



NFWF



APPENDIX 1: PROJECT LEVEL METRICS

To better gauge progress on individual grants and to ensure greater consistency of project data provided by multiple grants, the Easygrants application includes a list of standard metrics options for describing project impacts and reporting outcomes. We ask that applicants select **only the most relevant** metrics associated with the landscape level work being proposed from this list for their project.

IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS and SENTINEL LANDSCAPE GRANTS

ALL metrics are applicable to Implementation Grants and Sentinel Landscape Grants including the ones listed below.

| Habitat Restoration | |
|--|--|
| Beach habitat quality improvements - Miles restored | Enter the number of miles restored |
| Land restoration - Acres of trees planted | Enter # acres of TREES planted. In the NOTES, specify landcover type prior to planting (barren, cropland, grassland, shrubland), average # of trees per acre planted, and forest type (broadleaf, conifer, redwood, swamp--either broadleaf or conifer, shrub). |
| Land restoration - Acres restored | Enter # acres of habitat restored. In the NOTES, specify landcover prior to restoration (barren, cropland, grass, shrub) and post-restoration (broadleaf, conifer, redwood, grassland, shrubland, marsh, wet meadow, tidal marsh, swamp, seagrass, kelp forest). |
| Land restoration - Acres restored on tribal lands | Enter # acres of habitat restored. In the NOTES, specify landcover prior to restoration (barren, cropland, grass, shrub) and post-restoration (broadleaf, conifer, redwood, grassland, shrubland, marsh, wet meadow, tidal marsh, swamp, seagrass, kelp forest). |
| Wetland restoration - Acres restored | Enter # acres of WETLAND (not riparian or instream) habitat restored. In the NOTES, specify landcover prior to restoration (Marsh, Tidal marsh, Wet meadow, Swamp) and indicate % of vegetation on pre-project site (0-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, 81-100%). |
| Seed harvesting - lbs harvested | Enter the number of pounds of seeds collected. |
| Land, wetland restoration - # of native plants outplanted | Enter the # of native plants outplanted |
| Habitat Management | |
| BMP implementation for stormwater runoff - Acres with BMPs | Enter the number of acres with Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce and manage stormwater runoff. Please include size of area contributing runoff to the BMP. |
| Green Infrastructure - # trees planted | Enter the number of trees planted (include species, tree size, planting density and anticipated total acres of tree planting) |
| Green Infrastructure - access pts developed/improved | Enter the number of public access points developed/improved |
| Green Infrastructure - Acres of greenspace | Enter the number of acres of neighborhood green space created or improved. |
| Green Infrastructure - sq ft of green infrastructure | Enter the square footage of impervious surface removed or retrofitted |
| Improved irrigation practices - Acre feet of water conserved | Enter the number of acre feet of water conserved and indicate method of calculating water conservation in the NOTES section. |
| Capacity, Outreach, Incentives | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Public Access - # acres with public access | Enter the number of acres now open to public access |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| Public Access - # miles with public access | Enter the number of miles of stream or river opened to public access |
|--|--|

Species-specific Strategies

| | |
|--|--|
| Improving migration corridors - # road crossing improvements | Enter the number of wildlife road crossings improved |
|--|--|

Habitat Conservation

| | |
|---|--|
| Conservation easements - Acres protected under easement | Enter the number of acres protected under long-term easement (permanent or >30-yr). Assuming the specific parcel(s) has been identified, in the NOTES indicate what % of natural land cover would have been cleared in the absence of the easement(s). |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| Site protection - # of acres with enhanced protection | Use this metric for cultural site protection. Enter the number of acres with enhanced cultural site protection. |
|---|---|

PLANNING GRANTS

All metrics listed below are also applicable to Implementation Grants and Sentinel Landscape Grants.

Habitat Management

| | |
|---|--|
| Improved management practices - Acres under improved management | Enter the number of acres under improved management and indicate the types of practices in the NOTES section. Only count an acre once, even if multiple activities or treatments will occur on that acre during the project. |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Improved management practices - Acres under improved management on tribal lands | Enter the number of acres under improved management and indicate the types of practices in the NOTES section. Only count an acre once, even if multiple activities or treatments will occur on that acre during the project. |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Project footprint - Acreage of project footprint | Enter the total number of acres impacted by one or more project conservation activities. Only count an acre once, even if multiple activities or treatments will occur on that acre during the project. |
|--|---|

