outside or private interest is unduly influencing the review. The prompt disclosure of a conflict of interest will help to protect the integrity of the IRST's request for proposal and review process and the respective reviewer, allow the IRST and the reviewer to appropriately manage the conflict of interest for as long as the conflict(s) exists, and avoid unnecessary or unmanageable conflicts.
3. If your designation as a reviewer gives you access to information not generally available to the public, you must not use that information for your personal benefit or make it available for the personal benefit of any other individual or organization. This is to be distinguished from the entirely appropriate general benefit of learning more about the Adaptive Management Program, the IRST, and the Institute for Natural Resources (INR) – the IRST's housing agency – or becoming better acquainted with the state of a given discipline.
4. INR and the IRST receive proposals in confidence and must protect the confidentiality of their contents. For this reason, you must not copy, quote or otherwise disclose or use material from any proposal you review.
5. Contact [Sean.Gordon@oregonstate.edu](mailto:Sean.Gordon@oregonstate.edu), if you have any questions about this policy, or are unsure if you have an actual or potential conflict of interest.

### Definition of conflict of interest

Oregon Government Ethics law defines two types of conflicts of interest (ORS 244.020)

**Actual conflicts of interest (ORS 244.020(1)).** "Actual conflict of interest' means any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which would be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the person's relative or any business with which the person or a relative of the person is associated unless the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of circumstances described in subsection (13) of this section."

**Potential conflicts of interest (ORS 244.020(13)).** "Potential conflict of interest' means any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which could be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the person's relative, or a business with which the person or the person's relative is associated, unless the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of the following:

An interest or membership in a particular business, industry, occupation or other class required by law as a prerequisite to the holding by the person of the office or position.

Any action in the person's official capacity which would affect to the same degree a class consisting of all inhabitants of the state, or a smaller class consisting of an industry, occupation or other group including one of

which or in which the person, or the person's relative or business with which the person or the person's relative is associated, is a member or is engaged.

Membership in or membership on the board of directors of a nonprofit corporation that is tax-exempt under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.”

## Confidentiality of reviews and reviewer identities

OAR [629-603-0400](#) (4)d states, “The IRST shall not grant anonymity to authors, handling editors, or peer-reviewers before January 1, 2028. After January 1, 2028, the IRST may modify the anonymity requirements to peer reviewers by a substantial decision of the IRST.” Therefore:

- The name and affiliation of the reviewer will be listed on the IRST website.
- The reviews (scores, descriptions, comments, etc.) of a proposal will not be directly associated with the name and affiliation of the reviewer and will not be posted on the website.
- Verbatim copies of reviews, without the name and affiliation of the reviewer, will be sent to the principal investigator.

The Institute for Natural Resources cannot guarantee that it will not be forced to release the verbatim copies of the reviews, with the name and affiliation of the reviewer, under terms of the Freedom of Information Act or other laws.

## Appendix 1: Disclosure of Conflict of Interest for IRST reviewers or technical panelists

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe below any relationships, transactions, positions you hold (volunteer or otherwise), or circumstances that you believe could contribute to an actual or potential conflict of interest between the company and your personal interests, financial or otherwise that would hinder my governance duties:

- I have NO actual or potential conflict of interest to report
- I have an actual or potential conflict of interest to report (*Please provide details.*)

Description of actual or potential conflict(s) of interest, if applicable.

### Declaration

I hereby certify that the information provided above is true and complete to the best of my knowledge having made reasonable enquiries. I have received a copy of the conflict of interest statement dated [DATE] and had the chance to both read the policy and ask questions about it and agree to abide by it. I also understand that according to OAR [629-603-0400](#) (4)d, “The IRST shall not grant anonymity to authors, handling editors, or peer-reviewers before January 1, 2028”, and [that my name and affiliation will be listed on the IRST website as a reviewer, but will not be associated with any scores, descriptions, or comments I make to review a proposal.](#)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### 3. Rules (step 4) for Requests for Proposals (RFPs)

(6) Step 4: The IRST shall implement the research agenda approved by the board pursuant to subsection (5)(d) of this rule.

(a) No later than November 1 of odd-numbered years, the IRST shall develop an annual work plan to implement the research agenda approved by the board in subsection (5)(d) of this rule.

