

Attachment 3

EVALUATION AND SELECTION PLAN

[FUNDING OPPORTUNITY ANNOUNCEMENT NUMBER]
[FUNDING OPPORTUNITY ANNOUNCEMENT TITLE]

U.S Department of Energy



(Name)
Merit Review Panel
Chairperson

Date

(Name)
Grants Officer

Date

(Name)
Selection Official

Date

Attachment 3
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	GENERAL INFORMATION	1
III.	SUMMARY AND OBJECTIVES	1
IV.	CONFLICT OF INTEREST/CONFIDENTIALITY	1
V.	EVALUATION GUIDELINES	3
VI.	MERIT REVIEW EVALUATIONS	3
	A. Appointments	3
	B. Application Review Process	5
	C. Evaluation Process	6
	D. Program Policy Factors	10
	E. Selection/Selection Statement	11
	F. Environmental Review	11
	G. Congressional Notification	11
	H. Notification Letters	11
	I. Detailed Budget Evaluation	12
	J. Records	12
VII.	PERSONNEL	12
VIII.	RESPONSIBILITIES	13
IX.	ATTACHMENTS	17
	<i>Attachment 1</i>	<i>Conflict of Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgement</i>
	<i>Attachment 2</i>	<i>Record of Initial Compliance Review</i>
	<i>Attachment 3</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria and Rating Plan</i>
	<i>Attachment 4</i>	<i>Individual Rating Sheet</i>
	<i>Attachment 5</i>	<i>Budget Evaluation</i>
	<i>Attachment 6</i>	<i>Record of Consensus Strengths and Weaknesses</i>
	<i>Attachment 7</i>	<i>Record of Consensus Scores</i>
	<i>Attachment 8</i>	<i>Merit Review Panel Chairperson's Report</i>
	<i>Attachment 9</i>	<i>Selection Statement</i>

Attachment 3

EVALUATION AND SELECTION PLAN

I. INTRODUCTION

Merit review of Applications submitted in response to Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) Number _____, entitled, _____ will be conducted in accordance with this plan.

The FOA and all amendments will be posted on Grants.gov at <https://www.grants.gov/> and in FedConnect at <https://www.fedconnect.gov>. Applicants will apply through Grants.gov.

II. GENERAL INFORMATION

Merit review of applications will be performed in accordance with 10 CFR Part 600.13. Evaluators will be required to protect the confidentiality of any specifically identified trade secrets and/or privileged or confidential commercial or financial information obtained as a result of their participation in this evaluation. Information contained in the applications shall be treated in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth in 10 CFR Part 600.15.

III. SUMMARY AND OBJECTIVES

DOE [**insert program office name**] is conducting a Funding Opportunity Announcement to competitively seek [**cost-shared**] Applications for research and development of technologies and analytical capabilities needed to [**objectives to be completed by Program Office**].

The Areas of Interest of this Announcement are: [**to be completed by Program Office**].

IV. CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND NON-DISCLOSURE/CONFIDENTIALITY

Reviewers will be required to protect the confidentiality of all information obtained as a result of their participation in this evaluation. Information contained in the applications will be treated in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth in 10 CFR Part 600.15.

All persons involved in the evaluation and selection process must read and sign a *Conflict of Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgement (Attachment 1)* indicating an understanding of the obligations for participating in the merit review process. Once signed, strict adherence to the agreement is required. The official responsible for the review and/or the Grants Officer (GO) will be responsible for obtaining signed certificates from all merit review panel members, program policy reviewers, Selection Official (SO), and other involved parties, and maintaining the original certificates in the official master file for the FOA.

Attachment 3

Reviewers must notify the Merit Review Panel Chairperson (MRPC) of any potential conflicts of interest or any actions that might give the appearance of a conflict of interest. The Chairperson will direct questions concerning potential conflicts of interest to the GO/Grants Specialist (GS) for resolution.

