



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201
703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | www.accsp.org

Executive Committee Wednesday, May 14, 2014 12:15 PM – 1:45 PM

**Crowne Plaza Hotel Old Town
901 North Fairfax Street
Alexandria, Virginia**

MEETING DRAFT AGENDA

1. Welcome/Introductions (*Chair C. Patterson*)
2. Committee Consent **ACTION**
 - Approval of Agenda (Attachment I)
 - Approval of Proceedings from April 3, 2014, Conference Call (Attachment II)
 - Approval of FY2015 Request For Proposals and Funding Decision Document (Attachment III)
3. Public Comment*
4. ACCSP Program Updates (*M. Cahall*)
 - Lobster Trap Tag Reporting System Meeting
 - North Carolina Input on Methodology to Incorporate Census Data into MRIP Estimates.
 - FY2014 Funded Projects
5. Status of Independent Program Review Recommendations Implementation (*M. Cahall*)
 - IPR Progress Report (Attachment IV)
6. ACCSP Governance Ad-Hoc Committee Update (*R. Boyles*)
7. Funding Subcommittee Update (*R. Beal*)
8. Operations Committee and Subcommittee Update (*T. Hoopes*)
9. Discuss Potential State Implementation of MRIP-APAIS and Identify Opportunities to Assist the States in Developing Proposals and Budgets

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.

10. Progress Report of Action Items from Last Meeting

- Scorecard from the IPR Monitoring Committee Review of the IPR Recommendations (*M. Cahall*)
- The Lobster Trap Tag Reporting System (*M. Cahall*)
- Methodology to Incorporate Census Data into MRIP Estimates (*M. Cahall*)
- Governance Ad-Hoc Workgroup (*R. Boyles*)
- Funding Subcommittee (*R. Beal, C. Patterson*)
- Presentation of the Final Strategic Plan for Coordinating Council Approval (*M. Cahall*)
- Continue Discussion of Potential State Implementation of MRIP-APAIS and Opportunities to Assist the States in Developing Proposals and Budgets
- Operations Committee and Subcommittee (*T. Hoopes*)

11. Closed Session for Executive Committee Only

12. Other Business/Adjourn

*See Public Comment Guidelines:

http://www.accsp.org/documents/ACCSP_PublicCommentPolicyOct2013.pdf

ATLANTIC COASTAL COOPERATIVE STATISTICS PROGRAM
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL
APRIL 3, 2014
1:00 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mark Alexander (CT)
Gordon Colvin (NOAA Fisheries)
Ned Cyr (NOAA Fisheries)
Cheri Patterson (NH) Chair

Tom Hoopes (MA), Chair,
Operations Committee

STAFF

Mike Cahall, ACCSP
Laura Leach, ASMFC
Ann McElhatton, ACCSP

Chair C. Patterson called the Executive Committee meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. and welcomed everyone. The agenda was approved as presented. The proceedings from the meeting of February 4, 2014, were approved as presented.

PROGRAM UPDATE

Mike Cahall provided a program update:

Administrative:

- We have completed the transition of the shared IT position between ACCSP and Atlantic States Marine Fisheries (ASMFC), Ed Martino, (in house network and pc systems support).
- Ann McElhatton (ACCSP Program Manager) is back from leave and has hit the ground running; initially working on the annual report.
- We will begin recruiting for the additional approved position of Program Coordinator.

Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) State Conduct of the Access Point Angler Intercept Survey (APAIS) Status:

- The State partners on the Recreational Technical Committee are in the process of working on individual state budgets and plans to conduct the APAIS.
- ACCSP staff will be participating in the MRIP workshop at the ASMFC's Spring Meeting in May, which is being conducted to bridge the information gap with the State Directors.
- The NOAA Fisheries (NMFS) Recreational Fishing Summit was facilitated by the ASMFC and while the discussions were not on the operational level, there were many issues and concerns raised about data and science. Gordon emphasized that we should think about state's readiness. His read from the ASMFC's Executive Committee is different from the ACCSP Coordinating Council. Tom Hoopes is frustrated because the Recreational Technical Committee is doing great work but it does not seem to be

penetrating at the state director level. It seems that in some states there is not as strong of a connection between the Coordinating Council progress and state directors understanding/buy in. Hopefully there will be a better outcome after the May workshop.

- Action item for next meeting: State Director buy-in.

Federal Funding Awards:

- ACCSP has received money to conduct a study on an acceptable Proportional Standard Error (PSE) range in marine recreational fisheries statistics; the modeling work is complete and a workshop is planned for the Recreational Technical Committee.
- Funding has also been awarded to do a new MRIP project which will look at the current census data collection process in the MRIP For-Hire fishing fleet. Mike noted that there is a good deal of political pressure to implement electronic reporting in the For-Hire fisheries and that this project would help to facilitate the implementation process. The goal is to work with the States and MRIP to create an approved method to incorporate census data into the estimates. This will likely require changes to the data collection systems to account for non-compliance in reporting and tightened enforcement. It was recommended that Mike speak with Doug Mumford because he has already done this in North Carolina.
- Funds were also awarded from NOAA's Fisheries Information System (FIS) to rebuild ACCSP's end-user query interface. The Independent Program Review called for a rebuild of the query system used by on-line users. In addition, it suggested that better coordination occur between agencies providing data to their constituents and the public. This project will attempt to address both recommendations. ACCSP will collaborate with the NOAA's Northeast and Southeast offices to try to eliminate redundancies and make the data consistent. Mike has already talked with Hannah Goodale and Joan Palmer of Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office's (GARFO) and Northeast Fisheries Science Center respectively, but plans to have further discussions with them and NOAA Headquarters.
- The total awarded to ACCSP from FIS/MRIP in FY2014 was \$250,000.

Ongoing Projects:

- The Lobster Index Settlement data entry system was deployed on Monday, March 31. It quantifies the recruitment of newly settled lobsters and helps to assess the strength of an individual year class. The system is designed to be self-service where partners input data directly from the states conducting the survey.
- SAFIS Handheld Project (reporting data into SAFIS through hand-held devices) - ACCSP staff is making progress on developing prototypes of the handheld project with three popular hand held operating systems; Droid (Google), Windows, and IOS.
- The Lobster Trap Tag Reporting System, which is used to track lobster trap allocations and transfers, will shortly be modified to meet recent federal regulations. The Trap Tag Working Group has a conference call scheduled for next week.
- Staff has also been very busy on the rollout of a new SAFIS database server.

