



**NOAA**  
WEATHER  
PROGRAM OFFICE

## **NOAA Reviewer Instructions for Air Quality Research and Forecasting (AQRF) Proposals**

Fiscal Year 2025 Weather Program Office  
NOAA-OAR-WPO-2025-28603  
December 2024

### **Table of Contents**

<a href="#"><u>Review Process and Timeline</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>2</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Information About eRA</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>3</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Proposal Assignment</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>3</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Following the Review Period</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>5</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Table 1. Cumulative Scoring Rubric</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>5</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Appendix A. Program Objective as in the NOFO</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>7</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Appendix B. Program Priorities from the NOFO</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>9</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Appendix C. NOFO Evaluation Criteria</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>11</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Appendix D. NOAA Readiness Levels as in FY23 General Information Sheet</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>15</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Appendix E. Sample Images for Various Review Components in eRA</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>16</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Appendix F. Application Review Information and Scoring Summary Rubric</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>18</u></a>

---

## **Review Process and Timeline**

Before reading the reviewer guidelines below, please be aware of the following key dates that are pertinent to the review process:

- **Monday, December 30, 2024** – eRA, NOAA’s grants management website, distributes emails to reviewers with login information to eRA to start the review period.
- **Friday, January 10, 2025** – Email Lingyan Xin by this date if there is a conflict of interest with your assigned proposal(s).
- **Wednesday, February 26, 2025** – Final scores for all individual review score forms must be entered in eRA for all proposals.

The following instructions will be used by the reviewers and peer review panel to complete their reviews of the full proposal submissions for the above announcement of Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) published by NOAA on grants.gov on September 17, 2024.

## Information About eRA

As a reviewer, you will use NOAA's eRA Commons system to access and download proposals assigned to you and to submit evaluation scores and comments for each proposal. NOAA will start an eRA Commons reviewer profile for you (if you do not already have one), where you can access proposals and review forms. When you are assigned a proposal, an email will be sent to you by eRA. This email will contain a unique URL where you can create your username and password for your reviewer account. During this time, WPO will limit additional correspondence to reviewers via email, except to alert you to upcoming review deadlines and to request completion of any overdue reviews.

Questions related to technical difficulties and/or the eRA Commons system should be directed to the eRA Service Desk at <https://www.era.nih.gov/need-help>, or 1 (866) 504-9552. For all other non-system-related questions, contact the Review Panel Chairperson Dr. Lingyan Xin in NOAA/OAR/WPO by email ([lingyan.xin@noaa.gov](mailto:lingyan.xin@noaa.gov)), or phone (240) 624-0141.

## Proposal Assignment

You will receive an email from eRA with instructions on how to access your review materials and submit your scores. Reviewers may be assigned multiple proposals. **After reviewing all assigned proposals, please enter your final scores and comments into eRA by close of business February 26, 2025 (5 PM EST)**, which is approximately nine weeks after proposal distribution. Please immediately inform Dr. Lingyan Xin ([lingyan.xin@noaa.gov](mailto:lingyan.xin@noaa.gov)) if this due date is not possible and she will re-assign the proposal(s).

If you believe there may be a conflict of interest for one or more of your assigned proposals that could compromise your ability to provide an objective unbiased review (e.g., close relationships, work affiliations), please recuse yourself by informing Dr. Lingyan Xin by January 10th, 2025. More information about what constitutes a conflict of interest can be found in the [NOAA Conflict of Interest Policy for Non-Government Peer Reviewers of Influential Scientific Information](#). A proposal assigned to a reviewer requesting to be recused will be reassigned to another reviewer.

All reviewers must read and sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement/Conflict of Interest form before starting their review in the eRA System. This form is available electronically within the eRA system and must be signed electronically prior to starting your review.

