

**Fiscal Year 2024 NOAA Marine Debris Interception Technologies under the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law
Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOAA-NOS-ORR-2024-2007991)**

FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Scores are assigned value by question

Importance and Applicability of Proposal to Program Goals	35
Technical Merit	30
Overall Qualifications of Applicant	10
Project Costs	15
Community Support	10

Criteria	Question Value	Sub-Criteria Value	Criteria Value
----------	----------------	--------------------	----------------

Criteria	Question Value	Sub-Criteria Value	Criteria Value
Importance and Applicability of Proposal to Program Goals			
This criterion ascertains whether the proposed work is relevant to the goals set out by the NOAA MDP in this announcement. Applications will be evaluated based on the following:			
Project Outcomes			35
Will the project have impactful benefits to NOAA trust resources, and the surrounding coastal environment or community (as described in Section I.B)?	5	25	
Does the proposal clearly describe the anticipated ecological and socio-economic outcomes that the project is expected to produce?	5		
Does the project clearly demonstrate a need for the deployment of interception technologies in the desired location?	5		
Does the proposal include a prevention plan that will have a meaningful impact on the introduction of new marine debris in the area of the interception device?	5		
Are the prevention strategies appropriate for the debris being targeted with the interception technology? Does the proposal identify an appropriate target audience to prevent future debris accumulation?	5		
Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Justice, and Accessibility			
Does the applicant identify project activities taking place in and/or benefits flowing to a Tribal or underserved community, and does that community have a connection to the project activities? If project activities take place in and/or impact Tribal communities, the associated Tribe must be engaged in the project. Applicants that reference CEJST (https://screeningtool.geoplatform.gov/) will score higher in this criterion. If CEJST does not have adequate data to identify a community as disadvantaged, applicants should outline other identifying burdens that define that community as underserved.	4	10	
Does the application indicate the removal of this debris will help address other challenges the underserved community is facing (eg. removal of debris will help improve local fisheries/food security)?	2		
Does the applicant describe how their team will bring a diversity of viewpoints to this project?	2		
Does the applicant describe any experience they or their project partners have in promoting justice, equity, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility in their past work?	2		
Projects that demonstrate a thoughtful approach to coordinate among diverse groups and ensure federal funding is allocated in the most efficient and equitable way, and does not duplicate any existing efforts, as well as those that aim to prioritize the use of local partners/contractors, where possible and appropriate, will score higher on this criterion.			
Technical Merit This criterion assesses whether the approach is technically sound and if the methods are appropriate, and whether there are clear project goals and objectives. Applications will be evaluated based on the following:			
Project Goals and Objectives			
Does the proposal clearly identify the project's overall goals and objectives and are they realistic and achievable? Does the application provide a realistic project timeline? Reference Section IV.B.2 which describes the requirements for the Project Narrative.	5	5	
Project Description			
Has the technology/technologies been well described and has it been used successfully in the environment in which it is being proposed?	8	10	
Has consideration been given to alternative disposal methods?	2		

