ACCSP FY22 RFP Summary of Changes

1. RFP
1.1. General Changes
1.1.1. Updated dates appropriately

1.2. Funding Subcommittee Recommendation (**PAGE 2**)
1.2.1. New paragraph highlighted in yellow
1.2.2. In consideration of the unique situation the COVID 19 has created, the step down process will be paused in FY22. This means that all maintenance projects in the step down process will be in the same year of the step down process as they were in FY21. All maintenance project submissions that are in the step down process are required to submit an appendix to the proposal with a summary of why the additional funding is needed and if there are any funds from the previous year that were not spent. This status is reflected in Appendix A of the FDD, which has a list of those maintenance projects entering year 6 and the maximum funding available to them.

2. Funding Decision Document
2.1. General changes
2.1.1. All dates have been updated

2.2. Funding Decision Process Timeline (**PAGE 1**)
2.2.1. Highlighted text added to clarify involvement of PIs in initial review
2.2.2. July- Operations and Advisory Committees review initial proposals, PIs are invited (not mandatory) to this meeting to answer questions and hear feedback; ACCSP staff provide initial review results to submitting Partner

2.3. Detailed Steps of Funding Decision Process Added Bullet 3 (**PAGE 2**)
2.3.1. New bullet highlighted in yellow
2.3.2. In consideration of the unique situation the COVID 19 has created, the step down process will be paused in FY22. This means that all maintenance projects in the step down process will be in the same year of the step down process as they were in FY21. All maintenance project submissions that are in the step down process are required to submit an appendix to the proposal with a summary of why the additional funding is needed and if there are any funds from the previous year that were not spent. This status is reflected in Appendix A.

2.4. Appendix A (**PAGE 15**)
2.4.1. Change year 6 to year 6/7 to accommodate the recommendation of the Funding Subcommittee
2.4.2. Adjusted language to note that table referred to year 6/7 FY22 projects

3. Biological Priority Matrix – No Changes
3.1 Updated by Biological Review Panel for FY22 and FY23

4. Bycatch Priority Matrix

4.1 Updated by Bycatch Prioritization Committee for FY22 and FY23

5. Recreational Technical Committee Priorities – No Changes

6. Socioeconomic Priority Data Elements – No Changes

7. Timeline for Proposal Review

7.1. Dates are updated

7.2. Overall timeline remains relatively the same

8. Ranking Criteria Document – No Changes

TO: ACCSP Coordinating Council and All ACCSP Committees

FROM: Geoff White, ACCSP Director

SUBJECT: ACCSP Request for 2022 Proposals

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (Program or ACCSP) is issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) to Program Partners and Committees for FY22 funding.

ACCSP's Funding Decision Document (FDD) provides an overview of the funding decision process, guidance for preparing and submitting proposals, and information on funding recipients' post-award responsibilities. Projects in areas not specifically addressed in the FDD may still be considered for funding if they help achieve Program goals. These goals, listed by priority, are improvements in:

1a. Catch, effort, and landings data (including licensing, permit and vessel registration data);
1b. Biological data (equal to 1a.);
2. Releases, discards and protected species data; and,
3. Economic and sociological data.

Project activities that will be considered according to priority may include:

- Partner implementation of data collection programs;
- Continuation of current Program-funded partner programs;
- Funding for personnel required to implement Program related projects/proposals; and
- Data management system upgrades or establishment of partner data feeds to the Data Warehouse and/or Standard Atlantic Fisheries Information System.

Proposals for biological sampling should target priority species in the top quartile (Attachment II) of the Biological Priority Matrix. Proposals for observer coverage should align with fisheries affecting the top quartile priority species (Attachment III) of the Bycatch Priority Matrix. Brief descriptions of the current levels of biological or bycatch sampling by any of the Partners would be helpful to the review process. Projects for recreational catch and effort data should target the priorities set by the Recreational Technical Committee (Attachment IV). Projects involving socioeconomic data should reference the Socioeconomic Priority Data Elements (Attachment V).

Proposals to continue Program-funded partner projects ("maintenance proposals") may not contain significant changes in scope (for example the addition of bycatch data collection to a dealer reporting project), and must include in the cover letter whether there are any changes in the current proposal from prior years' and, if so, provide a brief summary of those changes.

Additionally, in FY16 a long-term funding strategy policy was instituted to limit the duration of maintenance projects. Maintenance projects are now subject to a funding reduction following their

fourth year of maintenance funding. For maintenance projects entering year 6, a further 33 percent cut will be applied and funding will cease in year 7.

In consideration of the unique situation the COVID 19 has created, the step down process will be paused in FY22. This means that all maintenance projects will be in the same year of the step down process as they were in FY21. Maintenance projects that are new to that category this year will be considered to be in year 0 and will begin year 1 in FY23. All maintenance project submissions are required to submit an appendix to the proposal with a summary of why the extension is needed and if there are any funds from the previous year that were not spent. This status is reflected in Appendix A of the FDD, which has a list of those maintenance projects entering year 6 and the maximum funding available to them.

All project submissions must comply with the Program Standards found here. Please consider using this successful project proposal as a template. Overhead rates may not exceed 25% of total costs unless mandated by law or policy. Items included within overhead should not also be listed as in-kind match.

Submissions will be reviewed in accordance with the FDD (Attachment I), ranking criteria (Attachment VII), and funding allocation. Current funding allocation guidelines are 75% for maintenance projects and 25% for new projects within the Program priorities. If either allocation is not fully utilized, remaining funds will be available to approved projects in the other category. For example, if maintenance projects only use 67% of the total available funds, the remaining balance would be added to the 25% new project allocation to fund new projects as approved by the Coordinating Council.

Attachment VI provides a timeline for the FY22 funding process. The final decision on proposals to be funded for FY22 will be made in October 2021. Project awards will be subject to funding availability and, if there is a funding shortfall, awards may be adjusted in accordance with the FDD. Successful applicants will be notified when funding becomes available.

Project Investigators will be required to report progress directly to the Program's Operations and Advisory Committees in addition to meeting the standard Federal reporting requirements.

Please submit initial proposals as Microsoft Word and Excel files no later than **June 12, 2021** by email to Julie Defilippi Simpson, ACCSP Deputy Director julie.simpson@accsp.org. If you have any questions about the funding decision process, please contact your agency's Operations Committee member (http://www.accsp.org/committees) or ACCSP staff (703-842-0780).

RELEVANT ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT I	FY2022 Funding Decision Document
ATTACHMENT II	FY2022 Biological Priority Matrix
ATTACHMENT III	FY2022 Bycatch Priority Matrix
ATTACHMENT IV	FY2022 Recreational Technical Committee Priorities
ATTACHMENT V	FY2022 Socioeconomic Priority Data Elements
ATTACHMENT VI	FY2022 Timeline for Proposal Review
ATTACHMENT VII	FY2022 Ranking Criteria Document

Our vision is to produce dependable and timely marine fishery statistics for Atlantic coast fisheries that are collected, processed, and disseminated according to common standards agreed upon by all program partners.

Funding Decision Process
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program
May 2021

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (the Program) is a state-federal cooperative initiative to improve recreational and commercial fisheries data collection and data management activities on the Atlantic coast. The program supports further innovation in fisheries-dependent data collection and management technology through its annual funding process.

Each year, ACCSP issues a Request for Proposals (RFP) to its Program Partners. The ACCSP Operations and Advisory Committees review submitted project proposals and make funding recommendations to the Deputy Director and the Coordinating Council.

