

Wildlife Habitat Canada  
Grant Review Criteria - External  
Habitat Conservation Stamp Initiative

| WHC Application Review - External Review Panel  |                    |
|---|--------------------|
| Habitat Conservation Projects   |                    |
| Criteria  | Scoring Range      |
| Supports NAWMP<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 5<br>- Project connection to NAWMP objectives   | 0-20               |
| Focus on Direct Interventions for Habitat<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 3 and 4<br>- Project focus on direct/on-the-ground interventions related to habitat conservation/restoration/enhancement   | 0-5                |
| Quality/Value of Habitat to be Impacted<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 3 and 8<br>- Species involved, acres involved, estimated location of acres   | 0-10               |
| Quality and Breadth of Partnerships<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 3, 4, 6 and 9  | 0-10               |
| Future Plans<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 2 and 7<br>- Well-defined plans for future activities beyond the scope of the project? Long term impacts of the project?<br>Previous funding and project results?   | 0-5                |
| Additional Points<br>- To reflect additional value of the project   | 0-5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>55</b>          |
| Conservation Networking Projects  |                    |
| Criteria  | Scoring Range      |
| Supports NAWMP<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 5<br>- Project connection to NAWMP objectives   | 0-15               |
| Program Planning Evaluation<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 3 and 7<br>- Review of the overall program planning and evaluation plans on the success of the program   | 0-10               |
| Audience<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 4<br>- Breadth of the projects target audience, overall expected reach of the project, etc.   | 0-5                |
| Communications Potential<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 7<br>- Is there a strong strategy to promote the project? Is there potential for communications collaborations with the organization and WHC?   | 0-5                |
| Future Plans<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 2 and 7<br>- Well-defined plans for future activities beyond the scope of the project? Long term impacts of the project?<br>Previous funding and project results?   | 0-10               |
| Quality and Breadth of Partnerships<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 3, 4, 6 and 9  | 0-5                |
| Additional Points<br>- To reflect additional value of the project   | 0-5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>55</b>          |
| Research Projects   |                    |
| Criteria  | Scoring Range      |
| Supports NAWMP<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 5<br>- Project connection to NAWMP objectives   | 0-20               |
| Innovative Developments in Project<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 3<br>- Does the project involve the development of new, pilot or innovative habitat conservation tools?   | 0-10               |
| Science Transfer<br>- Does the project indicate that the results will be published?<br>- Does the project indicate that the results will be used to transfer the information in a technology transfer (ex: workshops)?<br>- Does the applicant have any demonstrated ability to publish past results? | 0-5                |
| Focus on Direct or Indirect Interventions for Habitat<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 3 and 4<br>- Project focus on direct/on-the-ground interventions related to habitat conservation/restoration/enhancement   | 0-5                |
| Quality and Breadth of Partnerships<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 3, 4, 6 and 9  | 0-5                |
| Future Plans<br>- Evaluation of Application Section 2 and 7<br>- Well-defined plans for future activities beyond the scope of the project? Long term impacts of the project?<br>Previous funding and project results?   | 0-5                |
| Additional Points<br>- To reflect additional value of the project   | 0-5                |
| Letter of Support<br>- Is there a Letter of Support from the Joint Venture attached to the application?   | Yes/No             |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>55</b>          |
| NL Murre Projects   |                    |
| Criteria  | Scoring Range      |
| Defined Goals and Objectives<br>- Well-defined, SMART goals (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound)   | Qualitative Review |
| Collaborative Partnerships<br>- Demonstrates a collaborative, coordinated partnership approach  | Qualitative Review |
| Project Location<br>- NL-based projects will be prioritized over Murre projects in other provinces  | Qualitative Review |
| Commitment to Responsible Hunting<br>- Demonstrate a commitment to increasing awareness of responsible hunting and it's relationship to conservation  | Qualitative Review |
| Hunting Stewardship<br>- Dedication to sustaining hunting stewardship for future generations  | Qualitative Review |
| Applicant Background<br>- Nature and background of the applicant and their relevance to the program   | Qualitative Review |
| Application Relevancy<br>- Degree of importance and sustainability of the project as it relates to the principles of the program  | Qualitative Review |

