



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

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council

In-person Meeting

May 10th, 2017 | 11:00 am

The Westin Alexandria, 400 Courthouse Square, Alexandria, VA

Calendar Link:

https://safis.accsp.org:8443/accsp_prod/f?p=550:15:5951162874401::NO:15:P15_CAL_ID_1:1852

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Welcome/Introductions – Coordinating Council Chair R. Boyles
2. Public Comment – R. Boyles
3. Committee Consent – R. Boyles
 - a. Approval of Agenda (Attachment I) – **ACTION**
 - b. Approval of Minutes from October 2016 (Attachment II) – **ACTION**
4. ACCSP Status Report
 - a. Program Status – M. Cahall
 - b. Committee Updates – P. Campfield
5. Review and Consider Approval of 2017 Request for Proposals – M. Cahall (Attachment III) – **ACTION**
6. Other Business
7. Adjourn – R. Boyles



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

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council Meeting

October 26th, 2016

Harborside Hotel, 55 West Street, Bar Harbor, ME

https://safis.accsp.org:8443/accsp_prod/f?p=550:15:15680582875545::NO:15:P15_CAL_ID_1:1766

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Name	Partner	Phone	Email
Mark Alexander	CT DEEP	(860) 434-6043	mark.alexander@ct.gov
Tom Baum	NJ DFW	(609) 748-2020	tom.baum@dep.nj.gov
Bob Beal	ASMFC	(703) 842-0740	rbeal@asmfc.org
Deirdre Boelke (Proxy)	NEFMC	(978) 465-0492	dboelke@nefmc.org
Robert Boyles (Chair)	SC DNR	(843) 953-9304	boylesr@dnr.sc.gov
John Carmichael	SAFMC	(843) 571-4366	john.carmichael@safmc.net
Joe Cimino	VMRC	(757) 247-2237	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
John Clark (Proxy)	DE DFW	(302) 739-9108	john.clark@state.de.us
Gordon Colvin (Proxy)	NOAA	(240) 357-4524	gordon.colvin@noaa.gov
Michelle Duval (Proxy)	NC DMF	(252) 808-8011	michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov
Jim Estes (Proxy)	FL FWCC	(850) 617-9622	jim.estes@myfwc.com
Lynn Fegley (Vice Chair)	MD DNR	(410) 260-8285	lynn.fegley@maryland.gov
Martin Gary	PRFC	(804) 224-7148	martingary.prfc@gmail.com
Patrick Geer	GA DNR	(912) 264-7218	pat.geer@dnr.state.ga.us
Steve Heins (Proxy)	NYS DEC	(631) 444-0436	steve.heins@dec.ny.gov
Pat Keliher	ME DMR	(207) 624-6553	patrick.keliher@maine.gov
Wilson Laney (Proxy)	US FWS	(919) 515-5019	wilson_laney@fws.gov
Dan McKiernan (Proxy)	MA DMF	(617) 626-1536	dan.mckiernan@state.ma.us
Jason McNamee (Proxy)	RI DEM	(401) 423-1943	jason.mcnamee@dem.ri.gov
Derek Orner (Proxy)	NOAA	(301) 427-8567	derek.ornor@noaa.gov
Cheri Patterson (Proxy)	NH FGD	(603) 868-1095	cheri.patterson@wildlife.nh.gov
Andrew Shiels	PFBC	(814) 359-5181	ashiels@pa.gov

Committee Members Not in Attendance: B. King (DC FWD), C. Moore (MAFMC)

Others in Attendance

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

Name	Title	Partner	Phone	Email
David Bush	Legislative Proxy	NC DMF		davidbush@ncfish.org
Tom Moore	Legislative Appointee	PFBC	(610) 246-0664	jtm314@gmail.com
Craig Pugh	Legislative Proxy	DE DFW	(302) 222-4026	crabman31@aol.com
Malcolm Rhodes	Governor's Appointee	SC DNR	(843) 556-8110	rhodesmm@musc.edu
Terry Stockwell	Director of External Affairs	ME DMR	(207) 624-6553	terry.stockwell@maine.gov
Steve Train	Governor's Appointee	ME DMR	(207) 766-5738	fvhattierose@aol.com

Welcome and Introductions (Chair Boyles)

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council Meeting of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Stotesbury Grand Ballroom of the Bar Harbor Club, Harborside Hotel, Bar Harbor, Maine, October 26, 2016, and was called to order at 8:00 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Robert H. Boyles, Jr.

Review and Approve Agenda (R. Boyles) – Attachment I

CHAIRMAN ROBERT H. BOYLES, JR.: My name is Robert Boyles; I am the Chair of the ACCSP Coordinating Council. I would like to call to order the meeting of the Coordinating Council. The first item is to review and approve the agenda that was distributed. Are there any additions to the agenda? I did have one. Mark Alexander requested an item be placed on new business, so Mark we'll get to you. I hear feedback, as well. Cheri.

MS. CHERI PATTERSON: I was wondering if this could be sent to everybody, so that we are looking at the same thing in regards to how the operations and the advisors ranked.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Yes, we've got that in the slides, so sure. Any other items to be added to the agenda. Okay, seeing none; the agenda will be approved by consent.

Public Comment

Now is the time in the agenda for public comment. I'm not aware of anyone who has requested to address the Coordinating Council.

Review and Approve August Meeting Minutes (R. Boyles) – Attachment II

We will move on and review and approve the August meeting minutes, also, which were included in your briefing materials. Are there any additions or corrections to those minutes? Seeing none; those minutes are approved by consent. Now that takes us down to the Status Report; Mike.

ACCSP Status Report (M. Cahall)

- **Program Updates**

MR. MIKE CAHALL: Good morning, everyone. We're going to go ahead and start with the SAFIS. We've been doing a lot of work with that system. I'll start with the swipe card reporting. There are two versions of the system; they are both at this point up and running. We had some significant technical issues with the Maine tool, in part, because it is demanding more of the system.

But I think they've all been resolved at this point, so we have the Maine swipe card and Massachusetts swipe card systems are up and running and collecting data. There still remains an outstanding issue with the state versus federal reporting in the swipe cards, but that has been remanded to our Commercial Technical Committee, and hopefully, we'll have a recommendation on a good compromise there, so that we don't have the reporting requirements impinging on one another.

We have been running a SAFIS redesign project, partly funded by Saltonstall-Kennedy funding. The vision document for the redesign has been approved by our Information Systems (IS) Committee. The initial system review, which was conducted by Tom Hoopes under contract to us, has been completed, and we've distributed it to a lot of our program partners for comments. That will soon be going to our IS Committee for the recommendations to be approved and then integrated into the redesign process.

We're going to be submitting funding for the redesign from FIS, so that that, hopefully, will not be coming out of the ACFCMA or FIN pots for ACCSP. We continue to work very diligently with GARFO, and that project, I would say, is probably going about as quickly as we could have expected it to. There are a lot of hurdles that we still have to jump over in order to get it accomplished.

But we have biweekly planning meetings and discussions, and we're doing things like a capacity analysis, how much data actually is processed at GARFO, vice how much data are we capable of processing now? We always have additional capacity built into our systems, mostly because we're never 100 percent sure how much data we're going to end up processing; even things like how much data is passed back and forth across to the internet, and how much disc storage capacity is available and those sorts of things.

We, also, will be having a contractor from GARFO -- in fact, there will be two -- one to help support the redesign effort of the system and the other to begin working on universal electronic trip report numbers. Part of the linchpin for the new systems is a universal trip report that can be automatically generated and attached to any of the different modules that would be used in fisheries- dependent reporting.

Once this is stood up, then the modules for SAFIS will be asking this piece of software to uniquely stamp the initial trip report, and then distribute it to all of the other associated reports as they are generated. This is a critical component of the next generation of fisheries-dependent reporting. Those two contractors will be coming online, we hope, fairly soon, to the data warehouse.

Our new query interface has been released. A lot of your staff folks are beginning to get used to our new look and feel, and we're working with them to make sure that nothing is lost in the translation. I know that many of your folks are dependent on our confidential data interface for quota and compliance monitoring; and we're trying diligently to make sure that those have our first priority.

I believe we're well on our way to having most of those dealt with. We are working on some tweaks to the non-confidential interface. We've had a tester team of close to ten people that have been working with my folks on our non-confidential interface, and just about when we were ready to release it, some additional concerns about data shopping were raised.

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

We had a long conference call yesterday to see if we can't resolve those. I believe we've come to a consensus on the best way to do that; which means that our non-confidential query interface can be turned on, probably next week. We're also looking at how we are going to be able to provide better early data for stock assessments.

We recognize that the deadlines always get tighter; that everybody wants the data quicker, and we're looking at what is the reality of our ability to be able to provide those data reasonably accurately, and at the same time being able to meet the deadlines. It is not just a matter of us providing data. For example, if we provide the raw landings and trip reporting data, those typically on the northeast would go then to the Science Center. Then the Science Center has post processing that they perform that takes anywhere from a week to ten days to two weeks.

All of those have to be factored in, so that in the coming year, when we have these data requests come in, we're going to be a lot better prepared to be able to provide a realistic timeline on how long it will take us to provide those data. We got into a little trouble with that last year, and we just wanted to make absolutely sure.

One of the longstanding issues has always been how are we going to validate our datasets against others? We've had some problems where folks will go to the GARFO website and then to our website, and then maybe to yet another; and they come up with different numbers. This kicked off a series of discussions about a month ago for us to take a look at exactly how these numbers are being derived.

