For each Program in the Science and Research Theme, assessment criteria (a) to (f) are listed in Section 4.0 of the Terms and Conditions. Scores and rationales provided by reviewers on the project design, concept, expected outcomes, and more are essential to the evaluation of this application. Enter score of 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 for each criterion a, b, c, d, e and f. Enter below in the rows with highlighted text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores 1 if</th>
<th>Scores 2 if</th>
<th>Scores 3 if</th>
<th>Scores 4 if</th>
<th>Scores 5 if</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does NOT meet the criterion</td>
<td>Meets criterion to a limited degree</td>
<td>Meets criterion to some degree</td>
<td>Meets criterion for the most part</td>
<td>Meets criterion in nearly all aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See rows (a) to (f) for details on each program assessment criterion.</td>
<td>See rows (a) to (f) for details on each program assessment criterion.</td>
<td>See rows (a) to (f) for details on each program assessment criterion.</td>
<td>See rows (a) to (f) for details on each program assessment criterion.</td>
<td>See rows (a) to (f) for details on each program assessment criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### a) Degree to which the project addresses an identified need for an Alberta agriculture sector:

Consider:
- AF 3-year business plan;
- AF science, research and innovation priorities;
- Government of Alberta Strategic Plan;
- The Industry has identified need and its support is indicated.

| Does not appear to address any need (AF business plan, AF priorities, GoA strategy) and is not identified and supported by industry. | Limited connection to an identified need (AF business plan, AF priorities, GoA strategy) or is not identified or has limited support by industry. | Direct connection to at least one identified need (AF business plan, AF priorities, GoA strategy) and is identified with acceptable level of support by industry. | Direct connection to at least two identified needs (AF business plan, AF priorities, GoA strategy) and is identified with strong support by industry. | Direct connection to more than two identified needs (AF business plan, AF priorities, GoA strategy) and is identified with significant support by industry. |

### a) Score of Reviewer with RATIONALE of reviewer score, 100 words maximum. Please in particular highlight pertinent details from the project supporting how this work aligns with an industry priority:

<p>| SCORE: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Level of potential for the Innovation(s) in the project to have a sector-wide impact and be adopted in Alberta;</th>
<th>Does not appear to benefit any sector in agriculture and is unlikely to be adopted.</th>
<th>Appears to have limited benefits for any sector in agriculture or shows limited potential for adoption.</th>
<th>Appears to potentially benefit more than one agricultural sector and shows very good potential to be adopted.</th>
<th>Appears to potentially benefit multiple agricultural sectors and shows excellent potential to be adopted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Score of Reviewer with rationale</td>
<td>RATIONALE of reviewer score, 50 words maximum:</td>
<td>SCORE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Extent to which the knowledge gained by Alberta agriculture industry stakeholders from the project will positively change Alberta's agriculture industry;</td>
<td>Does not demonstrate any potential to positively change the Alberta agriculture industry.</td>
<td>Demonstrates to a modest extent the potential to positively change any sector of the Alberta agriculture industry.</td>
<td>Demonstrates to a very good extent the potential to positively change more than one sector in the Alberta agriculture industry.</td>
<td>Demonstrates to a significant extent, the potential to positively change the majority of the Alberta agriculture industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Score of Reviewer with rationale</td>
<td>RATIONALE of reviewer score, 50 words maximum:</td>
<td>SCORE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Level to which the design of the project plan in the application describes relevant activities, resources, budget, and success measures needed to achieve expected outcomes;</td>
<td>Insufficient details on: - Relevant activities - Resources - Budget - Success measures With information provided would not expect project to achieve the intended outcomes</td>
<td>Minimal level of detail on: - Relevant activities - Resources - Budget - Success measures: With information provided would expect project to achieve limited intended outcomes</td>
<td>Good level of detail on: - Relevant activities - Resources - Budget - Success measures: With information provided would expect project to achieve some of the intended outcomes</td>
<td>Very good level of detail on: - Relevant activities - Resources - Budget - Success measures: With information provided would expect project to achieve most of the intended outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Score of Reviewer with rationale</td>
<td>RATIONALE of reviewer score, 50 words maximum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| e) Range of opportunities (e.g. multiple channels, audiences, timing, and methods) provided in the application to successfully transfer knowledge gained from the project to Alberta agriculture industry stakeholders; and |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| (Note: KTT is mandatory on all projects.) |
| Provides minimal opportunities to transfer knowledge: | Provides good opportunities to transfer knowledge: |
| • Includes two channels, | • Includes three channels, |
| • Targets two audiences, | • Targets three audiences, |
| • Delivers two times | • Delivers three times |
| • Uses two methods/approaches | • Uses three methods/approaches |
| Provides minimal support for uptake and adoption | Provides good support for uptake and adoption |
| Expect technology (product, practice, process or system) to have limited chances to be successfully transferred to intended beneficiaries. | Expect technology (product, practice, process or system) to have a very good chance of being successfully transferred to intended beneficiaries. |

Lacks sufficient opportunities to transfer knowledge:
• Does not include multiple channels, |
• Does not target different audiences, |
• Does not deliver multiple times |
• Does not use different methods/approaches |
Lacks support for uptake and adoption.
Do not expect technology (product, practice, process or system) to have limited chances to be successfully transferred to intended beneficiaries.

