

TEAMER RFTS EVALUATION CRITERIA

Project Summary – 5% of Total Score

1. How well does the technical summary describe the assistance request, rationale, and intended outcomes? *100% of Project Summary Score*

All elements in summary are clearly described	Most elements in summary are clearly described	Most elements in summary are not clearly described	Assistance request, rationale, and/or outcomes are incomprehensible
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

Requested Assistance – 75% of Total Score

2. Are the assistance objectives and potential benefit clear? *10% of Requested Assistance Score*

Objectives and improvements clear and aligned	Objectives and improvements are clear, but not aligned	Objectives and improvements are unclear	Objectives and improvements are unclear and conflicting
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

3. How well described is prior work? - *5% of Requested Assistance Score*

Prior work descriptions and connection to request are clear	Prior work descriptions are clear, but are tangential to request	Prior work descriptions are unclear and relevance to request cannot be established	Prior work is irrelevant to request
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

4. Based on prior work, is this a logical next step? *5% of Requested Assistance Score*

Assistance represents a clear next step for the applicant, building on prior work	Assistance is one of several possible next steps	Assistance is not a clear next step	Assistance is a poor next step
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

5. Is the technical approach likely to achieve the intended objectives? - *50% of Requested Assistance Score*

Approach is likely to provide intended benefit	Approach may provide intended benefit	Approach is unlikely to provide intended intended	Approach has fatal flaws
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

6. Are the metrics appropriate for assessing the success of the technical approach? *5% of Requested Assistance Score*

Metrics are well-aligned with sector norms and descriptive of results	Metrics are non-standard, but descriptive of results	Metrics are poorly defined	Metrics cannot be evaluated from information provided
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

7. Is the plan for results dissemination reasonable? *5% of Requested Assistance Score*

Results dissemination will significantly increase impact of the assistance beyond the applicant	Results dissemination may have impact beyond the applicant	Results are likely to solely benefit the applicant	Results dissemination plan is insufficient and/or overly restrictive
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

8. Are any of the timing constraints incompatible? *5% of Requested Assistance Score*

Facility and applicant have limited schedule constraints	Facility or applicant have significant schedule constraints - schedule delays possible	Facility and applicant have conflicting and significant constraints - schedule delays probable	Facility and applicant schedules do not overlap
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

9. Is the schedule reasonable and achievable? *5% of Requested Assistance Score*

Schedule is reasonable and achievable - project should be completed on schedule	Schedule is achievable, but aggressive - project delays possible	Schedule may not be achievable - project delays likely	Schedule is unrealistic - project cannot be completed in time window
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

10. Is the budget to provide the assistance reasonable in comparison to the scope? *10% of Requested Assistance Score*

Project costs are low relative to scope and impact	Project costs are reasonable relative to scope and impact	Project costs are high relative to scope and impact	Project costs are exorbitant relative to scope and impact
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

Team Description and Roles – 20% of Total Score

11. How well-suited is the facility to achieving the applicant objectives? *25% of Team Description and Roles Score*

Facility is a match fit for project objectives	Facility is well-suited to achieve project objectives	Facility has some capability gaps that may inhibit project objectives	Facility cannot meet project objectives
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

12. Is facility selection sensible? For multi-facility proposals, is this an integrated activity? 50% of Team Description and Roles Score

Applicant selection criteria are clear	Applicant selection criteria are mostly clear	Applicant selection criteria is arbitrary	Applicant selection criteria has serious flaws
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

13. Is the applicant role clearly defined and consistent with the technical approach? 12.5% of Team Description and Roles Score

Applicant role is clearly defined and consistent	Applicant role mostly defined and/or consistent	Applicant role mostly undefined and/or inconsistent	Applicant role is undefined
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor

14. Is the facility role clearly defined and consistent with the technical approach? 12.5% of Team Description and Roles Score

Facility role is clearly defined and consistent	Facility role mostly defined and/or consistent	Facility role mostly undefined and/or inconsistent	Facility role is undefined
Excellent	Moderate	Fair	Poor