Site Visit Date:

Award Number:

Project Title:

Lead Principal Investigator:

Meeting Location:

Meeting Time:

Period Covered by this site visit (month/year): From \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_To \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

List of Attendees:

This form complements the *NOAA RESTORE Science Program Site Visit form*. It should be completed during an official site visit by the federal program officer (FPO) or designated technical monitor (TM) for a Science Program project. Completed evaluations should be submitted to the RESTORE Science Program (frank.parker@noaa.gov) within 30 days of the site visit.

Site visits are an opportunity to review the performance, quality, and relevance of ongoing projects funded by the RESTORE Science Program. Please refer to the *NOAA RESTORE Science Program Site Visit form* for detailed definitions of these terms and for detailed guidance about Science Program site visits (*e.g*., frequency, attendees, location, costs, purpose, topics to include, *etc*.). An agenda for the site visit should be developed by the PI and TM and approved by the FPO at least two weeks in advance of the meeting.

Site visits should cover progress and challenges to date and also look forward at least one year at upcoming activities and anticipated challenges. Site visits should include a thorough review of the research team, the science, application of the science and engagements with end users, data management, financial execution of the project, and environmental compliance and permit actions. Site visits may also include inspection or review of facilities and equipment, field sites, environmental compliance and permit controls, accounting and administrative controls, special award conditions, and other items as determined by the FPO or TM. The session should conclude with a status review of a project’s *Milestones and Gantt Timeline*, and include a discussion of mitigation measures for any that are ‘behind schedule’.

**Guidance**

Please assess each of the sections below, 1-4, during the site visit. For each section, please summarize the (a) key updates, (b) accomplishments, and (c) issues/red flags. If you are aware of updates, accomplishments, and issues/red flags not presented by the research team, please include those and indicate that they are your observations. Please also include your (d) recommendations under each section. After completing sections 1-4, please complete section 5 and assess the state of the overall project for *Performance*, *Quality*, and *Relevance* by selecting the appropriate rating (see below) and providing written input to explain your rating.

1. **Research team**
	1. Key updates
	2. Accomplishments
	3. Issues/red flags
	4. Recommendations
2. **Looking back**
	1. Key updates
	2. Accomplishments
	3. Issues/red flags
	4. Recommendations
3. **Looking forward**
	1. Key updates
	2. Accomplishments
	3. Issues/red flags, including contingencies
	4. Recommendations
4. **Project Administration**
	1. Key updates
	2. Accomplishments
	3. Issues/red flags
	4. Recommendations
5. **State of overall project:** please select a rating for the project based on what was presented during the site visit and provide a written rationale for that rating under the categories *Performance*, *Quality*, and *Relevance* (see *NOAA RESTORE Science Program Site Visit form* for definitions).

 Rating Options:

* *Highest Performance*: Project greatly exceeds the Satisfactory level and is outstanding in almost all areas (*e.g.*, deadlines for milestones, tasks, and deliverables are consistently met; findings are or will significantly advance the science; and end user application is particularly strong).
* *Exceeds Expectations*: Project goes well beyond the Satisfactory level and is outstanding in many areas.
* *Satisfactory*: Project meets expectations and generally meets deadlines for milestones, tasks, and deliverables.
* *Needs Improvement*: Project does not reach expectations and may not meet deadlines for milestones, tasks, and deliverables.

RATING:

* Rationale:
	+ Performance
	+ Quality
	+ Relevance