Review Criteria for Draft Proposals

Evaluation, Selection, and Award

The following process will be used to recommend project(s) for funding:

- A. Proposals will be reviewed by technical review teams consisting of Air Resources Board staff and select subject experts (generally from other funding agencies to avoid duplication of research) using the criteria described below. Only the information contained in the proposal will be used to evaluate and score proposals.
- B. ARB reserves the right to negotiate with proposers to modify the project scope, level of funding, or both.
- C. Proposals recommended for funding by technical review teams at ARB and by ARB's Research Screening Committee (RSC).
- D. If the RSC recommends the proposal for funding, the project will be presented to ARB's Board for approval at a public meeting.

If approved at an ARB Board Meeting:

- E. A research contract will be entered into between the proposer and the State and sent to the contractor(s) for review, approval, and signature.
- F. Once returned to ARB, ARB will fully execute the contract. Contractors are approved to begin the project only after full execution of the contract.

Scoring Criteria

Criteria	Points Possible	Proposer A points	Proposer B points	
Responsiveness to the Goals and Objectives Outlined in the Proposal Solicitation. Proposers should demonstrate a clear understanding of the policy objectives and research needs that ARB seeks to address with this project, and should convey their knowledge of the subject. The proposal should spell out, in adequate detail, exactly what the Proposer proposes to do to satisfy the requirements of the Solicitation. The proposed approach and workplan will be compared against the Solicitation to ensure that	15			

all specified tasks and deliverables			
are included in the proposal.			
Policy Relevance/Benefits to the			
State. Proposers should explain how the submission supports the Board's regulatory programs or upcoming policy decisions. Describe how the project will provide data, information, and/or products to help ARB accomplish its mission.	10		
Methodology/Technical Approach. Proposers should demonstrate the logic and feasibility of the methodology and technical approach to the project, spell out the sequence and relationships of major tasks, and explain methods for performing the actual work.	25		
Previous Related Experience. The Proposer should indicate how skills developed in previous related work will be applied to the proposed project.	15		
Level and Quality of Effort to be Provided, Including Project Management Plan. The project management plan will be evaluated based on the provisions for project management and oversight, the feasibility of the project schedule, the planned allocation of resources, proposed methods for measuring project progress against the plan, and proposed methods for detecting and correcting deviations from the planned schedule. Reviewers will base their ratings on answers to at least these questions: Does the proposal allocate time and resources in such a way that the objectives of the study will be met? Is supervision and oversight adequate for ensuring that the project will remain on schedule? Is the distribution of workload appropriate for activities	20		

such as research, evaluation and analysis, data reduction, computer simulation, report preparation, meetings, and travel? Cost and Cost-Effectiveness.			
Although there is no minimum or maximum funding amount that may be suggested for the conduct of the proposed research, suggested budgets are expected to be consistent with our historical levels. The Board's research budget is approximately \$5 million dollars per year and typically supports 15-25 projects with 2 to 3 year durations, and individual project budgets generally range from \$50,000-\$650,000. Projects that provide cofunding are evaluated more favorably. Cost-effectiveness will be evaluated primarily by comparing proposals that respond to the same solicitation topic.	20		
Total	100		