## Proposal Review Process

1. **Please review the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) in its entirety to understand the overall intent and application requirements of the competition.** You will be provided an electronic copy of the full NOFO in eRA via the "Meeting Materials" section (see Appendix E, Image #1). Please pay careful attention to the following sections:

- i. Section I: “Funding Opportunity Description” and the two subsections, “Program Objectives” and “Program Priorities.” These sections specify NOAA’s priorities for work funded by this NOFO for each competition. [Appendix A](#) and [Appendix B](#) are condensed versions of those sections from the NOFO and contain specific information for this particular competition.
2. **Each proposal should be reviewed independently of other reviewers and the proposal Principal Investigators (PIs), co-PIs, and others listed on the proposal title page.** Reviewers may not directly or indirectly contact any PIs or co-PIs to ask any questions or to get clarification.
3. Before beginning your reviews, please view the following short 5-minute video on Bias Awareness for Reviewers produced by the NOAA National Sea Grant Office located at <https://seagrant.noaa.gov/inside-sea-grant/bias-awareness-resources/>.
4. **Login to eRA Commons to view your assigned proposals and enter your scores.** Reviewers must have an eRA Commons account with the Internet Assisted Review (IAR) role. Reviewers with an existing eRA Commons reviewer account will receive an email notification inviting them to participate in a specific review event. Instructions on how to access IAR will be included. Reviewers without an existing eRA Commons reviewer account will receive an email notification inviting them to participate in a specific review event along with instructions detailing how to create a new account. [Appendix E](#), Image #s 2 and 3 detail the screens where you will see your assigned applications and how to access the content.
5. **Use the five evaluation criteria to score each assigned proposal ([Appendix C](#)).** The evaluation criteria provide standard information necessary to review and score each proposal. To reduce reviewer biases and better standardize review scores, a cumulative scoring rubric and worksheet have been developed ([Table 1](#)), with a maximum possible score of 100 points. Please use the rubric, worksheet, and Appendix C when scoring proposals.
6. **After reviewing all assigned proposals, you must submit your final review(s) through the eRA system by 5PM EST on February 26th, 2025.** A numerical score for each of the five evaluation criteria is required (Relevance, Technical or Scientific Merit, Qualifications of Applicants, Project Costs, and Outreach and Education and Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility). **Additional comments** for each of the evaluation criteria **are highly recommended** to explain your scores. In particular, there will be a box for “Strengths,” and a separate box for “Weaknesses” for each of the evaluation criteria sections. Again, while not required, **additional comments are highly recommended** (eRA will show you a warning screen if you leave these boxes blank). These comments provide the PI additional context in addition to a proposal’s numerical score, which is why we strongly recommend you provide them. A sample of these boxes is shown in [Appendix E](#), Image #4. NOAA will work to ensure the anonymity of each reviewer’s individual scores and comments to the extent permitted by law. After all scores are submitted, the WPO Air Quality Program will consolidate final reviews and scores, making selections according

to NOFO criteria. A summary of the reviewer comments will be provided to the applicants.

### **Following the Review Period**

You must destroy or delete any copies of proposals (including hard copies and/or electronic copies) downloaded from eRA once reviews are submitted.

NOAA will consolidate final reviews and scores, and selections will be made according to the NOFO criteria.

### **[Table 1. Cumulative Scoring Rubric](#)**

This page is intentionally blank.

## **Appendix A. Program Objective as in the NOFO**

The information below, specific to the Air Quality Research and Forecasting (AQRF) competition, is extracted directly from the published NOFO and associated AQRF Information Sheet and is included here for the reviewer's convenience.

### **Air Quality Research and Forecasting (AQRF)**

NOAA collaborates with the external science community to improve NOAA's air quality forecasting capabilities through applied research and it provides financial support for research-to-operations (R2O) transition projects through the United States Weather Research Program (USWRP) to accelerate transitions to operations and to enhance the public benefits derived from these projects.