Provides minimal opportunities to transfer knowledge:
• Includes two channels, |
• Targets two audiences, |
• Delivers two times |
• Uses two methods/approaches |
Provides minimal support for uptake and adoption |
Expect technology (product, practice, process or system) to have limited chances to be successfully transferred to intended beneficiaries.

Provides good opportunities to transfer knowledge:
• Includes three channels, |
• Targets three audiences, |
• Delivers three times |
• Uses three methods/approaches |
Provides good support for uptake and adoption |
Expect technology (product, practice, process or system) to have a very good chance of being successfully transferred to intended beneficiaries.

Provides very good opportunities to transfer knowledge:
• Includes four channels, |
• Targets four audiences, |
• Delivers four times |
• Uses four methods/approaches |
Provides very good support for uptake and adoption |
Expect technology (product, practice, process or system) to have a very good chance of being successfully transferred to intended beneficiaries.

Provides excellent opportunities to transfer knowledge:
• Includes five + channels, |
• Targets five + audiences, |
• Delivers five + times |
• Uses five + methods/approaches |
Provides excellent support for uptake and adoption |
Expect technology (product, practice, process or system) to have an excellent chance of being successfully transferred to intended beneficiaries.
process or system) to be successfully transferred to intended beneficiaries.

e) Score of Reviewer with Rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATIONALE of reviewer score, 50 words maximum:</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) Capacity (team members, capabilities, and ability to access resources) demonstrated in the application to successfully complete all activities for the project within timelines stated in the application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity to successfully complete all activities within timelines is not demonstrated:</th>
<th>Capacity to successfully complete all activities within timelines is minimally demonstrated:</th>
<th>Capacity to successfully complete all activities within timelines is partially demonstrated:</th>
<th>Capacity to successfully complete all activities within timelines is adequately demonstrated:</th>
<th>Capacity to successfully complete all activities within timelines is fully demonstrated:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Missing team members in key roles needed for identified activities and</td>
<td>• Lacks team members with necessary capabilities (knowledge and/or skills) for identified activities and</td>
<td>• Provides good information on most key team members needed for identified activities and</td>
<td>• Provides very good information on all key team members needed for identified activities and</td>
<td>• Provides excellent information on all team members needed for identified activities and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lacks ability to access all required resources for identified activities.</td>
<td>• Lacks a team member with necessary capabilities (knowledge and/or skills) for identified activities or</td>
<td>• Provides good description on most key team member capabilities (knowledge and skills) for the identified activities and</td>
<td>• Provides very good information on all key team member capabilities (knowledge and skills) for the identified activities and</td>
<td>• Provides excellent information on their ability to access all of the required resources for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lacks ability to access some of the required resources for</td>
<td>• Provides good information on their ability to access most of the required resources for</td>
<td>• Provides very good information on their ability to access all of the required resources for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reviewer Instructions. Please enter Project information:

Review is for applicants with Intake Due Date: Year ______ Month (spell) _____________ Day ______

Name of Applicant:

Name of Project:

For projects that are listed as ‘KTT only’, please circle to indicate: This is a KTT-only project.

### Reviewer Instructions. Please enter Scoring information:

List scores for each of the program assessment criteria: (a) ______ (b) ______ (c) ______ (d) ______ (e) ______ (f) ______

Now please take the score for criterion (a) and multiply it by 3. Enter that number here: ______ (Y)

Add number (Y) to scores for the remaining criteria (b, c, d, e, f) and enter that total here: __________ (WS)

The Weighted Score (WS) on any project application is a maximum of **40**.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Score (WS) and Rationale for this final score.</th>
<th>RATIONALE of reviewer score, no word limit:</th>
<th>Weighted SCORE (WS) is final score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you suggested YES to funding this project, Reviewer please complete:

Reviewer, would you suggest funding this project with ‘some changes’?
Please explain why.

COMMENT, no word limit:

OR,
Would you suggest funding this project ‘as is’?
Please explain why.

COMMENT, no word limit:

Reviewer Final Comments, Suggestions, and Observations.
Please include in your comments:
**How likely** you think the project work will be **useful to** and **used by** industry.

COMMENT, no word limit:

< Thank you >