All materials pertinent to the applications received are privileged communications that are to be used only by DOE staff and the Merit Review Panel (MRP)(s). These materials must not be shared or discussed with any other individuals. Merit reviewers must not solicit opinions on particular applications or parts thereof from experts outside the pertinent merit review group. There must be no direct communications between merit reviewers and applicants outside of the established review process. Any request for additional information from the Applicant or other application inquiries must be directed in writing to the GO. The information presented in applications must not be used for the benefit of the reviewer.

Merit reviewers must not be in contact with or inform the principal investigators, their organizations, or anyone else outside of the merit review panel of the conclusions or recommendations resulting from application reviews. A breach of confidentiality could deter qualified individuals from serving as merit reviewers and inhibit those who do serve from engaging in free and full discussions.

V. EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Each member of the MRP will strictly adhere to the following guidelines:

- Reviewers will not discuss the evaluation or the evaluation process with any unauthorized personnel.
- Reviewers will not divulge their identities to any applicant.
- Reviewers will immediately disclose conflicts of interest and not review any application where a conflict or appearance of a conflict may exist.
- Reviewers will not contact applicants.
- Reviewers will not discuss the Panel's proceedings outside of the MRP meeting, even after the selection and award is completed.
- Reviewers will not accept any invitations, gratuities (i.e., meals, gifts, favors, etc.), or job offers from any Applicant. If an evaluator is offered any invitations, gratuities, or job offers by or on behalf of any applicant, the evaluator will immediately report it to the GO.

Attachment 3

- Reviewers will only evaluate information provided in the applications and only evaluate applications against the established evaluation criteria. No additional criteria are to be considered by the Panel.
- Reviewers will initially independently evaluate applications and document its strengths and weaknesses without consultation with other Reviewers. Reviewers will individually assess all Applications subjected to comprehensive evaluation against the pre-established and published merit review criteria only. These criteria should form the only basis for the review rating and, more importantly, the narrative critique of each application.
- Reviewers may contact the MRPC or GO to obtain clarifications regarding applications but will NOT compare applications while conducting their evaluations.
- Each Reviewer is responsible for properly destroying paper copies and deleting electronic copies of all applications

VI. MERIT REVIEW EVALUATIONS

A. Appointments

The Selection Official (or delegate) will appoint the MRP(s). The MRP(s) will typically be comprised of no less than three qualified individuals who are knowledgeable in the scientific or technical field that is the subject of the application to be reviewed. The official selecting the panel members will consider the following qualifications:

1. The individual's scientific or technical education and experience.
2. The extent to which the individual has engaged in relevant work or research, the capacities in which the individual has done so, and the quality of such work or research.
3. The need for the merit review panel to include within its membership experts from various specialty areas within relevant scientific or technical fields.

If fewer than three reviewers are used, the official responsible for the merit review must document the reasons, obtain the approval of the selection official, and include this documentation in the merit review file.

The MRP will not include anyone who, on behalf of the Federal government, provides assistance to the applicants; has any decision-making role regarding the applications; serves as GO or performs business management functions for any selected project; audits the recipient of any selected project; or has any other conflict of interest.

Access to the applications by the merit review panel members will only be granted after the MRPC and the GO has received a signed copy of the *Conflict of Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgment* form (See Section IV above).

Attachment 3

The MRPC, in coordination with the GO), will ensure that a pre-evaluation meeting is conducted with all merit review panel members that is coincident with the initiation of the individual review of applications. This meeting may be led by the MRPC or technical leads for the program areas of interest, if applicable. Meetings may be face-to-face or via telephone/video conferencing. At this meeting, the GO or their representative will be provided with an opportunity to address issues that may be sensitive or critical to the successful completion of the evaluation. As a minimum, the meeting objectives are to:

1. Establish a common understanding of the FOA technical objectives and the review process
2. Reiterate the Evaluation Guidelines (Section V)
3. Emphasize the importance of strict and consistent application of evaluation criteria
4. Emphasize the importance of adherence to the established schedule
5. Emphasize the importance of providing clear, well written strengths and weaknesses (S&Ws)
6. Provide instruction and examples of acceptable S&Ws, including what to avoid

The following DOE Federal personnel are assigned by the SO to serve on the MRP:

[List Merit Review Panel members here.]

