

# PROPOSAL REVIEW CRITERIA AQUACULTURE & FISHERIES CRSP RFP WEBSITE

## INITIAL SCREENING CHECKLIST

(ALL Y/N; IF N, WHY NOT.)

ELIGIBILITY (INSTITUTIONAL; RFP THEME AND TOPIC AREA; COUNTRY)

PROPOSAL CHECKLIST COMPLETENESS

SUBMISSION DATE - DEADLINE MET

COMPLETE AND ELIGIBLE PROPOSALS WILL PROCEED TO THE REVIEW PROCESS.  
INELIGIBLE OR LATE PROPOSALS WILL NOT QUALIFY FOR REVIEW AND/OR FUNDING  
CONSIDERATION.

## I. CRSP PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: TECHNICAL PEER-REVIEW

*Much of the CRSP review process is based on NSF review guidelines, with permission from NSF.*

### INTELLECTUAL MERIT (50%)

#### 1. Soundness

- The proposal presents a sound, multidisciplinary approach for scientific investigation of the subject.
- The approach, design, methods, and geographic scope are practical and consistent with state-of-the-art practices.
- The proposed project is relevant and important to research related to enhancing food security and the environment, alleviating poverty, and improving livelihoods.
- Sufficient technical, physical, monetary, and human resources are available for the project to be successful.
- The project can be completed in the scheduled time period.

#### 2. Innovation

- Results from the project can contribute to advances in scientific understanding in the field of aquaculture.
- The proposal builds on recent discoveries, reflects innovative ideas, and explores unique or ingenious concepts or applications.
- The project addresses more than one of the following criteria: improving the efficiency of aquaculture in a specified region; enhancing sustainability of a specified ecosystem; and benefiting the social and economic well-being of people.

#### 3. Qualification of Researchers

- The team of researchers is well qualified for conducting research, and each researcher has an established publication and research record in the scientific field.
- The lead Principal Investigator (PI) is capable of serving as the administrator of the project, which will include participation by multiple institutions.

#### 4. Application of Research

- There are significant opportunities and a well-thought-out strategy for regional and global technology transfer, impact assessment, dissemination and near-term application.
- Plans to disseminate research results to the academic community (journal articles, books, conferences, etc.) are reflected in the proposal.
- The proposal presents opportunities for future synthesis with other CRSP and non-CRSP research.

- The proposed research is likely to return benefits to the US and be applicable on a regional or global scale.
- The proposed research is well within the scope of USAID environmental considerations as described in the RFP, and demonstrates broader application for improving ecosystem health.

## **COLLABORATION, CAPACITY BUILDING, AND BROADER IMPACTS (50%)**

### **1. Education and Training**

- The project promotes Host Country (HC) and US teaching, training, and learning.
- The project utilizes multiple methods of educational outreach (e.g., tuition support, publications, workshops, on-site training) to instruct farmers, extension agents, HC and US students, HC and US governmental and non-governmental employees, private sector and others.

### **2. Inclusiveness**

- The proposal identifies how diverse social groups (women, underrepresented groups, etc.) will be incorporated into the project.

### **3. Human Health and Welfare**

- The proposed project contributes to human health and welfare improvement in developing regions.

### **4. Networking and Institutional Development**

- The proposal builds on pre-established, strong relationships between HC and US researchers and institutions.
- The proposal describes strategies to develop and strengthen institutional research capacities via capable HC and US PIs who have equal intellectual control over the project.
- The project effectively strengthens “infrastructure” for research and education such as laboratories (CRSP funds are not to be used for construction of permanent buildings), instrumentation, networks, and partnerships.
- The proposed project is likely able to attract further funding from extra-CRSP resources.
- The project enhances development of local, regional, national, and global networks broadly related to aquaculture.

## **II. CRSP PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW**

*There are two consecutive tiers of review: technical and then programmatic. The programmatic review occurs after the technical review, and only for those proposals that received high rankings for technical merit.*

### **Part 1. RFP Adherence**

#### **Program analysis of each proposal based on correspondence to the RFP**

- Adherence to all Programmatic Criteria listed in the RFP
- Adherence to Budget Criteria, especially for match, HC funds, student support, PI FTE caps
- Adherence to Requested information for compliance and institutional support: cost share, letters of support, deliverables, schedules, etc.

### **Part 2. Portfolio Balance**

#### **Regional Balance Assessment**

- Objective is for regional balance of 2-3 awards for Asia; 2-3 awards for Latin America and Caribbean; and 2-3 awards for IEHA countries in Africa. Other countries in Africa will be most successful if linked with an IEHA country. Other regions, including regions not listed above, may get 1 award. (From RFP: anticipate 8 Lead Partner Awards of @\$400,000 each

to 8 different Lead Partner Institutions)

- Technical review takes into account global application of results and efforts, but the programmatic review will further evaluate global and regional application.

**Thematic Balance Assessment**

- Objective is to balance the 4 themes across the portfolio.

**Area of Inquiry (Topic Area) Representation**

- Objective is to balance topic areas with about half in Integrated Production Systems and half in People, Livelihoods, and Ecosystem Interrelationships.

**Technical Ranking within Region and Theme**

- Objective is to fund the highest technically ranked proposal within each theme and region, provided it shows close correspondence to the programmatic objectives in the RFP.

**Part 3. USAID Compliance**

**(For Top Ranked Proposals following Parts 1 and 2 of the Programmatic Review)**

**USAID Eligibility** (answers must be affirmative) - next steps for highest ranked projects

- Does the proposal have Mission concurrence?
- Does the PI propose work in a USAID-eligible country? Country preferences within a region will be considered under regional balance.
- Does the proposal address key USAID goals and interests as defined in the RFP materials?

**IEE Screening** (problems may delay projects, or decline projects) - next steps for highest ranked projects

- Assessment of whether there are any obvious environmental issues not raised by the technical review
- Screening process and findings
- Examination and review as necessary

HSE 11/06