UPDATE ON ACTION ITEMS FROM FEBRUARY 2014 MEETING:

Gordon Colvin distributed the comments on the strategic plan from the Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office (GARFO). Gordon will connect with Tony Conigliari and Hanna Goodale in GARFO to see if the comments need to be brought forward to the Coordinating Council now; if not, the comments can be put aside until the next strategic planning process. He also noted that NMFS has had five people on the Operations Committee for a year now. It appears ACCSP has already addressed many of their comments so it must be an issue of communication. Tony's comments are very focused on data quality and assurances. Mike noted that the ACCSP organizational structure is vertical, and many of the issues overlap among committees so he is looking at creating cross-committee groups to address these overlapping issues. Tom Hoopes noted that many of Tony's comments have been addressed already and can be addressed within the confines of the Strategic Plan so there is no need to amend the plan.

Mike Cahall noted that the Independent Program Review (IPR) Monitoring Committee is steadily moving forward on a number of different fronts with regard to the implementation of the Independent Program Review recommendations:

- They have updated the IPR chart/spreadsheet/scorecard and are working on a report to the Coordinating Council for May.
- Some recommendations are going to take time. Quality Control, for example, will require work from all committees to establish a process before approval by the Coordinating Council. And a number of the issues will be addressed by one or two standards.
- The IPR Scorecard will provide a general overview of the progress on implementation of the recommendations.
- The Scorecard will be provided to the Executive Committee before each of its meetings. It will also be sent out after the IPR Monitoring Committee meets.

ACCSP did get a request from Steve Turner in the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to help with contracting efforts in fishery data collection. While the work is not directly germane, it is part of our goal to support our partners. (Steve later withdrew his request citing the 20% overhead rate).

Chair Patterson provided an update on the progress of the formation of the Governance Ad-Hoc Workgroup. She has recruited Stephanie Iverson, Dee Lupton and Kathy Knowlton to the workgroup. Robert Boyles will chair the workgroup, and Chair Patterson and Gordon Colvin will complete the membership. Soon a Doodle Poll will be initiated to determine when the first call will be.

Chair Patterson asked if we have received the funds for the FY2014 projects approved last fall. Although ACCSP has not yet received the funds, Mike thinks we may be fully funded. All of the projects requesting funding for FY 2014 should be able to be funded. Mike Cahall noted that

there were requests for eight maintenance projects and four new projects plus the administrative request for a total of \$3.35 million. The swipe card pilot project in Massachusetts is generating a lot of interest. The industry seems receptive; both harvesters and restaurants. This will provide another mechanism for real time data to go into SAFIS. There are three new projects on fishery characterization studies looking at age, sex, bycatch and discards in commercial and recreational fisheries in North Carolina.

With regard to the development of the Standard Operating Procedures, Tom Hoopes's strategy is to create a subcommittee of a couple of Operations Committee members to hammer out the details and send back to the Operations Committee for review.

The final Strategic Plan, as modified by the Coordinating Council, is complete and will be part of the briefing materials distributed for the May Coordinating Council meeting. Mike noted the exemplary assistance of ASMFC staff person Lisa Hartman in the proofreading of this document.

The next Executive Committee meeting will be in person during the Commission's Spring Meeting on May 14 at 12:15 p.m. – 1:45 p.m. The MRIP Workshop will be the same day from 2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., and the Coordinating Council will meet on Thursday from 1:15 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.

Tom Hoopes requested that the Funding Subcommittee be comprised of a cross section of members from the Coordinating Council and the Operations Committee with differing opinions, so that they can develop a recommendation for the percentage of dollars that supports maintenance versus new projects. Chair Patterson will ask Paul Diodati, Terry Stockwell, and Mark Gibson to serve on this subcommittee.

There being no further business the Executive Committee conference call was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

ACTIONS ITEMS:

- Mike Cahall will provide updates for the next meeting on:
 - Scorecard from the IPR Monitoring Committee's review of the current work on the IPR recommendations.
 - The lobster trap tag reporting system's meeting.
 - Conversation with Doug Mumford in North Carolina on methodology to incorporate census data into MRIP estimates.
 - FY2014 funded projects.
- Robert Boyles will provide an update on the Governance Ad-Hoc Workgroup.
- Chair Patterson will provide an update on the Funding Subcommittee.
- Mike will supply the final Strategic Plan to the Executive Committee and Coordinating Council.

- Further discussion on how the ACCSP Executive Committee (EC) can help with the MRIP State Director buy-in process; such as communications, proposals and budgets, which will lead to a final decision on an ASMFC/ACCSP organized APAIS.
- Tom Hoopes will update the EC on Operations Committee and subcommittee work at the next meeting.

Funding Decision Process
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program
May 2014

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. This formal funding decision process has been developed to assist the Program committees in deliberations on funding of proposals intended to enhance timely implementation of the Program. The following process and proposal formats are provided as guidance to Program Partners.

The Coordinating Council has charged the Operations and Advisory Committees to review proposals and make funding recommendations to the Program Director and the Coordinating Council.

General Process for Setting Annual Program Priorities

The "Atlantic Coast Fisheries Data Collection Standards" provides the basic framework for implementation of the program by all Program Partners. The current Strategic and annual Operations Plans will be used to guide the determination of annual priorities.

Steps in the Funding Decision Process

1. Develop annual funding priorities, criteria and allocation targets (maintenance vs. new projects)
2. Issue Request for Proposals (RFP)
3. Review initial proposals
4. Provide initial results to submitting Partner
5. Review and rank final proposals
6. Proposal approval by the Coordinating Council
7. 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
8. Operation and/or Executive Committees and Coordinating Council review and make final decision with contingencies (e.g. scope of work, rescissions, no-cost extensions, returned unused funds, etc.)

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 later be used to rank projects and allocate funding between maintenance and new projects respectively.

2. Issue Request for Proposals

a. A 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 the current Strategic Plan. The RFP and related documents will also be posted on the Program's website. The public has the ability to work with a Program Partner to develop and submit a proposal. All proposals MUST BE submitted either by a Program Partner, jointly by several Program Partners, or through a Program Committee. Principle investigators are strongly encouraged to work with their Operations Committee member in the development of any proposal.

b. All proposals must be submitted electronically to the Program Director, and/or designee, in the following standard 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 two years. Second year funding is not guaranteed, partners must reapply.*
- *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). They 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.*

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 A). 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. Include coordinated method of data transmission to the Program in addition to module data elements gathered.

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 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.

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.

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, table of total project cost by year, a summary table of metrics 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.

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 that have submitted a proposal in order to represent the proposal. 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.

4. Provide initial review results to submitting Partner

Program staff will notify the submitting Partner of suggested changes or request responses to questions arising from the review process. 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 Program Director and the Advisory and Operations Committees will develop a list of prioritized recommended proposals and forward 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 proposed proposals. Projects to be funded by the Program will be approved by the Coordinating Council by the end of November each year. The Program 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. 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 Program 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.

