

Panel Scientific and Technical Review Form
(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public.)

Proposal number: 2001 - K204

Short Proposal Title: Using Molecular techniques...

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Hypotheses and objectives are very clear although the hypotheses are not really testable; testable hypotheses are possible but since the project is monitoring and assessment the hypotheses were more used to support the choice of objectives.

Panel Summary:

Concur; would like some thought given to what the hypotheses really are.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, clearly explains why the work should be done.

Panel Summary:

Concur.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Concur. Past success indicates that design is appropriate for meeting objectives.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Proposal listed as research but assume this is because this is first time work has been proposed for funding; other reviewer says that monitoring and assessment work falls under the domain of research

Panel Summary:

Concur, although we know that this is not the first funding of this effort.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes, very much so. Highly likely to inform future decision making

Panel Summary:

Concur, seems likely to be required for management and recovery.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Acceptable but not inspired.

Panel Summary:

Yes, assurance that results will be published in scientific journals is encouraging. Past publications should be followed up.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Acceptable but not inspired. Otherwise good.

Panel Summary:

Concur

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes. Success dependent on finding markers. These applicants demonstrated an ability to develop markers and no reason to doubt that they will be able to identify additional markers.

Panel Summary:

Concur

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes

Panel Summary:

Yes.

5)Other comments

Both reviewers rated excellent. It would have been helpful if the number of new markers needed was identified.

Without this information it will be difficult to gauge success of project.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel urges that targets of number of new markers be calculated based on previous genetic marker data; especially if this work is intended to be funded in the future. Management needs information on when genetic identification ability is sufficient.

Summary Rating

Excellent
Very Good
Good
Fair
Poor

Your Rating: EXCELLENT