This document provides an overview of the funding decision process, guidance for preparing and submitting proposals, and information on funding recipients' post-award responsibilities, including providing reports on project progress.

Overview of the Funding Decision Process
- **Funding Decision Process Timeline**
- **Detailed Steps**

Funding Decision Process Timeline

April- Operations and Advisory Committees develop annual funding priorities, criteria and allocation targets (maintenance vs. new projects)

May- Coordinating Council issues Request for Proposals (RFP)

June- Partners submit proposals

July- Operations and Advisory Committees review initial proposals; ACCSP staff provide initial review results to submitting Partner

August- Final proposals are submitted. Final proposals must be submitted electronically to the Deputy Director, and/or designee by close of business on the day of the specified deadline. Final proposals received after the RFP deadline will not be considered for funding.

September- Operations and Advisory Committees review and rank final proposals

October- Funding recommendations presented to Coordinating Council; Coordinating Council makes final funding decision

ACCSP Staff submits notification to submitting Partner of funded projects and notification of approved projects to appropriate grant funding agency (e.g. NOAA Fisheries Regional Grants Program Office, "NOAA Grants") by Partner

As Needed- Operation and/or Leadership Team and Coordinating Council review and make final decision with contingencies (e.g. scope of work, rescissions, no-cost extensions, returned unused funds, etc.)

Detailed Steps of Funding Decision Process

1. Develop Annual Funding Priorities, Criteria and Allocation Targets (maintenance vs. new projects).
Prior to issuing the Request for Proposals, the Coordinating Council will approve the annual funding criteria and allocation targets. These will be used to rank projects and allocate funding between maintenance and new projects respectively.

In FY16, a long-term funding strategy policy was instituted to limit the duration of maintenance projects. Maintenance projects are now subject to a funding reduction following their fourth year of maintenance funding.

- For maintenance projects entering year 5 of ACCSP funding in FY20, a 33 percent funding cut was applied to whichever sum was larger: the project's prior two-year-average base funding set in FY16, or the average annual sum received during the project's four years of full *maintenance* funding. In year 6, a further 33 percent cut will be applied and funding will cease in year 7. Please see Appendix A for a list of maintenance projects entering year 6 in FY20 and the maximum funds available for these projects.

- For more recent maintenance projects (i.e., those entering year 5 of maintenance funding after FY20), the base funding will be calculated as the average of funding received during the project's four years as a *maintenance* project. These projects will receive a 33 percent cut in year 5, a further 33 percent cut in year 6, and funding will cease in year 7.

- In consideration of the unique situation the COVID 19 has created, the step down process will be paused in FY22. This means that all maintenance projects will be in the same year of the step down process as they were in FY21. Maintenance projects that are new to that category this year will be considered to be in year 0 and will begin year 1 in FY23. All maintenance project submissions are required to submit an appendix to the proposal with a summary of why the extension is needed and if there are any funds from the previous year that were not spent. This status is reflected in Appendix A.

2. Issue Request for Proposals

An RFP will be sent to all Program Partners and Committees no later than the week after the spring Coordinating Council meeting. The RFP will include the ranking criteria, allocation targets approved by the Coordinating Council, and general Program priorities taken from Goal 3 of the current ASMFC Five-Year Strategic Plan. The RFP and related documents will also be posted on the Program's website here.

All proposals MUST be submitted either by a Program Partner, jointly by several Program Partners, or through a Program Committee. The public has the ability to work with a Program Partner to develop and submit a proposal. Principle investigators are strongly encouraged to work with their Operations Committee member in the development of any proposal. All proposals must be submitted electronically to the Deputy Director, and/or designee, in the standard format.

3. Review initial proposals

Proposals will be reviewed by staff and the Operations and Advisory Committees. Committee members are encouraged to coordinate with their offices and/or constituents to provide input to the review process. Operations Committee members are also encouraged to work with staff in their offices who have submitted a proposal in order to represent the proposal during the review. Project PIs will be invited to attend the initial proposal review, held in July. The review and evaluation of all written proposals will take into consideration the ranking criteria, funding allocation targets and the overall Program Priorities as specified in the RFP. Proposals may be forwarded to relevant Program technical committees for further review of the technical feasibility and statistical validity. Proposals that fail to meet the ACCSP standards may be recommended for changes or rejected.

4. Provide initial review results to submitting Partner

Program staff will notify the submitting Partner of suggested changes, requested responses, or questions arising from the review. The submitting Partner will be given an opportunity to submit a final proposal incorporating suggested changes in the same format previously described in Step 2(b) by the final RFP deadline.

5. Review and rank final proposals

The review and ranking of all proposals will take into consideration the ranking criteria, funding allocation targets, and overall Program Priorities as specified in the RFP. The Deputy Director and the Advisory and Operations Committees will develop a list of prioritized recommended proposals and forward them for discussion, review, and approval by the Coordinating Council.

6. Proposal approval by the Coordinating Council

The Coordinating Council will review a summary of all submitted proposals and prioritized recommended proposals from the Operations and Advisory Committees. Each representative on the Coordinating Council will have one vote during final prioritization of project proposals. Projects to be funded by the Program will be approved by the Coordinating Council by the end of November each year. The Deputy Director will submit a pre-notification to the appropriate

NOAA Grants office of the prioritized proposals to expedite processing when those offices receive Partner grant submissions.

7. Confirmation of final funding amounts
The Director and Deputy Director will be notified by NOAA Fisheries of any federal grant adjustments (e.g. additions or rescissions). Additional funds will generally go to the next available ranked project. Reductions may include, but are not limited to:

- Lower than anticipated amounts from any source of funding
- Rescission of funding after initial allocations have been made
- Partial or complete withdrawal of funds from any source

If these or other situations arise, the Operations Committee will notify Partners with approved proposals to reduce their requested budgets or to withdraw a proposal entirely. If this does not reduce the overall requested amount sufficiently, the Director, Deputy Director, the Operations Committee Chair and Vice-Chair, and the Advisory Committee Chair will develop a final recommendation and forward to the ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council. These options to address funding contingencies may include:

- Eliminating the lowest-ranked proposal(s)
- A fixed percentage cut to all proposals' budgets
- A directed reduction in a specific proposal(s)

8. Notification to submitting Partner of funded projects and submittal of project documents to appropriate grants agency (e.g. NOAA Grants) by Partner.
Notification detailing the Coordinating Council's actions relevant to a Partner's proposal will be sent to each Partner by Program staff.

- Approved projects from Non-federal Partners must be submitted as full applications (federal forms, project and budget narratives, and other attachments) to NOAA Grants via www.grants.gov. These documents must reflect changes or conditions approved by the Coordinating Council.
- Non-federal Partners must provide the Deputy Director with an electronic copy of the narrative and either an electronic or hard copy of the budget of the grant application as submitted to the grants agency (e.g. NOAA Grants).
- Federal Partners do not submit applications to NOAA Grants.

9. Operation and/or Leadership Team and Coordinating Council review and final decision with contingencies or emergencies.
Committee(s) review and decide project changes (e.g. scope of work, rescissions, no-cost extensions, returned unused funds, etc.) during the award period.

Proposal Guidance

- **General Proposal Guidelines**
- **Format**
- **Budget Template**

General Proposal Guidelines

- The Program is predicated upon the most efficient use of available funds. Many jurisdictions have data collection and data management programs which are administered by other fishery management agencies. Detail coordination efforts your agency/Committee has undertaken to demonstrate cost-efficiency and non-duplication of effort.

