

 <p>Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels</p>	<p><b>Fourth Meeting of the Parties</b> <i>Lima, Peru, 23 – 27 April 2012</i></p> <p><b>Report to MoP4 on the process for the allocation of funds to the Advisory Committee Work Programme</b></p> <p><b><i>Advisory Committee</i></b></p>
---	--

## RECOMMENDATION

The Advisory Committee recommends that the Meeting of the Parties note the current process for the allocation of “core” and grant funds and either endorse the process or make such amendments to improve the process as are considered necessary.

## 1. BACKGROUND

During MoP3 a procedure for allocating funding for the AC Work Programme was discussed and adopted ([MoP3 Doc 13 rev 3](#)). This method drew on experience gained in the first call for applications in 2008 and the selection of projects conducted during AC4 (see [AC4 Doc 24](#) and [AC4 Doc 53](#)). The procedure was successfully applied in the call for applications in 2009 and subsequently further refined to separate “core” and grant activities prior to the call for 2010 applications (see [AC5 Doc 30](#) and [AC5 Inf 6](#)).

The present document outlines the processes followed for the allocation of grant funds after MoP3 in 2009, 2010 and 2012, highlighting difficulties, lessons learnt and adjustments adopted by the Advisory Committee to improve the procedure.

## 2. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS

The schedule and steps followed for the call for applications in 2009, 2010 and 2012 is described in Table 1. In general terms the procedure included the following steps: (1) call for applications and the receipt of proposals, (2) evaluation of applications by relevant Working Groups, (3) compilation of evaluations by the Grants Sub-Committee, (4) discussion and final advice by Grants Sub-Committee reached on projects to be funded, (5) final endorsement from the Advisory Committee, and (6) transfer of funds by the Secretariat.

**Table 1.** Steps and timetables followed in 2009, 2010 and 2012 for the call for application and selection of proposals funded by the Advisory Committee.

Step in the fund allocation process	2009	2010	2012
Secretariat opens call for project proposals distributed electronically to WGs and NCP, with a copy posted on the ACAP website.	10 Jun [week 1]	19 May [week 1]	12 Dec 2011 [week 1]
Deadline for project applications	03 Jul [week 3]	16 Jul [week 8]	06 Feb [week 8]
Secretariat sends project proposals to the Grants Sub-Committee and afterwards to WGs for review following adopted criteria (see Annex 1).	27 Jul [week 7]	26 Jul [week 9]	13 Feb [week 9]
Working Group Convenors send revised proposals to the Grants Sub-Committee for ranking of satisfactory proposals	17 Aug [week 10]	15 Sep [week 17]	30 Mar [week 15]
Grant Sub-Committee send recommendations to the AC Members for final input prior to approval of funding	21 Aug [week 10]	17 Sep [week 17]	20 Apr [week 19]
Inputs received from AC Members and final approval of funding by the Advisory Committee.	11 Sep [week 13]	27 Oct [week 23]	18 May [week 24]
AC Chair communicates final results to the AC and applicants. Secretariat contact successful applicants to commence the transfer of funds.	15 Sep [week 13]	05 Nov [week 24]	25 May [week 25]
Some applicants were contacted for clarification and/or modification of project objectives. Proposals evaluated and communicated to the AC	07 Nov [week 16]	N/A	N/A

Twenty-three projects have been 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. Details of projects received, both funded and not funded, project leaders and grants provided are shown in Annex 2. Detailed information on the projects supported and their outcomes can be found in [AC5 Doc 23](#), [AC5 Inf 1](#), [AC6 Inf 8](#) and [AC6 Inf 9](#).

### 3. LESSONS LEARNT AND PROCESS REFINEMENT SINCE MOP3

- Following on from the experience gained in 2009, a more relaxed schedule was adopted in subsequent years, particularly for some stages such as the initial call for applications and evaluation stages.
- Some of the proposals in 2009 were considered valuable but required clarification or modification. In particular cases it was decided to request additional information from the applicants. This delayed substantially the final decision for several applications (see Table 1). To avoid these issues in further years, grant proponents were asked to submit their proposals via their NCPs to ensure all required sections were properly addressed in applications prior to final submission to ACAP.
- The call for 2009 applications referred to priority projects in the AC Work Programme and indicated the level 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, the AC agreed that indicative funding not be included in the 2010 call and only the total level of funds available was indicated in the 2012 call for applications.

