**MRGESCP Long-Term Plan for Science and Adaptive Management: Evaluation Criteria for Proposed Projects and Activities**

The overall objective for this evaluation framework is to assess the various MRGESCP projects and activities in terms of their scientific integrity, alignment with the MRGESCP mission and management priorities, and contribution to MRG ecosystem health. Review the SAMIS-generated summary for each Project Bank item to be evaluated. Use the following criteria to evaluate the project DESIGN and level of DETAIL on: **clarity and completeness** (A1-3), **relevance and value to the Collaborative Program mission**, including management and/or science priorities (B1-3), **and vision and utility for adaptive management** (C1-3). For each criterion, select a rating of **Exceptional**, **Adequate**, **Insufficient**, or **Unable to Determine** from the drop-down list provided. Rating scale definitions are provided below. Suggest improvements in the space provided, if needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Criterion** | **DESIGN**1 | **DETAIL**1 | **Suggested Improvements** | **Questions to Guide the Assessment of Each Criterion** |
| **Clarity and Completeness (REQUIRED)** | | | | | |
| A1 | Statement of purpose | Select a rating | Select a rating |  | How clear are the project objectives? If this is a scientific study, is the research question clearly articulated? |
| A2 | Scope and timeline | Select a rating | Select a rating |  | Does the scope describe a single, well-defined project or should it be split into several different projects? Is the timeline reasonable for the scope? |
| A3 | Aptness of methods | Select a rating | Select a rating |  | Are the methods well-suited to the project objectives or research question? Are important elements missing? |
| **Relevance and Value to Collaborative Program (REQUIRED)** | | | | | |
| B1 | Relevance to mission | Select a rating | Select a rating |  | How well does the project align with the Collaborative Program’s mission? Could anything be added to the description to increase relevance? |
| B2 | Relevance to management | Select a rating | Select a rating |  | How well does the project address the Collaborative Program’s management priorities and recommendations? Use the linkages to strategies and ISP recommendations to inform your answer. |
| B3 | Value to advancement of science | Select a rating | Select a rating |  | Will the project produce data or findings that will 1) inform other projects and/or 2) reduce a scientific uncertainty identified in the conceptual ecological models (CEMs)? Use the linkages to projects and uncertainties to inform your answer. |
| **Vision and Utility for Adaptive Management (ENCOURAGED)** | | | | | |
| C1 | Value to scenario planning | Select a rating | Select a rating |  | How valuable is the project for planning for future climate scenarios and/or increasing resilience under changing conditions? |
| C2 | Relevance to ecosystem approach | Select a rating | Select a rating |  | Will the project inform an integrated approach for management of systems supporting land, water, and living resources? Does the project contribute towards the amelioration of threats, offsetting the impact of threats, and/or promote conservation and sustainable use? |
| C3 | Proactivity and innovation | Select a rating | Select a rating |  | How forward thinking is the work described? Will the project result in a new technology, methodology, or model that improves the way we study the species or system or plan for the future? |

1See instructions below for rating scale.

**Rating Scale for Evaluation Criteria**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Value** | **Rating** | **How well does the project address this criterion?** |
| 3 | Exceptional | Project exceeds my expectation under this criterion. |
| 2 | Sufficient | Project meets my expectation under this criterion. |
| 1 | Insufficient | Project falls short of my expectation under this criterion. |
| 0 | Unable to Determine | Project does not contain enough information to rate this criterion. |

**Examples of Assessment Results – Median Ratings for Project X and Project Y**

n = 6

**Example Interpretation**:

Project X is well-scoped, fits within the mission of the Collaborative Program and will add scientific value. Direct relevance to management is not clear and may require additional explanation. The Project X will inform scenario planning but Project Y is more well-suited to the Collaborative Program, having greater relevance and scientific value. Project Y also better informs the ecosystem approach and may be useful towards improving ecosystem resiliency (note that criteria C1-3 are encouraged but optional). However, the description for Project Y would benefit from greater detail.

SAMIS Data Viewer report type – Long-Term Plan project summaries for SAMC evaluation

Project ID

* Project Bank ID#, Project Name, Project Status

Project Description fields

* MRGESCP Category, Focus, Species, Reach
* Anticipated Benefit
* Project Description, Study Considerations (if applicable)
* Planning or Regulatory document linkage(s) (e.g., Biological Opinions, Genetics Management Plan, NM State Wildlife Action Plan, etc.)

SAMIS Linkages (lookup lists can be found in the S&AM Plan appendices)

* Related Projects (#parent, #child, project names)
* MRGESCP Science or Management Strategies (#strategies; use numeric label to indicate goal, objective, strategy)
* ISP Recs (#recs; include panel name and rec number)