8. Operation and/or Executive Committees and Coordinating Council review and final decision with contingencies or emergencies.

Committee(s) review and decision of project changes (e.g. scope of work, rescissions, no-cost extensions, returned unused funds, etc.) during the award period.

Scope of Work Change:

- a) Partners shall submit requests for amendments to approved projects in writing to the Program Director. The Coordinating Council member for that Partner must sign the request.
- b) When Partners request an amendment to an approved project, the Program Director will contact the Chair and Vice Chair of the Operations Committee. The Program Director and Operations Committee Chairs will determine if the requested change is minor or substantial. The Chairs and Program Director may approve minor changes.
- c) For substantial proposed changes, a decision document including the opinions of the Chairs and the Program Director will be sent to the Operations Committee and the Executive Committee of the Coordinating Council for review.
- d) The Executive Committee will decide to approve or reject the request for change and notify the Program Director, who will send a written notification to the Partner's principal investigator with a copy to the Operations Committee.
- e) 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.
- f) The Program 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.

Determination of contingencies for funding adjustments (e.g. rescissions):

The Program Director will be notified by NOAA Fisheries of any federal grant reduction. Such 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, the Operations Committee Chair and Vice-Chair, and the Advisory Committee Chair will develop a final recommendation and forward to the Executive Committee 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)

No-Cost Extensions and Unused/Returned Funds:

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 an 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.

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 Program 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 will confer with the Operations Committee Chair and Vice-Chair and the Advisory Committee Chair, and then submit a written recommendation to the Executive Committee 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.

Relevant Deadlines

- April
 - Develop annual priorities and funding allocation targets.
- May
 - Distribute request for proposals
- July
 - Proposal submission ○ Proposals received after specified RFP deadline will not be considered for funding.
- July ○ August
 - Initial proposal evaluation - recommendations developed by Program staff, and Advisory and Operations Committees.
- August/September
 - Submission of final proposals ○ final proposals must be submitted electronically to the Program Director, and/or designee by close of business on the day of the specified deadline. Final proposals received after RFP deadline will not be considered for funding.
- September ○ October
 - Final proposal evaluation - recommendations developed by the Program Director, Advisory and Operations Committees.
- Late October/November
 - Coordinating Council approval of project proposals.

Guidelines

The following guidelines are intended to assist Partners in preparing proposals:

- 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 two 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 Outreach Coordinator and/or Outreach Committee.
- Proposals including 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.

Reporting requirements

- a) Program staff will assess project performance.
- b) 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 Program Director:
 - a. Semi-annual reports (due 30 days after the semi-annual period) throughout the project period including time periods during no-cost extensions,
 - b. One final report (due 90 days after project completion).
 - c. Federal Partners must submit reports to the Program Director, and State Partners must submit reports to both the Program Director and the appropriate NOAA Grants office.
- c) 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.
- d) Reports shall be submitted using the following format:
 - a. Semi-Annual(s) ó Progress Reports: (3-4 pages)
 - i. Title page - Project name, project dates (semi-annual period covered and complete project period), submitting Partner, and date.
 - ii. Objective
 - iii. Activities Completed ó bulleted list by objective.
 - iv. Progress or lack of progress of incomplete activities during the period of semi-annual progress ó bulleted list by objective.
 - v. Activities planned during the next reporting period.
 - vi. Metrics table
 - vii. Milestone Chart ó original and revised if changes occurred during project period.
 - b. Final Report:
 - i. Title page ó Project name, project dates, submitting Partner, and date.
 - ii. Abstract/Executive Summary (including key results)
 - iii. Introduction
 - iv. Procedures
 - v. Results:
 1. Description of data collected.
 2. Quality of the data pertaining to the projects objective (e.g. representative to scope of project, quantity collected, etc.).
 3. Compiled data results.

4. Summary of statistics.
- vi. Discussion:
 1. Discuss the interpretation of results of project by addressing questions such as, but not limited to:
 - a. What occurred?
 - b. What did not occur that was expected to occur?
 - c. Why did expected results not occur?
 2. Applicability of study results to Program goals.
 3. Recommendations/Summary/Metrics
 - vii. Summarized budget expenditures and deviations (if any).
- e) 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.
 - f) 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.
 - g) Project recipients will provide all reports to the Program in electronic format.
 - h) Partners who receive no-cost extensions must notify the Program 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.
 - i) Partners that have not met reporting requirements for past/current projects may not submit a new proposal.
 - j) 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 implementation of similar programs.

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.

BUDGET GUIDELINES & TEMPLATE FOR PROPOSALS

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 at: <http://www.nero.noaa.gov/StateFedOff/grants.html>

Object Classes:

- a. Personnel: include salary, wage, and hours committed to project for each person by job title. Identify each individual by name and position, if possible.
- b. Fringe Benefits: should be identified for each individual. Describe in detail if the rate is greater than 35 % of the associated salary.
- c. Travel: all travel costs must be listed here. Provide a detailed breakdown of travel costs for trips over \$5,000 or 5 % of award. Include destination, duration, type of transportation, estimated cost, number of travelers, lodging, mileage rate and estimated number of miles, and per diem.
- d. 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.
- e. 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.
- f. 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.
- h. Other: list items, cost, and justification for each expense.
- i. Total direct charges
- j. 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.
- k. Totals of direct and indirect charges

Example budget table template. 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)		

Appendix A: Ranking Criteria Spreadsheet for Maintenance and New Project

Ranking Guide - Maintenance Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of ranking consideration
Catch and Effort	0-10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological or bycatch funding rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0-8	
Bycatch Species Interactions	0-6	
Social and Economic	0-4	
Metadata	+2	Additional points if metadata collected and supplied to Program 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.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0-4, 0-3, 0-2, 0-1	Rank 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	0-5	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step2b and Guidelines

Ranking Guide - New Projects:

Program Priority	Point Range	Description of ranking consideration
Catch and Effort	0-10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological or bycatch funding rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0-8	
Bycatch Species Interactions	0-6	
Social and Economic	0-4	
Metadata	+2	Additional points if metadata collected and supplied to Program 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.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0-4, 0-3, 0-2, 0-1	Rank 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	0-5	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.
Properly Prepared	0-5	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step2b and Guidelines



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201
703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | www.accsp.org

TO: ACCSP Coordinating Council and All ACCSP Committees

FROM: Michael S. Cahall, ACCSP Director 

SUBJECT: ACCSP Request for 2015 Proposals

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (Program or ACCSP) is issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) to program partner agencies or Committees for FY15 funding.