This list may be modified by the SO through an amendment to this plan.

The following personnel are assigned by the SO to be ex-officio advisors to the MRP:

[List ex-officio members here.]

This list may be modified by the SO through an amendment to this plan.

B. Application Review Process

[Describe the process that will be used.]

The application evaluation process will be carried out in multiple steps, as per the following:

1. Merit Review of Concept Papers
2. Initial Compliance Review of Applications
3. Comprehensive Merit Review of Applications
4. Chairperson's Report

C. Evaluation Process

All applications that are received by the application due date and time, as specified in the FOA, will be subjected to an initial review, and upon satisfactorily passing the initial review, will be subjected to a comprehensive evaluation. In the event that an application

Attachment 3

is ‘untimely’ (i.e., “late”) and deemed ineligible for consideration, the GO will promptly notify the applicant in writing that the application cannot be considered for award. An application is late if the date and time stamp for submission to Grants.gov (or some other system) is after the stated closing date and time. A late proposal may be reviewed if the applicant provides evidence of technical issues that the system’s helpdesk failed to resolve prior to the receipt date and time.

1. Initial Review

Prior to conducting the comprehensive merit review, an initial review will be performed to determine whether: (1) the Applicant is eligible for an award; (2) the information required by the FOA has been submitted; (3) all mandatory requirements of the FOA are satisfied; and (4) the proposed project is responsive to the program objectives of the FOA (program determination). The initial review may be performed by the Grants Officer or a designated program official. The results of this review will be documented on the *Record of Initial Compliance Review (Attachment 2)*. This form should be tailored to the specific requirements of the published announcement.

As initially determined by the GO and MRPC, if an applicant clearly fails to meet the requirements and objectives of the FOA or does not provide sufficient information for evaluation, the applicant will be considered non-responsive and eliminated from further review. Prior to being determined non-responsive and ineligible for consideration for award, written documentation of this failure to meet the FOA requirements is to be provided to the program manager along with the concurrence of the GO and Legal Counsel. The GO will inform the applicant by letter of the reason (s) why the application is ineligible for further consideration.

2. Comprehensive Merit Review

The factors that are to be considered in the comprehensive merit review are specified in the FOA. All timely applications that satisfactorily pass the initial review will be eligible for comprehensive merit review in accordance with this Evaluation and Selection Plan. This review will be a thorough, consistent and objective examination of applications based on the pre-established evaluation criteria set forth in this Selection Plan and the FOA.

The comprehensive review is generally conducted in two stages: independent review and consensus.

a. Independent Review

Reviewers will conduct independent comprehensive reviews of each application assigned to them. Each reviewer shall be notified of applications assigned to them to review by the MRPC. A copy of each application shall be made available to each reviewer for independent review. In addition, each reviewer shall receive an explanation of the merit review process, a copy of

Attachment 3

the evaluation criteria, and an explanation of scoring (*See Attachment 3 Evaluation Criteria and Rating Plan*). Any printed or electronic copies of applications shall be returned to the MRPC, the GO or shall be destroyed following the consensus meeting. Any downloaded copies of the applications shall be deleted from the reviewer's hard drives, CD, or other electronic media.

Each reviewer shall independently review each application against the published evaluation criteria and provide written documentation of the strengths and weaknesses for each criterion. Applications will be rated using the technical rating standards in the *Evaluation Criteria and Rating Plan (Attachment 3)*. Reviewers will record their individual scores along with their significant/minor strengths and significant/minor weaknesses on the *Individual Rating Sheet (Attachment 4)* based upon the pre-established criteria. Peer Reviewers shall provide their advisory strengths/weaknesses and advisory scores to the MRPC to be considered as additional advisory information to be taken into consideration as determined necessary by the MRPC during the Consensus Meeting.