It turns out that the numbers that are being used by GARFO and the Northeast Science Center all comes from us. They start with SAFIS data and then there is some post processing. When we set up a test query, where we all used exactly the same parameters, we got exactly the same numbers. That was very encouraging.

I think it's a significant step forward in looking at the differences in the data that we're presenting to the public which, as many of you know, has been an ongoing problem. The tricky part is now making sure that we're all speaking to the public with the same language, and that it is clearly understood.

The example that I'll cite is the quota monitoring, that's provided through the GARFO website, uses SAFIS data. They take a date landed as their parameter, because the reports are all due by midnight on Tuesday, and then they typically will wait a couple days, and they will generate the quota report base on all of the landings that occurred by that date.

If you wait another week, and then come to ACCSP and ask for the data again, all those late reports will be in the numbers. In a couple of places where we looked where we had issues with the numbers, it turned out that what we had were the late reports, and that the GARFO report remained static for a week. They generate that report every week.

Those are the kinds of things now we have to kind of work though, and make clear to everyone that potentially one view is a snapshot, a point in time. Another view might be near real time, where you're looking at more current data and that would account for a lot of the differences that we see. I am going to go ahead and let Geoff take the Access Point Angler Intercept Survey (APAIS) update.

MR. GEOFF WHITE: This is a good opportunity to say just a thank you to all of the states and Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) for the support and the activity that has occurred related

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

to APAIS this year. Sitting at this point one year ago, there was a lot of curiosity about what was going to happen, how smoothly the transition of state connect of APAIS was going to go.

We couldn't have done it without the buy-in and support and efforts of all of you. I'm thrilled to be able to sit here and say, it is going well. We are definitely on track. I thank all of you for that. We are very excited about the transition and the implementation not going maybe without issues, but with things that were expected and we were able to work through. This partnership is definitely paying off. We had support from many of the states to learn what to do, as well as the Gulf Commission and their data processing.

At this point in the year, we've had three conference calls on the Wave Reports with the states. There has been a much greater level of interaction, and we just finished a Wave meeting last week where we had everybody in person. The data collection is on track with where the overall numbers were last year.

That is approximately 40,000 intercepts to date, and we're on track to reach about the 50,000 that we expected for the year. With that, I'm just giddy, in fact. It really has been amazing. We could not have done it without the amount of effort that all the states have put into this. At this point, we're not only able to keep up with the data entry in our deadlines to MRIP and NOAA Fisheries for the deliverables, but we're already planning the 2017 changes and adjustments to what need to occur.

I think the biggest one that you may have heard is the social economic add-on survey. This happens once every five years or so, and in fact, thank MRIP specifically on this one. That was supposed to occur on the Atlantic in 2016, and they decided to say, let's get through the state conduct and do that in 2017.

We're planning to ramp that in and get that to occur. The Gulf of Mexico is doing the SEA survey, socio-economic add-on survey. They are doing that this year, and they are on track. I am pleased with how that is going. Moving on to another piece, and again, it is the focus of a State Director's meeting in August.

MRIP definitely heard the need about that and ACCSP, we've had a bunch of conference calls and group efforts on how to work on outreach and address issues in for-hire refusals. That's partly APAIS. It is beyond that in terms of VTRs for-hire survey, overall interactions. But the communications team at MRIP and ACCSP drafted up a for-hire discussion guide.

We discussed it last week with all of the states, and we were able to come up with a lot of feedback on what are the most important things contributing to data collection problems on headboats, and what are the most important things that are contributing to issues with the charterboats.

There was some variation, but there were some common themes about improvements to the core of APAIS, whether it was the site registry, and the state involvement is helping that or whether it's the industry perspective or the anglers themselves. There were some state variation, but as we sort through those discussions and feedback and continue to work with Gordon Colvin, Dave Bard and the MRIP team, I think it's moving forward really well.

One of the good partnership issues again, is it was kind of a joint effort of here is what is seen at the federal level. Is that confirmed by the states? There are some resources that MRIP has and has

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

offered up; whether that is printing outreach materials or participating in discussions at the state level. We were looking for feedback on what the states would be open towards, or what the best approaches might be to incorporate that partnership and moving forward to get additional data; as the survey and the time goes on. The focus on the data, the partnership moving forward, has really been outstanding. The goal is, again, to develop some joint materials to move forward this winter, when the for-hire season is a little less active on the Atlantic Coast.

MR. CAHALL: Do you have any questions about any of our program updates?

MR. PATRICK KELIHER: Mike, thanks for that update. Could you go back to the slide on the swipe card, please?

MR. CAHALL: Certainly.

MR. KELIHER: You had put up there a redesign. Could you just give a little bit more detail on the redesign?

MR. CAHALL: Certainly. Fundamentally, SAFIS, I describe it as if you take a child's building block set and you have the multi-colors, and you stack the pieces on top of one another, which is kind of how SAFIS looks right now. It's old, the system was originally deployed in 2004 and the base database design has been modified as time goes by, and the applications have been updated based on different requirements that we get or changes in the reporting requirements.

What we really need to do is do a step back, take a comprehensive look at the system today, identify reporting needs that it doesn't meet now and also step back from a technical standpoint, to look at the design and see what we need to do to bring it into compliance with a clean design practice.

When you have a system that gets old, you go, well, we'll make this work this way and we'll make that work this other way; and so you end up with something that in hindsight if you had stepped back and designed it from the get go, you would have a cleaner design. There might be some changes in the way that your database structures look and things like that.

The primary overhaul to the end users almost certainly will be in the online tools. The tablet reporting tools won't require significant changes, other than somewhere in a background for the federal initially. The federal reporting tools will likely grab that universal trip identifier. We haven't even worked out how that is going to work yet but the IS Committee are working on what the business rules need to look like.

But the plan here is that the online tool, we know it needs an overhaul, the online dealer and trip reporting tool. The tablet tools likely won't change very much, if at all, because the way that they communicate back with the database won't require significant changes to those tools. We've got a lot of money and time and effort invested in them, and I get it. We're concerned about making significant adjustments to those.

MR. KELIHER: I guess what I was concerned about with the redesign is how it may relate back to the swipe card and the interface with the swipe card. Swipe card is up and running. As you know, we had some initial problems. We had some problems mid-stride as we went live. I think there is a lot more work to do there. At some point I do want to have a conversation about, as we move forward with

expanding the swipe card whether there should be a broader RFP to bring more people into the fold. For us, when we go live with the swipe card, customer service was really key. It wasn't bad. It could have been better, I think, from the contractor. Those are the things that I want to make sure we're addressing as we move forward. But the link between the two, it sounds like you're thinking about those links, so that is really where I was going here.

MR. CAHALL: Any other questions; Wilson.

DR. WILSON LANEY: We had what I thought was a very interesting discussion yesterday in the South Atlantic State/Federal Management Board meeting about quota monitoring for cobia in particular, and how those numbers are derived by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, using the MRIP estimates and the headboat estimates.

What I was wondering is, which set of numbers ultimately winds up in the ACCSP Data Warehouse? That may be a question with regard to northeast region, as well. I don't know what the Northeast Fisheries Science Center does with those numbers. But if a member of the public who is interested in a particular species and the quota monitoring for that species wants to see the numbers that go into that total, where do they go? Do they have to go to the Science Center or do they have to go to the ACCSP Data Warehouse?

MR. CAHALL: I think, at this point, they would have to go to two different places. We should have the Vessel Trip Reports (VTRs) for cobia in our Data Warehouse. The MRIP estimates would have to come from MRIP at this point. Certainly, as we move forward with cobia, and I heard about this discussion and I've been rattling it around in my brain about, how can we help here?

I think, certainly, if that is a problem we can certainly work on, I don't see why we wouldn't be able to potentially consolidate the different data sources together. But I also think that we have to keep in mind that the for-hire estimates are done in waves, and so what we may have is VTRs that are coming in, especially as we move forward with electronic trip reporting. They may be coming in real-time or near-real-time coupled with scanned VTRs; then coupled with the for-hire estimates; in order to get your total numbers.

I think it is going to be dicey at the beginning, as we start trying to work through the processes. Now if reporting requirements change or that species ends up being reported via logbooks or something, then we would be able to provide more definitive numbers. But certainly, I think, if that board wants to request that we put that on our list of things to do, we absolutely can. We would be happy to work with everybody to make sure we can pull those numbers together for you.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Any other questions on program updates from Mike or Geoff? Okay, seeing none; Mike, you want to do committee updates?

MR. CAHALL: I'm going to turn that over to the Chair of the Operations Committee.

- **Committee Updates**

MR. PATRICK A. CAMPFIELD: Good morning, everyone. I am going to start with the Operations and Advisory Committees. They had their fall meeting about a month ago in St. Petersburg. The focus of that meeting, as it often is in the fall, was to score and rank the proposals submitted to the FY17 RFP. There were 14 proposals overall, in both the maintenance and new categories; including the ACCSP

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

Administrative Grant Proposal. The total funding request was over 3.8 million for an available 3.35 million. There was some trimming that needed to be done. We also revisited briefly the work that an RFP Workgroup needs to do to discuss potential changes to the FY18 proposal, specifically perhaps reweighting the different modules, in terms of catch and effort, bio sampling, bycatch sampling; as well as social and economic data collection.

