



Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Sixth Meeting of Advisory Committee

Guayaquil, Ecuador, 29 August – 2 September 2011

Report to MoP4 on the process for the allocation of funds to the Advisory Committee Work Programme

Grants Sub-Committee, Secretariat

'This paper is presented for consideration by ACAP and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change. Data in this paper shall not be cited or used for purposes other than the work of the ACAP Secretariat, ACAP Advisory Committee or their subsidiary Working Groups without the permission of the original data holders.'

Report to MoP4 on the process for the allocation of funds to the Advisory Committee Work Programme

Grants Sub-Committee, Secretariat

Background

During MoP3 a procedure for allocating funding for the AC Work Programme was discussed and adopted (MoP3 Doc 13 rev 3). This method was outlined on the basis of the experience gained in the first call for application in 2008 and the selection of projects conducted during AC4 (see AC4 Doc 24 and AC4 Doc 53). The procedure adopted in MoP3 was successfully applied in the call for application 2009 and more experience discussed in AC5 (see AC5 Doc 30 and AC5 Inf 6) allowed the further refinement of the process applied in the call 2010.

The present document outlines those processes for the allocation of funds followed after MoP3 in 2009 and 2010, highlighting difficulties, lessons learnt and minor adjustments adopted by the Advisory Committee after Parties' recommendation on what experience with implementing the procedure should be used to improve it in future years.

General description of the process

The schedule and steps followed along the call for applications 2009 and 2010 is described in Table 1. In general terms the procedure included the following steps: (1) call for application and the reception of proposals, (2) evaluation of applications by relevant Working Groups, (3) compilation of evaluations by the Grants Sub-Committee, (4) advise sent the Advisory Committee for inputs, (5) discussion and final decision reached on projects funded, (6) transfer of funds by the Secretariat.

Table 1. Steps followed in 2009 and 2010 for the call for application and selection of proposals funded by the Advisory Committee.

Step in the fund allocation process	2009	2010
Secretariat opens call for project proposals distributed electronically to WGs and NCP, with a copy posted on the ACAP website.	10 Jun [3 weeks]	19 May [8 weeks]
Deadline for project applications	03 Jul	16 Jul
Secretariat sends project proposals to the Grants Sub-Committee and afterwards to WGs for review following adopted criteria (see Annex 1).	27 Jul [3 weeks]	26 Jul [9 weeks]
Working Group Convenors send revised proposals to the Grants Sub Committee for ranking of satisfactory proposals	17 Aug	15 Sep
Grant Sub Committee send advise to the AC on which proposals to fund and how much funding each proposal should receive.	21 Aug [3 weeks]	17 Sep [6 weeks]
Inputs received from AC Members and final approval of funding reached.	11 Sep	27 Oct

AC Chair communicates results to the AC and applicants. Secretariat contact successful applicants to commence the transfer of funds.	15 Sep	05 Nov
Some applicants were contacted for clarification and/or adaptation of project objectives. Proposals evaluated and communicated to the AC	20 Sep-30 Nov	N/A

Twenty-three projects were supported since 2008 for a total of AUD\$ 363,063: seven in 2008 for AUD\$ 128,817, eight in 2009 for AUD\$ 120,046 and eight in 2010 for AUD\$ 114,200. Projects supported, project leaders and funds granted is shown in Table 2. Detailed information on projects supported and their outcomes can be found in AC5 Doc 23, AC5 Inf 1, AC6 Inf 2 and AC6 Inf 3.

Table 2. Detail of projects funded by the Advisory Committee for the period 2008-2010

Project #	Project title	Funds (AUD\$)	Project leader
ACAP 08-01	Increased capacity to progress ACAP Action Plan and AC Work Programme	46,000	ACAP Secretariat
ACAP 08-04	At-sea trials to investigate the effectiveness of bait pods in reducing seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries	20,000	Ben Sullivan, BirdLife International
ACAP 08-05	Under attack! The effects of predation by the introduced House Mice on the breeding success and interval of the CE Tristan Albatross	4,750	John Cooper, Conservation and Restoration Initiatives
ACAP 08-06	Assessment of waved albatross abundance and behaviour near Peruvian fishing vessels and of socio-economic aspects related to seabird interactions	20,000	Pro-Delphinus, Peru
ACAP 08-07	Albatross, petrels and fisheries in Peru: Evaluating bycatch and seabird distribution and abundance	23,067	Asociación Peruana para la Conservación de la Naturaleza.
ACAP 08-10	Global Procellariiform Tracking Database	10,000	Cleo Small, Frances Taylor, BirdLife International

Project #	Project title	Funds (AUD\$)	Project leader
ACAP 08-11	Capacity Building – Observer Workshop	5,000	Argentina, Ecuador and BirdLife International
ACAP 09-01	Development of ACAP database-generated Implementation Reports	5,000	ACAP Secretariat
ACAP 09-02	Improving Waved Albatross Conservation: Monitoring Changes in Population Size and Vital Rates	16,950	Kate Huyvaert, Colorado State University
ACAP 09-04	Responding to the evolution of Peru's artisanal longline fleet: characterising fleet mechanisation and introducing weighted swivels	20,974	Pro-Delphinus, Peru
ACAP 09-05	Seabird interactions with trawl fishery for Peruvian hake in northern Peru	20,056	Asociación Peruana para la Conservación de la Naturaleza.
ACAP 09-06	Fact sheets for best practice techniques to mitigate seabird bycatch in pelagic longline, demersal longline and trawl fisheries	18,216	Ben Sullivan, BirdLife International
ACAP 09-09	Implementation of a Scientific Observer Programme to Evaluate the Interaction of Seabirds with Demersal Fisheries in the South of Chile	10,000	Instituto de Fomento Pesquero, Chile
ACAP 09-10	Regional workshop “Improving data collection on incidental mortality of seabirds from South American Observer Programmes”	23,000	Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay
ACAP 09-11	A stepped approach to evaluating the effectiveness of a fast sinking line-weighting regime	5,850	Graham Robertson, Australian Antarctic Division
ACAP 10-01	At-sea distribution of the WAAL and overlap with fishing fleets of the central Peruvian coast (Joanna Alfaro-Shigueto & Jeffrey C. Mangel, Pro Delphinus)	13,000	Pro-Delphinus, Peru
ACAP 10-03	Evaluating alternative approaches to predicting at-sea distributions and fisheries overlaps of ACAP species in Ecological Risk Assessments	7,200	Richard Phillips, British Antarctic Survey

