### Technical Assessment of your Proposal: Review Criteria at a Glance

Reviewers evaluate proposals based on these criteria to assess if the proposal is technically sound make recommendation on whether or not they feel the project should be funded. At the technical committee meeting, members discuss their own comments and the Primary Review assessment, and then the final score, rank, recommendation, and comments for each proposal are determined by consensus. The Board considers the scores and recommendations from the Technical Review Committee to make funding decisions.

**Project Effectiveness**

* Does the proposal identify the problem clearly?
* How well is the management or conservation problem understood?
* Is the need for the project supported by facts, statistics, other published reports?
* Does the proposal explain the expected benefits to fish and wildlife and how the results will be used to inform management or conservation?

**Project Objectives**

* Are the project objectives clearly defined?
* Are the objectives related to the issue statement?
* How realistic and attainable are the project objectives?

**Activities/Methodologies**

* Does the proposal contain sufficient detail explaining the specific methodologies for each objective?
* How well do the activities and methodologies relate to the objective(s)?
* Does the proposal cite pertinent scientific literature?
* Is the timeline of activities clear and realistic?
* How well are proposed activities and methodologies rationalized as feasible and appropriate for the issue being investigated?
* Are the proposed Measures of Success specific and quantifiable?

**Evaluation/Measures of Success**

* How clearly does the proposal provide a plan for evaluating success?
* Are the measures of success/targets well explained?
* Does the proposal include specific targets for each Measure of Success?

**Benefits/Risks**

* Does the proposal clearly explain the expected benefits to fish, wildlife or their habitat?
* How well does the proposal explain any larger ecosystem benefits that may occur?
* How well are the potential positive and negative impacts of the project explained?

**Benefit/Cost**

* Is the proposed work cost-effective (i.e., is there value for money?)
* How realistic is the project budget and/or in-kind rates?
* Is the budget information sufficiently detailed?
* Is there sufficient partner funding in place and/or other partners contributing in-kind support?

**Technical merits/shortcomings of this project**

* What is the probability that the lead proponent(s) and their partners will be capable of carrying out the proposal?
* If applicable, does the proposal describe implications or effects on other species?
* If applicable, how well does the proposal describe public support and/or opposition for the project?
* Does the proposal provide a realistic and achievable timeline to secure appropriate permits or authorizations?
* Does the proposal align well with Provincial management or conservation priorities?
* Are there sufficient and appropriate letters of support?