The National Air Quality Forecasting Capability (NAQFC) generates numerical guidance for predictions of ozone ( $O_3$ ), particulate matter with diameter equal to or less than 2.5 micrometers ( $PM_{2.5}$ ), wildfire smoke, and airborne dust over the contiguous United States (CONUS), Alaska, and Hawaii. The guidance products are produced with hourly outputs at 12 km resolutions out to 72 hours and are distributed in numerical and graphical format at <https://airquality.weather.gov/>. Ozone and  $PM_{2.5}$  products are generated by the NOAA National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) Unified Forecast System (UFS) and an online-coupled air quality component that simulates atmospheric chemistry using the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) model. The system also ingests inventory-based emissions estimates from the EPA, natural source emissions from wildfire smoke and dust. Satellite-derived fire products, high-resolution Regional Hourly Advanced Baseline Imager (ABI) and Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) Emissions (RAVE) are utilized to calculate fire emissions. The UFS-AQM online prediction system (i.e., AQMv7) is scheduled to replace the current regional air quality prediction system (i.e., AQMv6), which is based on the GFS-CMAQ offline system, in May 2024.

The Global Ensemble Forecast System-Aerosols (GEFS-Aerosols version 12) was implemented into operations in September 2020 with updates to scavenging and deposition processes. GEFS-Aerosols is a global atmospheric composition model that integrates weather and air quality using the FV3 dynamic core. GEFS-Aerosols currently produces five-day forecasts of the global distribution of smoke, soot, organic carbon, sulfate, and large and small particles of dust and sea salt. The aerosol modules are based on the NASA Goddard Chemistry Aerosol Radiation and Transport model (GOCART). Global anthropogenic emission inventories are derived from the Department of Energy's Community Emissions Data System. GEFS-Aerosols also includes a new dust emissions algorithm and biomass burning plume rise module. Work is underway to transition the unified NASA-NOAA GOCART system to the coupled Unified Forecast System (UFS). Possible upgrades for GEFS (version 13) include adding more ensemble members to produce a probabilistic aerosol forecast while including aerosol-radiation feedbacks and extending the forecast to the sub-seasonal time scale.

Emissions used for regional  $O_3$  and  $PM_{2.5}$  predictions are updated regularly with 2 improvements including projected changes in emissions from point and mobile sources (reducing NOx emissions especially in the eastern US), and inclusion of smoke and dust sources in CMAQ with

updates to CMAQ chemistry. The CMAQ model that provides operational ozone predictions was upgraded to use a newer CB06 chemical mechanism and includes the AERO7 module and real-time smoke and dust emissions to provide operational PM<sub>2.5</sub> predictions from the same system.

Projects focusing on air quality research and forecasting that are relatively mature and not in the early stages of development or proof-of-concept are appropriate for this funding opportunity. This includes those projects that propose practical outcomes that could be transitioned operationally to NOAA in the next 3 to 5 years. In the parlance of NOAA and other federal agencies, this requirement translates to the higher “readiness levels”. Readiness levels, as adopted by NOAA per [NAO 216-105B](#), have been described in the associated NOFO for this competition and announcement in Section I.A “Program Objectives”. Please refer to that section for additional information.

Projects that are most appropriate for this competition generally fall in or near the “demonstration” level of technical maturity, i.e., readiness levels of about 5 through 8 during the duration of the project. Ideally, the transition of a funded project from readiness level 5 or 6 at start-up to 8 at completion is OAR’s driving goal in funding these projects. On the other hand, projects in early stages of development or proof-of-concept during the project period (i.e. those with start-up readiness levels of 4 or below) are not the focus of this funding opportunity. Transitioning a mature demonstrated capability from level 8 to 9 is beyond the scope of this funding opportunity but could occur after the project’s end if they are successful and approved for operational implementation by NOAA’s National Weather Service (NWS). Completed projects satisfying NWS metrics for success and operational constraints (e.g. added value, ease of use, computational efficiency, etc.) may be selected later for operational implementation by appropriate NWS operational offices.