- All Program Partners conducting projects for implementation of the program standards in their jurisdictions are required to submit data to the Program in prescribed standards, where the module is developed and formats are available. Detail coordination efforts with Program data management staff with projects of a research and/or pilot study nature to submit project information and data for distribution to all Program Partners and archives.

- If appropriate to your project, please detail your agency's data management capability. Include the level of staff support (if any) required to accomplish the proposed work. If contractor services are required, detail the level and costs.

- Before funding will be considered beyond year one of a project, the Partner agency shall detail in writing how the Partner agency plans to assume partial or complete funding or, if not feasible, explain why.

- If appropriate to your project, detail any planned or ongoing outreach initiatives. Provide scope and level of outreach coordinated with either the Program Assistant and/or Deputy Director.

- Proposals including a collection of aging or other biological samples must clarify Partner processing capabilities (i.e., how processed and by whom).

- Provide details on how the proposal will benefit the Program as a whole, outside of benefits to the Partner or Committee.

- Proposals that request funds for law enforcement should confirm that all funds will be allocated towards reporting compliance.

- Proposals must detail any in-kind effort/resources, and if no in-kind resources are included, state why.

- Proposals must meet the same quality as would be appropriate for a grant proposal for ACFCMA or other federal grant.

- Assistance is available from Program staff, or an Operations Committee member for proposal preparation and to insure that Program standards are addressed in the body of a given proposal.

- Even though a large portion of available resources may be allocated to one or more jurisdictions, new systems (including prototypes) will be selected to serve all Partners' needs.

- Partners submitting pilot or other short-term programs are encouraged to lease large capital budget items (vehicles, etc.) and where possible, hire consultants or contractors rather than hire new permanent personnel.

- The Program will not fund proposals that do not meet Program standards. However, in the absence of approved standards, pilot studies may be funded.

- Proposals will be considered for modules that may be fully developed but have not been through the formal approval process. Pilot proposals will be considered in those cases.

- The Operations Committee may contact Partners concerning discrepancies or inconsistencies in any proposal and may recommend modifications to proposals subject to acceptance by the submitting Partner and approval by the Coordinating Council. The Operations Committee may recommend changes or conditions to proposals. The Coordinating Council may conditionally approve proposals. These contingencies will be documented and forwarded to the submitting Partner in writing by Program staff.

- Any proposal submitted after the initial RFP deadline will not be considered, in addition to any proposal submitted by a Partner which is not current with all reporting obligations.

Proposal Format

Applicant Name: Identify the name of the applicant organization(s).

Project Title: A brief statement to identify the project.

Project Type: Identify whether new or maintenance project.

> *New Project – Partner project never funded by the Program. New projects may not exceed a duration of one year.*

> *Maintenance Project – Project funded by the Program that conducts the same scope of work as a previously funded new or maintenance project. These proposals may not contain significant changes in scope (e.g., the addition of bycatch data collection to a catch/effort dealer reporting project). PIs must include in the cover letter whether there are any changes in the current proposal from prior years' and, if so, provide a brief summary of those changes. At year 5 of maintenance funding, a project's base funding will be calculated as the average of funding received during the project's four years as a* maintenance *project.*

Requested Award Amount: Provide the total requested amount of proposal. Do not include an estimate of the NOAA grant administration fee.

Requested Award Period: Provide the total time period of the proposed project. The award period typically will be limited to one-year projects.

Objective: Specify succinctly the "why", "what", and "when" of the project.

Need: Specify the need for the project and the association to the Program.

Results and Benefits: Identify and document the results or benefits to be expected from the proposed project. Clearly indicate how the proposed work meets various elements outlined in the ACCSP Proposal Ranking Criteria Document (Appendix B). Some potential benefits may include: fundamental in nature to all fisheries; region-wide in scope; answering or addressing region-wide questions or policy issues; required by MSFCMA, ACFCMA, MMPA, ESA, or other acts; transferability; and/or demonstrate a practical application to the Program.

Data Delivery Plan: Include coordinated method of the data delivery plan to the Program in addition to module data elements gathered. The data delivery plan should include the frequency of data delivery (i.e. monthly, semi-annual, annual) and any coordinate delivery to other relevant partners.

Approach: List all procedures necessary to attain each project objective. If a project includes work in more than one module, identify approximately what proportion of effort is comprised within each module (e.g., catch and effort 45%, biological 30% and bycatch 25%).

Geographic Location: The location where the project will be administered and where the scope of the project will be conducted.

Milestone Schedule: An activity schedule in table format for the duration of the project, starting with Month 1 and ending with a three-month report writing period.

Project Accomplishments Measurement: A table showing the project goals and how progress towards those goals will be measured. In some situations the metrics will be numerical such as numbers of anglers contacted, fish measured, and/or otoliths collected, etc.; while in other cases the metrics will be binary such as software tested and software completed. Additional details such as intermediate metrics to achieve overall proposed goals should be included especially if the project seeks additional years of funding.

Cost Summary (Budget): Detail all costs to be incurred in this project in the format outlined in the budget guidance and template at the end of this document. A budget narrative should be included which explains and justifies the expenditures in each category. Provide cost projections for federal and total costs. Provide details on Partner/in-kind contribution (e.g., staff time, facilities, IT support, overhead, etc.). Details should be provided on start-up versus long-term operational costs.

> **In-kind** - [1]Defined as activities that could exist (or could happen) without the grant. [2]In-kind contributions are from the grantee organization. In-kind is typically in the form of the value of personnel, equipment and services, including direct and indirect costs.
>
> [1] The following are generally accepted as in-kind contributions:
>
> i. Personnel time given to the project including state and federal employees
>
> ii. Use of existing state and federal equipment (e.g. data collection and server platforms, Aging equipment, microscopes, boats, vehicles)

Overhead rates may not exceed 25% of total costs unless mandated by law or policy. Program Partners may not be able to control overhead/indirect amounts charged. However, where there is flexibility, the lowest amount of overhead should be charged. When this is accomplished indicate on the 'cost summary' sheet the difference between the overhead that could have been charged and the actual amount charged, if different. If overhead is charged to the Program, it cannot also be listed as in-kind.

Maintenance Projects: Maintenance proposals must provide project history table, description of completed data delivery to the ACCSP and other relevant partners, table of total project cost by year, a summary table of metrics and achieved goals, and the budget narrative from the most recent year's funded proposal.

Principal Investigator: List the principal investigator(s) and attach curriculum vitae (CV) for each. Limit each CV to two pages. Additional information may be requested.

Budget Guidelines & Template

All applications must have a detailed budget narrative explaining and justifying the expenditures by object class. Include in the discussion the requested dollar amounts and how they were derived. A spreadsheet or table detailing expenditures is useful to clarify the costs (see template below). The following are highlights from the NOAA Budget Guidelines document to help Partners formulate their budget narrative. The full Budget Guidelines document is available here.

Object Classes:

Personnel: include salary, wage, and hours committed to project for each person by job title. Identify each individual by name and position, if possible.

Fringe Benefits: should be identified for each individual. Describe in detail if the rate is greater than 35 % of the associated salary.

Travel: all travel costs must be listed here. Provide a detailed breakdown of travel costs for trips over $5,000 or 5 % of the award. Include destination, duration, type of transportation, estimated cost, number of travelers, lodging, mileage rate and estimated number of miles, and per diem.

Equipment: equipment is any single piece of non-expendable, tangible personal property that costs $5,000 or more per unit and has a useful life of more than one year. List each piece of equipment, the unit cost, number of units, and its purpose. Include a lease vs. purchase cost analysis. If there are no lease options available, then state that.