Planning, Research, Monitoring

| | |
|---|--|
| Management or Governance Planning - # plan activities implemented | Enter the number of management plan activities being implemented |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| Management or Governance Planning - # plans developed | Enter the number of plans developed that had input from multiple stakeholders |
|---|---|

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Monitoring - # monitoring programs | Enter the number of monitoring programs established or underway |
|------------------------------------|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| Restoration planning/design/permitting - # E&D plans developed | Enter the number of Engineering and Design plans developed. Generally there will be 1 plan per project to be constructed. |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| Restoration planning/design/permitting - Acres restored | Enter the number of acres for which planning, design, or permitting activities are being conducted under this project. |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Restoration planning/design/permitting - Miles restored | Enter the number of miles for which planning, design, or permitting activities are being conducted under this project. |
|---|--|

NATIONAL FOREST GRANTS

All metrics listed below are also applicable to Implementation Grants and Sentinel Landscape Grants.

Habitat Restoration

| | |
|--|---|
| Fish passage improvements - # passage barriers rectified | Enter the number of aquatic organism passage barriers rectified. In the NOTES section indicate what type(s) of barrier(s) are being removed or replaced (e.g., culvert, dam). |
| Fish passage improvements - Miles of stream opened | Enter total # of miles opened to improve aquatic organism passage. Only include the miles of main stem & smaller tributaries connected until the next barrier upstream (or headwaters), but NOT lakes, ponds, or distance downstream from the barrier removed. |
| Floodplain restoration - Acres restored | Enter # of floodplain acres restored. In the NOTES, indicate % of vegetation on the pre-project site (0-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, 81-100%) and the dominant vegetation being restored (Broadleaf, Conifer, Redwood, Shrub, Grass, Marsh, Wet meadow, Swamp). |
| Instream restoration - Miles restored | Enter the number of miles restored |
| Riparian restoration - Miles restored | Enter total number of riparian forest miles restored. If you are restoring wetlands do NOT use this metric; use the acres of wetland restored metric. |
| Removal of invasives - Acres restored | Enter the number of acres restored by removal or control of INVASIVE SPECIES. In the NOTES section, specify: the vegetation type being removed (herbaceous, shrub, or tree), average frequency (in years) the treatment is expected to occur in the future, and whether the removed vegetation will be left on site to decompose (Yes, No). Projects should include post-removal monitoring and follow-up control efforts as necessary to ensure that invasive species do not reinvade. |

Habitat Management

| | |
|---|--|
| BMP implementation for prescribed burns - Acres burned | Enter # acres with prescribed burning. In the NOTES, specify if private or public land, average frequency (in yrs) for future burning, dominant vegetation burned (forest, shrubland, grassland, cropland, Phragmites marsh). If forest, note if trees have been planted in past 10 yrs (Yes, No), and type of forest (Alder-maple, Aspen-birch, Douglas-fir, Douglas-fir with high productivity and high management intensity, Elm-ash-cottonwood, Fir-spruce-mountain hemlock, Hemlock-Sitka spruce, Hemlock-Sitka spruce with high productivity, Loblolly-shortleaf pine, Loblolly-shortleaf pine with high productivity and management intensity, Lodgepole pine, Longleaf-slash pine, Longleaf-slash pine with high productivity and management intensity, Maple-beech-birch, Mixed conifer, Oak-gum-cypress, Oak-hickory, Oak-pine, Ponderosa pine, Redwood, Spruce-balsam fir, Western oak, White-red-jack pine). |
| Fuels management treatment (mechanical/hand) - # of acres treated | Enter # acres of vegetation treated by mechanical or hand treatments for wildfire risk reduction. In the NOTES, indicate dominant forest type, average frequency (in years) for future treatments, and whether the removed vegetation will be left on site to decompose (Yes/No). |

PRIVATE FORESTS, RANGELAND AND FARMLAND GRANTS

All metrics listed below are also applicable to Implementation Grants and Sentinel Landscape Grants.