(b) The IRST shall develop request for proposals (RFP) in an open, competitive process for research projects in the research agenda. The RFP shall include:

- (A) Research project objectives, deliverables, and deadlines;
- (B) A statement of work;
- (C) The level of rigor needed for successful research project completion;
- (D) The required expertise and capacity of proposers;
- (E) The data as a deliverable;
- (F) The expectations for a detailed final report;
- (G) An after-action review meeting between the IRST and the contractor and other cooperators; and,
- (H) Other RFP elements required by the IRST Housing Agency specified in OAR 629-603-0450.

(c) RFPs may include requirements for:

- (A) Contractor and other cooperator presentations to the AMPC, the board, or other entities as appropriate.
- (B) A summary report. If the contractor and other cooperators are required to produce a summary report for the agreement, it must contain the elements listed in section (6)(g) of this rule.

(d) The RFP announcement and award process shall follow procedures of the IRST Housing Agency, with the IRST selecting the RFP successful proposer.

(e) If an IRST member applies for an RFP, the IRST shall ensure RFP selections follow conflict of interest standards as established by the Oregon Government Ethics Commission.

(f) The IRST shall develop and manage agreements for RFP successful proposer.

(g) If the agreement in subsection (6)(f) of this rule did not require development of a summary report, the IRST shall complete the summary report within 90 days of receiving the contractor and other cooperator's detailed final report in paragraph (6)(b)(F) of this rule. The summary report shall be written for a lay audience and include:

- (A) Methods sufficient to allow others to understand what was done and to evaluate the results and conclusions;
- (B) A detailed description of the results; and
- (C) Discussion and conclusions about:

- (i) Effectiveness: In studies examining alternative prescriptions, the likely effectiveness of each prescription shall be reported.
- (ii) Causal links: An assessment of how the results of relevant new research findings developed by the IRST or through outside research clarify or support causal links between forest practices and aquatic resources, and implications regarding how well forest practice rules or rule sets are likely to address these linkages.
- (iii) Magnitude of impact: An assessment of the magnitude of impact on covered species or biological goals and objectives on a sliding scale.
- (iv) Timescale of effects observed, and the immediacy of likely changes in the environment.
- (v) Scope of inference.
- (vi) Scientific uncertainty versus confidence: An assessment of the scientific uncertainty and confidence in the results.

## 4. Template RFP

### Request for Proposal Announcement

Request for Proposal Title:

Funding Opportunity Number:

Date Issued:

Key Dates:

Questions on RFP submitted	
Compiled responses to questions available/posted	
Proposals Due	
Review Period	
Tentative Notice of Selection/Funding	
Awardee(s) begin(s) work	

*Note: This timeline is subject to change; any updates will be posted on the INR website*

Estimated Award Ceiling:

Estimated Total Program Funding:

Contact:

### Research Project Description

Description of funding opportunity/statement of work

The Independent Research and Science Team (IRST) seeks applicants for: \_\_\_\_\_

Background

Research project objectives

Research project deliverables and deadlines

Deliverables	General Date
Progress reports due to IRST	Quarterly
Data*	
Detailed final report*	
An after-action review meeting between the IRST and the contractor and other cooperators*	
IRST returns draft to awardee with comments	
Final Report due to IRST	

\* Indicates deliverables as defined in rule, OAR [629-603-0200\(6\)b](#).

## Public benefit

The proposed research supports \_\_\_\_\_

The proposed research is consistent with \_\_\_\_\_

The research will be used to \_\_\_\_\_

## Target audience

The audience for the Final Report includes the Oregon Board of Forestry, the IRST, the AMPC, and other diverse stakeholders who will provide continued interests and input on the ODF Adaptive Management Program.

## Award Information

The following information applies to awards issued under this announcement:

- This is a new program.
- There is no cost sharing or matching requirement.
- **Indirect cost rate is 26% and applies only to the first \$25,000 of the budget.**
- The IRST anticipates recommending \_\_\_\_ award(s) from this announcement but reserves the right to award more or less.
- The total amount of funding expected to be awarded through this announcement is \$\_\_\_\_\_.
- The expected amount of funding is \$\_\_\_\_\_ (with up to an additional of \$\_\_\_\_\_ ) for Year 1, and up to \$\_\_\_\_\_ each in years \_ through \_.
- Award(s) from this announcement will be Cooperative Agreement(s)/subawards/
- The anticipated period of performance is 1 year, with options to extend additional years, up to a total of \_\_\_\_ years.
- Applications for renewal or supplementation of existing projects are eligible to compete
- The IRST reserves the right to accept only portions of an application and to negotiate with potential awardees
- The IRST's substantial involvement includes \_\_\_\_\_

## Eligibility Information

### Eligible applicants

This opportunity is open to:

- **Researchers** who are \_\_\_\_\_
- **IRST members.** "If an IRST member applies for an RFP, the IRST shall ensure RFP selections follow conflict of interest standards as established by the Oregon Government Ethics Commission" (OAR [629-603-0200\(6\)e](#)). [Oregon Government Ethics law](#) defines two types of conflicts of interest: actual conflicts of interest (ORS 244.020(1)) and potential conflicts of interest (ORS 244.020(13)).

