

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

Guide for Ranking Proposals

FY2013 Edition

INTRODUCTION

Each year, the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (Program) distributes a [Funding Decision Document](#) (http://www.accsp.org/documents/RFP2013/ACCSP_FY2013FundingDecisionDocument.pdf) outlining the priorities for the coming fiscal year. These priorities are reviewed by the Coordinating Council each spring before the request for proposals is distributed. The Funding Decision Document is available to all ACCSP grant applicants.

We cannot assume that all proposals will meet the guidelines set forth by the document. This is precisely why we need a diverse set of eyes to review the proposals so we can distribute the funds in accordance with Program guidelines.

PHILOSOPHY

What is most important to remember as a proposal ranker is that you are consistent when reviewing the proposals. Many people have different viewpoints as to what would receive a high score. For instance, someone might think it is worth 10 points if a proposal states that it will collect all minimum data elements of catch and effort, whereas, someone else might view a proposal that collects all minimum data elements as worthy of 7 points, which would leave room if another proposal went above and beyond with an innovative data verification program.

It is entirely up to you how you view these proposals. We realize each proposal ranker is coming from a different perspective and we look forward to gathering a diverse set of rankings for each proposal. The most important aspect to ranking proposals is to remain consistent from proposal to proposal.

CATEGORIES FOR RANKING

For FY2013, there are three categories used to rank the project proposals:

- 1) *Primary Program Priority*;
- 2) *Project Quality Factors* (Partners, Funding and Data); and
- 3) *Other Factors*.

SCORING

The factors of each category carry a different weight. For instance, when ranking these proposals the score of the primary module (a factor of *Primary Program Priority*) given to the proposal is given a weight of 3 (the score given is multiplied by 3). Whereas, the improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness and impact on stock assessments (both categories of *Project Quality Factors*) are given a weight of 2 (the score given is multiplied by 2). Finally, if the proposal is properly prepared (a category of *Other Factors*) is given a weight of 1 (the score given is multiplied by 1). Review the [Ranking Criteria Spreadsheet](#) (http://www.accsp.org/documents/RFP2013/ACCSP_RankingCriteria.pdf) and the multiplier that is applied to each factor.

PRIMARY PROGRAM PRIORITY

Projects must be rated on how well the data being collected by the project fit the current [Atlantic Coast Fisheries Data Collection Standards](http://www.accsp.org/documents/programdesign/2012/ACCSP_StandardsandAppendices2012_Final105082012.pdf) (http://www.accsp.org/documents/programdesign/2012/ACCSP_StandardsandAppendices2012_Final105082012.pdf). You will rate only one module in addition to metadata. If a secondary one is recognized, it will be considered during the *Project Quality Factors*.

The highest possible score for this section (PRIMARY PROGRAM PRIORITY) is 32. The score of this category is 44% of the total score of the project.

A. *Catch and Effort* ó ACCSP is principally seeking to collect catch and effort data in FY2011. If a proposal description states that it will primarily collect catch and effort data, the proposal may score a maximum of 10 points.

How does a proposal receive the maximum 10 points? The ACCSP standard for commercial catch and effort statistics is mandatory, trip-level reporting of all commercial harvested marine species, with fishermen and/or dealers required to report standardized data elements for each trip by the tenth of the following month.

The ACCSP standard for recreational catch and effort statistics are covered in more detail in the current [Atlantic Coast Fisheries Data Collection Standards](http://www.accsp.org/documents/programdesign/2012/ACCSP_StandardsandAppendices2012_Final105082012.pdf).

Something you may want to consider when ranking proposals is whether or not all data elements outlined in the [Atlantic Coast Fisheries Data Collection Standards](http://www.accsp.org/documents/programdesign/2012/ACCSP_StandardsandAppendices2012_Final105082012.pdf).

To determine scoring for this factor consider the following:

- 1) If they collect the minimum data elements would the proposal be ranked a 5 and thus for all additional information it would lead up to the highest possible score ó a 10?
- 2) Is the data collection method they used (1 ticket vs. 2 ticket) a determining factor on the final score given in this category?
- 3) Also, is data validation a consideration for this ranking?

B. *Biological Sampling* ó A secondary priority for ACCSP for FY2013 is the collection of biological data. If a proposal description states that it will primarily collect biological data, the proposal may score a maximum of 8 points.

How does a proposal receive the maximum 8 points? [The FY2013 Biological Matrix](http://www.accsp.org/documents/RFP2013/ACCSP_FY2013BioMatrix.pdf) (http://www.accsp.org/documents/RFP2013/ACCSP_FY2013BioMatrix.pdf) identifies the top quartile of all species ranked by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, regional councils, NOAA and states. The top quartile species are grouped by average priority and biological sampling adequacy. The proposals should be given a high ranking if data are collected on species with high average priority and inadequate adequacy (FY2013 species: *no species*). A mid-level score would be given to those proposals that have a low average priority and inadequate sampling (FY2013 species: *weakfish, yellowtail flounder, Northern shortfin, and squid*) or high average priority and adequate sampling (FY2013 species: *black sea bass, winter flounder, dogfish, scup, summer flounder*). A low level score would go to those species that have a low average priority and are adequately sampled (FY2013 species: *snowy grouper, shad, winter skate, blueline tilefish, gray triggerfish, grouper, river herring, little skate, fine tooth shark, red grouper, tilefish, American lobster*).

C. *Bycatch/Species Interaction* - A third priority for ACCSP for FY2013 is the collection of bycatch data. If a proposal description states that it will primarily collect bycatch data, the proposal may score a maximum of 6 points.