The Funding Decision Document provides general guidance and includes information on proposal preparation, the project approval process, and the RFP schedule. Projects in areas not specifically addressed may still be considered for funding if they help achieve Program goals. These goals, listed by priority, are improvements in:

1. Catch, effort, and landings data (including licensing, permit and vessel registration data);
2. Biological data;
3. Releases, discards and protected species data; and
4. 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 I) of the Biological Priority Matrix. Proposals for observer coverage should align with fisheries affecting the top quartile priority species (Attachment II) of the Bycatch Priority Matrix. Brief descriptions of current levels of biological or bycatch sampling by any of the Partners would be helpful to the review process.

Submissions must comply with Program Standards found [here](#). Timelines for the 2015 RFP are shown in Attachment III. Please consider using this [successful project proposal](#) as a template.

Proposals to continue Program funded partner programs (“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.

Project submissions will be reviewed in accordance with the Funding Decision Document, ranking criteria (Attachment IV), and funding allocation. Current funding allocation guidelines are 75% for maintenance projects and 25% for new projects within the Program priorities. 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. The final decisions on proposals to be funded for FY15 will be made in October 2014. We strongly urge you to **carefully** review the Funding Decision Document, especially in reference to the budget template.

Project awards will be subject to funding availability. If there is a funding shortfall, adjustments may be made to awards in accordance with the Funding Decision Document.

Successful applications will be notified when funding becomes available and project investigators will be required to report progress directly to the Program Operations and Advisory Committees in addition to the standard Federal reporting requirements.

Please submit initial proposals as Microsoft Word and Excel files no later than **June 30, 2014**, by email to **both** Mike Cahall (mike.cahall@accsp.org) and Ann McElhatton (<mailto:ann.mcelhatton@accsp.org>). If you have any

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.

questions about the funding decision process, please contact your agency's Operations Committee member (<http://www.accsp.org/opercommittee.htm>), Mike Cahall (703-842-0781), or Ann McElhatton (703-842-0780).

RELEVANT ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT I FY 2015 Biological Priority Matrix


ATTACHMENT II FY 2015 Bycatch Priority Matrix

ATTACHMENT III Timeline for Proposal Review

ATTACHMENT IV FY 2015 Ranking Criteria Document

Biological Sampling Priority Matrix

FY 2015



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

Biological Review Panel recommends:

- Species in the upper 25% of priority matrix 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

	Fishery	Most	Current/	Council	ASMFC	State	NMFS	Fishery	Sig. change	Sig. change	Adequacy	Stock	# sampling	Seasonality	TOTAL
	Status	Recent	Next	Priority	Priority	Priority	Priority	Managed	in landings	in mgmt	of level of	Resilience	strata	of fishery	
		Stock	Stock						w/in 24 mo	w/in 24 mo	sampling				
	K: known	Assessment	Assessment	0=NA	0=NA	0=NA	0=NA	0 = No	1= <25%	0= None	0=Over-	1 = resilient	1= <20	1= >9 mo	
	U: unkn	(Year)	(Year)	1=low	1=low	1=low	1=low	1 = Yes	3= 25-75%	1=Minor	sampled,	5 = vulnerable	3= 20-75	3= 1-9 mo	
	K/U: partly			5=high	5=high	5=high	5=high		5= >75%	5= Signif	5= none		5= >75	5= <1 mo	
Species	known														
Black Sea Bass (1)															
Centropomus striata	K	2011	2011	5	5	3.5	5.0	1	1	5	1	3	5	1	35.50
Winter Flounder															
Pleuronectes americanus	K	2011	Unknown	5	3	2.4	5.0	1	1	5	2	3	3	1	31.36
Snowy Grouper															
Epinephelus niveatus	K		2013	5	0	1.3	5.0	1	1	3	4	5	3	3	31.29
Shad															
Alosa															
sapidissima/mediocris	U	2007	Unknown	0	5	4.1	0.0	1	1	5	4	5	3	3	31.14
Spiny Dogfish															
Squalus acanthias	K	2009	Unknown	5	4	2.5	3.0	1	1	3	2	5	3	1	30.50
Winter Skate															
Raja ocellata	K	2006	Unknown	4	0	0.8	3.0	1	3	5	4	5	3	1	29.79
Blueline Tilefish															
Caulolatilus microps	U		2013	5	0	1.0	4.0	1	1	4	4	3	3	3	29.00
Scup															
Stenotomus chrysops	K/U	2002	2010?	5	5	2.3	4.0	1	3	0	1	1	5	1	28.29
Gray Triggerfish															
Balistes capriscus	K/U		2013	5	0	1.1	4.0	1	5	0	4	2	3	3	28.07
Summer Flounder			Annual												
Paralichthys dentatus	K	2008	Update	5	5	3.6	5.0	1	1	0	1	2	3	1	27.57
Gag Grouper															
Mycteroperca microlepis	K	2006	2013	4	0	1.1	4.0	1	3	2	3	4	3	1	26.14
River Herring															
Alosa	U	1988	2011?	0	5	3.0	0.0	1	1	0	4	4	5	3	26.00
Weakfish															
Cynoscion regalis	U	2009	Unknown	1	5	3.0	0.0	1	3	5	1	3	3	1	26.00
Little Skate															
Raja erinacea	K	2006	Unknown	4	0	0.6	3.0	1	1	5	4	3	3	1	25.64
Yellowtail Flounder															
Pleuronectes ferrugineus	K	2008	2012	4	0	1.4	5.0	1	1	5	2	2	3	1	25.43
Finetooth Shark															
Carcharhinus isodon	K	2007	Unknown	0	1	1.0	5.0	1	3	0	3	5	3	3	25.00
Red Grouper															
Epinephelus morio	K/U	2010	2013	3	0	0.9	4.0	1	1	3	4	4	3	1	24.93
Tilefish (1)															
Lopholatilus															
chamaeleonticeps	K	2005	2013	3	0	1.8	4.0	1	1	0	4	4	3	3	24.79
N. Short-fin Squid															
Illex illecebrosus	K/U	2005	Unknown	2	0	0.7	3.0	1	1	5	2	4	3	3	24.71
American Lobster															
Homarus americanus	K	2009	2014	0	5	2.5	3.0	1	1	1	4	3	3	1	24.50

Bio-sampling Priority Matrix


		Biological Sampling Adequacy	
		Adequate (0 - 2)	Inadequate (3 - 5)
Averaged Priority Columns	High (≥ 3.0)	Black Sea Bass - Winter Flounder - Spiny Dogfish - Scup - Summer Flounder	
	Low (< 3.0)	Weakfish - Yellowtail Flounder - N. Shortfin Squid	Snowy Grouper - Shad - Winter Skate - Blueline Tilefish - Gray Triggerfish - Gag Grouper - River Herring - Little Skate - Finetooth Shark - Red Grouper - Tilefish - American Lobster

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).