Supplies: purchases less than $5,000 per item are considered by the federal government as supplies. Include a detailed, itemized explanation for total supplies costs over $5,000 or 5% of the award.

Contractual: list each contract or subgrant as a separate item. Provide a detailed cost breakdown and describe products/services to be provided by the contractor. Include a sole source justification, if applicable.

Other: list items, cost, and justification for each expense.

Total direct charges

Indirect charges: If claiming indirect costs, please submit a copy of the current approved negotiated indirect cost agreement. If expired and/or under review, a copy of the transmittal letter that accompanied the indirect cost agreement application is requested.

Totals of direct and indirect charges

Example. Budget narrative should provide further detail on these costs.

Description	Calculation	Cost
Personnel (a)		
Supervisor	Ex: 500 hrs x $20/hr	$10,000
Biologist		
Technician		
Fringe (b)		
Supervisor	Ex: 15% of salary	$1500
Biologist		
Technician		
Travel (c)		
Mileage for sampling trips	Ex: Estimate 2000 miles x $0.33/mile	$660
Travel for meeting		
Equipment (d)		
Boat	Ex: $7000, based on current market research	$7000
Supplies (e)		
Safety supplies		$1200
Sampling supplies		$1000
Laptop computers	2 laptops @$1500 each	$3000
Software		$500
Contractual (f)		
Data Entry Contract	Ex: 1000 hrs x $20/hr	$20,000
Other (h)		
Printing and binding		
Postage		
Telecommunications charges		
Internet Access charges		
Totals		
Total Direct Charges (i)		
Indirect Charges (j)		
Total (sum of Direct and Indirect) (k)		

Post-award Responsibilities
- **Changing the Scope of Work**
- **Requesting a No-cost Extension**
- **Declaring Unused/Returned Funds**
- **Reporting Requirements**
- **Report Format**
- **Programmatic Review**

Changing the Scope of Work
Partners shall submit requests for amendments to approved projects in writing to the Deputy Director. The Coordinating Council member for that Partner must sign the request.

When Partners request an amendment to an approved project, the Deputy Director will contact the Chair and Vice Chair of the Operations Committee. The Deputy Director and Operations Committee Chairs will determine if the requested change is minor or substantial. The Chairs and Deputy Director may approve minor changes.

For substantial proposed changes, a decision document including the opinions of the Chairs and the Deputy Director will be sent to the Operations Committee and the ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council for review.

The ACCSP Leadership Team will decide to approve or reject the request for change and notify the Deputy Director, who will send a written notification to the Partner's principal investigator with a copy to the Operations Committee.

When a requested major amendment is submitted shortly before a Coordinating Council meeting, the approval of the amendment will be placed on the Council Agenda.

The Deputy Director will notify NOAA Grants of any change in scope of work for final approval for non-federal proposals, and the Partner will need to request a Change in Scope through Grants Online. Necessary communications will be maintained between the concerned Partner, the Program and NOAA Grants. Any changes must be approved through the normal NOAA Grants process.

Requesting a No-cost Extension
If additional time is needed to complete the project, Program Partners can request a no-cost extension to their award period. Partners should let the Program know of the need for additional time and then request the extension as an Award Action Request through NOAA Grants Online at least 30 days before the end date of the award.

Necessary communications will be maintained between the concerned Partner, the Program, and NOAA Grants office. Any changes must be approved through the normal NOAA Grants process.

Declaring Unused/Returned Funds
In an effort to limit the instances in which funds are not completely used during the award period, draw down reports from the NOAA Grants offices indicating remaining grant balances will be periodically reviewed during each fiscal year.

While effort should be made to complete the project as proposed, if Program Partners find that they will not be able to make use of their entire award, they should notify the Program and their NOAA Federal Program Officer as soon as possible. Depending on the timing of the action, the funds may be able to be reused within the Program, or they may have to be returned to the U.S. Treasury.

Program Partners must submit a written document to the Deputy Director outlining unused project funds potentially being returned. The Partner must also notify their Coordinating Council member (if applicable) for approval to return the unused funds. If the funding is available for re-use within the Program, the Director and Deputy Director will confer with the Operations Committee Chair and Vice-Chair and the Advisory Committee Chair, and then submit a written recommendation to the ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council for final approval on the plan to distribute the returned money.

Necessary communications will be maintained between the concerned Partner, the Program, and NOAA Grants office. Any changes must be approved through the normal NOAA Grants process.

Reporting Requirements
Program staff will assess project performance.

The Partner project recipients must abide by the NOAA Regional Grant Programs reporting requirements and as listed below. All semi-annual and final reports are to include a table showing progress toward each of the progress goals as defined in Step 2b and additional metrics as appropriate. Also, all Partner project recipients will submit the following reports based on the project start date to the Deputy Director:

- Semi-annual reports (due 30 days after the semi-annual period) throughout the project period including time periods during no-cost extensions,
- One final report (due 90 days after project completion).
- Federal Partners must submit reports to the Deputy Director, and State Partners must submit reports to both the Deputy Director and the appropriate NOAA Grants office.

Program staff will conduct an initial assessment of the final report to ensure the report is complete in terms of reporting requirements. Program staff will serve as technical monitors to review submitted reports. NOAA staff also reviews the reports submitted via Grants Online.

A project approved on behalf of a Program Committee will be required to follow the reporting requirements specified above. The principle investigator (if not the Chair of the Committee) will submit the report(s) to the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee for review and approval. The Committee Chair is responsible for submitting the required report(s) to the Program.

Joint projects will assign one principle investigator responsible for submitting the required reports. The principle investigator will be identified within the project proposal. The submitted reports should be a collaborative effort between all Partners involved in the joint project.

Project recipients will provide all reports to the Program in electronic format.

Partners who receive no-cost extensions must notify the Deputy Director within 30 days of receiving approval of the extension. Semi-annual and final reports will continue to be required through the extended grant period as previously stated.

Partners that have not met reporting requirements for past/current projects may not submit a new proposal.

A verbal presentation of project results may be requested. Partners will be required to submit copies of project specifications and procedures, software development, etc. to assist other Program Partners with the implementation of similar programs.

Report Format

Semi-Annual(s) – Progress Reports: (3-4 pages)
- Title page - Project name, project dates (semi-annual period covered and complete project period), submitting Partner, and date.
- Objective
- Activities Completed – bulleted list by objective.
- Progress or lack of progress of incomplete activities during the period of semi-annual progress – bulleted list by objective.
- Activities planned during the next reporting period.
- Metrics table
- Milestone Chart – original and revised if changes occurred during the project period.

Final Report:
- Title page – Project name, project dates, submitting Partner, and date.
- Abstract/Executive Summary (including key results)
- Introduction
- Procedures

- Results:
    - Description of data collected.
    - The quality of the data pertaining to the objective of the project (e.g. representative to the scope of the project, quantity collected, etc.).
    - Compiled data results.
    - Summary of statistics.
- Discussion:
    - Discuss the interpretation of results of the project by addressing questions such as, but not limited to:
    - What occurred?
    - What did not occur that was expected to occur?
    - Why did expected results not occur?
    - Applicability of study results to Program goals.
    - Recommendations/Summary/Metrics
- Summarized budget expenditures and deviations (if any).

Programmatic review

Project reports will inform Partners of project outcomes. This will allow the Program as a whole to take advantage of lessons learned and difficulties encountered. Staff will provide final reports to the appropriate Committee(s). The Committees then can discuss the report(s) and make recommendations to modify the Data Collection Standards as appropriate. The recommendations will be submitted through the Program committee(s) review process.