How does a proposal receive the maximum 6 points? The [FY2013 Bycatch Matrix](http://www.accsp.org/documents/RFP2013/ACCSP_FY2013BycatchMatrix.pdf) (http://www.accsp.org/documents/RFP2013/ACCSP_FY2013BycatchMatrix.pdf) identifies the top quartile of all groups of fisheries ranked by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, regional councils, NOAA and states. The top fisheries are grouped by average priority and adequate sampling targets (days at sea). High sampling targets would include those fisheries that need more than 101 days at sea and adequate sampling targets would be those fisheries that need less than 100 days at sea. The proposals should be given a high ranking if data are being collected on fisheries with high average priority and high sampling targets (FY2013 fisheries: *South Atlantic coastal gillnet, south Atlantic shrimp trawl, New England lobster pot, Mid-Atlantic small mesh otter trawl (bottom), New England large mesh gillnet, New England large mesh otter trawl (bottom), Mid-Atlantic inland gillnets*). A mid-level score would be given to those proposals that have a low average priority and high sampling targets (FY2013 fisheries: *Mid-Atlantic pound net, Mid-Atlantic large mesh otter trawl (bottom), New England extra large mesh gillnet, Mid-Atlantic extra large mesh gillnet*) or **high average priority and adequate sampling targets** (FY2013 fisheries: *Southeastern, Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico HMS pelagic longline, South Atlantic skimmer trawls, and South Atlantic snapper-grouper handline/electric reel*). A low level score would go to those fisheries that have a low average priority and are adequately sampled (FY2013 fisheries: *Mid-Atlantic general cat. Access area scallop dredge*).

D. *Social and Economic* ó Another important priority, although low this year, for ACCSP in FY2011 is the collection of social and economic data. If a proposal description states that it will primarily collect social and economic data, the proposal may score a maximum of 4 points.

How does a proposal receive the maximum 4 points? Standards for commercial social and economic data collection are under construction by the Committee on Economic and Social Science. There is a list of data elements found in the [Atlantic Coast Fisheries Data Collection Standards](#) in you may want to consider as a proposal ranker.

The ACCSP has established standards for social and economic data collection in recreational and for-hire finfish fisheries. Our standard is voluntary surveys of finfish fisheries conducted at least every three years.

E. *Metadata* ó All proposals are collecting some degree of metadata. The [2010 Metadata Directory](#) will provides the most up-to-date metadata submitted by each partner. A score of 0-2 points is subjective based on a review of the proposal and how data collected can best be integrated into the Metadata Directory.

PROJECT QUALITY FACTORS (Partners, Funding and Data):

A. *Multi-Partner Regional impact including broad applications (PARTNERS)* - To determine scoring for this factor (a score of 0-5) consider the following:

- 1) Does this project involve one or multiple partners?
- 2) Does this project collect data from one or multiple partners?
- 3) What is the timeline for benefiting from the data?
- 4) Does this project have a narrow or broad scope of work?

The highest possible score for the above section (PARTNERS) is a 5. The score of this category is 7% of the total score of the project.

B. *Contains funding transition plan/Defined end point (FUNDING)* - To determine scoring for this factor (a score of 0-4) consider the following:

- 1) How long has the project been receiving funds from ACCSP or other sources?
- 2) Does the project have an end point or continue year after year?
- 3) If the project continues does this project explain how new funds will be applied in coming years?
- 4) Is there a transition plan?

C. *In-kind contribution (FUNDING)* ó To determine scoring for this factor (a score of 0-4) consider the following:

- 1) Is the partner adding funds as well as ACCSP?
- 2) At what level is the partner applying additional funds?
- 3) Is it at a level that is acceptable for the ACCSP standards?

The highest possible score for the above section (FUNDING) is a 12. The score of this category is 17% of the total score of the project.

D. *Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness (DATA)* - To determine scoring for this factor (a score of 0-4) consider the following:

- 1) At what rate can this project provide data to the ACCSP Data Warehouse?
- 2) Are the data collected from this project a higher pedigree than in previous years?
- 3) Does this project include innovative ways to collect data?
- 4) Does this project outline a clear and timely mechanism for sharing data to ACCSP?

E. *Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order) (DATA)* ó In determining what (if any) score to give for a proposal that addresses a secondary module as a by-product consider the following, if the secondary module is:

- 1) Catch and effort data receives a score of 4;
- 2) Biological data receives a score of 3;
- 3) Bycatch data receives a score of 2; and
- 4) Social and economic data receives a score of 1.

F. *Impact on stock assessment (DATA)* ó To determine scoring for this factor (a score of 0-3) consider the following:

- 1) Does this project collect data from a species that has a stock assessment in the next few years (see ACCSP distributed news release [2012 ó 2014 Stock Assessments](http://www.accsp.org/PressReleases/2012-2014StockAssessmentSchedule.pdf) <http://www.accsp.org/PressReleases/2012-2014StockAssessmentSchedule.pdf>)?
- 2) Does this project collect data that can be organized in a fashion suitable for the ACCSP Data Warehouse that can be used for a stock assessment when needed?

The highest possible score for the above section (DATA) is 18. The score of this category is 25% of the total score of the project.

OTHER FACTORS

A. *Properly Prepared* ó To determine scoring for this factor (a score of 0-5) consider the following:

- 1) Does the proposal follow the guidelines of the [Funding Decision Document](#)?
- 2) Does this proposal follow the directions of the guidelines set forth by the request for proposals?

The highest possible score for the above section (OTHER FACTORS) is a 5. The score of this category is 7% of the total score of the project.

If you have any additional questions it is best to consult with the Operations Committee member from your state, agency or organization. Committee lists can be found at <http://www.accsp.org/committees.htm>. Thank you for your hard work in reviewing the proposals.