An application must be evaluated even if the application does not address the criteria or follow the prescribed format. However, it is not the Reviewers' responsibility to search for information which is not readily apparent. Reviewers are expected to use their best judgment in evaluating applications.

At a minimum, three (3) qualified individual reviewers will review each application. Any combination of Federal or Peer Reviewers can satisfy the requirement for three (3) independent reviews. In the unanticipated instance that fewer than three (3) reviewers review a particular application, the reason will be documented in the Chairperson's Report.

Reviewers are responsible for destroying any printed or electronic copies of applications following the disbanding of the Panel. Any downloaded copies of applications will be deleted from reviewers' computer hard drives, CD or other electronic media.

b. Consensus Meeting

Following completion of the Independent Review, the MRP will meet to discuss the individually identified strengths and weaknesses of each application and coordinate the development of the MRP's Consensus Strengths and Weaknesses of each application, based on the established evaluation criterion. Through their deliberations, the MRP will determine if there are any divergent opinions that should be addressed before the final panel strengths and weaknesses are recorded.

Separate Consensus Meetings will be held for each technical area of the FOA. Each MRP will meet and discuss in detail the strengths and weaknesses of

Attachment 3

each criterion of each application assigned. Each MRP Member shall be prepared to discuss each assigned application's strengths and weaknesses during the Consensus Meeting. The MRP Members will consider the input from the Advisory Reviewers (Peer reviewers and Ex-officio Advisors if provided) as well as the results of their own independent reviews and will develop an initial set of consensus strengths and weaknesses.

Based on these consensus strengths and weaknesses for each criterion the MRP will develop a consensus rating score for each evaluation criterion for each application and provide written documentation of their final consensus comments and scores on the *Record of Consensus Strengths and Weaknesses (Attachment 6)*.

The subtotal score for each criterion will be calculated by multiplying the consensus score for that criterion by the criterion weighting factor. A final total score for each application will be generated by summing these consensus score subtotals for all criteria. These scores will be documented on the *Record of Consensus Scores (Attachment 7)*.

The MRPC must be diligent in assuring that the ratings developed by the Panel are consistent with the established evaluation criteria.

[Include if applicable] Once the final scores have been assigned, the MRP will propose a range of scores that will constitute applications recommended for selection. This selection range will determine the order in which Applications will be recommended for negotiation of an award.

3. Budget Evaluation

A budget evaluation (not point scored) is conducted after the consensus review meeting only on the most highly rated application(s). The MRPC is responsible for having this preliminary budget evaluation completed, and should rely on other project management personnel assigned to the panel. The budget evaluation serves to provide the SO and management personnel with an understanding of the annual funding requirements for the suite of potential awards, as well as cost realism of the budget estimate, appropriateness and reasonableness of resources, and reasonableness and feasibility of the schedule relative to the Applicant's Statement of Project Objectives (SOPO). The budget evaluation would validate or confirm the merit ratings of the review panel, where scope, schedule and cost are reasonably aligned. Importantly, the budget evaluation provides some initial insight to project-related risk, beyond those dealing with technical uncertainty, which should be considered prior to award. Deficiencies, as well as suggested adjustments, should be noted for possible negotiation purposes and to assist with completion of the Detailed Technical Evaluation of Budget Report supporting any Cost/Pricing Reports and/or Cost Analysis by GS, if selected for award. Although the budget evaluation does not affect the technical score, the results can be used by the SO as

Attachment 3

a deciding factor. See *Budget Evaluation* (Attachment 5)

4. **Merit Review Panel Chairperson's Report**

The MRPC will be responsible for reviewing the findings of the MRP(s), Consensus Strengths and Weaknesses, Record of Consensus Scores, and ultimately completing a MRPC *Report* to provide recommendations to the Selection Official.

