

**TABLE 2 - SMALL CETACEAN CONSERVATION RESEARCH PROPOSALS - REVIEW CRITERIA**

	Criteria	Weighting	Score
1	Is the intrinsic scientific value of the project of a high standard?	0 Not demonstrated 1 Low scientific value 2 Useful/basic scientific value 3 Good scientific value 4 Very good scientific value 5 Excellent/innovative scientific value	
2	How well will the scientific outcomes of the project address the Small Cetaceans subcommittee priority areas?	0 Not addressed 1 Poorly addressed 2 Reasonably addressed 3 Well addressed 4 Very well addressed 5 Excellently addressed	
3	Does the methodology outlined effectively and efficiently address the research questions in the proposal?	0 Not demonstrated 1 Poor methodology 2 Reasonable methodology 3 Good methodology 4 Very good methodology 5 Excellent methodology <i>*Yes after incorporation of reviewers' suggestions</i>	
4	Does the project involve good participation and engagement of regional participants?	0 Not demonstrated 1 Poor engagement proposed 2 Reasonable engagement proposed 3 Good engagement proposed 4 Very good engagement proposed 5 Excellent engagement proposed	
5	Is the research proposed feasible, well organised and timeline achievable?	0 Not demonstrated 1 Feasibility, organisation and timeline unrealistic 2 Feasibility, organisation and timeline not properly addressed 3 Feasibility, organisation and timeline sound 4 Feasibility, organisation and timeline demonstrated well 5 Feasibility, organisation and timeline very well demonstrated <i>*Yes after incorporation of reviewers' suggestions</i>	
6	Do you consider the principal investigator and research team have demonstrated that they are capable of conducting the research and publishing the results?	0 Not demonstrated 1 Poor record 2 Reasonable record 3 Good record 4 Very good record 5 The Principal Investigator and research team have an excellent research and publication record relevant to the proposed work	