SECOORA 2020 IOOS Proposal Development
Weighted Criteria for Evaluation of SECOORA Letters of Intent (LOIs)*

The LOI must state succinct project goals and objectives that align with the overall goals and priorities in the SECOORA Regional Coastal Ocean Observing System Strategic Operational Plan and the request for LOIs. SECOORA staff will conduct the initial screening and noncompliant LOIs will be eliminated from further review.

1. Technical and Scientific Merit: 30%

LOI must demonstrate a credible scientific/technical approach or methodology to meet the objectives. The LOI must identify the specific SECOORA focus area(s) and sub-theme(s) which the team is addressing (climate variability, coastal hazards, ecosystems, marine operations). The project team must be comprised of competent members with relevant education, scientific, and technical experience to complete the work described within the LOI. Additionally, the project team must have a clear data management strategy that explains how the data/product/service will be shared with SECOORA.

Suggested evaluation criteria:

> 5 points: Excellent - The scientific need and technical approach for the proposed effort is well articulated. The LOI describes how the effort is useful to SECOORA and will be beneficial to a broad spatial coverage of the SECOORA region (i.e. two or more states). Objectives are clearly written, methods are sound, and there is a clear work plan and timeline. Data management strategy describes how data/product/service will be shared with SECOORA.

> 4 points: Very Good - The scientific need for the proposed effort is well articulated but the project only takes place in a portion of the SECOORA region (i.e. localized focus). Objectives are clearly written and methods are sound. Data management strategy describes how data/product/service will be shared with SECOORA.

> 3 points: Good - The scientific need for the proposed effort is well articulated; however, the objectives and/or methods need clarification.

> 2 points: Fair - Project team will need to make significant changes to address deficiencies. Data management strategy needs more details on how data/product/service will be shared with SECOORA.

> 1 point: Poor - The proposal does not provide enough information to effectively determine the objectives, methods, and/or work plan and timeline. The proposal effort does not effectively address a SECOORA focus area. Project team has not contacted Axiom Data Science to determine data/product/service will be shared with SECOORA.

2. Innovation, Efficiency, and Effectiveness: 10%
- Innovation is determined as the extent to which the project will improve, develop, or support new assets/models/products and/or services.
- Efficiency and effectiveness are determined as the project team demonstrating that they have the infrastructure, expertise, and experience to cost effectively deliver the product or service being proposed.

Suggested evaluation criteria:

5 points: Excellent - The proposed effort is innovative in its approach and will contribute to the overall SECORA effort AND the proposed effort will build upon the infrastructure, expertise, and experience already in place; thereby creating economies of scale to deliver the new/improved proposed product or service (i.e. faster or cheaper than a startup operation).

4 points: Very Good - The proposed effort is innovative in its approach and will contribute to the overall SECOORA effort OR the proposed effort will build upon the infrastructure, expertise, and experience already in place; thereby creating economies of scale to deliver the proposed product or service (i.e. faster or cheaper than a startup operation).

3 points: Good - The proposed effort is innovative OR efficient, but more information is required to determine if the project team has the ability to complete the objectives outlined in the proposal.

2 points: Fair - Project team will need to make significant changes to address deficiencies

1 point: Poor- The proposed effort is neither innovative nor efficient in its approach.

3. Leveraging Potential: 20%
The LOI must demonstrate leveraging with either other SECOORA or non-SECOORA projects. Projects provide extra value by bringing, or having the potential to bring, non-IOOS resources to leverage SECOORA investments as this provides critical growth opportunities for SECOORA. LOIs should provide information of the value provided by the project or activity and include any other projects that are or have the potential to leverage the work that is being proposed.

Suggested evaluation criteria:

5 points: Excellent - The proposed effort is leveraged by other projects and funding sources. The project team clearly shows how other projects leverage the proposed effort, and how SECOORA investments are leveraged with non-SECOORA investments to expand project results and impacts to other sectors/users.

3 points: Good - The proposed effort is leveraged by other projects (i.e. data/results of project can be used by other project teams); however, SECOORA is the only funding source for the proposed effort.

1 point: Poor - Standalone project that has no leveraged projects/activities or resources.

4. End User and Co-Sponsors Engagement: 30%
The LOI and letters of support must demonstrate the degree to which end-users have been brought into the development of the proposal and how the end-users will be engaged in project execution. Project teams should include strategic partners to assure that products, services, or activities will meet the requirements of a significant number of users. LOIs and associated letters of support will be evaluated based on end-to-end involvement of targeted audiences and/or end users, from proposal development to active participation in the project, potentially as co-investigators on the proposal itself.

Suggested evaluation criteria:

5 points: Excellent – End user contributes direct funding or in-kind support to assure that the project achieves success. End user is a key member of the project team and contributes to the design and implementation of the proposed effort as demonstrated by supporting

documentation. There is a clear engagement strategy between the project team and the user group(s).

4 points: Very Good - The end user group(s) do NOT contribute funding or in-kind support to the project. End user is a key member of the project team and contributes to the design and implementation of the proposed effort. There is a clear engagement strategy between the project team and the end user group(s).

3 points: Good - LOI and letter(s) of support describe how end users will benefit from the proposed effort being funded but end user is not a key member of the project team

2 points: Fair – End user(s) listed in the LOI; letter(s) of support NOT included.

1 point: Poor – No end user listed in the LOI and no letters of support provided.

5. Budget and Budget Justification: 10%
LOI budget must clearly identify annual costs (direct and indirect costs) and include the institution's IDC rate. Project teams should also identify cost savings from personnel sharing, leveraged activities, in-kind support, reduced/waived IDC, etc.

Suggested evaluation criteria:

5 points: Excellent - Budget is reasonable for the work proposed and significantly leverages (i.e. greater than 50% of the requested budget) other funding sources.

4 points: Very Good - Budget is reasonable for the work proposed and includes some leveraged funding (i.e. less than 50% of the requested budget) from other funding sources.

3 points: Satisfactory - Budget is reasonable for the work proposed but does not leverage other funding sources.

2 points: Fair - Budget is lacking some key elements which should be addressed.

1 point: Poor - Budget does not seem reasonable for the work being proposed.

---

* Assumes NOAA NOFO will be similar to previous IOOS RA NOFOs. We may have to ask for follow-up information after the NOFO is released.