That is work that we will continue and hopefully have prepared for next year's RFP. Moving on to the Bycatch Committee, they continue to work hard on the bycatch prioritization matrix. Testing has been completed in the redesign of the matrix, and notifications have gone out for partners to submit information to complete the matrix.

Please make sure that your staff is contributing to this. Heather has been doing a great job in communicating with all the partners on the Bycatch Panel, and they will have a deadline coming up the second week of December, to submit partner input; and then they will review this at their in-person meeting in February.

The Biological Review Panel will have a conference call coming up here in November. They will discuss the herring biological project, as well as an update of the biological matrix; and they will meet together with the Bycatch Panel in February, to hopefully further those matrices along. The IS Committee will also have a conference call in November.

Their Change Management Board had their first meeting and focused on three changes, including issues with multiple VTRs. As Mike touched on, that is becoming a new venture for ACCSP. They also continued work on issuing permits to corporations and to individuals and discussed a disposition display, in terms of catch disposition. Those are the brief committee updates.

The Universe of Electronic Reporting Efforts on the Atlantic Coast Presentation (M. Cahall)

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Questions for Pat? Seeing none; we'll roll on into -- can I tee this up for a moment, Mike? I think it was a conversation that Vice-Chair Fegley and I were having some time ago. Sometimes I fail to pay attention to the really important details on things like electronic monitoring and reporting efforts.

Lynn and I were talking several months ago about how it would be nice to have, kind of in one sock, an overview of electronic monitoring, quite selfishly and parochially, because it would help get me up to speed on this. We had talked to Mike, and Mike readily agreed to kind of give us a survey of the universe. This was a result of a conversation Lynn and I had, and I'm certainly looking forward to it; so with that, Mike.

MR. CAHALL: I think what I want to draw at the very beginning is the distinction between electronic reporting and electronic monitoring. The electronic monitoring is broadly defined as the video monitoring efforts that are ongoing, and mostly in pilot form. There are a couple of programs that are running right now.

But we didn't actually cover those directly, because there is no ACCSP standard yet for electronic monitoring. That is on the list of things to do for the Commercial Technical Committee. With reference, for example, to the SAFIS redesign; we know we have to have hooks to attach those electronic monitoring reports or videos to the trip reports. We didn't touch on that per se, but it is not broadly in

place right now on the east coast. There are a lot of research efforts ongoing on the west coast, especially in the Alaska region. I'll talk a little bit about why electronic reporting. I think that the reasons for doing this are pretty well understood. One of the very first benefits that occurred when the NERO, now GARFO, went online with electronic dealer reporting was immediately, the issues that you run into with paper went away.

You would receive codes you couldn't read; you would receive incorrectly manually entered codes on those pieces of paper. You have immediate upfront data validation, because of your electronic interface, so you cannot enter a code that doesn't exist. You can enter a code that's inappropriate, but you can't enter things that don't exist.

The main reason was we could get better understanding of what's going on. It was faster and provided immediate data to managers. Right now, we have the capability for electronic reporting for commercial dealers and fishermen, and for a smaller universe of for-hire captains. The directions that we've been taking our user interfaces are to make them as easy to use as possible.

All of you are familiar with the issues that are incumbent with paper reporting systems. They sometimes have human error, they are hard to read, and of course, there is always timeliness. For example, even with partial electronic reporting systems, the GARFO VTR system is an example of that. Those forms are scanned, and then once they are scanned, they are reviewed and entered into a database system; even when they're scanned using optical character recognition, there are always update issues.

Even if you cut back on your data reporting time, still it can take anywhere from weeks to months for data to get in from the paper-based reporting system. We started with electronic reporting for dealers, which is actually fairly widespread coastwide. The northeast and southeast regions both require electronic reporting from their dealers.

In the northeast they are using either the SAFIS online system; there is an upload component to the SAFIS system that allows large scale dealers to submit data directly in the SAFIS system; or there is also a bluefin application that is in use by a lot of the northeast dealers that pushes data into SAFIS through the same file upload interface that is used by large scale dealers. In the southeast there is a version of the SAFIS system that was deployed, the E-1 Ticket System, which models the single trip ticket model that's in use.

Then we have a smattering between the states. Some states are doing it in a hybrid way, for example, Massachusetts allows their dealers to report electronically but doesn't require it. But they are all using the SAFIS database interface, in order to get data into the system. As you can see, between 2000 and 2012, we've had a very widespread adoption of electronic dealer reporting coastwide.

The benefits that everyone expected pretty much have been realized from that. We do have some other - - for example, in North Carolina there is a hybrid system, where they are using the bluefin tool to receive data, and then they transmit the federal records directly to SAFIS. State records go into their local systems.

We still do have some of those hybrid solutions that are in place, and we expect that probably to increase. One of the issues that we have as a system is that it is difficult for us to respond to complex local user requirements. In other words, the baseline for what SAFIS requires, the baseline ACCSP standards, our systems are all designed to accommodate that. Of course, all of you recognize that your

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

data collection twists, I described them as twists, and can be unique and sometimes quite complex. One of the things that we have been looking at as we move forward into the future is working to better allow for the third party tools; some of which are already in place, for example, FACTS in Maryland, to allow them to be able to interface directly into our data system, so that those data can be provided in a more expeditious way.

Moving forward to commercial fishermen, the transition to electronic trip reporting has been a lot slower and more fragmented, in part, because of the technical issues locally. There were problems with local technology. Many of you have been around long enough to remember old ruggedized specialized systems, Thistle, for example, made a system that was intended to be used for lobster reporting.

As the technology has become less expensive and more rugged and faster, it has become easier to allow for electronic trip reporting with inexpensive, almost dispensable hardware. Where we are right now with electronic trip reporting, at this point no large scale jurisdiction requires no mandatory electronic trip reporting on a very large scale.

There is electronic trip reporting in place in a lot of places where it is optional. For example, the GARFO VTRs can be submitted electronically, and many of the other states allow for it, as well. The eTrips/Mobile is deployed in the for-hire fisheries in Rhode Island and is being used as a template for the research projects that are ongoing.

We're going to talk about those. That is where a lot of the confusion comes from, I think. Then the eTrips tool itself is in use in a hybrid way in many of the northeast states. Some of you allow the captains to report electronically online, and then key the balance of the paper reports into the system. But that realizes part of the benefit, in the sense that the data are all in a single repository and are relatively easy to associate with dealer reports.

The e1-Ticket System also accommodates vessel trip data. We're putting it up here as electronic reporting in the southeast, and that's in place in the southern states of South Carolina and Georgia. There are other electronic reporting tools in Maryland and Virginia, North Carolina and Florida. I sort of alluded to a couple of those before.

Our long term goal would be to eventually be able to incorporate those data directly into the database in something approaching near-real time. That would eliminate some of the data feed lag that we have. For example, although we receive data from everyone regularly, our program standards only really require that they submit it to us once.

When we were working on a slower time scale, that worked okay, but at this point now when we're being pressed to provide data in a closer timeframe, we're looking at ways to try to get data into the systems more quickly; and also, frankly, with less trauma at the individual level. If the tools will automatically transmit the data to us, then your staff doesn't have to worry about it, and we have it faster.

Moving to the vessel trip reporting, a little bit more detail. GARFO does allow for paper or electronic, and the requirements vary some. You can see the permits that are up there on the right. By the way, my thanks to Ali Schwaab, she did almost all the research on this. If you note any issues or errors with information I'm presenting, please contact us. You're kind of my trial run for this presentation. I'm looking for feedback from you. We plan to go to the fisheries management councils with this, since the

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

question arose at the South Atlantic Council. I certainly welcome any feedback from you, if you felt like it was useful; or if there is additional information you might want; or you catch us in an error. We're glad to make some updates. Oh, Gordon already has something.

MR. GORDON COLVIN: Would you send it to us, Mike?

MR. CAHALL: Oh certainly, absolutely.

MR. COLVIN: That will be easier to get feedback from others, not just the people at the table if you do that.

MR. CAHALL: Going back to GARFO. GARFO has authorized electronic submission from, at this point, five different systems, which include the SAFIS eTrips/Mobile. We are also working with them to authorize the online tool, as well. Even though they do have authorized electronic applications, very few of them are taking advantage of the applications program interface that GARFO wrote, and in fact, the eTrips/Mobile tool shook some bugs out of that thing while we were working with them.

When the VTRs move down to ACCSP, of course, we're going to adopt the same model, and initially, we're not going to change anything, I don't think, the way that the plans are working right now. In the Southeast Science Center, they accept paper VTRs. They can access the northeast data. Where we have dual permitted vessels, they are able to pull the VTRs from the northeast. We have a copy of the northeast's VTRs in our database, and also our own, and they're able to access those and they are using those actively.

Moving on to state trip reporting, of course, as soon as we switch to state we have to switch gears, because keep in mind that the federal agencies permit vessels and the states typically permit harvesters. We sometimes run into some issues with overlapping areas of authority, because you may have a licensed state harvester on a federally permitted vessel, and then whose report really is it?

We're still working on some of those issues. But typically, the state reports are based on the fishermen's permit. We do have a pretty good universe of those permits. We have either direct connections to the state permitting systems, or your folks help keep our systems update through the SAFIS interfaces or provide us with flat files that we load in.