- Weakfish, yellowtail flounder and northern short-fin squid are being sampled adequately and have low priority so additional sampling is not needed.
- Projects that target multiple upper quartile species should also be given a higher priority.

Bycatch Sampling Priority Matrix

FY 2015



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

Top Quartile of FY 2015 Prioritization Matrix

Fishery	Sig. Change	# trips	% of total	Chg in	Amt of	Prot Sp	Reg Sp	Impact of	Amt of non	Impact of	Adequacy	TOTAL	# Sea Days	
Managed	in mgmt w/in		landings	landings	disc of	Interact	Discards	disc on other	reg disc	Disc on non-	of level of		to adequately	
	past 36 mo				target sp			reg sp		reg sp stock	sampling	75th %	sample	
y=1 n=0	0= none	1 - 1/100	1 = <33%	0 = < 50%	0=none,	0 = none	0=none	0 = none	0=none	0 = none	N=not adeq	50th %	(20-30% CV)	
	3= yes	2, 3, 4, 5	2 = 33-66%	3 = > 50%	1=<5%	3 = low	1= <5%	1=low	1= <5%	1=low	Y=adeq	25th %	or 2% trips	
			3 = >66%		2= 5-20%	6 = med	2= 5-20%	2=med	2= 5-20%	2=med	U=unkn			
					3= >20% or unkn	8= unkn 9= high	3= >20% or unkn	3=high or unkn	3= >20% or unkn	3=high or unkn				
original ACCSP FLEET name	ACCSP Fleet Name													
Gillnet NE Florida - Kingfish ("whiting")	South Atlantic Coastal Gillnet	1	3	3	3	0	3	8	3	3	3	N	33	724
Otter Trawl - Southern shrimp	South Atlantic Shrimp Trawl	1	3	3	3	0	1	9	3	2	3	N	31	280
Lobster Trap - inshore/offshore	New England Lobster Pots	1	3	5	3	0	3	9	2	3	1	N	31	452
Pelagic Longline - large pelagics	Southeastern, Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico HMS Pelagic Longline	1	3	3	3	0	3	9	3	3	1	Y	30	77
Otter Trawl - squid, butterfish	Mid-Atlantic Small-Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom	1	3	3	2	0	1	6	3	3	3	N	28	3,006
Gillnet - NE groundfish	New England Large-Mesh Gillnet	1	3	3	2	0	3	9	3	2	1	N	28	720
Otter Trawl - groundfish	New England Large-Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom	1	3	4	3	0	3	6	2	3	1	N	27	5,853
Otter Trawl - squid, butterfish	New England Small-Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom	1	3	3	3	0	3	6	3	3	1	N	27	4,274
Mid-Atlantic Inland Gillnets (small mesh <5") inland (bays, sounds and estuaries from NY - NC) - Weakfish, bluefish, spot, croaker, river herring, spotted sea trout, sea mullet (kingfish)	Mid-Atlantic Inland Gillnets (bays, sounds and estuaries from NY - NC)	1	0	3	1	3	3	6	3	3	2	N	26	144
Skimmer Trawl - Southern Shrimp	South Atlantic Skimmer Trawls	1	0	3	1	0	1	9	3	2	3	N	25	23
Bandit H&L - snapper/grouper	South Atlantic Snapper-Grouper Handline/ Electric Reel	1	3	2	2	0	3	3	3	2	3	N	25	26
Floating fish trap (pound net), inshore - weakfish, striped bass, scup, squid	Mid-Atlantic Pound-Net	1	3	3	1	0	3	6	3	2	1	N	24	325
Otter Trawl - fluke	Mid-Atlantic Large-Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom	1	3	3	2	0	2	6	2	3	1	N	24	2,835
Gillnet - monkfish	New England Extra-Large-Mesh Gillnet	1	3	3	2	0	1	9	3	0	1	N	24	1,843
Dredge - scallop	Mid-Atlantic General Cat. Access Area Scallop Dredge	1	3	2	3	3	1	6	1	0	1	N	23	29
Gillnet - monkfish	Mid-Atlantic Extra-Large-Mesh Gillnet	1	3	3	1	0	2	9	1	1	1	N	23	746

Bycatch Sampling Priorities

Top Quartile

Grouping of fisheries in upper 25% of total matrix score, grouped by Sea Days Needed to Adequately Sample (20-30% CV OR 2% of trips) and Matrix Priority Score.

		Adequate Sampling Targets	
		1-100 Sea Days Needed	>100 Sea Days Needed
Matrix Priority Score	High (≥ 25)	Southeastern, Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico HMS Pelagic Longline South Atlantic Skimmer Trawls South Atlantic Snapper-Grouper Handline/Electric Reel	South Atlantic Coastal Gillnet South Atlantic Shrimp Trawl New England Lobster Pots Mid-Atlantic Small Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom New England Large Mesh Gillnet New England Large Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom Mid-Atlantic Inland Gillnets
	Low (<25)	Mid-Atlantic General Cat. Access Area Scallop Dredge	Mid-Atlantic Pound Net Mid-Atlantic Large Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom New England Extra-Large Mesh Gillnet Mid-Atlantic Extra-Large Mesh Gillnet



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201
703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | www.accsp.org

TIMELINE FOR FUNDING PROCESS & PROPOSAL REVIEW

March 1, 2014: Start of FY15 for ACCSP

May 2014: ACCSP request for proposals issued following approval by the Coordinating Council

June 30: Initial proposals due

July 7: Initial proposals distributed for initial review to Operations and Advisory Committees (approximately three weeks prior to call to review)

Week of July 21: Operations and Advisory Committees conference call to review initial proposals

August 11: Feedback submitted to PIs on initial proposals

September 1: Revised proposals due

September 8: Revised proposals distributed for final review to Operations and Advisory Committees (three weeks+ to review before in-person meeting)

October 1-2: ACCSP Operations and Advisory Committee Meeting for rankings

Late October: Coordinating Council approves projects

Early 2015: ACCSP distributes award letters for funded projects

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.

Ranking Guide - Maintenance Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of ranking consideration
Catch and Effort	0-10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological or bycatch funding rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0-8	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0-6	
Social and Economic	0-4	
Metadata	+2	Additional points if metadata collected and supplied to Program 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.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0-4, 0-3, 0-2, 0-1	Rank 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	0-5	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step2b and Guidelines

Ranking Guide - New Projects:

Program Priority	Point Range	Description of ranking consideration
Catch and Effort	0-10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological or bycatch funding rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0-8	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0-6	
Social and Economic	0-4	
Metadata	+2	Additional points if metadata collected and supplied to Program 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.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0-4, 0-3, 0-2, 0-1	Rank 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	0-5	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.
Properly Prepared	0-5	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step2b and Guidelines

Recommendation Details

Recommendation ID: *Click box and choose a recommendation from the list and all attributes will auto-populate*

Recommendation: Periodically review the data standards to ensure they are still pertinent and address the needs of program partners and move the program towards full implementation (TOR 5).