PIs selected for funding will collaboratively develop R2O Transition Plans in coordination with designated NWS staff within six months of the project start date. This plan will outline how the project outcomes are envisioned to be transitioned to NWS operations. NOAA guidance will be provided for the development of R2O Transition Plans.

**Competition Contact Information:**

WPO Program Manager: Lingyan Xin ([lingyan.xin@noaa.gov](mailto:lingyan.xin@noaa.gov))



## **Appendix B. Program Priorities from the NOFO**

The information below, specific to the Air Quality Research and Forecasting (AQRF) competition, is extracted directly from the published NOFO and is included here for the reviewer's convenience.

Air quality forecasting involves the use of science and technology to predict the concentration of air pollution in the atmosphere for a given location and time. Projects that have the potential to improve both air quality prediction and research by incorporating scientific advances in chemistry modeling and inputs from the latest pollutant emission datasets will be considered. Applicants to this competition should clearly identify and address one or more of the following priorities in their proposal.

**Priority AQRF-1:** Development and evaluation of high-resolution (1-3 km) air quality forecast capabilities that are consistent with NOAA weather forecast models at these resolutions, including two-way coupled models that capture air quality-weather interactions. In addition, this priority encourages work focusing on representation of local phenomena such as fine-scale processes in coastal regions, over complex terrain, or in urban areas, especially those that take advantage of recent air quality field experiments.

**Priority AQRF-2:** Evaluate the National Air Quality Forecast Capability (NAQFC) system consisting of the UFS-based regional model coupled with an online Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) chemistry model for both the warm and cool seasons for likely occurrence of poor air quality episodes. Investigation to identify the key variables dictating AQ forecast (ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) performance at the gray zone to cloud permitting weather model resolutions are encouraged. Process-oriented evaluations to investigate the causes of model biases in different assumptions/parameterizations, especially over complex terrains/water-land interface/urban areas with poor air quality.

**Priority AQRF-3:** Improved spatial and temporal estimates of anthropogenic and natural pollutant emissions, including smoke from wildland fires and small fires and other potential sources of model biases, using NOAA satellite remote sensing and other data sources and through improved representation of emission physics coupled to the land surface model.

**Priority AQRF-4:** Explore and quantify the potential value of ensemble model approaches, post processing and artificial intelligence to NOAA's operational air quality forecasting guidance.

**Priority AQRF-5:** Improved model accuracy using data assimilation of remotely-sensed products or in-situ observations, including emissions update through coupled data assimilation.

**Priority AQRF-6:** Development of verification software, methods, and techniques to ensure AQ forecast capabilities are performing to standards.

**Priority AQRF-7:** Optimizing chemistry processes to increase the computational efficiency, including but not limited to applying AI/ML methods to chemistry that can lead to a reduced number of species to be advected or limiting vertical layers to carry out chemical processes.

Prioritizing chemical mechanisms based on relative impacts on prediction of essential NAQFC forecast fields.

## **Appendix C. NOFO Evaluation Criteria**

The information below is extracted directly from the published NOFO and included here for the reviewer's convenience.

The criteria described in this section are the fundamental basis for reviewing, scoring, and ranking of the proposals. Applicants are required to address the following criteria in their proposals. The evaluation criteria and weighting of the criteria are as follows for this competition (for a total of 100 points).

### **1. Relevance of Proposed Project to Competition Goals (Relevance, Impact and Stakeholder Support) (30 points)**

Reviewers will consider the following questions:

1. Relevance and alignment with competition priority(ies)
  - a. How clearly defined is the problem and/or opportunity?
  - b. How aligned is the proposal with the competition's priority(ies)?
  - c. How appropriate for the competition is the proposal's expected Readiness Level (RL) progression, given the competition's designated RL range?
2. Potential impact/benefit/outcomes
  - a. How relevant to the competition's desired outcomes are the project outputs/products?
  - b. How impactful or beneficial would this project's outcomes be, if successful?
3. Stakeholder support and/or involvement
  - a. If applicable to the proposal, how robust is the proposed collaboration with operational stakeholders and/or potential adopters? This question should be addressed with a focus on quality over quantity of collaboration.

