



**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE  
SEVENTEENTH REGULAR SESSION  
ELECTRONIC MEETING  
11-19 August 2021**

---

**Scoring of the Proposed Scientific Committee Projects**

---

**WCPFC-SC17-GN-WP-01  
August 17 2021 Rev2**

**Prepared by the PNA Members and Tokelau**

## **Introduction**

PNA members and Tokelau have noted that there is some ambiguity on how the proposed projects are scored for the work plan and budget under Agenda item 6.1. In the past proposals are scored High, Medium and Low, with some Members, Cooperating Non-Member and Participating Territories (CCMs) adding in High 1, High 2 or Medium low. There are no agreed criteria that are regularly used to separate proposals into these ranks. This leads to some ambiguity in how proposals are scored, and similar priorities could mean different things to different CCMs.

## **Proposal**

In order to resolve this, we propose that the SC project ranking is changed to a scoring system with specific definitions for the scores applied to proposals and that the average of the scores provided by all CCMs for each proposal provides the final priority rank.

In order to progress this, we have developed a scoring table (Table 1) for CCMs input and consideration. The table is 2- dimensional. The first dimension provides consideration for the projects importance to providing management advice and also for consideration of projects that assist the functioning of the SC. The second dimension introduces a likelihood of success concept. This is a useful approach as it not only notes the contributions to the SC but also the tractability of the work.

The proposed projects are then ranked simply by averaging the scores for each proposal provided by CCMs at the SC. The overall scores then provide the project ranking as high (scores of 6-9), =medium (scores 3-4) and low (scores 1-2).

The PNA Members and Tokelau have received feedback and support from a number of CCMs and make the following recommendation: **SC recommends that Table 1 be used to score and rank SC projects. This system will be implemented for use at SC17 and used thereafter.**

**Table 1: SC project scoring table. Colours represent priority rankings as follows orange = High; purple = Medium; blue = Low.**

		Importance to WCPFC Management Outcomes or to the functioning of the SC			
		Rank	Low	Moderate	High
Feasibility: Likelihood of Success	Low	1	2	3	
	Moderate	2	4	6	
	High	3	6	9	

Notes:

**Importance criteria** evaluate the significance of the outcomes of the proposal in contributing to the successful management of the WCPFC stocks or the functioning of the SC (e.g. is the proposal aligned with the WCPFC research and/or management priorities; does the proposal contribute to the effective planning and functioning of the SC; are the intended outputs/benefits well-defined and relevant; what is the level of impact and likelihood that the proposal outputs will be adopted; is the proposal cost effective). High= Essential; Moderate=Important but not essential; Low=Not Important.

**Feasibility criteria** evaluate the proposal’s potential for success i.e., how likely is the proposal to achieve its stated objectives (e.g. are the objectives clearly stated, is the methodology sound, are the project objectives realistic and likely to be achieved, does the research team [if identified] have the ability, capacity and track record to deliver the outputs).