Responding Group: Operations Committee

Timetable: Mid term

Vehicle: SOP

Action(s): The ACCSP data collection standards were just reviewed/updated/approved in 2012. However, the frequency of review needs to be defined. Additionally, those standards that are less well defined (e.g., socio-economic) need to be reviewed more frequently.

Expected Outcome: Documentation of the process and periodicity by which standards are reviewed (to be incorporated as a part of the Standard Operating Procedure).

Current Score Card

Recommendation ID	Current Score	Responding Group	Notes	Product
DCS-01	2	Operations Committee	Develop thresholds for standards revisions - develop Timeframe 1 yr for first v SOP	
DCS-02	2	Operations Committee	Discussions Ongoing - part of basic ACCSP process	SOP
DCS-03	1	Operations Committee	Need to initiate review through CommTech - start with the ASMFC	SOP
DM-01	1	Staff	Discussions Ongoing with Regions and HQ, Funding authorized for new query	SOP
DM-02	2	Staff	Communications and Outreach plan completed, Funding authorized for new q OP	
DM-03	1	Staff	Warehouse Outreach Group formed, Funding authorized for new query interf:	SOP
DM-04	1	Staff	Warehouse Outreach Group formed, Funding authorized for new query interf:	SOP
DM-05	2	Staff	Data status provided through web site	SOP
DM-06	3	Staff	Public access now available	SOP
DM-07	1	Staff	Staff needs to develop reminders to security contacts	SOP
DM-08	1	Executive Committee	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	OP
DM-09	1	Staff	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	SOP
DM-10	1	Operations Committee	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	SOP
DM-11	3	Staff	Cost Prohibitive Closed by Staff, approved by Council	
DM-12	1	Staff	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	SOP
DM-13	2	Staff	See DM-05, data are available, process formalized	SOP
M-01	2	Operations Committee	Outreach Strategic Plan Completed	OP
M-02	2	Staff	Graphic created and on web page, routinely included in presentations	OP
M-03	1	Staff	Requirements in development by staff will be reviewed by IS Committee	SOP
M-04	2	Staff	Strategic Plan completed, Ops and SOP in planning	SP
M-05	2	Executive Committee	Provided for in funding decision process	SOP
M-06	2	Executive Committee	Staff Performed in accordance with ASMFC policy, Director in progress	SOP
M-07	2	Operations Committee (jointly w/ Staff)	Continue with current outreach, needs communications and outreach strategi	OP
ORG-01	1	Staff	Staff working on SOP format and contents	SOP
ORG-02	2	Staff	Funding made available, training req in performance plans	SOP
ORG-03	3	Staff	Planning/Rewards in accordance with ASMFC Policy	
ORG-04	3	Executive Committee	Continued Coordination with ASMFC required	SOP
ORG-05	2	Executive Committee	Exec Comm meeting bi-monthly	SOP
ORG-06	3	Executive Committee	Membership reviewed and agreed upon	
ORG-07	2	Executive Committee	Chair and V Chair have monthly briefings decisions jointly made	SOP

Total	111
Total Possible	335
% complete	33.13%

0 – no progress
 1 – in planning
 2 – implemented but not finalized (not in an SOP or Plan etc)
 3 – closed (either completed or not adopted)

ORG-08	1	Executive Committee	Terms of Reference Completed, Workgroup creation in progress	GR
ORG-09	2	Operations Committee	Face to face meetings dramatically reduced, parameters under development	SOP
ORG-10	2	Operations Committee	Likely to be completed through alternate, less expensive means - Ops Commit	SOP
ORG-11	2	Staff	Chair and V Chair have monthly briefings decisions jointly made	SOP
ORG-12	2	Executive Committee	Exec Comm meeting bi-monthly	SOP
PM-01	2	Staff	Specific outreach teams have met, first council site visits completed, commun	OP
PM-02	2	Executive Committee	First Regional Workshop Completed (SAFMC)	SP
PM-03	0	Executive Committee	Committee not yet formed	SP
PM-04	0	Executive Committee	Dependent on PM-03	OP
PM-05	2	Executive Committee	First Regional Workshop Completed (SAFMC)	SP
PM-06	2	Executive Committee	ASMFC provided testimony, also dependent on PM-03	SP
PM-07	2	Executive Committee	Funding Decsion Document amended	SOP
PM-08	2	Operations Committee	Admin Grant review occurred during regular PI review	SOP
PM-09	2	Operations Committee	Communications and Outreach plan in progress, related to Science Center anc	OP
PM-10	0	Operations Committee (jointly w/ Staff)	List(s) not developed	SOP
PM-11	3	Operations Committee (jointly w/ Staff)	Strategic Plan Completed and Approved	SOP
PM-12	2	Staff	Communications and Outreach plan in progress	OP
PM-13	2	Executive Committee	Workshops in planning, coordination routine	SOP
PP-01	1	Operations Committee	Funding Sub-committee not yet formed	SOP
PP-02	1	Operations Committee	Project process modified see PP-01	SOP
PP-03	1	Operations Committee	See PP-01	SOP
PP-04	1	Operations Committee	See PP-01	SOP
PP-05	3	Executive Committee	Council Rejected - item closed	
PP-06	1	Operations Committee	See PP-01	SOP
PP-07	1	Operations Committee	Task assigned to IS Committee	SOP
PP-08	2	Operations Committee	ACCSP grant document to be modified annually	SOP
PP-09	1	Staff	Working on tracking system - IS Committee will establish requirements	SOP
PP-10	2	Operations Committee (jointly w/ Staff)	HMS agreed to fund work, funding received - funding threshold to be establish	SOP
S-01	2	Staff	SAFIS Outreach group created	OP
S-02	1	Operations Committee	Communications and Outreach plans in progress	OP
S-03	1	Staff	Communications and Outreach plans in progress	OP
S-04	1	Staff	New software released to Trips, Dealer Reporting mods completed. Change m	SOP
S-05	1	Staff	New software released to Trips, Dealer Reporting mods completed. Change m	SOP
S-06	2	Staff	Need to integrated into SOP and Communications and Outreach Plan	SOP
S-07	2	Staff	PC based tools exist and are in use. New tools in development	SOP
S-08	1	Staff	New software released to Trips, Dealer Reporting mods ongoing, committee fi	SOP
S-09	2	Operations Committee (jointly w/ Staff)	SAFIS Outreach group created	OP

Scores in this table reflect the most recent score, found in the Scorecard All sheet. All cells autopopulate with changes in DATA ENTRY - Running Scorecard sheet.

