

**The Commission for the Conservation and Management of  
Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean**

**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**

---

The SC4 adopted the process for formulating the work programme and budget of the Scientific Committee as identified in Table 1 below. SC5 further considered Table 2 (Research proposal assessment criteria) and a template for project proposals in Table 3 and adopted the process as a revision. This process may be reviewed as needed.

**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
SC Meeting in August	1. Update list of SC work programme 2. Review and re-prioritize project themes (i.e. High, Medium, Low) 3. Scoping of New High priority project themes (objectives, scope and tasks, and expected outputs) 4. Science budget	Informal Small Group, including Research Sub-Committee, makes recommendations on Task/Activity to SC Plenary for consideration and adoption
December	Commission reviews and endorses SC recommendations	Commission
December	Call for expressions of interest for priority project themes posted on WCPFC website <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat
February	Deadline for receipt of proposals by Secretariat	Proposer
March	Review and appraisal (and modification, if required) of proposals and identification of projects for funding support using agreed proposal assessment criteria in Table 2	Research Sub-committee: Secretariat (coordinator), SWG Convenors, and Expert Advisors
	Signing project contracts	Secretariat
August	1. Update list of SC work programme 2. Review and re-prioritize project themes (High, Medium, Low)	Informal Small Group, in consultation with SWG conveners, makes recommendations on Task/Activity to SC Plenary for

	3. Scoping of New High priority project themes (objectives, scope and tasks, and expected outputs) 4. Science budget	consideration and adoption
December	Commission reviews and endorses SC recommendations	Commission

<sup>1</sup> 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.

**Table 2.** Research proposal assessment criteria

Assessment Criteria	Score (1-5)	Justification for score
<b>Attractiveness</b>		
Is the proposal aligned with a priority project listed in the Commission's Scientific Work Programme 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?		
<b>Feasibility</b>		
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?		
<b>Total score</b>		

# 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:

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