APPENDIX F: RANKING OF PROPOSED EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING PROJECTS
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Ranking Method for Monitoring Projects

Critical Question: Proposed monitoring project addresses one or more EMC critical monitoring questions with appropriate study design and experimental methods.

Scientific Uncertainty: Current scientific understanding is not well-studied or validated. This ranking is weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings.

Geographic Application: Critical question and proposed project has broad geographic application.

Collaboration & Feasibility: Number of active contributing collaborators relative to the monitoring subject. Consider the magnitude and expertise of the collaborators. Feasibility of monitoring project to meet stated goals and objectives within expected budget and timelines needed by the EMC, Board or stakeholders.

On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing any category:

1 = Does not meet any portion of the Ranking
2 = Does not meet key portions of the Ranking
3 = May meet some portions of the Ranking, either key or ancillary
4 = Meets key portions of the Ranking and does not address ancillary portions
5 = Meets all portions of the Ranking

1 Additional guidance for ranking criteria follows on the next page.
2 The funding requested is not a ranking criterion.
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