Appendix A: Maximum Funding for Maintenance Projects Entering Year 6/7 of Funding in FY22

Projects in Year 6/7 of Maintenance Funding	Calculated Base (formula used)	Maximum Funding Year 5	Maximum Funding Year 6/7
ME DMR: Portside commercial catch sampling and bycatch sampling for Atlantic herring, Atlantic mackerel, and Atlantic menhaden	**$133, 452.50** (2-year base)	$88,968.33	**$44,484.17**
ME DMR: Managing Mandatory Dealer Reporting in Maine	**$183, 934.50** (4-year avg)	$122,623.00	**$61,311.50**
RI DEM: Maintenance and Coordination of Fisheries Dependent Data Feeds to ACCSP from the State of Rhode Island	**$82,563.50** (2-year base)	$55,042.33	**$27,521.17**
NJ DFW: Electronic Reporting and Biological Characterization of New Jersey Commercial Fisheries	**$163,803.75** (4-year avg)	$109,202.50	**$54,601.25**
SC DNR: ACCSP Data Reporting from South Carolina's Commercial Fisheries	**$170,770.00** (2-year base)	$113,846.67	**$56,923.33**
ACCSP RTC: At-sea Headboat Sampling	**$162,114.00** (2-year base)	$108,076.00	**$54,038.00**
SEFSC: Continued processing and ageing of biological samples collected from U.S. South Atlantic commercial and recreational fisheries	**$266,792.00** (4-year avg)	$177,861.33	**$88,930.67**

Appendix B: Ranking Criteria Spreadsheet for Maintenance and New Projects

Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort Biological Sampling Bycatch/Species Interactions Social and Economic	0 – 10 0 – 10 0 – 6 0 – 4	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according priority matrices.
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. geographic range of the stock).
> yr 2 contains funding transition plan and/or justification for continuance	0 – 4	Rank based on defined funding transition plan away from Program funding or viable justification for continued Program funding.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections ⬇ 4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 1	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects: (*to be used only if funding available exceeds total Maintenance funding requested***)**

Ranking Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Achieved Goals	0 – 3	Proposal indicates project has consistently met previous set goals. Current proposal provides project goals and if applicable, intermediate metrics to achieve overall achieved goals.
Data Delivery Plan	0 – 2	Ranked based if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.
Level of Funding	-1 – 1	-1 = Increased funding from previous year 0 = Maintained funding from previous year 1 = Decreased funding from previous year
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	-1 = Not properly prepared 1 = Properly prepared
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

Ranking Guide – New Projects:

<u>Primary</u> Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort Biological Sampling Bycatch/Species Interactions Social and Economic	0 – 10 0 – 10 0 – 6 0 – 4	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according priority matrices.
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. fisheries sampled).
Contains funding transition plan / Defined end-point	0 – 4	Rank based on quality of funding transition plan or defined end point.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections ↓ 4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 1	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Innovative	0 – 3	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

Biological Sampling Priority Matrix

Created in February 2021
For FY2022

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.

Biological Review Panel Recommends:

- Species in the upper 25% of the priority matrix should be considered for funding.

- Sampling projects which cover multiple species within the upper 25% are highly recommended.

Biological Review Panel Recommendations Based on Matrix*:

* UPPER 25% OF MATRIX

Species	Overfished	Overfishing	Most Recent Stock Assessme	Current/Next Stock Assessment	Council Priority	ASMFC Priority	State Priority	NMFS Priority	Fishery Managed	Sig. change in landings	Sig. change in mgmt w/in 24 mo	Adequacy of level of sampling	Stock Resilience	Seasonality of Fishery	Average Priority	TOTAL
Black Sea Bass *Centropristis striata*	N: MA N:SA	N: MA N:SA	MA: 2019 SA: 2018	MA:2021 SA:2023	5.0	5	3.5	5.0	5	1	1	4	3	1	4.5	32.43
Red Grouper *Epinephelus morio*	Y	Y	2017	2023	5.0	0	1.1	5.0	3	1	4	3	4	3	2.8	32.14
Snowy Grouper *Epinephelus niveatus*	Y	N	2019	2021	5.0	0	0.9	5.0	3	3	1	3	5	3	2.8	30.14
Bluefin Tuna *Thunnus thynnus*	U	N	2017	2021	0.0	0	1.8	5.0	5	5	5	3	3	1	2.0	30.14
River Herring *Alosa*	D	U	2017	2023	0.0	4	3.6	0.0	5	3	1	4	4	4	2.3	30.00
Cobia *Rachycentron canadum*	N	N	2020		1.0	5	1.5	4.0	3	1	3	4	3	3	3.1	29.86
Tilefish *Lopholatilus*	N: MA N:SA	N: MA Y:SA	MA:2017 SA:2016	MA/SA:2021	5.0	0	1.9	4.0	5	1	1	3	4	3	2.8	29.71
American Shad *Alosa*	D	U	2020		0.0	3	3.8	0.0	5	3	1	4	5	3	2.2	29.21
Atlantic halibut *Hippoglossus*	U	U	2020		4.0	0	1.2	1.0	3	5	1	4	5	3	2.0	28.71
Atlantic Menhaden *Brevoortia tyrannus*	N	N	2020	2022	0.0	5	3.1	3.0	5	1	3	3	3	1	2.8	28.64
Gray Triggerfish *Balistes capriscus*	U	U			5.0	0	1.0	4.0	3	5	1	3	2	3	2.6	28.36
Atlantic Smooth Dogfish *Mustelus canis*	N	N	2015	2021	0.0	3	1.4	3.0	5	5	1	3	2	3	2.1	28.21
Ocean Pout *Macrozoarces americanus*	Y	N	2020		0.0	0	0.2	0.0	3	5	5	5	5	3	1.0	27.79
Spanish Mackerel *Scomberomorus*	N	N	2020	2022	5.0	2	1.2	4.0	3	1	2	3	2	3	3.0	27.50
Blueline Tilefish *Caulolatilus microps*	U	U	2017	2024	3.0	0	1.1	5.0	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.4	27.29
Sandbar Shark *Carcharhinus plumbeus*	Y	N	2017		0.0	1	1.1	5.0	5	5	1	2	3		1.8	27.21
American Eel *Anguilla rostrata*	D	U	2017	2022	0.0	5	3.5	0.0	5	1	1	4	5	1	2.5	27.21
Gag Grouper *Mycteroperca microlepis*	N	N	2014	2021	5.0	0	0.9	5.0	3	1	0	3	4	3	2.8	26.57
Red Snapper *Lutjanus campechanus*	Y	Y	2016	2021	5.0	0	0.6	5.0	3	1	1	1	5	3	2.9	26.57
Dolphin *Coryphaena hippurus*	U	U			5.0	0	1.1	4.0	5	3	0	4	1	1	2.8	26.43
Horseshoe Crab *Limulus polyphemus*	U	U	2019	2021	0.0	4	3.1	0.0	5	3	0	3	4	2	2.0	26.00
Scamp *Mycteroperca phenax*	U	U		2022	5.0	0	1.0	4.0	3	1	0	3	4	3	2.6	25.93
Winter Skate *Raja ocellata*	N	N	2019	2023	0.0	0	1.0	0.0	3	5	5	4	5	1	1.0	25.36
Spiny Dogfish *Squalus acanthias*	N	N	2018	2022	0.0	3	2.6	2.0	5	3	0	2	5	1	1.9	24.93

Bio-sampling Priority Matrix

- Grouping of species in upper 25% of total matrix score, based on sampling adequacy and average priority (average of ASMFC, Council, NMFS and State priorities).