Habitat Restoration

| | |
|---|--|
| Land restoration - Acres of field buffers created | Enter the # of acres of FIELD BUFFER created. In the NOTES section, specify the landcover type prior to planting (barren, cropland, grassland), and the dominant vegetation being planted (Broadleaf, Conifer, Redwood, Shrub, Grass, Marsh, Wet meadow, Swamp). |
|---|--|

Habitat Management

| | |
|---|---|
| BMP implementation for nutrient or sediment reduction - Acres with BMPs | Enter the # of acres with BMPs. In the NOTES section, indicate the type of BMP(s) (e.g. agriculture and working lands BMPs) and the method of calculating reduction. DO NOT include managed grazing, use specific managed grazing metric. |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| Improved management practices - Acres with managed grazing | Enter the number of acres with managed grazing (i.e., promoting plant growth above and below ground, improving wildlife habitat, and maximizing soil carbon through grazing approaches that optimize stocking rates, livestock rotations, utilization rates, and plant rest and recovery, including development of associated grazing infrastructure). Please describe the grazing practices in the NOTES section. |
| BMP implementation for fencing improvements - Miles of fencing improved | Enter the number of miles of fencing improved |
| BMP implementation for fencing improvements - Miles of fencing removed | Enter the number of miles of fencing removed |
| BMP implementation for fencing improvements - Miles of corridor reconnected | Enter the number of miles of migration corridor reconnected. Do not double count with miles of stream opened. |

All Capacity, Outreach, Incentives metrics shown below

ALL GRANT CATEGORIES

Capacity, Outreach, Incentives

| | |
|---|---|
| Building institutional capacity - # of orgs contributing to goals | Enter the number of organizations contributing to the initiative's conservation goals |
| Economic benefits - # jobs created | Enter the number of new jobs created. If applicable, in the NOTES section report the number of new jobs created for people in the Historically Underserved, Tribal or Special Emphasis categories. |
| Economic benefits - # jobs sustained | Enter the number of jobs sustained. If applicable, in the NOTES section report the number of jobs sustained for people in the Historically Underserved, Tribal, or Special Emphasis categories. |
| Outreach/ Education/ Technical Assistance - # internships/fellowships | Enter the number of people employed as interns, fellows, or youth corps participants. |
| Outreach/ Education/ Technical Assistance - # people reached | Enter the number of people who responded to an offer of outreach, training, or technical assistance. This number should be a subset of the # of people targeted. In the NOTES, if applicable, note the number of people in the Historically Underserved, Tribal or Special Emphasis categories. |
| Outreach/ Education/ Technical Assistance - # people targeted | Enter the number of people targeted by outreach, training, or technical assistance activities. In the NOTES, if applicable, note the number of people in the Historically Underserved, Tribal, or Special Emphasis categories. |
| Outreach/ Education/ Technical Assistance - # workshops, webinars, meetings | Enter the number of workshops, webinars, and meetings held to address project activity |
| Volunteer participation - # of volunteer hours | Enter the # of volunteer hours in this project, who will be engaged, and what activities they will complete. |



APPENDIX 2: AGENCY FUNDING DETAILS

Department of Defense

The Department of Defense (DOD) is providing \$5 million to fund projects that support the goals of an existing [Sentinel Landscape](#), advance conservation goals in the Pacific, or address installation-level off-base species, habitat goals, and climate resilience. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2684a(h), this funding may be counted as “non-federal” matching funds for the project. Projects must meet the requirements of this RFP and propose a project ***in the vicinity of or ecologically related to***, a military installation or military airspace, and/or to maintain or enhance the climate resilience of one or more military installations. DOD funds ***cannot*** be used to support projects directly on military lands (i.e., “inside the fence line” of the DOD installation or range). The proposal narrative should clearly describe the encroachment challenges, environmental hazards or resource concerns that threaten the military mission, the conservation or nature-based solution proposed to address those threats, and how the project will maintain and improve military resilience and directly benefit defense mission capabilities of the DOD installation or landscape the project is associated with. Applications involving military installation projects should provide evidence demonstrating coordination with the appropriate military installation(s) or sentinel landscape.

Department of the Interior

Funding from the Department of the Interior (DOI) can only be awarded to state government agencies, territories of the United States, and federally recognized Indian Tribal governments for implementing voluntary ecosystem restoration projects on public and private land, with a priority for cross-boundary projects. Other entities are encouraged to partner with states, territories, and Tribal Nation governments as subrecipients of a larger project they submit. Approximately, \$100 million of DOI funding will be made available to support projects that advance the goals of this RFP and align with existing or developing landscape or species conservation plan.

U.S. Forest Service

U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is providing at least \$7 million to advance the goals of Challenge program. This funding will support collaborative-based landscape-scale restoration projects on National Forest System lands to achieve the restoration of a forest ecosystem through the removal of vegetation, the use of prescribed fire, the restoration of aquatic habitat, or the decommissioning of an unauthorized, temporary, or system road. USFS gives priority to project proposals that would result in the most miles of streams being restored for the lowest amount of Federal funding. Applicants should consider discussing their project with the National Forest their project will benefit prior to submission.

