**UFS-R2O Year 3 Review; December 6&7, 2021**

**Evaluation Worksheet**

**Name of reviewer:** *reviewer’s name*

**Application name:** *application name (MRW/S2S, SRW/CAM, or Hurricane)*

**Development area/areas (if needed):** *development area/areas (Atmospheric Composition, Marine Components, Atmospheric Physics and Dynamics, Data Assimilation, Reanalysis & Reforecast, Application Support, Modeling Infrastructure, or Verification & Post-Processing Infrastructure)*

**Please provide comments, observations/findings, and recommendations for each of the questions below. Due to NOAA program office (****jamese.sims@noaa.gov** **and** **farida.adimi@noaa.gov****) by December 14, 2021.**

**Evaluation Criteria**

1. **Importance/Relevance and Applicability** of Proposed Project to Program Goals: This criterion determines if there is intrinsic value in the proposed work and/or relevance to NOAA, federal, regional, state, or local activities. This criterion is not intended to evaluate technical or scientific merit.
	1. Is the proposed project appropriately aligned with other modeling efforts, including the broader UFS community, other programs/projects at NOAA, and with the broader national/international NWP and modeling community?
	2. Does the proposed project adequately foster code unification, contributing towards the reduction of the number of code versions in use by the UFS and NCEP?
2. **Research Leadership and Planning**: Assess whether the project has clearly defined objectives, scope, and methodologies.
	1. Does the proposed project include an effective strategy to bring research-to- operations and operations-to-research (R2O2R)?
	2. Does it include engagement with the research community to achieve forecast improvements and engagement with the forecast community to achieve forecast goals?
	3. Does the Project have a clear management and organization plan?
3. **Technical/Scientific Merit**: This criterion assesses if the proposed approach is technically sound and/or innovative, if the methods are appropriate, and clarity of project schedule and outputs.
	1. How technically sound are the proposed methods and solutions to the scientific problem?
	2. How achievable are the proposed methods and solutions to the scientific problem?
	3. How does the proposed project improve technology, concepts, or methods and advance the field of study?
	4. If applicable, how clearly does the proposed project advance technology, concepts, or methods to eventually improve NOAA operations?
	5. How clear and feasible is the schedule for milestones, outputs, and advancing Readiness Levels (RLs)?
	6. How clearly defined are metrics to evaluate project success and/or failure?