### **2. Technical or Scientific Merit (Technical/Scientific Merit and Project Design) (30 points)**

This criterion assesses if the proposal is well-designed, technically sound and/or innovative. Reviewers will consider the following questions:

1. Technical /Scientific Merit
  - a. How rigorous are the proposed methods and solutions?
  - b. How much does the proposed project improve technology, knowledge, or methods and advance the field of study?
2. Project Design
  - a. How well-defined are the proposed project milestones, outputs, and timeline?
  - b. How achievable are the proposed methods and solutions, given the project milestones and timeline?
3. How well does the proposal describe the management of data in the Data Management Plan? This includes data storage during the project, plans for sharing and public

availability of data at the conclusion of the project (with specific mention of data repositories), and the format of data, metadata, and documentation that will be provided with publicly available data.

4. If applicable, how well does the proposal describe the management of data in the Software Management Plan and sharing of code? This includes storing code in code repositories with corresponding documentation.

### **3. Qualifications of Applicants (Applicant(s) Qualifications and Collaborative Environment) (14 points)**

This criterion assesses whether the research team possesses the necessary experience, education, training, facilities, collaboration environment, and administrative resources to accomplish the proposed project. Reviewers will consider the following questions:

#### **1. Research Team Qualifications**

- a. How will the research team's experience, education, training, facilities, and/or resources help accomplish the project?
- b. How effectively has the research team demonstrated the ability or potential to conduct successful research, development, and/or transition?
- c. How effectively has the research team demonstrated the ability or potential to publish peer reviewed articles and/or otherwise present or disseminate their research findings in professional and/or outreach settings?

#### **2. Collaborative Environment**

- a. If applicable to the proposal, how effective are proposed collaboration efforts and partnerships, and are they sufficient to accomplish the proposed project goals?

### **4. Project Costs (10 points)**

This criterion evaluates the budget (considering both financial and time costs) to determine if it is realistic, efficient, and aligns with project needs and proposed timeline. Reviewers will consider the following questions:

1. How reasonable, realistic, allocable, and necessary are the requested costs, and do they align with project outputs/products, outcomes/benefits, and time period assuming that institutional costs such as projected salary increases are set by institutions and not controlled by the applicants?
2. How reasonable are the proposed staffing resources, and are they sufficient to successfully complete the proposed work?
3. How impactful are the potential benefits relative to the cost?
4. How cost efficient is the proposed project?

## **5. Outreach and Education, and Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility (8 points each subsection, 16 points total)**

*For outreach and education, this criterion assesses whether the project provides a focused and effective education and outreach strategy (8 points). Reviewers will consider the following questions:*

1. How well does the proposed project engage in knowledge sharing activities with the scientific community and/or the weather enterprise? Examples include hosting or attending a workshop, developing training materials, etc.
2. How well does the proposed project engage, build relationships, iterate, and co-produce knowledge, materials, or initiatives with target groups, relevant decision-makers, practitioners, underserved populations, and/or the general public? This might include: hosting workshops, developing training materials, developing a website, engaging with K–12 educators and students, etc.
3. How well does the project proposal incorporate student involvement and engagement? This might include training, mentoring, scholarship, paid internship and/or development opportunities for students throughout their educational career.

*For diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility, this criterion assesses the project's compliance with NOAA's policy on diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA), as defined in Section IV.F (as well as on NOAA's official website*

*<https://www.noaa.gov/organization/inclusion-and-civil-rights/diversity-and-inclusion>), and its potential broader impact on DEIA (8 points). Reviewers will consider the following questions:*

1. How strong is the potential of the project outputs and outcomes to directly benefit one or more traditionally underserved and/or vulnerable populations?
2. How strong is the potential of this project to broaden the participation of one or more traditionally underserved and/or vulnerable populations? The definition of underserved populations can be found in the General Information Sheet.
3. How well does the proposed work advance DEIA through the outputs of their project? Examples include, but are not limited to: easy-to-use tools or products, new community engagement approaches, incorporating social science and evaluation capacity.
4. How well does the research team prioritize and advocate for DEIA throughout the proposed project? This could include how DEIA principles are interwoven into their work culture, their research group, their community, their institution, or in the preparation of the proposal.