- Projects that target multiple upper quartile species should be given a higher priority.

		Biological Sampling Adequacy	
		Adequate (0 - 2)	Inadequate (3 - 5)
Averaged Priority Columns	High (≥ 3.0)		Black Sea Bass - Bluefin Tuna
	Low (< 3.0)	River Herring - Tilefish	Red Grouper - Snowy Grouper - Cobia - American Shad - Atlantic Halibut - Atlantic Menhaden - Atlantic Smooth Dogfish - Gray Triggerfish - Oceanpout - Spanish Mackerel - Blueline Tilefish - Sandbar Shark - Gag Grouper - American Eel - Red Snapper - Dolphin - Horseshoe Crab - Scamp - Winter Skate - Spiny Dogfish

Bycatch Sampling Priority Matrix

Created in February 2021
For FY 2022

Top Quartile of Bycatch Matrix Suggestions

Combined Fleets	Sig. Change in mgmt w/in past 36 mo	Amt of reg discards	Amt of non reg discards	Prot Spp Interactions	Score
Mid-Atlantic Gillnet	3	4	2	5	14
Mid-Atlantic Pound Net	1	4	2	5	12
american american lobster Pots-GOM	1	4	1	5	11
american american lobster Pots-SNE	1	4	1	5	11
Snapper grouper H&L Fleet	3	4	1	3	11
New England Extra-Large-Mesh Gillnet	0	4	2	5	11
Mid-Atlantic Small-Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom	1	4	1	5	11
Mid-Atlantic Fish Pots and Traps	1	4	1	5	11
South Atlantic Large Mesh Gillnet	0	4	2	5	11
Southeastern, Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico HMS Pelagic Longline	1	4	1	5	11
New England Crab Pots	3	2	1	5	11
South Atlantic shrimp Trawl	1	4	2	3	10
New England Otter Trawl	1	4	2	3	10
Southeastern, Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico HMS Shark Bottom Longline	0	4	1	5	10
Pelagic H&L Fleet (North)	1	4	1	3	9
Mid-Atlantic Extra-Large-Mesh Gillnet	1	2	1	5	9
New England Gillnet	1	2	1	5	9
South Atlantic Skimmer shrimp Trawl	3	2	1	3	9

ACCSP Funding Prioritization of the Recreational Technical Committee
July 2017

The Recreational Technical Committee sets the recreational data collection priorities for inclusion in ACCSP's annual request for proposals (RFP). In 2017, the committee opted to use its Atlantic Coast Recreational Implementation Plan priorities as the recreational data priorities for ACCSP's annual funding process. The prioritized list of data needs, which were reviewed and approved by the ACCSP Coordinating Council, is provided below:

1. **Improve precision (PSE) of MRIP catch estimates**
2. **(t) Comprehensive for-hire data collection and monitoring**
2. **(t) Improved recreational fishery discard and release data**
4. **Biological sampling for recreational fisheries separate from MRIP APAIS**
5. **Improved spatial resolution and technical guidance for post-stratification of MRIP estimates**
6. **Improved timeliness of recreational catch and harvest estimates**

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

SOCIOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC DATA

The Committee on Economics and Social Sciences (CESS) developed a list of priority socioeconomic data elements for coastwide collection. The list is not exhaustive; it represents key elements that can serve as a baseline of fundamental socioeconomic information to support management decisions. The list of priority data elements includes:

1. Trip-level information (to be collected through voluntary or mandatory reporting, for all or a subset of participants)
2. Data elements for an owner/operator survey (to be collected through an annual or semiannual survey)*

The CESS identified these priority data elements with the understanding that data would be collected in the aforementioned methods and would be linked to other ACCSP data through identifiers. Alternative collection methods or the inability to link data with identifiers may require changes to the priority data elements list in order to ensure the utility of the data.

Note: Priorities for standalone surveys will differ from the priorities identified below due to their distinct methodologies and inability to leverage other ACCSP data. The CESS should be consulted when identifying data elements for standalone socioeconomic surveys to ensure their utility and, where practical, consistency across studies.

*The ACCSP recognizes the analytic value of collecting the data elements below. We recommend that partners be aware of and take into account the reporting burden to industry, the sensitivity and at times confidentiality of socioeconomic information, and other relevant perspectives when determining which data elements to collect and set as optional or mandatory.

A. COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Table 1:
TRIP LEVEL INFORMATION

DATA ELEMENT	DESCRIPTION / CRITERIA
Trip Information	
Vessel Identifier	-Unique vessel identifier (e.g., US Coast Guard, state registration number, etc.) -These identifiers must be trackable through time and space.
Trip Identifier	- Unique identifier assigned to the trip
Labor Cost Information	
Total Crew Cost	- Total monetary amount that was given to the crew for this trip

Total Captain Cost (If other than owner)	- Total monetary amount that was given to the captain for this trip
Owner Share	- Total monetary amount the vessel (or permit) owner received for this trip
Other Trip Cost Information	
Fuel & Oil Costs	- Cost for all fuel and oil used on this trip
Bait Costs	- Cost for all bait used on this trip
Ice Costs	- Cost for all ice used on this trip
Grocery Costs	- Cost for all groceries used on this trip
Miscellaneous Costs	- Cost of any other expenses specific to this trip (not including wages, overhead, or fixed costs) E.g., offloading/non-crew labor costs, packaging costs, etc.

Table 2:
DATA ELEMENTS FOR OWNER/OPERATOR SURVEY

DATA ELEMENT	DESCRIPTION / CRITERIA
Vessel Identification*	-Unique vessel identifier (e.g., US Coast Guard, state registration number, etc.) -These identifiers must be trackable through time and space.
Fishermen Identification	-Unique ACCSP Identifier for fishermen
Labor Cost Information	
Crew Payment System	- Code to identify crew & captain payment system (e.g. share system, per day, per trip)
Percentage Share Crew	- Percentage share to crew (if applicable)
Percentage Share Captain	- Percentage share to captain (if applicable)
Percentage Share Boat/Owner	- Percentage share to boat/owner (if applicable)
Crew Wages	- Average crew wages for the year (crew payment system indicates whether by hour, trip, day, etc.) (if applicable)
Captain Wages	- Average captain wages for the year (crew payment system indicates whether by hour, trip, day, etc.) (if applicable)
Annual Costs (Most Recent Year)	
Labor costs (captain and crew not in household)	- Total costs of labor for captain and crew outside the owner/operator's household
Labor costs (to people within owner/operator household)	- Total costs of labor for captain and crew within the owner/operator's household
Annual Insurance Costs	- Hull, health, protection and indemnity, mortgage, etc.
Dockage	- Total cost for vessel dockage, home port and transient dockage
Loan Payments	- Principal and interest
New Gear/ Equipment	- Total cost of new gear or equipment acquired
Repairs & Maintenance	- Total cost of repairs & maintenance of vessel and gear that were conducted in the previous year
Permits & Licenses	- Total cost of fishing permits / licenses for the previous year

