

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

Scientific Committee
Ninth Regular Session

Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia
6-14 August 2013

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

The Fourth Regular Session of the Scientific Committee (SC4) adopted the process for formulating SC's work programme and budget 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. Further discussion was undertaken at SC9 where Table 1 was reviewed. This process may be reviewed as needed.

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

Month	Task/Activity	Responsibility
1) SC meeting in August, year 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review, prioritize (High, Medium, Low) and update Record of SC work programme 2. Select appropriate high priority projects for funding 3. Scope new high priority projects (objectives, scope and tasks, and expected outputs) 4. Formulate budget for SC's consideration 5. ISG recommends specific projects to SC plenary for consideration and adoption. 	Informal Small Group, including Research Sub-Committee (RSC), makes recommendations on Task/Activity to SC plenary for consideration and adoption. Research Sub-committee includes Secretariat (coordinator), SC Chair, Theme Convenors, and Expert Advisors
2) December, year 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commission reviews and endorses SC-recommended projects including the budget. 	Commission
3) January – July, year 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Call for expressions of interest projects by posting advertisement on WCPFC's website 2. Secretariat distributes scoring matrix with received proposals to RSC members. 3. RSC members score projects, consider/negotiate budgets and scope of work with proposers. 4. RSC selects final projects for funding. 5. Secretariat finalizes contracts with selected consultants. 	Secretariat, RSC, proposer
4) August, year 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Secretariat reports to SC on the progress described in section 3) above 2. Redo steps 1–4 in section 1) above. 	Secretariat, ISG, RSC, SC,

5) December, year 2 – July, year 3	1. Same as shown in section 2) – 3) above	Commission, Secretariat, RSC, proposer
6) August, year 3	1. Consultants present papers contracted in section 3) to SC detailing the work undertaken and results achieved. 2. Secretariat reports to SC on the progress described in section 5) above 3. Redo steps 1–4 in section 1) above	Consultant Secretariat, ISG, RSC, SC

Table 2: Research 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 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?		
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 issues below.

Part A: Administrative summary	Part B: Project proposal description
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Project title2) Organization3) Administrative contact4) Principal investigator and CV5) Commencement and completion date6) Project budget summary: salaries, travel, operating and other	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Background and need (also identify which project within SC's work programme the proposal addresses)2) Objectives and benefits3) Project outcomes4) Form of results5) Methods6) Risks of project not achieving project objectives7) Schedule of milestones8) Data management plan9) Other related projects10) Collaborations11) Project staff and CVs12) Detailed costs against milestones