A *MRPC Report* must be prepared presenting the findings of the MRP Panel. The final scores and funding recommendation for each application will be documented in the Chairperson's Report. The MRP will provide the complete report for review and obtain concurrence from the GO and Legal Counsel prior to submitting the report to the SO. See Attachment 8 for an outline for the Report.

In addition to the written Chairperson's Report, the SO may require the Chairperson or the MRP to present the report orally at the Senior Management Technical Briefing.

D. **Program Policy Factors**

The Program Policy Factors will not be point scored, but the SO may consider them in making the selections for negotiation of award. The SO may request that an independent person provide assistance in the application of the program policy factors. These factors, while not indicators of the application's merit (e.g., technical excellence, cost, applicant's ability, etc.) nevertheless may be essential to the process of selecting the application(s) that, individually or collectively, will best achieve the program objectives. Such factors are often beyond the control of the applicant. The SO may apply the Program Policy Factors to make selections for programmatic balance. It may be desirable to select one or more projects that represent a sample of technology approaches and methods. Further, the SO may desire to make roughly equal numbers of awards in each of the areas of interest or in a particular geographic region.

The SO will evaluate applications on the following Program Policy Factors:

[\[List specific Program Policy Factors from the FOA here\]](#)

The following are examples of Program Policy Factors that may be used by the SO (not inclusive of all factors that may be appropriate):

- It is desirable to select for award a group of projects which represents a diversity of technical approaches, methods, Applications and/or market segments;
- It may be desirable to support complementary and/or duplicative efforts or projects, which, when taken together, will best achieve the research goals and objectives;
- It may be desirable that different kinds and sizes of organizations be selected for Award in order to provide a balanced programmatic effort and a variety of different technical

Attachment 3

perspectives;

- It is desirable, because of the nature of the energy source, the type of projects envisioned, or limitations of past efforts, to select for award a group of projects with a broad or specific geographic distribution.

E. Selection/Selection Statement

The Record of Consensus Scores and program policy factors will be independently considered by the Selection Official in determining the optimum mix of applications that will be selected for support. The Program Policy Factors will provide the Selection Official with the capability of developing, from the competitive funding opportunity, a broad involvement of organizations and organizational ideas, which both enhance the overall technology research effort and upgrade the program content to meet the goals of the DOE.

The SO (or designee) will complete the *Selection Statement* (Attachment 9). The Selection Statement will specify a ranked order of applications recommended by the Panel for negotiation of award. The SO will document all selections, noting which Program Policy Factor(s) were applied in making the selections.

The SO must sign the Selection Statement.

Depending on the circumstances regarding the complexity of the selection process as it relates to the consideration of program policy factors, the SO (or delegate) may clearly delineating the thought process that ultimately culminates into the actual selection(s). This analysis included in the selection statement will address all criteria specified in the announcement along with Application of the Program Policy Factors

F. Environmental Review

Applicants may be required to complete an Environmental Questionnaire. This will be done in accordance with the requirements of the FOA.

G. Congressional Notification

The Grants Officer/Specialist will coordinate with the Merit Review Panel Chairperson and the Office of Public Affairs Coordination (OPAC) with regard to required Congressional notifications prior to public announcement of selected applicants is made.

H. Notification Letters

Following completion of the Congressional Notification Process, GO should ensure that notification is made to all applicants on the selection or non-selection of their applications. Successful applicants should be notified as soon as possible and advised what, if any, additional documentation must be submitted in order to commence negotiation leading to the execution of the Financial Assistance Award documents. The GO will sign the notification letters to successful Applicants.

Attachment 3

Unsuccessful applicants should be notified in writing that their applications were not selected for award and provided an explanation as to why. After consultation with the SO the notification to the unsuccessful applicants should be prepared and signed by the GO with a copy to be included in the official file of record.