Leased Quota Cost	- Total cost of leased quota for the previous year
Other Professional Expenses	- Professional expenses not otherwise itemized
Demographic Information	
Household Size	- # of individuals in the household (including respondent)
Employment Status	- Current employment status (e.g., employed fulltime, part-time, unemployed, retired, etc.)
Education	- Highest level of education completed
Marital/Cohabitational Status	- Current marital or cohabitational status of respondent
Age	- Age of the respondent
Gender	- Gender of the respondent
Ethnicity	- Ethnic background
Total Annual Household Income	- Total annual household income
Number of Household Individuals Involved in Commercial Fishing	-Total number of household individuals involved in commercial fishing (including respondent)
Percent of Annual Household Income from Commercial Fishing	- Percent of household income that is generated through commercial fishing or support activities
County of Residence	-County of residence
Years in Community	- Years in county of residence
Fishing Activity Information	
Fishermen status	-Fishermen status (e.g. full time, part time, not actively fishing)
Years in Commercial Fishing	- Number of years participating in commercial fishery
Permits held	- fishing permits held (by permit type)
Permit use	- Were all permits used within the last year
Reason for Latency	-Reason for not using permit within the last year
Primary Species Landed by Month	- Primary species landed by month
Primary Gears Used by Month	- Primary gears used by month

*Vessel Identifier is needed to link trip-level data to survey results

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

This list includes dates for fiscal year 2021, including ACCSP committee meetings, relevant dates of the funding cycle, as well as meetings or conferences ACCSP typically attends or which may be of interest to our partners. Due to the restrictions from COVID-19, some in-person meetings may be held virtually. If you have any questions or comments on this calendar please do not hesitate to contact the ACCSP staff at info@accsp.org.

Date	Event
Jan 20-21:	APAIS South Atlantic Training – Webinar
Jan 26-27:	APAIS Mid-Atlantic Training – Webinar
Jan 26-28:	NEFMC Meeting – Webinar
Feb 1-4:	ASMFC Meeting/Coordinating Council Meeting – Webinar
Feb 9-10:	APAIS North Atlantic Training - Webinar
Feb 17:	Biological Review Panel Annual Meeting – Webinar
Feb 18:	Bycatch Prioritization Committee Annual Meeting –Webinar
Feb 10-11:	MAFMC Meeting – Webinar
Mar 1:	Start of ACCSP FY21
Mar 1-5:	SAFMC Meeting – Webinar
Week of Mar 23:	Commercial Technical Committee Annual Meeting – Webinar*
Week of Mar 23:	Information Systems Committee Annual Meeting – Webinar*
Apr 6-8:	MAFMC Meeting – Galloway, NJ
Week of April 13:	Operations and Advisory Committees Spring Meeting – Webinar*
Week of Apr 13:	Recreational Technical Committee – Webinar *
Apr 13-15:	NEFMC Meeting – Mystic, CT
May 3-6:	ASMFC/Coordinating Council Meeting – Arlington, VA
May 11:	ACCSP issues request for proposals
Late May:	APAIS Wave 2 Meeting - Webinar
Jun 8-10:	MAFMC Meeting – Virginia Beach, VA
Jun 14-18:	SAFMC Meeting – Ponte Vedra Beach, FL
Jun 12:	Initial proposals are due
Jun 19:	Initial proposals are distributed to Operations and Advisory Committees
Jun 22-24:	NEFMC Meeting – Portland, ME
July 6:	Any initial written comments on proposals due
Week of Jul 13:	Review of initial proposals by Operations and Advisory Committees – Webinar
July 20:	If applicable, any revised written comments due
Week of Jul 27:	Feedback submitted to principal investigators
Late July:	APAIS Wave 3 Meeting – Webinar
Aug 3-5:	ASMFC Meeting/Coordinating Council Meeting – Arlington, VA
Aug 9-12:	MAFMC Meeting – Philadelphia, PA
Aug 14:	Revised proposals due

Our vision is to produce dependable and timely marine fishery statistics for Atlantic coast fisheries that are collected, processed, and disseminated according to common standards agreed upon by all program partners.

Aug 21:	<mark>Revised proposals distributed to Operations and Advisory Committees</mark>
Week of Sep 7:	<mark>Preliminary ranking exercise for Advisors and Operations Members – Webinar</mark>
Sep 13-17:	SAFMC Meeting – Charleston, SC
Week of Sep 21:	<mark>Annual Advisors/Operations Committee Joint Meeting (TBD)</mark>
Sep 28-30	NEFMC Meeting – Plymouth, MA
Late September:	APAIS Wave 4 Meeting – Webinar
Oct 5-7:	MAFMC Meeting – New York, NY
Oct 19-21:	<mark>ASMFC Annual Meeting/Coordinating Council Meeting – Long Branch, NJ</mark>
Nov 6-10:	AFS 151st Annual Meeting – Baltimore, MD
Dec 6-10:	SAFMC Meeting – Beaufort, NC
Dec 7-9:	NEFMC Meeting – Newport, RI
Dec 13-16:	MAFMC Meeting – Annapolis, MD

Indicates meetings not yet scheduled.

Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort Biological Sampling Bycatch/Species Interactions Social and Economic	0 – 10 0 – 10 0 – 6 0 – 4	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according priority matrices.
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. geographic range of the stock).
> yr 2 contains funding transition plan and/or justification for continuance	0 – 4	Rank based on defined funding transition plan away from Program funding or viable justification for continued Program funding.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections 4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 1	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Properly Prepared	-1–1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects: (*to be used only if funding available exceeds total Maintenance funding requested***)**

Ranking Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Achieved Goals	0 – 3	Proposal indicates project has consistently met previous set goals. Current proposal provides project goals and if applicable, intermediate metrics to achieve overall achieved goals.
Data Delivery Plan	0 – 2	Ranked based if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.
Level of Funding	-1 – 1	-1 = Increased funding from previous year 0 = Maintained funding from previous year 1 = Decreased funding from previous year
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	-1 = Not properly prepared 1 = Properly prepared
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

Ranking Guide – New Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort Biological Sampling Bycatch/Species Interactions Social and Economic	0 – 10 0 –10 0 – 6 0 – 4	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according priority matrices.
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. fisheries sampled).
Contains funding transition plan / Defined end-point	0 – 4	Rank based on quality of funding transition plan or defined end point.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections ↓ 4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 1	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Innovative	0 – 3	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.
Properly Prepared	-1–1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

View this email in your browser

February 2021 Committee Newsletter

This monthly newsletter is intended to keep all committee members informed of the activities and accomplishments of ACCSP committees and staff. ACCSP staff welcomes feedback on all content.

PUT THIS on YOUR CALENDAR!

Upcoming Events

- **March 2:** Information Systems Committee Meeting
- **March 4:** Commerical Technical Committee Meeting
- **See ACCSP Calendar Link for more information**

Highlights

The ACCSP fiscal year 2021 is beginning on March 1 and we are very excited about the coming year. We have updated the program calendar located on our website to include many significant partner events.

This allows our partners and the public to see what is happening on the coast in one place. These events include ACCSP funding cycle deadlines, ACCSP Committee meetings, Council meetings, APAIS/ FHTS wave meetings, and ASMFC quarterly meetings.

Coordinating Council

- During the February 3, 2021 meeting approved final ACCSP Administrative grant and all ACCSP 2021 proposals.

Commercial Technical Committee

- Virtual meeting March 4, primary agenda items listed and see the ACCSP calendar for more information:
- SAFIS Redesign
  - Update on the release of SAFIS eTrips V2 and the SAFIS Redesign.
- Gill Nets: Gear Quantity and Gear Attributes
- One-Stop Reporting
  - Update on the status of a technical specifications document for vendors / developers seeking OSR compliance.
- Spatial Data Coordination
  - Staff will detail the development of Atlantic coastal reporting maps using GIS software in response to new reporting requirements. Feedback is desired on new processes available in Oracle 19c that allow greater spatial data visualization and integration.
- Committee Small Group Updates

conversion factors.