5. How well does the proposal provide accommodations and modifications to foster an inclusive and safe environment and ensure equal access to employment and participation in activities for people with disabilities?

## Appendix D. NOAA Readiness Levels as in the NOFO

The information below is extracted directly from the published NOFO and included here for the reviewer's convenience. The FY25 General Information Sheet can be found on Grants.gov, within the relating documents tab linked [here](#).

**RL 1 (Basic Research):** Basic research, experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge of the underlying foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without any particular application or use in view. Basic research can be oriented or directed towards some broad fields of general interest, with the explicit goal of a range of future applications.

**RL 2 (Applied Research):** Applied research, original investigation undertaken in order to acquire new knowledge. It is, however, directed primarily towards a specific, practical aim or objective. Applied research is undertaken either to determine possible uses for the findings of basic research, or to determine new methods or ways of achieving specific and predetermined objectives.

**RL 3 (Development):** Proof-of-concept for system, process, product, service, or tool; this can be considered an early phase of experimental development; feasibility studies may be included.

**RL 4 (Development):** Successful evaluation of system, subsystem, process, product, service, or tool in a laboratory or other experimental environment; this can be considered an intermediate phase of development.

**RL 5 (Development):** Successful evaluation of a system, subsystem process, product, service, or tool in a relevant environment through testing and prototyping; this can be considered the final stage of development before demonstration begins.

**RL 6 (Demonstration):** Demonstration of a prototype system, subsystem, process, product, service, or tool in a relevant or test environment (its potential is demonstrated).



**RL 7 (Demonstration):** Prototype system, process, product, service or tool demonstrated in an operational or other relevant environment (functionality is demonstrated in a near-real world environment; subsystem components fully integrated into system).

**RL 8 (Demonstration):** Finalized system, process, product, service or tool tested, and shown to operate or function as expected within the user's environment; user training and documentation completed; operator or user approval given.

**RL 9 (Deployment):** System, process, product, service or tool deployed and used routinely.

## Appendix E. Sample Images for Various Review Components in eRA

- (1) Meeting Materials Section: Relevant review materials will be located here, including an electronic copy of the NOFO. You can access the materials by clicking on the 3-dots (circled in red below) and then "View" (boxed in red below).


**Internet Assisted Review**


Internet Assisted Review

### Meeting Materials ?

Go To
2024/08 ZQE1 VD-1(02) 1 : For Guidance Document Purposes

Meeting Materials

Filter Table
1 Results

Order ^	Name ^	Description ^	PI Name - Application ^	Modified ^
1	Test Reviewer Instructions	...		07/16/2024 04:56:32 AM

View

- (2) Review Event Information and Assigned Applications: This screen shows the applications assigned to a reviewer.

All times are in Eastern Standard Time/ Eastern Daylight Time.

Meeting: 2024/08 ZQE1 VD-1 (02) 1

Meeting Title	Meeting Identifiers	Current Phase ?	Meeting Date	Critique Due
For Guidance Document Purposes	2024/08 ZQE1 VD-1 (02) 1	RECRUITMENT/SUBMIT	07/30/2024 - 08/03/2024	07/29/2024 08:00 PM EDT

☒ Show only Assigned Applications

My Assigned Applications (ZIP) ?
Generate ZIP
Download

Filter Table
2 Results

Review Order ^	Application Number (Opportunity Number) ^	PI Name ^	Project Title (Latest eAdditions Date) ^	Assignment Role ^	Prelim. Score ^	Submitted Date ^
	NA25NMF427G001-T1-01 NOFO NUMBER	Last Name, First Name	Project Title	Rev 1		
	NA25NMF427G000-T1-01 NOFO NUMBER	Last Name, First Name	Project Title	Rev 1		Draft



- (3) Application Information: When you click on the Grant Folder for an application (the “file folder” icon in Image #2 above), this is the information you will see. You can access the necessary application materials in the “Multiple Documents” section (boxed in red below).