Disclosures of conflict of interest

## Conflict of Interest

**General Requirement for Disclosure.** You and your organization must disclose any potential or actual scientific or nonscientific conflict of interest(s) to us. You must also disclose any potential or actual conflict(s) of interest for any identified sub recipient you include in your application. We may have to ask you more questions if we need more information. At our discretion, we may ask you for a conflict-of-interest mitigation plan after you submit your application. Your plan is subject to our approval.

**Scientific Conflict of Interest.** Scientific collaborations on research and development projects are generally the result of close collaboration prior to the submission of applications for support. Accordingly, these collaborations should be considered when considering potential conflicts of interest. The potential conflict is mitigated by the disclosure of these collaborations, and the list of current and pending support you provide for senior and key researchers. Therefore, you must include in your list of current and pending support all collaborators, even if they did not formally provide support.

If you are unsure if a Conflict of Interest exists, please contact INR at \_\_\_\_\_.

## Application and Submission Information

### Content and form of application submission

Limit the **proposal narrative (technical approach)** to **10 pages**. The title page, references, bios, and budgets **do not count toward the page limit**. Please use 1-inch margins and 12-point font.

#### A. Title Page should include:

- a. Project Title
- b. **Principal Investigator** (primary contact for the project)
  - i. Title/Position
  - ii. Institution
  - iii. Telephone number
  - iv. Mailing address
  - v. Email address
  - vi. Conflict of interest declaration
- c. **Additional Team Members** – name, institution, telephone, email, and conflict of interest declaration
- d. **Date of Submittal**

#### B. Technical Proposal/Project Approach (10-page limit)

Describe each stage of the proposed work plan and how it links to the deliverables in the Scope of Work. If your work plan proposes additional analyses beyond the requested Final Report and related policy recommendations, give reviewers ample information regarding the following: 1) how you will access or generate the needed data and information needed for the analyses; 2) what methods and tools (e.g., models, special analytical approaches, etc.) you will use; 3) why the methods are appropriate and/or needed, and how they will succeed within the time and funding constraints outlined in this RFP; and 4) the approach that will be used to develop policy recommendations.

#### C. Project Timeline (1-page limit)

Using the **Milestones and Deliverables Timeline** listed in the **Scope of Work** section as a guide, provide a detailed outline of the proposed team's strategy for successfully completing the .....

#### D. Overview of Project Team (1-page limit)

Describe how the PI's previous accomplishments are relevant both to leading a multidisciplinary team and to this specific project. Indicate why the proposed team is appropriate for this project and whether individuals, sub-units, or the entire team have worked together on similar projects. Specify the roles and responsibilities of each team member, including who will be involved in day-to-day project activities.

#### E. References

Provide those cited in the proposal body

#### F. Qualifications

- a. Supply biographical sketches of the PI, co-PIs, and key persons. Each bio should be no more than two (2) pages. Bios should include information regarding current grants pertinent to this assessment.
- b. Disclosure of Current and Pending Support:
  - i. A list of all current projects the individual is working on, in addition to any future support the individual has applied to receive, regardless of the source.
  - ii. Title and objectives of the other research projects.
  - iii. The percentage per year to be devoted to the other projects.
  - iv. The total amount of support the individual is receiving in connection to each of the other research projects or will receive if other applications are awarded.
  - v. Name and address of the agencies and/or other parties supporting the other research projects.
  - vi. Period of performance for the other research projects.