Then again, obviously, the frequency reporting widely varies depending on the state requirements. There is electronic or paper reporting in many states. We kind of have gone over some of those, and in a few of the states, it is almost entirely paper. Again, in other states in the southeast again, we have that one Ticket model. It varies. In the northeast there is typically a two Ticket model, which is used; one ticket is intended to validate the other.

Then in the southeast, starting at South Carolina south, they use a one ticket model where they collect some data from the harvesters and additional data from the dealers. Moving on to for-hire, it was interesting; we just were having a little conversation earlier about this. How for-hire reporting is managed is pretty heavily mixed. There is HMS reporting, which is specifically for their species that are managed. Those are electronic. For GARFO they could submit paper or electronic trip tickets, but it's mandatory reporting for the federally permitted for-hire boats.

They are also surveyed through MRIP, which has the consequent issues that I'm sure we're all aware of. Then the GARFO data are used by MRIP at the end of the year, to calculate effort and adjust estimates, if needed. In the southeast they have headboat, the Beaufort Headboat Program, where they do have the headboats submitting trip reports electronically.

They've been doing a lot of work on that system; it's been improving steadily over the years. We currently don't have direct access to those data, but we're able to get summaries from it later. Then, of course, the charterboats are surveyed through MRIP, so you have this mix; which I think was pretty clearly articulated when you were trying to get the cobia numbers.

I think that is going to be an interesting challenge for us probably, over the course of this next year or two, as we work with the commission to try and figure out the best way to get and process those cobia numbers. Of course, the state for-hire reporting varies very widely. In many states there is no mandatory reporting, in others, you do have paper or electronic reporting for some specific species.

Then again, we have a couple of voluntary programs that are running. The New Jersey Striped Bass Bonus Program is an example of those, where they issue a bonus card if folks report their catch. They use those numbers later in adjusting, you don't use them in your official estimates, I assume. I don't actually know how your numbers are used.

Then there is some mandatory electronic reporting in Rhode Island, which is, of course, where the for-hire redesign all started. Adding to further confusion are a lot of different recent electronic reporting efforts. We'll start with in 2011 that electronic trip reports were authorized by GARFO in the northeast region.

There is a pilot study in 2012 in the southeast region, which was a headboat survey, which was run by Beverly Sauls, I believe, which concluded in 2013. Then in 2014 you have the northeast modernization, which has been running in the background for a number of years. The southeast federally permitted begin to be required to report electronically.

Southeast headboats had to start reporting electronically through the Beaufort Headboat Survey. A pilot study for electronic reporting for federally permitted southeast commercial vessels was also conducted. In 2015 the northeast region published their Electronic Technology Plan, which we helped participate in a little bit. The southeast region also did that.

These are the consequences of ongoing reviews of the programs. NMFS has put in place cyclical reviews of the regional and headquarters programs that will result in an ongoing review process with a view towards improving their services and their ability to accomplish their tasks. We're going to see those as ongoing.

Then in 2016 the southeast is looking at mandatory electronic reporting for for-hire. The Mid-Atlantic has mandated, I believe, electronic reporting in some portions of the for-hire industry. There are also ongoing efforts, which haven't quite finished up yet for mandatory reporting in some specific areas of the private angler with the Mid-Atlantic; I'm thinking of tilefish there.

I know that the South Atlantic is working right now on pulling together a pilot project to look at other ways of collecting data in red snapper. There is a large checkerboard of activities that are going on, and

sometimes it is difficult to tell the difference between the ongoing programs that are running and the pilots.

There is also a southeast pilot that is running right now looking at a South Atlantic Council pilot, looking at validation of efforts from for-hire census reporting that looks like it is utilizing the APAIS survey to validate the for-hire reports. There is so much going on that it can be difficult. Next steps for our program, we expect to see mandatory electronic reporting in the for-hire industry.

These are the kinds of questions that we're looking at as a program, how we're going to work through this. A really good example, there is a lot of activity going on in the southeast region, but right now there is not an infrastructure to support the data collection process. How is that going to be accomplished? What is the role of the program in that? How can we help? How is training and support going to be provided; those kinds of questions.

Finally, how is ongoing technical support going to be provided? If there is electronic trip reporting mandated coastwide, are we going to have 13 individual states plus two regions each managing their own system? Are we going to try to set something up to coordinate something on a coastwide basis that would have applicability to all of the different programs?

In this year's administrative grant request, there is money set aside to set up a pilot help desk, to see how that would work, to initially look at how we would support the tablet tools and see what's going to be involved in managing that. In terms of our eTrips/Mobile tool, most of you are aware of it.

It is intended to allow trip reports to be done on a mobile device. It satisfies the federal VTR reporting requirements, and we're looking at it as being intended as a universal tool, and so it is designed to be user centric. It knows who you are. It knows whose permit you're operating under and it adjusts itself, depending on how you have logged into it; and those data go directly into SAFIS.

The program we recognize that there are local needs that we're simply not going to be able to meet, without putting substantial effort into it. The question then becomes, is it better for the program to provide a default tool, and allow the individual program partners to develop solutions tailored to their own needs, or do we want to take e-Trips Mobile, which is built on a very powerful platform. It can do a lot more things than we have it doing.

But I think that the model that is likely to work for us best, is to develop a common data transfer standard, and work with our program partners locally; who develop their own tools, and make sure that we remain compatible, and we're able to manage the data for them.

What we're doing right now for eTrips /Mobile, assuming that you all approve our administrative grant request, we want to conduct a series of in-person training workshops, to make sure everybody is comfortable using the tool, especially the state and federal folks who might be directly involved. This will include working with the port agents in the northeast region. We've been taking with them, and they are very interested in working with us on that.

We'll conduct some webinars. We will set up a 24-hour help desk, and I'm going to show you how the decision tree kind of works in that scenario, as we're talking our way through it. We're going to put similar resources on our website that should help folks who have questions about how to use this particular system.

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

This is the first time that we're going to deploy a system, sort of independently. The dealer reporting system in GARFO in the northeast region was supported by their port agents and by their own training and outreach and help desk activities. The mobile tool, the tablet-based tools, because of the scale, almost have to be supported centrally. If you would skip to the eTrips/Mobile decision tree, this is the decision tree.

Right now, we have a temporary process in place, because of how the systems are managed. Basically, you go down different tracks. If you're just a state person, we go down one track. If you're just a federal person, we go down another track. If you're both, there is yet another track, and basically, do you have a state or a federal reporting requirement?

This is for, where do you direct the problem? For example, if you are reporting a federal trip, and you have a problem with your federal reporting requirement, you can use the tool, but you have to contact ACCSP to set up your account right now, because GARFO doesn't have anything in place to do it.

Then if you have issues with the reporting itself, you have to go back to GARFO. If you have a technical problem, we direct the call to Harbor Light, who is the contractor. This is typical of the kind of complexity that is involved in supporting these systems on a large scale. Does anybody have any questions? We'll distribute the presentation to everyone.

I'm very interested in your input. I want to make sure that we answer any questions that you have, and that we cover the bases so that folks understand where the state of the art is. Of course, it's a constantly moving target. There are a lot of projects ongoing in the different partner agencies, and of course, pilot programs that are going on sponsored by any one of a number of our different partners.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Questions for Mike? Lynn.

MS. LYNN FEGLEY: Well, Mike, thank you. That was, for me, just enormously helpful. I think it's going to serve, when you send that around, as a great reference. I just want to say that one of the reasons I started thinking about this was because I was just desperately trying to understand all of the different pieces that are going on out there; and for Maryland in particular, how we fit in.

Then that led to sort of this efficiency of scale, and kind of this bigger question that I think might come before this group at some point of, what is the most efficient way to handle all this. I think, Mike, you really hit on that very well. Really, I don't have a question, but I just also wanted to bring up the fact, too, that in Maryland, one of the other things that we've been thinking about, and every state has different objectives, and one of ours is very much not only this idea of more rapid, timely, better quality data, but also the fact that for us in Maryland, I think this is a very Maryland centric problem. We have a devil of a time enforcing the harvest reporting, so there is really no mechanism to enforce reporting.

When we go to paper reports, if we can even try to enforce reporting, it has to go before a judge. The result is invariable where the judge says, well, why didn't you report, and a fisherman says, well, I did, I sent my paper by mail; didn't you get it? Then at that point there is just no way to prove legally where that piece of paper went.

We also have issues in Maryland, and particularly for Maryland specific fishery like blue crab, where we made some management choices to base regulation on harvest history; and this was not an ITQ. It was

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

a one-year management approach, and what happened with the harvesters was they reacted in a very human way, which is, our blue crab harvest increased by about an order of magnitude in a year.

Because folks really wanted to get harvest on the books so that if we ever did this again, they would be ready for it. What happened in Maryland is our industry actually got together and said, one of the things that they need is a mechanism through electronic reporting that allows for validation of harvest. It allows for a real mechanism, are you on the water today, are you fishing today.

If you're fishing today that means we get a report, and there is a mechanism for that harvester to be intercepted at the dock, and for that catch to be verified. I am sort of spouting off here, but there are a lot of really big questions with this electronic reporting stuff, and Mike, I just can't thank you enough, because for me, that was just enormously helpful. There is going to be a lot of stuff to discuss in the coming months. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Again, Mike, thank you, I'll echo that; it's very, very helpful; and Gordon, thank you for requesting that the members of the Coordinating Council receive that. When that is sent out, if you would pay careful attention to it, because I find it to be very, very helpful again with just all the things that are going on. Mike, thank you, nice job! Next item on our agenda is Consideration of Approval of the Recommendations for FY2017 Proposals. Jerry Morgan and Pat Campfield are here for our Ops and Advisory Committee.