- 0 – no progress
- 1 – in planning
- 2 – implemented but not finalized (not in an SOP or Plan etc)
- 3 – closed (either completed or not adopted)

Recommendation ID	Responding Group	Notes	Product	Timeline	Score	Shortterm	ShorttoM	Midterm
DCS-01	Operations Committee	Develop thresholds for standards revisions - develop	Timeframe 1 yr for first vSOP	Mid term	2			2
DCS-02	Operations Committee	Discussions Ongoing - part of basic ACCSP process	SOP	Mid term	2			2
DCS-03	Operations Committee	Need to initiate review through CommTech - start with the ASMFC	SOP	Mid term	1			1
DM-01	Staff	Discussions Ongoing with Regions and HQ, Funding authorized for new query	SOP	Short term	1			1
DM-02	Staff	Communications and Outreach plan completed, Funding authorized for new qOP	OP	Mid term	2			2
DM-03	Staff	Warehouse Outreach Group formed, Funding authorized for new query interf.SOP	SOP	Mid term	1			1
DM-04	Staff	Warehouse Outreach Group formed, Funding authorized for new query interf.SOP	SOP	Mid term	1			1
DM-05	Staff	Data status provided through web site	SOP	Mid term	2			2
DM-06	Staff	Public access now available	SOP	Short term	3			3
DM-07	Staff	Staff needs to develop reminders to security contacts	SOP	Short term	1			1
DM-08	Executive Committee	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	OP	Mid term	1			1
DM-09	Staff	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	SOP	Mid term	1			1
DM-10	Operations Committee	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	SOP	Mid term	1			1
DM-11	Staff	Cost Prohibitive Closed by Staff, approved by Council	SOP	Mid term	3			3
DM-12	Staff	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	SOP	Mid term	1			1
DM-13	Staff	See DM-05, data are available, process formalized	SOP	Mid term	2			2
M-01	Operations Committee	Outreach Strategic Plan Completed	OP	Mid term	2			2
M-02	Staff	Graphic created and on web page, routinely included in presentations	OP	Short term	2			2
M-03	Staff	Requirements in development by staff will be reviewed by IS Committee	SOP	Short term	1			1
M-04	Staff	Strategic Plan completed, Ops and SOP in planning	SP	Short term	2			2
M-05	Executive Committee	Provided for in funding decision process	SOP	Short term	2			2
M-06	Executive Committee	Staff Performed in accordance with ASMFC policy, Director in progress	SOP	Short term	2			2
M-07	Operations Committee (jointly w/ Staff)	Continue with current outreach, needs communications and outreach strateg	OP	Mid term	2			2
ORG-01	Staff	Staff working on SOP format and contents	SOP	Mid term	1			1
ORG-02	Staff	Funding made available, training req in performance plans	SOP	Mid term	2			2
ORG-03	Staff	Planning/Rewards in accordance with ASMFC Policy	SOP	Short term	3			3
ORG-04	Executive Committee	Continued Coordination with ASMFC required	SOP	Short term	3			3
ORG-05	Executive Committee	Exec Comm meeting bi-monthly	SOP	Short term	2			2
ORG-06	Executive Committee	Membership reviewed and agreed upon	SOP	Short term	3			3
ORG-07	Executive Committee	Chair and V Chair have monthly briefings decisions jointly made	SOP	Short term	2			2
ORG-08	Executive Committee	Terms of Reference Completed, Workgroup creation in progress	GR	Short term	1			1
ORG-09	Operations Committee	Face to face meetings dramatically reduced, parameters under development	SOP	Short term	2			2
ORG-10	Operations Committee	Likely to be completed through alternate, less expensive means - Ops Commit	SOP	Short term	2			2
ORG-11	Staff	Chair and V Chair have monthly briefings decisions jointly made	SOP	Short term	2			2
ORG-12	Executive Committee	Exec Comm meeting bi-monthly	SOP	Short term	2			2
PV-01	Staff	Specific outreach teams have met, first council site visits completed, commun	OP	Short to M	2			2
PV-02	Executive Committee	First Regional Workshop Completed (SAFMC)	SP	Mid term	2			2
PV-03	Executive Committee	Committee not yet formed	SP	Mid term	0			0

PM-04	Executive Committee	Dependent on PM-03	OP	Mid term	0	0
PM-05	Executive Committee	First Regional Workshop Completed (SAFMC)	SP	Mid term	2	2
PM-06	Executive Committee	ASMFC provided testimony, also dependent on PM-03	SP	Short term	2	2
PM-07	Executive Committee	Funding Decision Document amended	SOP	Short term	2	2
PM-08	Operations Committee	Admin Grant review occurred during regular PI review	SOP	Mid term	2	2
PM-09	Operations Committee	Communications and Outreach plan in progress, related to Science Center anc OP	anc OP	Mid term	2	2
PM-10	Operations Committee (jointly w/ Staff)	List(s) not developed	SOP	Short term	0	0
PM-11	Operations Committee (jointly w/ Staff)	Strategic Plan Completed and Approved	SOP	Short term	3	3
PM-12	Staff	Communications and Outreach plan in progress	Op	Mid term	2	2
PM-13	Executive Committee	Workshops in planning, coordination routine	SOP	Short term	2	2
PP-01	Operations Committee	Funding Sub-committee not yet formed	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-02	Operations Committee	Project process modified see PP-01	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-03	Operations Committee	See PP-01	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-04	Operations Committee	See PP-01	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-05	Executive Committee	Council Rejected - item closed		Short term	3	3
PP-06	Operations Committee	See PP-01	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-07	Operations Committee	Task assigned to IS Committee	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-08	Operations Committee	ACCP grant document to be modified annually	SOP	Mid term	2	2
PP-09	Staff	Working on tracking system - IS Committee will establish requirements	SOP	Short term	1	1
PP-10	Operations Committee (jointly w/ Staff)	HMS agreed to fund work, funding received - funding threshold to be established	SOP	Short term	2	2
S-01	Staff	SAFIS Outreach group created	OP	Short to M	2	2
S-02	Operations Committee	Communications and Outreach plans in progress	Op	Mid term	1	1
S-03	Staff	Communications and Outreach plans in progress	Op	Mid term	1	1
S-04	Staff	New software released to Trips, Dealer Reporting mods completed, Change m SOP	Change m SOP	Mid term	1	1
S-05	Staff	New software released to Trips, Dealer Reporting mods completed, Change m SOP	Change m SOP	Short to M	1	1
S-06	Staff	Need to integrate into SOP and Communications and Outreach Plan	SOP	Mid term	2	2
S-07	Staff	PC based tools exist and are in use. New tools in development	SOP	Mid term	2	2
S-08	Staff	New software released to Trips, Dealer Reporting mods ongoing, committee f SOP	f SOP	Mid term	1	1
S-09	Operations Committee (jointly w/ Staff)	SAFIS Outreach group created	Op	Short to M	2	2