Natural Resources Conservation Service

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) is providing \$1 million of technical assistance funding through this RFP to support outreach and engagement with private landowners to

advance voluntary conservation efforts on working lands that align with NRCS Working Lands for Wildlife frameworks or initiatives, and especially increase Working Lands for Wildlife participation among farmers, ranchers, and forest landowners in the Historically Underserved and Special Emphasis categories. NRCS is also committed to aligning additional financial assistance funds through its state offices to projects that advance the goals of the America the Beautiful Challenge. Applications involving private lands should be shared with the appropriate NRCS State Conservationist for input and guidance before submission. A list of NRCS state contacts can be found [here](#).

APPENDIX 3: MATCH REQUIREMENTS

The non-Federal match required for a recipient to be eligible under this program varies by recipient type, and the source of funds, as follows:

Matching Funds

Non-federal match helps demonstrate broad support for the project and may be required for federal funding. The following is the minimum match (in-kind and cash) requirements for potential applicants:

DOI Conservation and Restoration Funds

| Recipient Type | Federal cost share | Non-federal cost share |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| States | 90% of total project costs | 10% of total project costs (11% of grant request), of which at least 2.5% must be cash |
| Tribal Nations & territories* | 97% of costs | 3% of costs, of which at least .75% must be cash (COVERED for Tribal Nations, fully covered by partnership with Native Americans in Philanthropy; WAIVED for territories per DOI legal interpretation, see below)* |

DOD Conservation and Restoration Funds

| Recipient Type | Federal cost share | Non-federal cost share |
|----------------|--------------------|--|
| All entities | 100% of costs | Not required. DOD REPI Program funds can serve as a non-federal match for the other federal programs in the ATBC grants. |

USFS Conservation and Restoration Funds

| Recipient Type | Federal cost share | Non-federal cost share |
|----------------|----------------------------|---|
| All entities | 80% of total project costs | 20% of total project costs (24% of grant request) (COVERED for Tribal Nations, fully covered by Native Americans in Philanthropy)* |

NRCS Technical Assistance Funds

| Recipient Type | Federal cost share | Non-federal cost share |
|----------------|----------------------------|---|
| All entities | 50% of total project costs | 50% of total project costs (equal to grant request)** (COVERED for Tribal Nations, fully covered by Native Americans in Philanthropy)* |

*Pursuant to Section 601 of Pub. L. 96-205, as amended, the match requirement is waived for the territories of the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. [Native Americans in Philanthropy](#) (NAP), as a part of their new partnership with NFWF, will be providing all match for any granted Tribally led projects. Tribally led applications can leave the matching contributions section of Easygrants blank, NFWF will be able to tag NAP funds to applicable projects on the back end. If there is match that an applicant would like to include, you are still able to do so in Easygrants, but it is not required.

** Organizations relevant to any of NRCS's Underserved/Special Emphasis Categories other than Tribes that are unable to meet the 1:1 non-federal matching contribution requirement are eligible to receive grant funding, but they must contact NFWF to discuss potential match adjustment options prior to submitting a proposal.

The non-federal share of eligible recipient award costs must include cash **that meets or exceeds** the percentages shown above. The match requirements may be met in all or in part by contributions from a third party, including in-kind contributions of staff and volunteer time, work performed, materials and services donated, or other tangible contributions to the project objectives and outcomes. Recipients may also voluntarily attribute some or all of their allowable indirect costs as matching funds; however, you may only charge to the award the indirect costs calculated against the allowable direct costs charged to the award.

The uniform requirements for matching funds are described in 2 CFR 200.306. Match contributions must be necessary and reasonable for accomplishment of project or program objectives. To be allowable, the recipient's funds and all third-party contributions, including cash and in-kind contributions, must meet the requirements in 2 CFR 200.306. The value of third-party in-kind contributions must be determined in accordance with the standards in 2 CFR 200.306.

Federal partner contributions, besides DOD REPI funds and 638 BIA funds, do not qualify to be used as match under this program. However, applicants should identify any Federal partners and their contributions to the project in the project narrative, as those partnerships show support for this program's priority for collaborative projects.

Applicants who are unable to meet these minimum requirements are still encouraged to apply and to proactively contact NFWF staff before submission. Where possible, NFWF will work with potential applicants to help meet these minimum requirements.

