

NHCP-LTCF EVALUATION TABLE 2021-2022

Please note, WHC will conduct a preliminary review and evaluation of each application for eligibility and program requirements. WHC will assess applications on hectares, match and risk (projects with 3 or more landowners will be subject to additional evaluation parameters). Applications deemed eligible by WHC, will be presented to the External Review Panel for further consideration.

FOR USE BY NHCP-LTCF EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL MEMBERS:

External Review Panel - Application Evaluation Form NHCP-LTCF - Large Grant Program			
Please select one ranking per row.			
Conservation and Biodiversity Significance	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
The project takes place in an area identified as a Key Conservation Area (KCA) meaning areas including ECCC priority places or areas identified in provincial protected areas plans/strategies, provincial habitat conservation strategies, or regionally identified priority ecosystem types or places.			
KEY	<i>Satisfactory = project demonstrates inclusion 1 element</i>	<i>Good = project takes place in a KCA and demonstrates inclusion in 1 elements</i>	<i>Excellent = project takes place in a KCA and demonstrates inclusion of 2 + elements</i>
Comment for special consideration:			

Poor: it is of a low quality or standard or it is in bad condition; Satisfactory: meets the minimum requirements; Good: exceeds the minimum requirements but there remains area for improvement; Excellent: exceeds the minimum requirements and offers additional value added.

***Evaluation form/content subject to change**

The project protects habitat for federally or provincially identified species at risk (SAR) with the applicant having identified the number of species at risk, their status, as well as the significance and area of the habitat for the species.	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
KEY	<i>Poor = project protects 0 SAR</i>	<i>Satisfactory = project protects 1 SAR</i>	<i>Good= project protects 2 SAR OR 1 high risk species</i>	<i>Excellent = project protects 3 + SAR OR 2+ high risk species</i>
Comment for special consideration:				
Points for projects that specifically protect habitat for species federally listed as threatened or endangered (FT/E) – again the applicant should identify the species, their status as well as the significance of the habitat.	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
KEY	<i>Poor = project protects 0 FT/E</i>	<i>Satisfactory = project protects 1 FT</i>	<i>Good= project protects 2+ FT OR 1 FE</i>	<i>Excellent = project protects 1+ FT AND at least 1 FE</i>
Comment for special consideration:				

Poor: it is of a low quality or standard or it is in bad condition; Satisfactory: meets the minimum requirements; Good: exceeds the minimum requirements but there remains area for improvement; Excellent: exceeds the minimum requirements and offers additional value added.

**Evaluation form/content subject to change*

The project identifies habitat important for continental migrants (CMs) (e.g., Important Bird Areas, RAMSAR Wetlands of Significance) or is located within a Biosphere Reserve (BR).	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
KEY	<i>Poor = project not ID'd for CMs and not in a BR</i>	<i>Satisfactory = project is ID'd for CMs but not in a BR</i>	<i>Good = project is ID'd for CMs AND is in a BR</i>	<i>Excellent = project encompasses 1+ important habitats for CMs AND is in a BR</i>
Comment for special consideration:				
The project protects a broad range of biodiversity i.e. does it have high biodiversity vs for example habitat for a single species at risk but not necessarily for a broad range of species.	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Comment for special consideration:				
The project contributes to the conservation of an ecosystem or habitat that is currently underrepresented in federal/provincial protected areas targets (this can be defined on either a provincially based ecological sub-region or the national natural regions).	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Comment for special consideration:				

Poor: it is of a low quality or standard or it is in bad condition; Satisfactory: meets the minimum requirements; Good: exceeds the minimum requirements but there remains area for improvement; Excellent: exceeds the minimum requirements and offers additional value added.

**Evaluation form/content subject to change*

Connectivity and/or Adjacency to Other Conservation Lands	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Expands area of existing protected conservation lands (public or private) through adjacency or near adjacency.				
Comment for special consideration:				
Supports functional connectivity between (b/w) patches of habitat and ideally between protected patches of habitat.	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
KEY	<i>Poor = project demonstrates no connectivity</i>	<i>Satisfactory = project demonstrates connectivity b/w patches of habitat (not protected)</i>	<i>Good = project demonstrates connectivity b/w normal and protected patches</i>	<i>Excellent = project demonstrates connectivity b/w 2+ protected patches</i>
Comment for special consideration:				

Poor: it is of a low quality or standard or it is in bad condition; Satisfactory: meets the minimum requirements; Good: exceeds the minimum requirements but there remains area for improvement; Excellent: exceeds the minimum requirements and offers additional value added.

**Evaluation form/content subject to change*

Project Resiliency	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
There is minimal risk to the long-term preservation of the project's biodiversity value based on adjacent land use, conservation tool used, and proposed management regime.				
Comment for special consideration:				

Conservation Co-benefits	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
<p>The project has co-benefits that are well identified and of meaningful scale/impact. NHCP identifies the following 5 co-benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recovery of species at risk • Prevention of other species from becoming at risk • Climate change adaptation and mitigation • Provision of ecosystem • Services and opportunities for completion of ecological gifts 				
KEY	<i>Poor: 0 identified co-benefits</i>	<i>Satisfactory: 1 identified co-benefit</i>	<i>Good: 2 identified co-benefits</i>	<i>Excellent: 3+ identified co-benefits</i>
Comment for special consideration:				

Poor: it is of a low quality or standard or it is in bad condition; Satisfactory: meets the minimum requirements; Good: exceeds the minimum requirements but there remains area for improvement; Excellent: exceeds the minimum requirements and offers additional value added.

**Evaluation form/content subject to change*