**eRA Service Desk**  
 Hours: Monday, Friday, 7:00 AM 8:00 PM EDT/EST  
 Web: <https://www.era.nih.gov/need-help>  
 Toll free: 866 504 9552  
 Phone: 301-402-7469  
 Contact initiated outside of business hours via Web or voice mail will be returned the next business day.

**Application Folder ?**  
**NA24NMF427G0038-T1-01** Appl ID: 11137427  

<b>Status:</b> Pending IRG Review	<b>Project Title:</b>  Project Title	<b>PI Name:</b> Last Name, First Name
<b>Institution:</b> APPLICANT ORGANIZATION	<b>Accession Number:</b> 5016981	

**Multiple Documents**  

e-Application

**Additions for Review**  

Document Event Log

No data available.

- (4) Sample Reviewer Scoring Box for One Evaluation Criteria: This is an example of the screen where you’ll be providing your review comments and score (\*\*NOTE: the criteria title and scoring range are taken from another competition and therefore are not accurate in this photo for this NOFO).

**Internet Assisted Review**

**Online Critique for NA24NMF437G0009-T1-01 - Last Name, First Name** ? DRAFT  

<b>Opportunity Number:</b>	NOFO Number
<b>Title:</b>	Project Title
<b>Assignment Role:</b>	Rev 1

**Grant Number :** NA24NMF437G0009-T1-01
 Open All Close All Top Print Cancel Save Save & Exit Delete Submit

**PI Name :** Last Name, First Name
 Last Saved: 07/16/2024 05:26:55 AM by Dodd, Tori

**Grant Number :** NA24NMF437G0009-T1-01
 Open All Close All Top Print Cancel Save Save & Exit Delete Submit

**PI Name :** Last Name, First Name
 Last Saved: 07/16/2024 05:26:55 AM by Dodd, Tori

Important Reminders

**Evaluation Criteria**

Score  
 Score 0 0

**1. Importance/relevance and applicability of proposed projects to the program goals**  
**Strengths**  
**Weaknesses**

**Appendix F. Application Review Information and Scoring Summary Rubric**

The information below is provided as a supplement to the review screens you will utilize in eRA. You may use this appendix to support your preliminary review of your assigned proposals prior to entering it in eRA.

**Online Critique for [application number] - Last Name, First Name****Opportunity Number:** NOAA-OAR-WPO-2025-28603**Title:****Assignment Role:****Scoring Summary**

Total Score:

Scoring Details

Score Range Criterion

**Review Criteria****Relevance of Proposed Project to Competition Goals (Relevance, Impact and Stakeholder Support)**

Scoring Range: 0 - 30

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Required)

Comments (Not Required):

**Technical or Scientific Merit (Technical/Scientific Merit and Project Design\_**

Scoring Range: 0 - 30

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Required)

Comments (Not Required):

**Qualifications of Applicants (Applicant(s) Qualifications and Collaborative Environment)**

Scoring Range: 0 - 14

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Required)

Comments (Not Required):

**Project Costs**

Scoring Range: 0 - 10

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Required)

Comments (Not Required):

**Outreach and Education, and Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility**

Outreach and Education Sub-Section Scoring Range: 0 - 8

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments (Not Required):

Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility Sub-Section Scoring Range: 0 - 8

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments (Not Required):

**Outreach and Education, and Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility Section TOTAL  
Scoring Range: 0 - 16**

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Required)