Wildlife Habitat Canada  
Grant Review Criteria - Internal  
Habitat Conservation Stamp Initiative

| WHC Application Review - Internal   |                    |
|---|--------------------|
| Habitat Conservation Projects   |                    |
| Criteria  | Scoring Range      |
| Total Land Area (conserved/restored/enhanced)<br>- 1-50 acres of habitat = 0-4 points<br>- 51+ acres of habitat = 5-10 points   | 0-10               |
| Focus on Waterfowl/Migratory Game Birds<br>- Focus on waterfowl species/wetland associated migratory game birds/species at risk   | 0-3                |
| Participation in On-the-Ground Programs<br>- Considers the number of anticipated participants/in-person days  | 0-10               |
| Voluntary Preventative Measures/Stewardship<br>- Encompasses a wide range of voluntary actions<br>- # of landowners involved, amount of in-kind contribution, etc.  | 0-2                |
| Waterfowl/Migratory Game Bird Hunting<br>- Allowance for access to migratory game bird hunting<br>- Plans to acknowledge the contributions of hunters to conservation   | 0-5                |
| Multiple Project Partners<br>- 1-3 partners = 0-2 points<br>- 3+ partners = 3-5 points  | 0-5                |
| Match Ratio/Funds Leveraged<br>- Total partner contributions in comparison to the WHC funding request<br>- Minimum 1:1 match ratio (excluding government funds)   | 0-10               |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>45</b>          |
| Conservation Networking Projects  |                    |
| Criteria  | Scoring Range      |
| Total Land Area (conserved/restored/enhanced)<br>- 1-10 acres of habitat = 0-2 points<br>- 11+ acres of habitat = 3-5 points  | 0-5                |
| Project Focuses<br>- Connection to wetland education, hunter education and hunter recruitment   | 0-5                |
| Waterfowl/Migratory Game Bird Hunting<br>- Clear focus on waterfowl/migratory game birds<br>- Plans to acknowledge the contributions of hunters to conservation   | 0-5                |
| Participation in On-the-Ground Programs<br>- Considers the number of anticipated participants/in-person days  | 0-10               |
| Voluntary Preventative Measures/Stewardship<br>- Encompasses a wide range of voluntary actions<br>- # of landowners involved, amount of in-kind contribution, etc.  | 0-5                |
| Multiple Project Partners<br>- 1-3 partners = 0-2 points<br>- 3+ partners = 3-5 points  | 0-5                |
| Match Ratio/Funds Leveraged<br>- Total partner contributions in comparison to the WHC funding request<br>- Minimum 1:1 match ratio (excluding government funds)   | 0-10               |
| Program Curriculum<br>- Is there a well-developed program curriculum attached to the application?   | Yes/No             |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>45</b>          |
| Research Projects   |                    |
| Criteria  | Scoring Range      |
| Project Focuses<br>- Focus on waterfowl species/wetland associated migratory game birds/species at risk<br>- Focus on Joint Venture priority species  | 0-5                |
| Participation in On-the-Ground Programs<br>- Considers the number of anticipated participants/in-person days  | 0-10               |
| Voluntary Preventative Measures/Stewardship<br>- Encompasses a wide range of voluntary actions<br>- # of landowners involved, amount of in-kind contribution, etc.  | 0-10               |
| Waterfowl/Migratory Game Bird Hunting<br>- Clear focus on waterfowl/migratory game birds<br>- Research will improve MGBH opportunities in some way<br>- Plans to acknowledge the contributions of hunters to conservation | 0-5                |
| Multiple Project Partners<br>- 1-3 partners = 0-2 points<br>- 3+ partners = 3-5 points  | 0-5                |
| Match Ratio/Funds Leveraged<br>- Total partner contributions in comparison to the WHC funding request<br>- Minimum 1:1 match ratio (excluding government funds)   | 0-10               |
| Letter of Support<br>- Is there a Letter of Support from the Joint Venture attached to the application?   | Yes/No             |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>45</b>          |
| NL Murre Projects   |                    |
| Criteria  | Scoring Range      |
| Defined Goals and Objectives<br>- Well-defined, SMART goals (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound)   | Qualitative Review |
| Collaborative Partnerships<br>- Demonstrates a collaborative, coordinated partnership approach  | Qualitative Review |
| Project Location<br>- NL-based projects will be prioritized over Murre projects in other provinces  | Qualitative Review |
| Commitment to Responsible Hunting<br>- Demonstrate a commitment to increasing awareness of responsible hunting and it's relationship to conservation  | Qualitative Review |
| Hunting Stewardship<br>- Dedication to sustaining hunting stewardship for future generations  | Qualitative Review |
| Applicant Background<br>- Nature and background of the applicant and their relevance to the program   | Qualitative Review |
| Application Relevancy<br>- Degree of importance and sustainability of the project as it relates to the principles of the program  | Qualitative Review |