Consider Approval of Recommendations of FY2017 submitted proposals (Operations Committee Chair P. Campfield and Advisory Committee Chair J. Morgan) – Attachment III

MR. CAMPFIELD: Again, at the fall meeting, the Operations and Advisory Committees scored the 14 proposals that were submitted for the FY17 RFP. The program priorities remained top priority of catch effort and landings data, followed by biological data and then releases, discards and protected species data, and finally economic and social data.

Again, 14 proposals were submitted, 7 in the maintenance category and 6 in the new category; as well as the Administrative Grant Proposal. For maintenance this is the eighth year that we have used the breakdown of 75 percent of the funding should be allocated towards maintenance proposals, and 25 percent towards new proposals.

This is the second year that we are using the long term funding limit policy. This translates to full funding of maintenance projects through FY19, and then begin to reduce the funding by 33 percent in FY20, and again in FY21 cycles. Also notable, the seventh year that we've had what we are calling a sufficient number of new proposals, which is good for the program. We're getting innovative projects coming in, and hopefully transitioning some of these maintenance projects off of ACCSP funding.

The next slide is just a time series of the funding provided to the program, to ACCSP through the Administrative Grant from 1999 through 2016. You can see that the funding amount in blue started around \$800,000.00 and had essentially doubled up to about 1.6 and now 1.8 million dollars in the Administrative Grant over the years.

That funding amount is very much in parallel with a number of staff as the program has grown over time, and that is in the red line and then the green line, I think, is the funding available to the partner proposals over the years, so there is a slight decline in that over time. For this year, assuming that the amount of

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

funding available is 3.35 million, the administrative grant will be as proposed at 1.8 or roughly 57 percent of the total available funding, leaving about 1.3, 1.4 million dollars towards partner projects.

Then the pie chart on the right is the breakdown between maintenance at 75 percent in red, and new proposals, the available funding, in green at about \$375,000.00. With that, I think I'll turn it over to Jerry, our Advisor's Chair, to give you an overview of how Ops and Advisors ranked the proposals.

MR. JERRY MORGAN: Good morning, everybody, thank you Maine DNR and thank you Bar Harbor, for sure. One of ACCSPs Advisors most important functions is to bring to the program input from industry, both recreational and commercial fisheries. That has the potential to affect management decisions during these exciting, innovative changing and challenging times.

The flip side is being able to reach out to these same groups explaining who we are, what we do, and why it is important. Another very important function performed is evaluating and ranking the fiscal year proposals from our state partners. That being said, we can go over some of the items. Although there were some slight differences when the Advisors met, it did not change the rankings.

There were a couple of flips in between. Maintenance, we found, was pretty consistent throughout. Those we've approved and sent our recommendation to Ops. The joint recommendation to fund all maintenance projects and fund the new Massachusetts and Georgia projects completely, with any balance of the funding going to the Southeast Fisheries Project was by consensus.

Now our Number 1 ranking went to the Northeastern Black Sea Bass Otolith Age and Validation, and that was Massachusetts. Our Number 2 was the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Estimation of Bycatch in the South Atlantic Snapper Grouper Fishery; a comparison of self-reporting logbooks on log onboard observers.

Number 3 went to Georgia, the Data Entry and Management of Commercial Fisheries Paper Trip Tickets in Georgia. The balance of the new proposals was fairly consistent, with what we've decided and what we looked at. Ahead of our joint meeting, the Advisors did get together, hash out all of these proposals, rendered some input, and took a look at how these rankings stacked, and as a result, forwarded these recommendations to our Ops Committee. Pat, you can take it from here.

MR. CAMPFIELD: You can see, in conclusion, on the screen, both Ops and Advisors reached a consensus to recommend to the Coordinating Council to fund all of the maintenance proposals, if our math is right. After all maintenance proposals are supported, that would leave about \$21,000.00 to roll into the funding available to the new projects.

Again, as Jerry mentioned, we're suggesting and have reached consensus that the top ranked project is the Massachusetts Sea Bass Aging Project, and had a little bit of a difference between numbering 2 and 3, between Advisors and Ops; but I think we agreed that Georgia Trip Ticket Data Collection is essential, and so we moved that up to Number 2. Then the third project, again, would be the Southeast Science Center's proposal to support observer and logbook sampling for the snapper grouper fishery.

The result would be the Southeast Center Observer Proposal came in at sort of a scalable approach, 1 or 2 percent. Their total request was \$333,000.00 and it looks like we have about two-thirds of that available to put towards Southeast Observers. Those are the recommendations from Ops and Advisors.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Pat and Jerry, thank you all. know that is always a difficult process, but I appreciate the perspective that you all bring to the program and to the efforts. Questions for Jerry or for Pat on the recommendations? Gordon.

MR. COLVIN: Pat and Jerry, thanks for that report. I think we're fine with this, but I just wanted to raise one question, Pat. Did the Ops Committee discuss at all with respect to the Massachusetts Aging Project. What we see is that it seems to be more of a pure science kind of a project, as opposed to a fisheries data and statistics related project; as so many of our others are? If so, what was the thinking of the committee about it?

MR. CAMPFIELD: Yes, the committees did discuss that. I think, in short, it addresses some biological information, so it is eligible in that sense. But also, I think maybe the more important factor was the bang for the buck, as was discussed yesterday. Black sea bass science assessment management has a number of questions or issues that we're collectively trying to address.

This project at, if I've got the number right, about \$18,000.00 will really move the ball down the field, at least on the science and the aging information that would go into future stock assessment, and that's why we ranked it highly. But it was eligible.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Further questions? Seeing none. Bob.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: A quick question to Pat, I suppose. All the recommendations that are up on the screen now are based on 3.35 million. If there is funding at 3.5, the extra \$150,000.00, would that be used to round out the scalable project for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and then the remainder of that would go where? There is probably \$50,000.00 or so left over.

MR. CAMPFIELD: That's correct, Bob. If we got an additional \$150,000.00 that would right go over the top. We would fully fund or recommend to fully fund the Southeast Observers Project. Then if you could put back up on the screen, please, the new proposals. I'm not sure where we left off. I think there were differences between Ops and Advisors, in terms of those last three new proposals.

I think, under one scenario, the New Jersey proposal ranked higher than others. It may have been the Maryland or Maine project. I think we would fully fund Southeast. I guess a related question is whether the remaining money, after fully funding Southeast, would be able to -- New Jersey or Maryland or Maine could actually use that; because it would be a relatively small amount of funding. I don't know if Mike has more to add to that based on the discussions at the meeting.

MR. CAHALL: I think that typically my guess is that if we do receive additional funding, it will be what they refer to as a little bit of couch cushion exercise. If they have the funding to cover the South Atlantic Project, then that is probably where they would stop, unless we specifically asked them to provide additional money.

Typically, we would just go down to the next highest ranked proposal, but we haven't received in recent years a full 3.5, we've come within \$20,000.00, \$50,000.00. I would think it would be really unlikely that we would get a full 3.5. I would suggest that we really won't know until we know exactly how much we get what the process would be.

My suggestion might be, there is no way we can adequately fund the other two projects with anything likely to be left over. It is a possibility that we might be able to do the New Jersey Bycatch project, or part of it. Typically, the guidance that we've gotten from the council is that you try to fund the next highest ranked project.

That might be my suggestion at this point. We could go back to the -- what are we calling the Executive Committee now? The Leadership Team, if we end up with the additional funds, and allow that group to make a decision about what the best thing to do might be.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Mike, let me just clarify. We can presume then that the new project proposals; the next in line is the New Jersey DFW Project?

MR. CAHALL: I would say that from a practical standpoint it almost has to be, because we are unlikely to get anything like enough money to fund either of the other two projects.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Do we have a sense of when that number might be, we're under a continued resolution, so I guess that is the \$64.00 question, perhaps.

MR. CAHALL: Typically, we find out in usually April or May, sometimes earlier; you never know the lame duck, if the lame duck Congress passes the CR, then we'll know. But typically, we don't know, and there is always a little bit of a scramble. Last year, for those of you, you might recall that ST in Sustainable Fisheries reprogrammed some funds internally and funded a couple of our projects through a different funding source; which then freed up the ACFCMA and FIN funding. You never can be exactly sure what's going to happen.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: What we have is a consensus recommendation to fund all the maintenance projects and the new Massachusetts DMF and the Georgia DNR projects, along with the scalable portion of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center for new projects, on the presumption that we would have 3.35 million dollars available. That is the consensus recommendation from the Advisors and the Ops. Is there a motion to that effect? Terry.

MR. TERRY STOCKWELL: On behalf of the state of Maine, I greatly appreciate the consensus recommendations from the Advisors and the Ops Group. It is nice to be back before the ACCSP this year without having to throw another Hail Mary. With that said, I am going to move that the ACCSP supports and approves the joint recommendations of the Advisors and the Ops for 2017.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: It's a motion by Mr. Stockwell, is there a second? Second by Cheri. Discussion? Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: Yes, I would like to add to that motion that if there are additional funds that do become available through Congress, that the Leadership Committee meet and make a recommendation to the Coordinating Council; or make the decision as to how to deal with the extra funds.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Terry, is that fair? Okay. The motion then, if I may read it, is **to accept the Operations and Advisory Committee recommendations of funding all maintenance proposals; fund the Massachusetts DMF Sea Bass Aging; the Georgia DNR Trip Ticket; and partially fund the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Snapper Grouper Observer Project; and if additional funds are made available to the ACCSP, the Leadership Team will meet to determine how to allocate those additional funds.**

That was a motion by Mr. Stockwell, seconded by Cheri. Is there further discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none; that motion carries. Thank you. Next up is to consider the approval of the Addendum to the MOU reflecting the governance change. Let me see if I can do this quickly.

