



North Pacific Fisheries Commission

Guidelines Outlining the Process for Submission, Review, Approval and Implementation of Projects to Finalize the Commission Work Program and Budget

Abstract:

This process includes five steps: (1) review and prioritization of the submitted projects by an appropriate Committee, (2) endorsement to and approval by the Commission, (3) call for expressions of interest for approved projects and receiving proposals where appropriate, (4) evaluation of proposals and signing of contracts with successful bidders, and (5) monitoring review and reporting on project implementation.

Table 1. Schedule outlining the process for submission, review, approval and implementation of projects to be supported by the NPFC budget

Time	Task/Activity	Responsibility
Committee's meeting (<i>SC in spring, TCC in summer</i>)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update Committee's work program including projects* submitted by Members or subsidiary bodies 2. Review and re-prioritize projects (i.e. High, Medium, Low) 3. Source of funds (Committee's fund or Special Project Fund (SPF)) 	Informal Small Group compiles the projects, prioritize them and makes recommendations to Committee for consideration and adoption
FAC and Commission meetings (<i>summer</i>)	FAC reviews SC and TCC recommendations and prioritize projects suggested to be funded by SPF. Commission reviews and approves FAC recommendations.	FAC Commission
After Commission meeting (<i>summer</i>)	Call for expressions of interest for priority projects posted on NPFC website** Requirements for proposals are listed in Table 3.	Secretariat
<i>October</i>	Deadline for receipt of proposals by Secretariat	Proposer
<i>November</i>	Review and appraisal (and modification, if required) of proposals and identification of projects for funding support using agreed proposal assessment criteria in Table 2	Secretariat and Chair, if appropriate
	Signing project contracts	Secretariat
Committee's meeting (<i>SC in spring, TCC in summer</i>)	<p>Reports on the status of projects approved the previous year(s), and for new projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update Committee's work program including projects* submitted by Members or subsidiary bodies 2. Review and re-prioritize projects (i.e. High, Medium, Low) 3. Source of funds (Committee's fund or Special Project Fund (SPF)) 	Informal Small Group compiles the projects, prioritize them and makes recommendations to Committee for consideration and adoption
FAC and Commission meetings (<i>summer</i>)	FAC reviews SC and TCC recommendations and prioritize projects suggested to be funded by SPF. Commission reviews and approves FAC recommendations.	FAC Commission

* Project submission shall include Project title, Description, Objective, Tasks/TOR, Expected outputs, Timelines, Rough estimation of costs, History/Background.

** There is the option of posting the recommended projects on the website after completion of the Committee's meeting in order to provide more time for consideration by organizations which may submit a proposal. The approved budget for supporting proposals would not be known until after the Commission meets in summer.

Table 2. Proposal assessment criteria

Assessment Criteria	Score (1-5)	Justification for score
Attractiveness		
Is the proposal aligned with a priority project listed in the Commission’s or Committee’s Work Programs and the budget allocated to it?		
Is the need and are the planned outputs/benefits well-defined and relevant?		
Adoption and uptake. What is the level of impact and likelihood that the project outputs will be adopted? Is the pathway for uptake described?		
Cost effectiveness: Is the project cost effective? Is it using other sources to lever additional funds?		
Is there an appropriate level of collaboration between the applicant and other relevant researchers, fisheries managers and the fishing industry?		
Feasibility		
Are the objectives clearly specified and are they consistent with the planned project outputs/benefits?		
Sound methodology: Is the project design/method well described and is it consistent with the projects objectives?		
Likelihood of success: Are the project objectives likely to be achieved?		
Is there a strategy for managing data arising from the project so that it will be easily accessible by others in the future?		
Applicant’s expertise/experience. Does the research team have the ability, capacity and track record to deliver the outputs?		
Total score		

Scores for assessing proposals: 1 = very low; 2 = low; 3 = medium; 4 = high; 5 = very high

Table 3. Proposals should address, as a minimum, the following issues:

Part A: Administrative Summary	Part B: Project Proposal Description
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Project Title 2) Organization 3) Administrative Contact 4) Principal Investigator and CV 5) Commencement and Completion Date 6) Project Budget Summary – Salaries, Travel, Operating and Other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Background and Need 2) Objectives 3) Project Outcomes 4) Form of Results 5) Methods 6) Risks of project not achieving Project Objectives 7) Schedule of Milestones 8) Other Related Projects 9) Project Staff and CV's 10) Detailed costs against milestones