APPENDIX 4: EVALUATION CRITERIA – BENCHMARKS AND REVIEW PROCESS

Following is the process that will be used to review proposals and determine final awards.

First, every ATBC proposal will be evaluated by a minimum of three reviewers (usually five or more), including at least one NFWF program staff member, at least one external, technical expert, and at least one representative from an ATBC funding agency partner. All reviewers agree to comply with a Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality policy and receive training on reviewing proposals.

Proposals will be reviewed, evaluated, and scored based on the extent to which they meet the criteria of the five categories below, which correspond to the evaluation criteria listed in the ATBC RFP and the questions in the proposal sections and narrative. Reviewers consider the degree to which the proposals align with these criteria when determining the score for each category and provide written comments on their assessments. Each of the criteria will be evaluated on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is insufficient, 2 is significantly deficient, three is satisfactory, four is excellent and five is outstanding.

The benchmarks below that are associated with the criteria are intended as a guide for reviewers and applicants may consider them when preparing their proposals. It is important to note that a score of 1 or 2 for any individual criterion can result in a proposal being turned down for funding regardless of high scores in other categories.

Once all of the proposals are reviewed based on the extent to which they meet the five criteria, final funding decisions will be based on proposal scoring as well as additional factors applied to the overall slate of funded projects, which may include: geographic distribution of projects, variety of ATBC program priorities addressed, representation of project type and applicant, alignment with available funding, and performance on prior and/or current NFWF grants.

| Program Goals and Priorities | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Scale | Description |
| 1 | Project does not address program priorities nor does it align with agency funding priorities. |
| 2 | Project somewhat addresses one program priority but does not align with agency funding priorities. Project lacks specific, quantifiable performance metrics to evaluate project success. |
| 3 | Project addresses one or more program priorities and aligns somewhat with agency funding priorities. Project has at least one specific, quantifiable performance metric to evaluate project success. |
| 4 | Project addresses two or more program priorities and aligns with agency funding priorities. Project has more than one specific, quantifiable performance metric to evaluate project success. |
| 5 | Project addresses three or more program priorities and aligns with agency funding priorities. Project has multiple specific, quantifiable performance metrics to evaluate project success. |
| Technical Merit | |
| 1 | Significant concern that project is not technically sound or feasible as proposed. The proposal omits a work plan or timeline. Project does not engage technical experts in planning, design, and/or implementation. For Planning proposals, the applicant omits information on how proposed work will lead to other projects. |
| 2 | Some concern that project may not be technically sound and feasible. The proposal includes a limited work plan and timeline. Project negligibly engages technical experts in planning, design, and implementation. For Planning proposals, the applicant notes that efforts may lead to other projects but does not justify the assertion. |
| 3 | Project is likely technically sound and feasible but lacks sufficient detail. The proposal includes a basic work plan and timeline. Project engages technical some experts in project planning, design, and implementation. For Planning proposals, the applicant includes basic information on how efforts could lead to other projects. |
| 4 | Project is technically sound and feasible, and the proposal sets forth a clear work plan and timeline but some details are questionable. Project engages technical experts in project planning, design, and implementation. For Planning proposals, the applicant demonstrates how efforts will lead to implementation projects, but some justification is unclear. |
| 5 | Project is technically sound and feasible, and the proposal sets forth a clear, logical, and achievable work plan and timeline. Project engages appropriate technical experts throughout project planning, design, and implementation to ensure activities are technically sound and feasible. For Planning proposals, the applicant clearly and logically demonstrates how efforts will lead to implementation projects. |