Consider Approval of Addendum to Memorandum of Understanding to Reflect Governance Change
(R. Boyles) – Attachment IV

We're under the gun with Business Session. You all, again, be reminded that there has been a lot of discussion and a lot of effort looking at modifying the nature of the relationship between ACCSP and ASMFC. We have talked about this extensively over the last several years, culminating in a discussion back in August that was reflected in the meeting minutes that requested the Governance Transition Workgroup go back and review some of the elements of the MOU to actually affect this marriage, if you will.

I may lean on Bob and Mike to make sure I'm stating things clearly for the record. What you have -- the Governance Transition Working Group, has worked very diligently to go through a Draft MOU Addendum that has been submitted to you all. It's in the briefing materials. I want to say thank you, particularly for the Governance Transition Workgroup; there have been a lot of people with a lot of eyes and a lot of brain power looking at this.

I certainly appreciate everybody's efforts, and what I would refer you to, please, in the briefing materials is the Draft MOU. It is dated October 20th, 2016, Addendum to the Memorandum of Understanding for the establishment of the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program. The Transition Group met via conference call a week ago, 10 days ago; I'm on hurricane time, so I'm not quite sure when it was. A lot of background gone over, a lot of editorial comments made. Specifically, among other things, to explicitly state that the ACCSP, through the adoption of this MOU, will be a formal part of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. That MOU, again, is a five-pager in the supplemental material.

We talked about, among other things, what to call the Executive Committee, the ACCSP Executive Committee; where we have landed is to call it the ACCSP Leadership Team, the intent to have a group that could meet, a smaller group that could meet to make decisions and/or recommendations to the Coordinating Council, in the event of needing a quick response.

There was a question that we asked of staff, and that was the question regarding affecting this change via the MOU, whether it would need to be signed again; and Bob and Mike, correct me if I'm wrong. I believe, through your research, you've indicated that formal adoption of previous MOU addenda have been via a vote here.

What I would seek today among the Coordinating Council is an approval of the MOU, as presented, and with that one last thing, I would like to point out is that we had, again, the transition working group, a lot of work, a lot of eyes, a lot of effort went into this. The Transition Working Group is making a unanimous recommendation that the Coordinating Council approve the MOU as presented. With that, I might look to Bob or Mike to make sure I didn't mangle anything too poorly and ask for any questions about affecting this change.

MS. PATTERSON: I don't want to drone on with questions. I just wanted to clarify that the Leadership Committee, formally the Executive Committee, is still made up of the same general group of people that covers the whole coastline, the two federal agencies and the council.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Thank you, Cheri, good point. Thank you for clarifying that. Further questions for me? Further discussion on this issue? What I would then look for from the body is a motion to accept the MOU Version 2, October 20th Addendum to the MOU for ACCSP. Can I get a motion to that effect? Steve Heins. Motion by Mr. Heins, seconded by Dr. Duval. Discussion? Bob.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BEAL: Just a point of clarification, I hope. I think you only mentioned the MOU Addendum, but there is probably value in also including the Transition Document, which lays out the plan of attack for the next couple years.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Thank you for that Bob, yes you're right. Recall that we went through that pretty extensively back in the August meeting, so that Transition Document is also included in your briefing materials. Further discussion? Any opposition to the motion? I guess I should read that: **Motion to accept the Governance Transition Workgroup unanimous recommendation of approval of the ACCSP Transition Document, and the MOU Addendum, thereby approving the transfer of ACCSP from an independent program to a program of the ASMFC.**

That motion was by Mr. Heins and seconded by Dr. Duval. Is there any opposition to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved unanimously; thank you all, and congratulations on the marriage. We had the rehearsal dinner last night. Party is in 1067 tonight. With that, we are down to other business, and Mark, could you bring your item, please?

Other Business

MR. MARK ALEXANDER: I would like to draw your attention to an e-mail that was circulated just prior to the meeting today. It is an e-mail from Peter Zukoski of Sea Plan to Mike. Peter of Sea Plan, the Northeast Regional Planning Body ACCSP, George Lapointe Consulting, Harbor Light Software have been working on a pilot study to refine a methodology to characterize the for-hire industries use of the ocean.

This effort coincided with the development of the Northeast Ocean Plan, and arose out of an interest by the industry that their activities be documented as part of the Ocean Planning Process. Specifically, the pilot study is using a feature of eTrips/Mobile that allows vessel tracking by recording a location every two minutes.

As you might imagine, this is sensitive data and Peter has worked hard with the industry to gain their trust and that the data would not be misused and distributed without their permission. Peter has worked with fishermen from each state to develop data visualizations that are acceptable to them for publications of data.

So far, vessels from Connecticut, Rhode Island and New York have been involved in the study. Sea Plan's involvement in the pilot project is ending in December, and Peter is seeking to engage ACCSP and the states involved in the project in a discussion to address some loose ends as Sea Plan's involvement comes to an end.

Their concerns involve the fact that the precise location data is quite sensitive in this industry. There is going to be a little bit of ambiguous ownership of the data, in their eyes. This lack of clear guidelines about handling and vetting the location data for release, and the industry needs insurance that the data already submitted and data that will be submitted in the future will not be misused.

There are several needs pointed out in this e-mail, one is what does this whole effort look like going forward without the involvement of Sea Plan? There is a need that ACCSP continue to recognize the sensitivity of the data. I know the ACCSP is extremely cognizant of confidentiality, but that is still an issue that the industry has a concern about; and that ACCSP continue to be engaged with the industry, both in terms of continuing the project, and establishing standards and a process for data access, and publication of visualizations of the data.

Peter provided me with a project report for that project, and I'll see that it gets circulated to all the Coordinating Council Members, but one thing that arose out of that project was that the vessels involved from the three states had different ideas about what were acceptable visualizations of the data.

That is going to be a little bit of a challenge going forward, is coming up with something that will be acceptable to everybody. One of the states whose vessels are engaged in this pilot project that was asked to participate in further discussion before Sea Plan's involvement comes to an end. I'm also the New England Council's representative to the Northeast RPB, so that is how I got involved in this.

The question for the Coordinating Council here is who from ACCSP should be involved in this discussion? Should maybe some of the committees be involved in coming up with some idea of ACCSP policy in this regard? Of course, time permitting, we only have until the end of the year. What are some of the Coordinating Council's thoughts on some of the possible actions that Peter outlines in his e-mail? If anybody has any ideas on this, I would certainly like to hear about them.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: What I would suggest, maybe in the interest of time, is that we look to Mike and staff to circulate the information, the e-mail that you shared with me, for instance, and also be prepared to discuss how we might be involve, but look to Mike to lead that effort. Mike, do you want to comment?

MR. CAHALL: Just as a quick background, the eTrips reporting tool uses onboard GPS capabilities of the tablet, and can record location data either when catch is recorded, which assumes near real time reporting and/or maintain a track of the vessel by a mechanism essentially waking the tablet up every so often and recording its speed and its location.

We added those in response to this particular pilot, and I think it does bring up a little bit of a larger question. I mean, clearly, tracking data exceeds ACCSPs current standards. We are storing that data for this project, but there is no use within ACCSP of these data per se. We have no method to distribute it. There is no way for us to display the plots. We simply are holding the data on behalf of this pilot project.

I think there are a couple different questions that also -- this is the first time where we've actively participated in a pilot like this, and now the pilots over, and what do we do? I think that's another question. We're very amendable to working with whomever is going to be taking this over, whether it is potentially a group of captains or a state agency or whomever.

The tracking capabilities of the tablets, I think, have a lot of potential, because they're far less expensive than the existing VMS systems. On the other hand, I, personally, am certainly cognizant of how sensitive

these data are. Personally, I am open to whatever suggestion anyone might have about how the best way to move forward.

I'm happy to coordinate with these folks to work through the solution. We can certainly wipe the data if they wish. We can continue to provide it to them if they wish. A couple of these other pieces, the tool is continuing to be developed. The capability to turn the tracking off and on is now added to the latest couple of releases of the tool, and it also tells you whether or not you're tracking as the system is running.

That came out in part of the work that we're doing in the South Atlantic. It is undergoing a continuing evolution. We wanted to make it more obvious that the tool was capable of providing the tracking, and also whether or not you were doing it. It is clearly indicated whether or not you are collecting those data. But however we wish to move forward, I'm certainly happy to work with whomever and do whatever we need to do.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Mark, I think what I would do is suggest that Mike reach out and have some conversation, bring that back to us. I presume we'll meet in February. Is that reasonable?

MR. ALEXANDER: The thing is that the discussions that Peter wants to have will all have to take place before December. If people have any issues or sentiments on some of the possible actions or concerns that Peter outlines in his e-mail, I certainly want to hear about them sooner than later.

MR. CAHALL: Would a call that would include you and Peter potentially be a good way to go?

