Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE
FIFTH REGULAR SESSION
Port Vila, Vanuatu
10-21 August 2009

Guidelines Outlining the Process for Formulating the
Work Programme and Budget of the Scientific Committee
(Revision of Attachment M, SC4 Summary Report)

WCPFC-SC5-2009/GN-WP-04
27 July 2009

Introduction

SC4 Summary Report, Paragraph 310 requested the Secretariat to further develop Table 2 of SC4-Attachment M, with consideration of increasing the weight given to cost factors, and to prepare a template for project proposals in consultation with the Chair of the SC and SWG conveners. The following revision is provided for consideration at SC5. SC5 is invited to refine and finalize the Guidelines.

GUIDELINES OUTLINING THE PROCESS FOR FORMULATING THE WORK PROGRAMME AND BUDGET OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

At SC4, aAn informal small group (ISG) met during afternoon tea on Monday, 18 August to discussed working paper SC4-GN-WP-3. This working paper outlined two options for supporting the process of updating the SC work programme and science budget, and identifying projects to be supported by the WCPFC science budget.

Based on this discussion, the process identified in Table 1 below (closely based on Option B in SC4-GN-WP-3) was agreed upon and recommended toadopted by the SC4.

SC5 further considered Table 2 (Research proposal assessment criteria) and a template for project proposals (Table 3).

Table 1. Schedule outlining the process for updating the SC work programme and science budget and identifying projects to be supported by the WCPFC science budget

Month	Task/Activity	Responsibility
August	1. Update SC work programme 2. Prioritize projects (i.e. High, Medium, Low) 3. Scoping of High priority projects 4. Science budget	ISG makes recommendations to SC for discussion and adoption
December	Commission reviews and endorses SC recommendations	Commission
December	Call for expressions of interest for priority projects posted on WCPFC website[1]	Secretariat

31 January	Deadline for receipt of proposals by Secretariat	Proposer
February	Review and appraisal (and modification, if required) of proposals and identification of projects for funding support (using agreed proposal assessment criteria)[2]	Secretariat (coordinator)/ SWG Convenors/ Expert Advisors
March	Signing project contracts	Secretariat
August	1. Update SC work programme 2. Prioritize projects (High, Medium, Low) 3. Science budget	ISG makes recommendations to SC for discussion and adoption
December	Commission reviews and endorses SC recommendations	Commission

[1] There is the option of posting the recommended prioritised SC Work Programme on the website after completion of the SC in order to provide more time for consideration by scientists/organizations who may submit a proposal. The approved budget for supporting proposals would not be known until after the Commission meets in December.
[2] Example selection criteria are given in Table 2.

Table 2. ~~Example r~~Research proposal assessment criteria

Assessment Criteria	Score (1,2,3)	Justification for score
Attractiveness		
Is proposal aligned with requests from the Commission and WCPFC research priorities?		
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 proposal aligned with the budget scale that the Commission allocated to?		
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 (out of 30)		

Scores for assessing proposals: 1 = Low; 2 = Medium; 3 = High

Table 3. Template for project proposals

Sub-title	Remarks
Objective	
Scope and tasks	
Outputs and schedule	
Capacity statement	
Work plan, including methodology and data accessibility	
Detailed costs for funding	
Contract person for reference	