| Conservation Plan or Indigenous Traditional Knowledge | |
|--|---|
| 1 | Project is entirely unrelated to an existing conservation, restoration, resilience, stewardship, or recovery plan, nor is it informed by Indigenous Traditional Knowledge (ITK). Proposal does not include or explain current capacity, partnerships, and/or processes necessary to develop or implement a plan. |
| 2 | Project is somewhat related to one existing conservation, restoration, resilience, stewardship, or recovery plan or includes basic incorporation of ITK. Proposal notes but does not describe current capacity, partnerships, and/or processes necessary to develop or implement a plan. |
| 3 | Project contributes to one existing conservation, restoration, resilience, stewardship, or recovery plan or is meaningfully informed by ITK. Proposal describes how project utilizes capacity, partnerships, and/or processes necessary to develop or implement a plan. Proposal articulates the degree to which the project activities are connected to outcomes and goals set forth in a plan. |
| 4 | Project contributes significantly to one or more existing conservation, restoration, resilience, stewardship, or recovery plans or is meaningfully informed by and incorporates ITK. Proposal describes how project ensures capacity, partnerships, and/or processes necessary to develop or implement a plan. Proposal articulates the degree to which the project will advance outcomes and goals set forth in a plan(s). |
| 5 | Project meaningfully advances one or more existing conservation, restoration, resilience, stewardship, or recovery plans or is wholly guided by ITK. Proposal describes how project establishes and adaptively manages capacity, partnerships, and/or processes necessary to develop or implement a plan. Proposal articulates outcomes and goals set forth in a plan(s) that will be achieved. |
| Partnership and Community Impact | |
| 1 | The project is not supported by a partnership or lacks capacity. The applicant does not engage or contribute to the capacity of local community members, leaders and other relevant or impacted stakeholders. |
| 2 | The project appears to be supported by a partnership with sufficient capacity, but proposal lacks details. The applicant acknowledges but does not engage local community members, leaders and other relevant stakeholders in the project. Project does not develop capacity in non-traditional partners, engage an underserved community, uplift Tribal and Indigenous led efforts, or boost the conservation workforce (e.g., AmeriCorps and 21 st Century Conservation Service Corps). |
| 3 | The project is supported by a narrow but adequate partnership. The applicant informs, partners with, and engages with some local community members, leaders, and other relevant stakeholders to develop and implement the project. Project is likely to do one of the following: develops capacity in non-traditional partners, engages an underserved community, uplifts Tribal and Indigenous led efforts, and/or develops the conservation workforce (e.g., AmeriCorps and 21 st Century Conservation Service Corps). |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| 4 | The project is supported by a comprehensive partnership with necessary expertise and capacity. The applicant partners with, elevates, and engages collaboratively with diverse local community members, leaders, community-based organizations, and other relevant stakeholders to develop and implement the project but may omit some key constituencies. Project directly engages non-traditional partners or underserved communities and broadens the sustained impact from the project. Project is likely to do more than one of the following: develops capacity in non-traditional partners, uplifts Tribal and Indigenous led efforts, and/or develops the conservation workforce (e.g., AmeriCorps and 21 st Century Conservation Service Corps). |
| 5 | The project is supported by a robust partnership with necessary expertise and capacity. The applicant partners with, elevates, and engages collaboratively with or directly represents diverse local community members, leaders, community-based organizations, and other relevant stakeholders to develop and implement the project. Project engages non-traditional partners or communities—or are applicants themselves—thereby broadening the sustained impact from the project. Project develops capacity in non-traditional partners, uplifts Tribal and Indigenous led efforts, and/or develops the restoration workforce (i.e. AmeriCorps and 21 st Century Conservation Service Corps). |
| Budget | |
| 1 | Amount requested is not proportionate to proposed outcomes and project is not cost-effective. Costs are not allowable, reasonable, and budgeted in accordance with NFWF’s Budget Instructions cost categories. Match is insufficient. Costs are not justified. |
| 2 | Amount requested does not seem proportionate to proposed outcomes and project is likely not cost-effective. Some costs are allowable, reasonable, and budgeted in accordance with NFWF’s Budget Instructions cost categories. The budget does not include enough detail to determine overall cost effectiveness. Match contributions are unclear. The costs are not reasonable for the area where work is being performed and for the tasks being proposed. |
| 3 | Amount requested is somewhat proportionate to proposed outcomes. Costs are mostly allowable, reasonable, and budgeted in accordance with NFWF’s Budget Instructions cost categories. The budget includes some details, but overall cost effectiveness is unclear. Match contributions are likely sufficient but lack details. The costs are somewhat reasonable for the area where work is being performed and for the tasks being proposed. |
| 4 | Amount requested is proportionate to proposed outcomes. Costs are allowable, reasonable, and budgeted in accordance with NFWF’s Budget Instructions cost categories. The budget includes sufficient details to assess overall cost effectiveness. Match is sufficient and most details are clear. The costs are largely reasonable for the area where work is being performed and for the tasks being proposed. |
| 5 | Amount requested is proportionate to proposed outcomes. Costs are allowable, reasonable, and budgeted in accordance with NFWF’s Budget Instructions cost categories. The budget includes robust detail enabling a clear picture of overall cost effectiveness. Match is sufficient, detailed, and fully eligible. Costs are reasonable for the area where work is being performed and for the tasks being proposed. The budget and match include sufficient detail and justification to instill confidence that proposed outcomes will be achieved. |