MR. ALEXANDER: Yes, in talking to Peter, it sounds like what he's going to eventually put together is a conference call that involves industry people, state people and ACCSP. My purpose in bringing this here today was to try to get some feedback, just so I understood or have a good sense of where ACCSP might want to stand on some of these potential actions that Peter outlines.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Jerry, do you have something?

MR. MORGAN: Mike, can that tracking data on the uptake be encrypted at all?

MR. CAHALL: I'm sorry I didn't...

MR. MORGAN: On that tracking data, on the upload, can that be encrypted?

MR. CAHALL: Oh yes, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: I'm cognizant of the fact that we're ten minute past, and in order to get substantive input here from the group, it might be a bridge too far this morning. I'm wondering if we're comfortable asking Mike to reach out. I think Mike has certainly been around the block with this group long enough to know what some of the issues and concerns might be; and would that suffice for your purposes, and is the Coordinating Council comfortable with that? Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: I would be comfortable with Mike reaching out and getting how strongly the industry feels about how this should be dealt with, and then come back to the Leadership Committee, and have that conversation before the end of the year.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Mark, do you think that is sufficient? Okay, very good, first task for the newly formed Leadership Team, very good.

MR. CAHALL: All right, so I'll reach out to Peter, and we'll offer to provide facilities for the industry call if needed.

Adjourn

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Terrific, any other business to come before the Coordinating Council? Seeing none; we will stand adjourned.

INDEX OF MOTIONS

PAGE 18: Motion to accept the Operations and Advisory Committee recommendations of funding all maintenance proposals and fund the Massachusetts DMF Sea Bass Aging and the Georgia DNR Trip Ticket, and partially fund the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Snapper Grouper Observer Project; and if additional funds are made available to the ACCSP, if the Leadership Team will meet to determine how to allocate those additional funds. Motion passes on Page 18.

PAGE 20: Motion to accept the Governance Transition Workgroup unanimous recommendation of approval of the ACCSP Transition Document, and the MOU Addendum, thereby approving the transfer of ACCSP from an independent program to a program of the ASMFC. Motion passes on Page 19.



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 2018 Proposals

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (Program or ACCSP) is issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) to program partner agencies or Committees for FY18 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 II) of the Biological Priority Matrix. Proposals for observer coverage should align with fisheries affecting the top quartile priority species (Attachment III) of the Bycatch Priority Matrix. Brief descriptions of current levels of biological or bycatch sampling by any of the Partners would be helpful to the review process. Projects for recreational catch and effort data should target the priorities set by the Recreational Technical Committee (Attachment IV).

Submissions must comply with Program Standards found [here](#). Timelines for the 2018 RFP are shown in Attachment V. 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 (Attachment I), ranking criteria (Attachment VI), and funding allocation. Current funding allocation guidelines are

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.

75% for maintenance projects and 25% for new projects within the Program priorities. Additionally, a long-term funding strategy policy was approved requiring maintenance projects to be subject to a prior two year average as base funding. A funding decrease will begin after year 4 of maintenance funding with funds decreasing 33% each year starting in year 5 with no funding year 7. 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 FY18 will be made in October 2017. 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 19, 2017**, by email to **both** Mike Cahall (mike.cahall@accsp.org) and Elizabeth Wyatt (elizabeth.wyatt@accsp.org). If you have any questions about the funding decision process, please contact your agency's Operations Committee member (<http://www.accsp.org/committees>), Mike Cahall (703-842-0781), or Elizabeth Wyatt (703-842-0780).

RELEVANT ATTACHMENTS

[ATTACHMENT I Funding Decision Document](#)

[ATTACHMENT II FY 2018 Biological Priority Matrix](#)

[ATTACHMENT III FY 2018 Bycatch Priority Matrix](#)

[ATTACHMENT IV FY 2016 Recreational Technical Priorities](#)

[ATTACHMENT V Timeline for Proposal Review](#)

[ATTACHMENT VI FY 2018 Ranking Criteria Document](#)

Funding Decision Process
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program
May 2017

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. Starting in FY2016 a long-term funding strategy policy was approved requiring maintenance projects to be subject to a prior two-year average as base funding. A funding decrease will begin after year 4 with funds decreasing 33% each year starting in year 5 with no funding year 7.

2. Issue Request for Proposals

a. An RFP will be sent to all Program Partners and Committees no later than the week after the spring Coordinating Council meeting. The RFP will include the ranking criteria, allocation targets approved by the Coordinating Council and general Program priorities taken from 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

support, overhead, etc.). Details should be provided on start-up versus long-term operational costs.

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

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

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

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. Proposals that fail to meet the ACCSP standards may be recommended for changes or rejected.

4. Provide initial review results to submitting Partner

Program staff will notify the submitting Partner of suggested changes, request responses, or questions arising from the review process (especially if a proposal initially fails to meet ACCSP standards). 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 decide 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 ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council for review.

- d) The ACCSP Leadership Team 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 ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council. These options to address funding contingencies may include:

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

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 ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council for final approval on the plan to distribute the returned money.

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

Relevant Deadlines

- April
 - Develop annual priorities and funding allocation targets.
- May
 - Distribute request for proposals
- June
 - 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 a collection of aging or other biological samples must clarify partner processing capabilities (i.e., how processed and by whom).
- Provide details on how the proposal will benefit the Program as a whole, outside of benefits to the Partner or Committee.
- Proposals that request funds for Law Enforcement should confirm that all funds will be allocated towards reporting compliance.
- Proposals must detail any in-kind effort/resources, and if no in-kind resources are included, state why.
- Proposals must meet the same quality as would be appropriate for a grant proposal for ACFCMA or other federal grant.
- Assistance is available from Program staff, or an Operations Committee member for proposal preparation and to insure that Program standards are addressed in the body of a given proposal.
- Even though a large portion of available resources may be allocated to one or more jurisdictions, new systems (including prototypes) will be selected to serve all Partners' needs.
- Partners submitting pilot, or other short-term programs, are encouraged to lease large capital budget items (vehicles, etc.) and where possible, hire consultants or contractors rather than hire new permanent personnel.

- The Program will not fund proposals that do not meet Program standards. However, in the absence of approved standards, pilot studies may be funded.
- Proposals will be considered for modules that may be fully developed but have not been through the formal approval process. Pilot proposals will be considered in those cases.
- The Operations Committee may contact Partners concerning discrepancies or inconsistencies in any proposal and may recommend modifications to proposals subject to acceptance by the submitting Partner and approval by the Coordinating Council. The Operations Committee may recommend changes or conditions to proposals. The Coordinating Council may conditionally approve proposals. These contingencies will be documented and forwarded to the submitting Partner in writing by Program staff.
- Any proposal submitted after the initial RFP deadline will not be considered, in addition to any proposal submitted by a Partner which is not current with all reporting obligations.

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) – 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 – bulleted list by objective.
 - iv. Progress or lack of progress of incomplete activities during the period of semi-annual progress – bulleted list by objective.
 - v. Activities planned during the next reporting period.
 - vi. Metrics table
 - vii. Milestone Chart – original and revised if changes occurred during the project period.
- b. Final Report:
- i. Title page – 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. The quality of the data pertaining to the objective of the project (e.g. representative to the scope of the project, quantity collected, etc.).
 - 3. Compiled data results.
 - 4. Summary of statistics.
 - vi. Discussion:
 - 1. Discuss the interpretation of results of the 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 the 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.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/ob/grants/budget_narrative_guidance-04.09.2015.pdf

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 the 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, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0 – 8	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	
Social and Economic	0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. geographic range of the stock).
> yr 2 contains funding transition plan and/or justification for continuance	0 – 4	Rank based on defined funding transition plan away from Program funding or viable justification for continued Program funding.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25%

		2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections ↓ 4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 4 0 – 3 0 – 2 0 – 1	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.


Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Properly Prepared	0 – 5	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 5	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

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

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

Ranking Guide – New Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort	0 – 10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0 – 8	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	
Social and Economic	0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	

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

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Innovative	0 – 5	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.

Properly Prepared	0 – 5	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 5	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

Biological Sampling Priority Matrix

Created in February 2017
For FY2018

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

Biological Review Panel recommends:



- Species in the upper 25% of the priority matrix should be considered for funding.
- Sampling projects which cover multiple species within the upper 25% are highly recommended.