Biological Review Panel & Bycatch Prioritization Committee

- Last week the Biological Review Panel & Bycatch Prioritization Committee finalized the matrices and came to committee consensus regarding matrix scores.
- These scores will be presented to the Coordinating Council and used as reference material for funding priorities.

Information Systems Committee

- Virtual meeting March 2, primary agenda items listed and see the ACCSP calendar for more information:
- SAFIS Redesign status
- Phase out of Pre-Redesign applications
    - eTRIPS original online and e-1Ticket

Recreational Technical Committee

- The Comprehensive For-hire Data Collection Program's list of core data elements, those which would be required for all logbooks, have been discussed and are close to full agreement by Committee.
- The next steps include finalizing the list of non-core (i.e., which could be collected by partners but not required for all logbooks) data elements and presenting the program progress to NOAA Fisheries.

 MRIP Survey Conduct:

- State APAIS agreements and increased annual assignment totals have been allocated by state/month for all Atlantic states.

Standard Codes Committee

- Request for new Port codes for "Unknown County" in Georgia and South Carolina:
    - Julie Califf, Eric Hiltz and Jackie Wilson have requested the addition of "Unknown County" Port codes to be included in SAFIS.
    - Currently, SAFIS maintains similar codes for all other states on the Atlantic Coast – except for SC and GA.

Program Update

- The software team continues work on eTRIPS/Redesign including a newly integrated map feature which will provide NOAA topographical charts overlaying existing maps.
- The benefit of this map is that it provides the ability for a fisherman to pinpoint a fishing area on the map. The point will automatically be translated to latitude/longitude and to ten-minute grid point(s).

- SAFIS eTRIPS UPLOAD redesign will be deployed in early March. This will complete the alignment of processing of records coming into SAFIS via online, mobile, and upload pathways.
- SAFIS server and Oracle upgrade were successfully completed on February 19th.

Editor: Marisa Powell
Please contact us if you have any questions or feedback at info@accsp.org

View this email in your browser

March 2021 Committee Newsletter

This monthly newsletter is intended to keep all committee members informed of the activities and accomplishments of ACCSP committees and staff. ACCSP staff welcomes feedback on all content.

- **April 13:** Recreational Technical Committee Meeting
- Operations and Advisory Committees Spring Meeting - **TBD**
- **May 3-5:** ASMFC/Coordinating Council Meeting
- **See ACCSP Calendar Link for more information**

Highlights

- The ACCSP Data Team is working with state and federal partners to deliver the 2020 Spring Data Load. There will also be a Mid-Summer Data Load to increase flexibility for partners. A public announcement with more details and release of the data in the Data Warehouse will be in mid-April.

Coordinating Council

- ACCSP 2021 project support finalized for NOAA distribution of funds

Commercial Technical Committee

The committee held its annual meeting via webinar on March 3, 2021. Discussion topics included:

- SAFIS Redesign
- Gill nets and gear attributes
- Small group tasking
- Oracle Spatial and SAFIS applications

Mike Lewis (NOAA S&T) completed his two years as Chair of the committee, and Chris Bradshaw (FWCC) became the new Chair. Anna Webb (MA DMF) was elected Vice-Chair by unanimous consent. Follow-up and action items are being coordinated with ACCSP staff and committee members over the next month.

The Electronic Monitoring working group is meeting on April 8th to discuss Haul and Drop level data elements.

Information Systems Committee

- A demo of the new eTRIPS/redesign-UPLOAD feature was presented to partners in early March and we are awaiting feedback.
- Once all features have been addressed, a copy will be moved to production. The redesign-UPLOAD will work in tandem with the older version.

Future release of eTRIPS/redesign (online, mobile, upload) will include HMS Species/Disposition validations which will prevent HMS attributes from being requested for discards.

Standard Codes Committee

Bradley Walter and Connie Lewis requested that these existing Maryland port codes be made available for commercial trips reported in SAFIS:

PORT	STATE	FIPS_PLACE_NAME
231007	MD	GANEYS WHARF COUNTY RAMP
231321	MD	MATTAPEAKE COUNTY PARK AND PIER
231329	MD	ROARING PT COUNTY PARK
231503	MD	COX'S POINT COUNTY PARK
231527	MD	TUCKAHOE COUNTY RAMP
232025	MD	ST. PETER'S CREEK COUNTY RAMP
236223	MD	ABELLS WHARF (COUNTY PARK)

Editor: Marisa Powell
Please contact us if you have any questions or feedback at info@accsp.org

ACCSP Announces FY21 Funding Recipients

April 7, 2021

ACCSP is pleased to announce the recipients of its FY21 funding awards. Thanks to NOAA Fisheries, ACCSP is able to fund 6 new and 8 ongoing projects submitted by our state and federal partners to improve fisheries data collection and processing on the Atlantic coast. This year's awards, including the Administrative Grant, total approximately $3.4 million.

FY21 Proposal Recipients

wdt_ID	Partner	Project Title	Approximate Funding
2	ME DMR	FY21: Managing Mandatory Dealer Reporting in Maine	$61,263
3	ME DMR	Portside Commercial Catch Sampling and Comparative Bycatch Sampling for Atlantic Herring, Atlantic Mackerel and Atlantic Menhaden fisheries	$25,896
4	RI DEM	FY21: Maintenance and Coordination of Fisheries Dependent Data Feeds to ACCSP from the State of Rhode Island	$27,521
5	RI DEM	Advancing Fishery Dependent Data Collection for Black Sea Bass (Cetropristis striata) in the Southern New England and Mid-Atlantic Region Utilizing Modern Technology and a Vessel Research Fleet Approach	$132,064
6	NJ DFW	Electronic Reporting and Biological Characterization of New Jersey Commercial Fisheries	$63,461
7	SC DNR	ACCSP Data Reporting from South Carolina's Commercial Fisheries	$56,923
8	SAFMC	FY21: SAFIS Expansion of Customizable Fisheries Citizen Science Data Collection Application	$114,792
9	SEFSC	Continued Processing and Aging of Biological Samples Collected from U.S. South Atlantic Commercial and Recreational Fisheries	$88,931
10	RI DEM	FY21: Economic Efficiency Assessment of the Rhode Island Fluke and Black Sea Bass Aggregate Management Programs	$56,334
11	ACCSP Comm Tech	Continual Validation and Development of Conversion Factors for Priority Fish and Crustacean Species	$142,056
	Partner	Project Title	Approximate Funding

ACCSP's annual funding process kicks off each May with the release of our RFP. Stay tuned for FY22 RFP announcements!

2020 Fisheries Data are Now Available in the ACCSP Data Warehouse

April 12, 2021

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program is pleased to announce that the Spring Data Load to update the 2020 commercial data is complete. The commercial and recreational data for 2020 excluding the North Carolina trip ticket data and New York datasets are available in the Data Warehouse.

ACCSP partner data suppliers have added CARES Act work to their regular data intensive activities. The increased workload for many of our partners has caused some delay in data delivery and availability for the Spring Data Load.

ACCSP has shown flexibility in our process to respond to the needs of our partners and data users and is creating an additional load for this summer to include the data that was unable to be delivered during the Spring Data Load. We are calling this the "Mid-Summer Data Load," with deadlines to ACCSP in June and a release of data in early July. ACCSP is committed to providing the most comprehensive data to all users as soon as available.