#### G. Data Management Plan (2-page limit)

The data management plan must include the following considerations:

- a. The types of data, software, and other materials to be produced.
- b. How the data will be acquired.
- c. Time and location of data acquisition, if scientifically pertinent.
- d. How the data will be processed.
- e. The file formats and the naming conventions that will be used.
- f. A description of the quality assurance and quality control measures during collection, analysis, and processing.
- g. A description of dataset origin when existing data resources are used.
- h. A description of the standards to be used for data and metadata format and content.
- i. Appropriate timeframe for preservation.
- j. The plan may consider the balance between the relative value of data preservation and other factors such as the associated cost administrative burden. The plan will provide a justification for such decisions.
- k. A statement that the data cannot be made available to the public when there are **privacy concerns** (e.g., "This data cannot be cleared for public release in accordance with the requirements in \_\_\_\_\_)

## H. Budget and Budget Justification (Cost proposal)

Clear, concise, and accurate budget and budget justification reflect the proposer's financial plan for accomplishing the effort contained in the technical proposal. As part of its cost proposal, the proposer shall submit a full budget in sufficient detail so that a determination of reasonableness can be made. **A recommended template is included in the RFP.** The cost breakdown should include the following, if applicable:

- a. **Direct Labor:** Direct labor should be detailed by level of effort (i.e. numbers of hours, etc.) of each labor category and the applicable labor rate. The source of labor rates shall be identified and verified. If rates are estimated, please provide the historical based used and clearly identify all escalation applied to derive the proposed rates.
- b. **Fringe Benefit Rates:** The source of fringe benefit rate shall be identified and verified.
- c. **Travel:** Travel costs must include a purpose and breakdown per trip to include destination, number of travelers, and duration.
- d. **Materials/Equipment:** List all material/equipment items by type and kind with associated costs and advise if the costs are based on vendor quotes and/or engineering estimates; provide copies of vendor quotes and/or catalog pricing data.
- e. **Subrecipient costs:** Submit all subrecipient proposals and analyses. Provide the method of selection used to determine the subrecipient.
- f. **Tuition:** Provide details and verification for any tuition amounts proposed.
- g. **Indirect Costs:** Currently the negotiated indirect rate for awards is 26%. **Indirect costs can only be applied to the first \$25,000.**
- h. **Any other proposed costs:** The source should be identified and verified.

## I. Conflict of interest declaration for PI and other team members

## Proposal Submission Deadline

Proposals should be submitted no later than 5:00pm PDT on **DATE**.

## Evaluation Process/Criteria for Selection

Upon conclusion of the review process, meritorious proposals may be recommended for funding by the IRST. **Attributed** reviews and the panel summary will be made publicly available.

### Evaluation Process

Proposals must comply with all submission instructions and proposal guidelines to be considered for funding. Each compliant full proposal will be peer-reviewed by 3-5 external peer reviewers.

External peer reviewers will provide both written comments and a proposal rating using the following criteria. All written peer reviews will then be provided to the IRST, who will review the proposals and external reviewer scores, and make the final funding recommendation to the AMPC, which will provide the recommendation to the Oregon Board of Forestry.

As per rule, all selected reviewers will be identified though not associated with their individual reviews.

**Criteria for Selection (EXAMPLE - We can fine-tune this piece to align it with the content of the RFP. It needs more detail, but we don't have that information yet)**

Applicants should directly and explicitly address the following criteria within their proposal. Each submittal will be rated under a point system, with a total of 100 points possible. Applicants will be evaluated based on the quality and extent to which they address the criteria; failure to provide applicable information in the proposal will affect the score.

**1. Technical Proposal/Project Approach – 25 points total**

- a. **Technical Aspects** – 20 points: To what extent does the proposed work plan adhere to the objectives laid out in the RFP/Scope of Work?
- b. **Collaborative Process** – 5 points: To what extent does the work plan reflect a holistic understanding of the information needs of the Oregon Board of Forestry, the Adaptive Management Program Committee, and the Private Forest Accord stakeholders? To what extent does the work plan describe appropriate methods for collaboration related to completion of the desired project deliverables?

**2. Roles, Responsibilities, and Team Qualifications – 15 points total**

To what extent do the PIs and other team members possess the skills, experience, and qualifications to execute the proposed work plan? How suitable is the PI to lead a multidisciplinary assessment process, and will they be involved in the day-to-day project activities? To what extent have individuals or the team addressed similar issues? How well defined are roles within the team?

**3. Feasibility – 10 points total**

- a. **Practicality** - 10 points: How feasible is the approach given the available data, expertise of the team, and proposed work plan? How realistic is the timeline in terms of completing the proposed work and any other analyses that the team may choose to perform? Can the work outlined be realistically completed within the existing budget and deadlines?
- b. **Potential Impact** – 10 points: Will the work plan provide the information needed to inform policy, adaptive management, and/or other types of decision-making?