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

Biological Review Panel recommendations

based on matrix*:

* UPPER 25% OF MATRIX

New Species																
Species	Overfished	Overfishing	Most Recent Stock Assessment	Current/Next Stock Assessment	Council Priority	ASMFC Priority	State Priority	NMFES Priority	Fishery Managed	Sig. change in landings w/in 24 mo	Sig. change in mgmt w/in 24 mo	Adequacy of level of sampling	Stock Resilience	Seasonality of Fishery	TOTAL	
Atlantic halibut <i>Hippoglossus hippoglossus</i>	U	U	2015	2017	4.0	0	1.1	4.0	1	5	1	4	5	3	28.07	
Atlantic Smooth Dogfish <i>Mustelus canis</i>	N	N	2015		3.0	3	1.3	3.0	1	3	3	3	2	3	25.29	
American Eel <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>	Y	Y	2012	Update 2017	0.0	5	3.5	0.0	1	1	5	4	5	1	25.50	
American Lobster <i>Homarus americanus</i>	N	N	2015		0.0	5	2.6	3.0	1	1	3	3	4	1	23.57	
Atlantic Menhaden <i>Brevoortia tyrannus</i>	N	N	2015	Update 2017	0.0	5	2.1	3.0	1	1	5	2	3	1	23.14	
Black Sea Bass <i>Centropristis striata</i>	N: MA N:SA	N: MA N:SA	2016	2017	5.0	5	3.4	5.0	1	1	4	3	3	1	31.36	
Bluefin Tuna <i>Thunnus thynnus</i>	Y	N	2014	2017	0.0	0	1.6	5.0	1	5	5	3	3	1	24.64	
Blueline Tilefish <i>Caulolatilus microps</i>	N	Y	2013	Benchmark 2017	5.0	0	1.1	5.0	1	3	5	4	3	3	30.14	
Cobia <i>Rachycentron canadum</i>	N	N	2012	2020	5.0	4	1.4	3.0	1	1	3	4	3	3	28.36	
Dolphin <i>Coryphaena hippurus</i>	U	U			5.0	0	1.3	3.0	1	3	3	3	1	3	23.29	
Gag Grouper <i>Mycteroperca microlepis</i>	N	N	2014	2020	5.0	0	0.9	4.0	1	1	2	3	4	3	23.93	
Gray Triggerfish <i>Balistes capriscus</i>	U	U	2016		5.0	0	1.0	4.0	1	5	4	4	2	3	29.00	
Red Drum <i>Sciaenops ocellatus</i>	U	N	2017		1.0	5	1.2	1.0	1	5	0	3	3	3	23.21	
Red Grouper <i>Epinephelus morio</i>	Y	Y	2010	2017	5.0	0	1.0	4.0	1	1	0	4	4	3	23.00	
Red Snapper <i>Lutjanus campechanus</i>	Y	Y	2016		5.0	0	0.7	5.0	1	1	1	2	5	5	25.71	
Scamp <i>Mycteroperca phenax</i>	U	U		2020	5.0	0	0.9	3.0	1	1	3	4	4	3	24.86	
Snowy Grouper <i>Epinephelus niveatus</i>	Y	N	2013	2019	5.0	0	1.1	5.0	1	3	4	4	5	3	31.14	
Spanish Mackerel <i>Scomberomorus maculatus</i>	N	N	2012	2019	5.0	2	1.4	4.0	1	1	3	3	2	1	23.36	
Tilefish <i>Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps</i>	N: MA N:SA	N: MA Y:SA	2016		5.0	0	1.7	4.0	1	1	2	4	4	3	25.71	
Winter Flounder <i>Pleuronectes americanus</i>	Y: GB U: GOM Y: SNE/MA	Y: GB U: GOM Y: SNE/MA	2016	Update 2017	5.0	2	2.4	5.0	1	3	0	2	4	1	25.43	
Winter Skate <i>Raja ocellata</i>	N	Y	2016		4.0	0	0.9	3.0	1	5	1	3	5	1	23.86	

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

Bio-sampling Priority Matrix



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

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).

- Red Snapper and Atlantic Menhaden are being sampled adequately and have low priority so additional sampling is not needed.
- Projects that target multiple upper quartile species should be given a higher priority.

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

Bycatch Sampling Priority Matrix

Created in February 2017
For FY 2018

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

Top Quartile of Bycatch Matrix Suggestions

	<u>Sig. Change in mgmt w/in past 36 mo</u>	<u>Amt of reg discards</u>	<u>Amt of non reg discards</u>	<u>Prot Spp Interactions</u>	<u>Score</u>
<u>Combined Fleets</u>					
Mid-Atlantic Gillnet	3	4	2	5	14
Southeastern, Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico HMS Pelagic Longline	3	4	1	5	13
New England Extra-Large-Mesh Gillnet	0	4	2	5	11
South Atlantic shrimp Trawl	0	4	2	5	11
South Atlantic, black sea bass Pot	3	2	1	5	11
New England Otter Trawl	1	4	2	3	10
Mid-Atlantic Pound Net	1	4	2	3	10
American Lobster Pots - SNE	1	2	1	5	9
New England Gillnet	1	2	1	5	9
Mid-Atlantic Small-Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom	1	4	1	3	9
South Atlantic Otter Trawl	0	4	2	3	9
Mid-Atlantic Eel Trap/Pot	1	2	1	5	9
New England Fish Pots and Traps	3	2	1	3	9
New England Floating Trap	1	2	1	5	9
South Atlantic Large Mesh Gillnet	0	4	2	3	9
Mid-Atlantic Bottom Longline	3	2	1	3	9
Southeast Calico Scallop Trawl	0	2	2	5	9
South Atlantic small mesh gillnet	1	2	1	5	9

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

Additional Fleets of Importance



- Mid-Atlantic Purse Seine: Menhaden
- HMS species, South Atlantic dealer data not included in Trips dataset
- Pelagic Longline Fleet reports via logbooks which are not in the Trips data
- Snapper Grouper H&L Fleet: volatile and have bycatch issues

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

ACCSP Funding Prioritization of the Recreational Technical Committee

March 2015

The Recreational Technical Committee was tasked with providing priorities for recreational data collection to be included in the annual ACCSP request for proposals process. Agencies were asked to prioritize recreational data collection needs within twelve items identified in the ACCSP recreational data standards across the shore, private, and for-hire modes. Also, an "OTHER" category was available to identify needs which may be of importance to a partner. Each agency ranked categories sequentially from '1' to '13' with a value of '1' representing a partner's high prioritization level. The cumulative values of rank were calculated separately for the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and South Atlantic regions. The number of angler-trips taken in 2014 (MRIP effort data) are included in the regional column headers as additional information on the size of the recreational fisheries in that region (e.g. the Gulf of Mexico had 18,587,742 angler-trips in 2014). Partners that span more than one region (ASMFC, GSMFC, GARFO, SERO, USFWS-NE and USFWS-SE) are ranked as coastal agencies. The GSMFC was included as MRIP methodologies are consistent in Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. NMFS-MRIP and NMFS-HMS chose not submit priorities for ACCSP funding. The final overall prioritization rank was calculated as a simple average of the three regions plus coastal agency ranks. The ACCSP Advisors support the top four recommended priorities. The table of all rankings is presented below.

ACTION: The Recreational Technical Committee recommends the following recreational priorities for inclusion in the 2016 ACCSP Request for Proposals. 1) Improve precision of estimates (by increasing sample size); 2) Improve discard/release data; 3) Change from 2 month waves to monthly estimates; and 4) For-Hire logbook implementation and validation.

For reference, full 2015 rankings are listed below:

Recreational Data Topic	2015 Priority Level (1 is top priority, 13 is Lowest priority)				
	North Atlantic (ME-NH-MA-RI-CT - NEFMC) 6,504,683 trips	Mid-Atlantic (NY-NJ-DE-MD-VA-MAFMC) 14,035,613 trips	South Atlantic (NC-SC-GA-FL-SAFMC) 17,358,930 trips	Coastal Agencies (ASMFC, GSMFC, GARFO, SERO, USFWS-NE, USFWS SA)	OVERALL PRIORITY (Regional average rank)
Improve PSE for estimates	1	1	4	1	1
Improve discard/release data	5	2	1	6	2
Change from 2 month waves to monthly estimates	3	6	3	5	3
For-Hire logbook implementation and validation	2	3	6	7	4
Integration / coordination of for-hire data reporting	4	5	7	4	5
Biological sampling for Recreational Fisheries (separate from MRIP)	8	3	2	8	6
Improve geographical resolution for major geographic boundaries	5	8	7	2	7
Collection more detailed fishing areas on intercepts	7	12	5	3	8
Effort Sampling Jan-Feb MD-FL	11	7	9	9	9
Improve Data Availability from 45 to 38 days	9	10	9	11	10
Catch Sampling Jan-Feb MD-FL	12	9	11	11	11
Adjust upstream extent of the survey	10	11	13	10	12
OTHER	12 (Increase For-Hire coverage in wave 2&6)	13	12 (invertebrate sampling, social-economic data collection, and turtle/dolphin take survey as add-on to MRIP effort survey)	13	13



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


This list includes dates for fiscal year 2017 in preparation for FY2018 funding. If you have any questions or comments on this calendar please do not hesitate to contact Elizabeth Wyatt, ACCSP Program Coordinator, at elizabeth.wyatt@accsp.org.

March 1:	Start of ACCSP FY17
May 8-11:	ASMFC Meeting/ACCSP Executive Committee Meeting and Coordinating Council Meeting; ACCSP issues request for proposals - Alexandria, VA
June 19:	Initial proposals are due
June 26:	Initial proposals are distributed to ACCSP Operations and Advisory Committees
Week of July 17:	Review of initial proposals for ACCSP Operations and Advisory Committees (webinar)
July 31:	Feedback submitted to principal investigators
August 21:	Revised proposals due
August 28:	Revised proposals distributed to ACCSP Operations and Advisory Committees
Week of September 4:	Preliminary ranking exercise for Advisors (webinar)
Week of September 18:	Annual Advisors and Operations Committee Joint Meeting (in-person; location TBD)

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, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0 – 8	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	
Social and Economic	0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

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


Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Properly Prepared	0 – 5	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 5	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

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

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

Ranking Guide – New Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort	0 – 10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0 – 8	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	
Social and Economic	0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

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

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Innovative	0 – 5	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.
Properly Prepared	0 – 5	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 5	Ranked based on subjective worthiness