Environmental Impacts		5	30
Does the application include detailed maps of deployment sites, information on the expected species that may be encountered in the area and affected by project activities, and a descriptive project timeline?	3		
Does the applicant provide assurances that implementation will meet all federal, state, and local environmental laws?	2		
Applications submitted with all of the above information, along with evidence of completed environmental assessments, completed consultations, or secured permits, and that demonstrate that proposed debris removal activities are legally permissible in the project area are likely to score higher on this criterion.			
Monitoring and Maintenance Plan		10	
Does the proposal provide an adequate and appropriate monitoring and maintenance plan which describes how the chosen technology/technologies will be monitored and maintained both throughout the award (if made), but also in the long-term with the absence of federal funding following any award?	7		
Does the applicant describe how they and any project partners will collect specific, measurable metrics on removal, waste characterization, disposal, prevention, and other performance measures as described above in Section IV. B ("Content and Form of Application")? Do they provide realistic estimates of these metrics?	2		
Does the proposal include a Data Management Plan? If so, does it adequately describe what data will be collected during the project and how it will be made accessible and independently understandable to general users in a timely manner, in compliance with Data Management requirements described in Section VI.B. ("Content and Form of Application")?	1		
Overall Qualifications of Applicant This criterion ascertains whether the applicant possesses the necessary experience, training, facilities, and administrative resources to meet project objectives. Applications will be evaluated based on the following:			10
Applicant Technical & Administrative Qualifications			
Does the applicant and any identified project partners have the ability and expertise to conduct the scope and scale of the proposed work? Do they have the demonstrated capacity to procure and deploy selected interception technologies, navigate any regulatory hurdles and secure permits, maintain equipment in the long-term, lead effective prevention strategies, and ability to secure appropriate partnerships with municipalities or other public and/or private partners?	5	10	
Does the applicant have the administrative capacity (i.e. the facilities and/or administrative resources and capabilities that are available to the applicant) to successfully manage the award?	5		
Proposals that demonstrate access to extensive technical expertise and federal grant experience, or that have systems and personnel in place to effectively manage federal grant requirements are likely to score higher on this criterion. Applicants with the ability to ensure project success through on-the-ground monitoring and oversight, and effectively track and report on project accomplishments are likely to score higher on this criterion.			
Project Costs This criterion evaluates the budget to determine if it is realistic and commensurate with the project needs and timeframe. Applications will be evaluated on the following:			15
Project Budget Composition			
Is the overall budget realistic, enabling the applicant to effectively and successfully meet all proposed objectives with the funding requested?	3	5	
Is the overall budget reasonable and cost effective, including only those costs necessary to effectively and successfully meet all proposed objectives?	2		
Funding directed at supporting new interception efforts, or programs that require funding to scale-up or expand their existing efforts to achieve broader and more impactful outcomes are likely to score higher under this criterion.			
Project Budget Organization			
Does the budget justification narrative contain a sufficient level of detail, as required in Section IV.B.? This includes whether the applicant includes a detailed summary budget table, the budget is organized by SF-424A object classes, and describes both the federal and non-federal funding needs for all required project costs (i.e., for both implementation and administration activities).	5	5	
Proposals with detailed Budget Narratives that follow the format of NOAA's Budget Narrative Guidance document (link is provided in Section IV.B. "Content and Form of Application") are likely to score higher on this criterion.			
Cost-sharing and Leveraging Federal Funds			

<p>Does the applicant complement NOAA's investment with other funding sources, including formal, non-federal matching contributions and/or informal, leveraged funds? Are matching and/or leveraged funding sources (both planned and confirmed) documented in the proposal? In cases where non-federal match or informal leverage are not provided, does the proposal describe challenges in a way that indicates it is unlikely the applicant could have done more to secure match or leveraged funds?</p>	5	5	
<p>Community Support This criterion evaluates whether the project has effective engagement from relevant stakeholders, including engagement of underserved and underrepresented communities, if applicable. Applications will be evaluated based on the following:</p>			
<p>Community & Partner Support</p>			
<p>Does the proposal effectively integrate well with existing regional or national publicly vetted programs, priorities, or strategic plans?</p> <p>Program or plan examples include, but are not limited to: National Estuary Program or NOAA Habitat Focus Area sites, 2021-2025 NOAA MDP Strategic Plan, NOAA Marine Debris Action Plans, etc. Check your region's page on the NOAA Marine Debris Program website (https://marinedebris.noaa.gov/your-region) for a regional Marine Debris Action Plan. Project types (or even specific projects) that are mentioned and/or prioritized in the above, or similar, plans will score higher on this criterion.</p>	2		
<p>Has the applicant demonstrated meaningful engagement from project partners, and strong community support for the project? This may be reflected by the diversity, strength and involvement of project participants, partners and local entities, as well as include letters of support from project partners, state and local governments, members of Congress, private landowners, community groups, or relevant resource agency personnel familiar with the issue? Do these letters indicate that the partners are meaningfully involved in the planning and execution of the project?</p>	8	10	10
<p>Proposals that include letters of support from all proposed project partners will score higher on this criterion. This also includes letters from landowners and other stakeholders involved with or impacted by the project, granting permissions and other assurances that the project has their full support. As appropriate, projects that make connections to underserved and/or underrepresented individuals or communities to broaden participation of stakeholders for whom there is currently limited direct engagement on marine debris issues and/or for whom social and economic vulnerability due to marine debris impacts is high, may score higher on this criterion.</p>			