I. Detailed Technical Evaluation of Budget (Post-Selection)

For each application selected, a comprehensive Technical Evaluation of Budget (TEB) should be prepared by a knowledgeable program official. If the budget submitted with the original application requires supplemental information, to prevent any delay in the ultimate negotiation of an award to the applicant, the program official will work with the GS to contact the applicant to obtain the necessary information in a timely manner.

J. Records

The GS will retain a master record of the FOA and appropriate documentation, including the Preliminary Review, MRPC Report, Record of Consensus Strengths and Weaknesses, Record of Consensus Scores, the Selection Statement, copies of debriefing notes (if applicable), and letters to unsuccessful and successful applicants.

VII. PERSONNEL

Title	Assignee
Selection Official	
Merit Review Panel Chairperson (MRPC)	
Merit Review Panel Members	
Federal Project Manager (FPM)	
Grants Officer	
Grants Specialist	
Program Official	
Technical Division Director	
Legal Counsel	
Patent Counsel	
NEPA Representative	
Ex-Officio Members	
Merit Review Panel Members-Area of Interest 1: Merit Review Panel Members-Area of Interest 2: Merit Review Panel Members-Area of Interest 3:	

Attachment 3

VIII. RESPONSIBILITIES

Selection Official is responsible for:

- Signing the Conflict-of-Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgement;
- Approving the Evaluation and Selection Plan;
- Reviewing the Merit Review Panel Chairperson's Report of Recommendations;
- Applying the program policy factors, when appropriate;
- Selecting applications for award;
- Preparing the Selection Statement;
- Appointing the Merit Review Panel Chairperson;
- Selecting Merit Reviewers, when appropriate; and
- Signing the unsuccessful applicant notification letters

Grants Officer (GO) is responsible for:

- Signing the Conflict-of-Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgement ;
- Advising Program Officials and the MRPC on matters relating to soliciting and awarding financial assistance instruments, including conflicts of interest and confidentiality of information issues;
- Concurring on the Evaluation and Selection Plan;
- Evaluating proposed costs and determining whether Applicant is a responsible entity;
- Concurring on any determination of applicant ineligibility;
- Signing the successful applicant notification letters;
- Reviewing and concurring with Selection Statement, MRPC Report ; and
- Executing the financial assistance awards.

Grants Specialist is responsible for:

- Signing and obtaining all of the signed Conflict-of-Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgement for official file documentation;
- Preparing the FOA
- Notifying the GO of any potential conflicts of interest;
- Advising the MRPC on matters relating to soliciting and awarding financial assistance instruments, including conflict of interests and confidentiality of information issues;
- Conducting the Initial Review for conformance with the FOA requirements (see Attachment 2 for detailed requirements);
- Determining whether an applicant failed to meet the requirements/objectives of FOA;
- Preparing the notification of successful applicant letter(s) for GO signature;
- Assisting the MRPC with following and administering the Evaluation and Selection Plan;
- Coordinating with project manager the notification of applicants, as necessary;
- Maintaining the FOA file; and
- Negotiating and preparing the award agreement

Attachment 3

Merit Review Panel Chairperson is responsible for:

- Signing the Conflict-of-Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgement;
- Assisting program in developing a rating plan, if requested;
- Concurring with Evaluation and Selection Plan;
- Notifying the GO/GS of any potential conflicts of interest or any actions that might give the appearance of a conflict of interest;
- Reading and understanding the evaluation criteria, rating plan, merit review procedures and application preparation instructions;
- Evaluating each application through the MRP members (except those that present a conflict of interest or an appearance of a conflict);
- Selecting the merit reviewers, when appropriate;
- Ensuring that reviewers follow the Rating Plan and provide sound, well documented evaluations;
- Coordinating all MRP meetings;
- Determining whether an applicant failed to meet the requirements/objectives of FOA;
- Assuring physical control and security of applications;
- Recommending application of the program policy factors, when appropriate;
- Ensuring that each member of the MRP individually evaluates, assigns a numerical rating, develops clear and substantive strengths and weaknesses for all Applications subjected to comprehensive evaluation;
- Preparing the MRPC for the SO; and
- Making a presentation, if requested, to the SO and other Senior DOE Executives in the form of a pre-selection briefing. This briefing shall include, as a minimum:
 - A spreadsheet presenting a final consensus score for each application as well as each application's proposed cost (all applications reviewed);
 - A discussion of each application's technical objective, uniqueness of technology/s proposed, technical and/or economic issues which must be overcome to be successful, plan for overcoming these issues, and an assessment of the risks associated with the application achieving its technical objectives;
 - A budget evaluation of those applications identified as candidates for selection and award as an indication of the reasonableness of the total cost proposed for each application relative to the total amount of work proposed;
 - A spreadsheet presenting a funding plan, by fiscal year, for those applications identified as candidates for selection and award.
- Assisting SO with notification of unsuccessful applicants; and
- Maintaining of all merit review documentation.

Merit Review Panel Members are responsible for:

- Signing the Conflict-of-Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgement;
- Notifying the official responsible for the review or the GO/GS of any potential conflicts of interest or any actions that might give the appearance of a conflict of interest;
- Reading and understanding the evaluation criteria, rating plan, merit review procedures and Application preparation instructions;

Attachment 3

- Individually evaluating each application (except those that present a conflict of interest or an appearance of a conflict) against the pre-established evaluation criteria as published in the FOA;
- Assigning numerical rating, developing clear and substantive strengths and weaknesses for all applications subjected to comprehensive evaluation;
- Assuring physical control and security of applications; and
- Assisting in debriefing applicants, as necessary.

Program Official(s): typically Technology Program Manager(s), Senior Management and Technical Advisors, and HQ Program Manager(s) are responsible for:

(resource/technical assistance but not part of MRP or Ex-Officio)

- Signing the Conflict-of-Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgement;
- Assisting MRPC in developing a rating plan;
- Developing the technical description of the areas of interest for inclusion in the FOA;
- Notifying the GO of any potential conflicts of interest or any actions that might give the appearance of a conflict of interest;
- Developing evaluation criteria and instructions for preparing Applications for FOA;
- Directing questions concerning potential conflicts of interest to the GO;
- Coordinating with GS the debriefing of Applicants as necessary;
- Serving as a resource to provide expertise to the MRP prior to discussions (if requested by MRPC). If serving as resource to panel, cannot participate in merit review discussions;
- Serving as a resource to the merit review panel prior to discussions, if requested by the Chair. When program officials serve as a resource, they may not participate in the merit review discussions;
- Recommending application of program policy factors, when appropriate; and
- Completing a Technical Evaluation of Budget on selected Applications.

Legal Advisor, Financial Advisor, NEPA Representative, and Property Advisor are responsible for:

- Signing the Conflict-of-Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgement;
- Notifying the GO of any potential conflicts of interest or any actions that might give the appearance of a conflict of interest;
- Providing the SO with advice and recommendations on aspects of the application that are important to the SO but fall outside of the technical evaluation criteria;
- Concurring on any GO requested determination of applicant ineligibility (legal); and
- Reviewing and concurring on the MRPC Report (legal)

Attachment 3

IX. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Conflict of Interest and Non-Disclosure Acknowledgment
Attachment 2	Record of Initial Compliance Review/Initial Compliance Review All-Applicants
Attachment 3	Evaluation Criteria and Rating Plan
Attachment 4	Individual Rating Sheet
Attachment 5	Budget Evaluation
Attachment 6	Record of Consensus Strengths and Weaknesses
Attachment 7	Record of Consensus Scores (Individual/All Applicants)
Attachment 8	Merit Review Panel Chairperson's Report
Attachment 9	Selection Statement