Monthly scores should be

- 0 – no progress
- 1 – in planning
- 2 – implemented but not finalized (not in an SOP or Plan etc)
- 3 – closed (either completed or not adopted)

Recommendation ID	Notes	Product	Timeline	SCORES									
				Oct-2013	Mar-2014	Apr-2014	May-2014	Jun-2014	Jul-2014	Aug-2014	Sep-2014		
					16 updated								
DCS-01	Develop thresholds for standards revisions - develop Timeframe 1 yr for first version	SOP	Mid term	2	2	2							
DCS-02	Discussions Ongoing - part of basic ACCSP process	SOP	Mid term	1	2	2							
DCS-03	Need to initiate review through CommTech - start with the ASMFC	SOP	Mid term	1	1	1							
DM-01	Discussions Ongoing with Regions and HQ, Funding authorized for new query interface	SOP	Short term	0	1	1							
DM-02	Communications and Outreach plan completed, Funding authorized for new query interface	OP	Mid term	1	2	2							
DM-03	Warehouse Outreach Group formed, Funding authorized for new query interface	SOP	Mid term	1	1	1							
DM-04	Warehouse Outreach Group formed, Funding authorized for new query interface - IS Committee will work on requirements	SOP	Mid term	1	1	1							
DM-05	Data status provided through web site	SOP	Mid term	2	2	2							
DM-06	Public access now available	SOP	Short term	2	3	3							
DM-07	Staff needs to develop reminders to security contacts	SOP	Short term	1	1	1							
DM-08	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	OP	Mid term	1	1	1							
DM-09	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	SOP	Mid term	1	1	1							
DM-10	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	SOP	Mid term	1	1	1							
DM-11	Cost Prohibitive Closed by Staff, approved by Council	SOP	Mid term	3	3	3							
DM-12	Discussions with Regions, Science Centers and HQ initiated	SOP	Mid term	1	1	1							
DM-13	See DM-05, data are available, process formalized	SOP	Mid term	2	2	2							
M-01	Outreach Strategic Plan Completed	OP	Mid term	1	2	2							
M-02	Graphic created and on web page, routinely included in presentations	OP	Short term	2	2	2							
M-03	Requirements in development by staff will be reviewed by IS Committee	SOP	Short term	0	1	1							
M-04	Strategic Plan completed, Ops and SOP in planning	SP	Short term	1	2	2							
M-05	Provided for in funding decision process	SOP	Short term	2	2	2							
M-06	Staff Performed in accordance with ASMFC policy, Director in progress		Short term	2	2	2							
M-07	Continue with current outreach, needs communications and outreach strategic plans, achievements documented in Annual Reports, Newsletters, Press Releases and Workshops	OP	Mid term	2	2	2							
ORG-01	Staff working on SOP format and contents	SOP	Mid term	1	1	1							
ORG-02	Funding made available, training req in performance plans		Mid term	2	2	2							
ORG-03	Planning/Rewards in accordance with ASMFC Policy		Short term	3	3	3							
ORG-04	Continued Coordination with ASMFC required	SOP	Short term	2	3	3							
ORG-05	Exec Comm meeting bi-monthly	SOP	Short term	2	2	2							
ORG-06	Membership reviewed and agreed upon	MOU	Short term	3	3	3							

ORG-07	Chair and V Chair have monthly briefings decisions jointly made	SOP	Short term	2	2
ORG-08	Terms of Reference Completed, Workgroup creation in progress	GR	Short term	1	1
ORG-09	Face to face meetings dramatically reduced, parameters under development	SOP	Short term	1	2
ORG-10	Likely to be completed through alternate, less expensive means - Ops Committee will discuss	SOP	Short term	2	2
ORG-11	Chair and V Chair have monthly briefings decisions jointly made	SOP	Short term	2	2
ORG-12	Exec Comm meeting bi-monthly	SOP	Short term	2	2
PM-01	Specific outreach teams have met, first council site visits completed, communications plan in development	OP	Short to Mid term	1	2
PM-02	First Regional Workshop Completed (SAFMC)	SP	Mid term	1	2
PM-03	Committee not yet formed	SP	Mid term	0	0
PM-04	Dependent on PM-03	SP	Mid term	0	0
PM-05	First Regional Workshop Completed (SAFMC)	SP	Mid term	1	2
PM-06	ASMFC provided testimony, also dependent on PM-03	SP	Short term	2	2
PM-07	Funding Decision Document amended	SOP	Short term	2	2
PM-08	Admin Grant review occurred during regular PI review	SOP	Mid term	2	2
PM-09	Communications and Outreach plan in progress, related to Science Center and Regional Coordination	OP	Mid term	1	2
PM-10	List(s) not developed	SOP	Short term	0	0
PM-11	Strategic Plan Completed and Approved	SOP	Short term	0	3
PM-12	Communications and Outreach plan in progress	OP	Mid term	1	2
PM-13	Workshops in planning, coordination routine	SOP	Short term	1	2
PP-01	Funding Sub-committee not yet formed	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-02	Project process modified see PP-01	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-03	See PP-01	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-04	See PP-01	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-05	Council Rejected - item closed	SOP	Short term	3	3
PP-06	See PP-01	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-07	Task assigned to IS Committee	SOP	Mid term	1	1
PP-08	ACCSP grant document to be modified annually	SOP	Mid term	1	2
PP-09	Working on tracking system - IS Committee will establish requirements	SOP	Short term	1	1
PP-10	HMS agreed to fund work, funding received - funding threshold to be established by Ops	SOP	Short term	2	2
S-01	SAFIS Outreach group created	OP	Short to Mid term	2	2
S-02	Communications and Outreach plans in progress	OP	Mid term	1	1
S-03	Communications and Outreach plans in progress	OP	Mid term	1	1
S-04	New software released to Trips, Dealer Reporting mods completed. Change management process will influence as well	SOP	Mid term	1	1
S-05	New software released to Trips, Dealer Reporting mods completed. Change management process will influence as well	SOP	Short to Mid term	1	1
S-06	Need to integrated into SOP and Communications and Outreach Plan	SOP	Mid term	2	2
S-07	PC based tools exist and are in use. New tools in development	SOP	Mid term	2	2
S-08	New software released to Trips, Dealer Reporting mods ongoing, committee formed	SOP	Mid term	1	1
S-09	SAFIS Outreach group created	OP	Short to Mid term	2	2