## Award Administration Information

Notification of Award

Award Conditions

Reporting Requirements

## 5. Rubric for Proposal Development

### EXAMPLE 1 – (the descriptors – these are not in alignment with our work)

#### 1. Alignment and Rationale (Out of 5 points):

Criteria: Evaluate the extent to which the proposal aligns with stated priorities (A-D on guidelines) and demonstrates a compelling rationale for the scientific and societal impacts of the proposed work (see documents: narrative plan, and optional logic model).

Descriptors:

- 5 points: The proposal aligns closely with all stated priorities and clearly articulates the potential scientific and societal impacts of the proposed project. There is a strong rationale for pursuing the proposed work, with evidence of its significance and relevance to addressing critical challenges.
- 3-4 points: The proposal generally aligns with stated priorities and presents a rationale for the potential impacts of the proposed work, but there may be some gaps or inconsistencies in the argumentation. The significance of the project could be further clarified or strengthened.
- 1-2 points: The proposal lacks alignment with stated priorities or fails to provide a compelling rationale for the scientific and societal impacts of the proposed work. There may be significant gaps in the argumentation or a lack of clarity regarding the project's significance.

#### 2. Team Development (Out of 5 points):

Criteria: Assess the diversity and preparedness of the team to complete the proposed work, including the inclusion of core team members, external partners, and plans for team building activities that are likely to lead to successful proposals (see documents: narrative plan).

Descriptors:

- 5 points: The proposal demonstrates a diverse and well-prepared team, with at least two committed core team members and identified external collaborators. There is evidence of a feasible plan for assembling a broadly representative team, including consideration of Team Building activities. The team's preparedness to complete the proposed work is evident with each team member's role and contribution being well-defined, and there is evidence of effective collaboration and coordination.
- 3-4 points: The proposal includes a diverse team with committed core members and identified external collaborators, but there may be some gaps in representation or clarity regarding the team's preparedness. Roles and responsibilities are outlined but additional detail or clarification may be needed to fully assess the team's readiness for the proposed work.
- 1-2 points: The team composition lacks diversity or may not be sufficiently prepared to complete the proposed work. Core team members and external collaborators may be inadequately identified, and there may be limited consideration of Team Building activities or preparedness factors. Roles and responsibilities of team members are unclear, and there is little evidence of effective collaboration or coordination.

#### 3. Quality and Feasibility (Out of 5 points):

Criteria: Evaluate the quality and feasibility of the project plan and resource allocation including strategies for inclusive engagement of external partners, the justification of planned expenditures including a viable list of specific existing or anticipated solicitations or philanthropic sources of funds the team intends to pursue toward submitting at least one

(or a collection of) well-constructed proposal with a total budget  $\geq$  \$1MIL within the award period (see documents: narrative plan, budget, budget justification, and optional logic model).

Descriptors:

- 5 points: The proposal presents a detailed and well-justified project management plan, with strategies for achieving inclusivity and project outcomes. Planned expenditures are thoroughly justified, and resources are equitably shared among contributing partners. The feasibility of the plan is evident, with clear mechanisms for evaluation and adaptation.
- 3-4 points: The project plan outlines strategies for inclusive engagement of external partners and justifies planned expenditures, but there may be some areas where additional detail or justification is needed. Resource allocation appears equitable, but there may be some uncertainties regarding feasibility or implementation.
- 1-2 points: The project management plan lacks detail or justification, with unclear strategies for achieving inclusivity or project outcomes. Planned expenditures may be inadequately justified, and there may be limited consideration of resource sharing or feasibility factors.

#### 4. Overall:

COMMENTS Overall (please provide any overall assessment or issues for the applicant to consider as their future work)

[comment box]

### EXAMPLE 2

#### 1. Specific Project Criteria

- a. Proposal is responsive to the specific RFP criteria and stated goals and objectives can be met within proposal timeline.
- b. Deliverables are clearly defined.
- c. Proposed project advances the state of the science through clear and understandable robust methods.
- d. Proposed project is technically sound.

#### 2. Project Team Qualifications

- a. Principal applicants have specialized knowledge in topic area.
- b. Principal applicants have research or appropriate experience relevant to proposed work.
- c. Principal applicants have demonstrated understanding of needed research.
- d. Principal applicants have experience working in . . .

#### 3. Project Budget

- a. Project budget is justified and aligned with project goals, outcomes and timelines.
- b. Project supplies, materials, and personnel costs (if applicable) are clearly described and reasonable to accomplish goals and objectives.