

## 2026 Multistate Conservation Grant Program

Criteria					
<b>Need - Maximum Points 10</b>					
<b>1</b>	How well does the proposal meet regional or national priority needs?	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>
		The proposal loosely meets a regional or national need and lacks clarity on how it contributes to the overarching priority topic.	The proposal shows some alignment with a strategic priority but does not clearly address the core problem and lacks a relevant approach.	The proposal moderately meets regional or national needs with a solid problem statement and practical approach, though key details or best practices may be lacking.	The proposal clearly meets regional or national needs with a well-defined problem statement and a practical, detailed approach. It reflects a strong understanding of the priority area and integrates best practices to maximize outcomes.
<b>Multiple States Benefits and Applicability - Maximum Points 15</b>					
<b>2</b>	Does this proposal clearly describe benefits and applicability to multiple states?	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>
		The proposal only benefits a small number of states, and it holds little potential for application in other states	The proposal benefits a small number of states, and it might be applicable in only a few other states.	The proposal has moderate potential broad application but lacks significant detail on how it might be funded, adopted, or supported by other states or organizations.	The proposal has very high potential for broad application, and fully describes for how its results can and will be used to address the needs of a majority of states or regions.

**Feasibility and Technical Merit - Maximum Points 25**

	<p><b>3</b> Are the objectives specific, measurable, and time-bound?</p>	<p><b>1</b> Objectives are vague, lack measurability, and are not time-bound.</p>	<p><b>2</b> Objectives show some specificity but lack full measurability and/or are not time-bound.</p>	<p><b>3</b> Objectives are specific, mostly measurable, and include a timeframe for completion, though additional detail or refinement is needed.</p>	<p><b>4</b> Objectives are highly specific, fully measurable, and clearly time-bound.</p>
	<p><b>4</b> Does the proposal incorporate the most relevant scientific knowledge and/or best practices?</p>	<p><b>1</b> The proposal lacks a science-based foundation, shows no inclusion of best practices, and provides little to no description of methodology.</p>	<p><b>3</b> The proposal has a weak science-based or best practices approach but shows significant methodological gaps that undermine its validity and reliability.</p>	<p><b>5</b> The proposal moderately incorporates science-based principles and/or best practices in its approach and methodology but could benefit from stronger methodological detail or support.</p>	<p><b>7</b> The proposal is grounded in solid scientific principles, applies appropriate methodologies, and is supported by strong data or references.</p>
	<p><b>5</b> Is the Approach section described in sufficient detail to unambiguously outline what the investigators are planning to do?</p>	<p><b>2</b> The proposal lacks a coherent, planned approach, making it difficult to understand how it would be implemented.</p>	<p><b>4</b> The proposal approach is vague or incomplete, leaving significant gaps in its proposed methodology, timeline, resource allocation, and team expertise.</p>	<p><b>6</b> The proposal provides a moderately sufficient description of its approach, but still leaves some uncertainties in its methods, team experience, or estimates of needed resources.</p>	<p><b>8</b> The proposal presents a strong, well-defined, detailed approach with a realistic timeline, clear deliverables, and a capable team with relevant experience. Risks are identified and mitigated.</p>
	<p><b>6</b> How likely is it that the described approach will achieve the stated goals and objectives within the proposed timeline?</p>	<p><b>1</b> The approach is unrealistic and unlikely to achieve the stated goals within the proposed timeline.</p>	<p><b>2</b> The approach has significant gaps and poses a low likelihood of success within the timeline.</p>	<p><b>4</b> Approach is feasible, well-aligned with goals, and likely to succeed within the timeline.</p>	<p><b>6</b> Approach is highly feasible, closely aligned with objectives, and easily achievable within the proposed timeline.</p>

**Innovation - Maximum Points 15**

		<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>7</b>	Does the proposal demonstrate innovation in addressing known challenges facing state fish and wildlife agencies and their partners?	The proposal lacks innovation and relies on conventional methods without offering new ideas, tools, or approaches to address known challenges.	The proposal shows minimal innovation, with some new elements or slight improvements to existing approaches.	The proposal demonstrates moderate innovation by introducing new methods, tools, or creative approaches that could improve how challenges are addressed.	The proposal is highly innovative, offering creative, forward-thinking solutions or tools that have strong potential to significantly advance how state agencies and partners address known challenges.

**Impact on Conservation/R3 Efforts and Longevity - Maximum Point 20**

		<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>8</b>	Are the proposal's deliverables clearly defined and realistic to achieve within the proposal's scope?	The deliverables are vague, poorly defined, unrealistic, or not feasible within the proposal's scope.	Deliverables are somewhat defined, but remain unclear, overly ambitious, or unachievable within the project's scope.	Most deliverables are moderately defined and generally realistic within the proposal's scope, though additional clarification is needed.	Deliverables are clearly defined, specific, and realistic to achieve within the proposal's scope.
<b>9</b>	Will the proposal result in dependable, practical deliverables for state fish and wildlife agencies and their partners?	The proposal is unlikely to produce dependable or practical deliverables for state fish and wildlife agencies and their partners.	The proposal is likely to produce only limited useful deliverables that are unlikely to be used by state fish and wildlife agencies and their partners.	The proposal is likely to result in dependable, practical deliverables that agencies and partners can apply with minimal modification.	The proposal is highly likely to produce dependable, practical deliverables that directly support and benefit state fish and wildlife agencies and their partners.

		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>10</b>	How reasonable is the proposal's plan for the longevity of the deliverables?	The proposal's plan for the longevity of the deliverables is unrealistic or insufficient.	The proposal's plan for the longevity of the deliverables is somewhat reasonable, but lacks strong, actionable steps or relies heavily on external factors for	The proposal's plan for the longevity of the deliverables is realistic, reasonable and considers long-term viability.	The proposal's plan for the longevity of the deliverables is highly reasonable, well thought out, and includes clear, practical strategies to ensure long-term use and effectiveness.
<b>Budget - Maximum Point 15</b>					
		<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>11</b>	Based on your expertise, do the budgeted costs appear reasonable and appropriate in relation to the activities planned?	The budget is grossly inflated, missing details, or unjustified.	The budget contains several unnecessary, unrealistic, or excessive costs, and the transparency or explanation of budget categories is weak.	The budget is reasonable and appropriate, but lacks strong justifications for some costs.	The budget is well-documented, reasonable, appropriate and directly tied to project outcomes.

**Total Max Score**

**100**