Project #	Project title	Funds (AUD\$)	Project leader
ACAP 10-04	Concluding six years of research on seabird bycatch reduction through modified discharge management regimes: Is batch discharge better than ad-hoc discharge from trawl vessels?	14,500	Johanna Pierre, DOC, New Zealand
ACAP 10-09	Internal Consultation Process for the Consolidation of the National Plan of Action for the Conservation of Seabirds in Peru	15,400	Elisa Goya, IMARPE, Ministerio de la Producción, Peru
ACAP 10-10	Defining high-risk areas in the Argentinean Continental Shelf: to which extent albatrosses and petrels interact with the Argentine high-seas commercial trawl fleet?	14,100	S Copello & JP Seco Pon (CONICET, Argentina)
ACAP 10-11	Improving data collection on seabird incidental mortality associated with fisheries in South American observer programmes: Part II – year 2011	10,000	Argentina, Brasil, Chile, Ecuador, Perú and Uruguay
ACAP 10-13	Final on-shore development of 'hook-pod' to reduce seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries	25,000	Ben Sullivan, BirdLife International
ACAP 10-15	Estimates of the Waved albatross mortality in artisanal fisheries during the critical period of incubation	15,000	Jorge Samaniego, ATF Ecuador, Aves & Conservación

Lessons learnt and process refinement since MoP3

Following the experience in 2009, a more relaxed schedule was adopted in 2010, particularly for some stages such as the actual call for application and evaluation stages.

Some of the proposals in 2009 were considered valuable but required clarifications or modifications. In particular cases it was decided to request additional information from the applicants, fact that delayed substantially the final decision for several applications (see Table 1). To avoid these issues in further years, it was recommended that the NCPs and other Organisations make sure that all required sections are properly addressed in applications prior to submission to ACAP.

The call for applications 2009 referred to priority projects in the AC Work Programme and indicated a figure of funds available for each one. Since there was a perception that identifying indicative funding produced an undesirable effect on the budget in some applications, it was recommended and decided that indicative funding would not be included in the call 2010.

Reviewers used a table with criteria for the evaluation and ranking of the proposals. After the call 2009 the table was revised and the amended version in Annex 1 was used in 2010.

Costs associated with the translation of proposals were not considered until the call 2009 but in AC5 it was recommended that a minimum of AUD\$ 5,000 be allocated from the total budget in order to cope with these potential costs.

During AC5 it was decided that funding requests be divided into: (a) 'Core tasks', including *ad hoc* work essential to the functioning of the Agreement, and normally undertaken by the Secretariat with funding from the AC's appropriation; and (b) 'Other (fund) tasks', to be considered for funding from the AC's appropriation through the grants assessment process adopted MoP3.

Due to the large number of projects applications recommended for funding but relatively limited funds available (AUD\$ 50,643, since \$ 68,000 were allocated in AC5 to core projects), during the call 2010 the AC endorsed the recommendation of the Grants Sub Committee to include the 2011 allocation of grant funds (\$ 80,621) with the funds remaining for 2010 (\$30,000 set aside for 'core' project to fund attendance at RFMO meetings in 2011).

In AC5 it was recognized that although there were benefits in the grants assessment process being undertaken during the WG/AC meetings, in practice it is necessary to undertake the process after the meetings so that the meeting outcomes can be used to guide allocation of funds. However, the allocation of funds to core tasks would take place at the AC meetings.

Action required from Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee is requested to:

- (1) Endorse the information contained in this document, and
- (2) Advise on any relevant information and/or recommendations that should be included in the present document for its presentation to MoP4.



Annex 1

Procedure for the Allocation of Funds to the Advisory Committee Work Programme

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels

Working Group:

Name of Member:

Project # and applicant	Merit ^(a) (1-5)	Relevance ^(b) (1-10)	Team ^(c) (1-3)	Project feasibility ^(d) (1-5)	Budget feasibility ^(e) (1-3)	Score ^(f)	RANK	Comments	
								Strengths	Weaknesses

Notes

Scientific, technical or other merit of the proposal, such as the potential for capacity building (high = 5, low = 1);

Extent to which the project addresses the AC Work Programme and areas specified in the current call for applications (high = 10, low = 1);

Expertise of the team (particularly the Senior Researchers) who would undertake the proposed project (high = 3, low = 1);

Project feasibility (is the project capable of being achieved within the proposed timeframe) (high = 5, low = 1);

Budget feasibility (is the proposal capable of being achieved within the budget sought) (high = 3, low = 1);

Scoring standard: “unsatisfactory” [1], not to be considered further; “possibly unsatisfactory” [2], needs clarification or improvement before it could be considered satisfactory; “satisfactory” [3], a feasible but not strong/high priority proposal; “above average” [4], a competent proposal; “excellent” [5], competent, good value and contributes to high priority tasks.