- Reviewers used criteria agreed by the AC for the evaluation and ranking of the proposals. After the 2009 call the criteria were revised and the amended version shown in Annex 1 was used in 2010. Additional information was also requested from applicants, such as a short biography/CV of the project leader.
- Costs associated with the translation of proposals were not considered for the 2009 call 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 agreed that funding requests be divided into: (a) 'Core tasks', including ad hoc work essential to the functioning of the Agreement, and work to be undertaken by the Secretariat with funding from the AC's appropriation; and (b) 'Other (fund) tasks', to be considered for competitive funding from the AC's appropriation through the grants assessment process adopted MoP3.
- Due to the large number of projects applications recommended for funding in 2010, but the relatively limited funds available (AUD\$50,643, since \$68,000 were allocated in AC5 to core projects), 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 (except for \$30,000 set aside for 'core' project to fund attendance at RFMO meetings in 2011).
- AC5 also 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. Thus, only the allocation of funds to core tasks could take place at the AC meetings.
- In cases where a Working Group Member was an applicant, co-investigator, or part of the group of researchers applying for funds, then such Member did not participate in the evaluation process, in order to avoid a conflict of interest. In cases where the applicant, or co-investigator was a Working Group Convenor, the Vice-Convenor took on their role and became responsible for the distribution and compilation of rankings as well as participating in the discussions of the Grant Sub-Committee for the elaboration of recommendations to the Advisory Committee.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

The AC considers that the current process, which separates "core" and other activities requiring funding, works well and has been an efficient method to identify and fund practical activities of high priority in the AC Work Programme. The AC recommends it continue to be applied during 2013-2015.

**ANNEX 1. PROCEDURE FOR THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME**



**AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF ALBATROSSES AND PETRELS**

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

**Working Group:**

**Name of Member:**

Project # and applicant	Merit <sup>(a)</sup> (1-5)	Relevance <sup>(b)</sup> (1-10)	Team <sup>(c)</sup> (1-3)	Project feasibility <sup>(d)</sup> (1-5)	Budget feasibility <sup>(e)</sup> (1-3)	Score <sup>(f)</sup> (1-5)	RANK <sup>(g)</sup> (1-x)	Comments	
								Strengths	Weaknesses

**Notes**

- (a) Scientific, technical or other merit of the proposal, such as the potential for capacity building or innovation (high = 5, low = 1);
- (b) Extent to which the project addresses the AC Work Programme and areas specified in the current call for applications (high = 10, low = 1);
- (c) Expertise of the team (particularly the Senior Researchers) who would undertake the proposed project (high = 3, low = 1);
- (d) Project feasibility (is the project capable of being achieved within the proposed timeframe) (high = 5, low = 1);
- (e) Budget feasibility (is the proposal capable of being achieved within the budget sought) (high = 3, low = 1);
- (f) Scoring standard: [1] “unsatisfactory”, not to be considered further; [2] “possibly unsatisfactory”, needs clarification or improvement before it could be considered satisfactory; [3] “satisfactory”, a feasible but not strong/high priority proposal; [4] “above average”, a competent proposal; [5] “excellent”, competent, good value and contributes to high priority tasks.
- (g) Sort assessed applications in order of most highly to least recommended for funding, where 1 = most highly recommend for funding.

**ANNEX 2. DETAILS OF PROJECT APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AND GRANTED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE PERIOD 2008-2010.**

*Projects granted are highlighted in grey.*

<b>Project #</b>	<b>Project title</b>	<b>Requested (AUD\$)</b>	<b>Granted (AUD\$)</b>	<b>Project leader, affiliation</b>
ACAP 08-01	Increased capacity to progress ACAP Action Plan and AC Work Programme	46,000	46,000	ACAP Secretariat
ACAP 08-02	Does the thaw status of bait used in pelagic longline fisheries affect the sink rates of baited hooks in depths of the water column accessible to seabirds?	8,000		Graham Robertson, Australian Antarctic Division
ACAP 08-03	The Southern Giant Petrel: steps towards the conservation of procellariiform birds within the Patagonian Shelf	60,000		Flavio Quintana, Centro Nacional Patagónico
ACAP 08-04	At-sea trials to investigate the effectiveness of bait pods in reducing seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries	20,000	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	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	30,080	20,000	Pro-Delphinus, Peru
ACAP 08-07	Albatross, petrels and fisheries in Peru: Evaluating bycatch and seabird distribution and abundance	36,636	23,067	Asociación Peruana para la Conservación de la Naturaleza.
ACAP 08-08	Seed funding – 2010 World Seabird Conference	20,000		Louise Blight, Local Organising Committee
ACAP 08-09	Population assessment and at-sea distribution of black petrels breeding on Little Barrier Island, New Zealand	35,450		Johanna Pierre. Department of Conservation

<b>Project #</b>	<b>Project title</b>	<b>Requested (AUD\$)</b>	<b>Granted (AUD\$)</b>	<b>Project leader, affiliation</b>
ACAP 08-10	Global Procellariiform Tracking Database	10,000	10,000	Cleo Small, Frances Taylor, BirdLife International
ACAP 08-11	Capacity Building – Observer Workshop	5,000	5,000	Argentina, Ecuador, BirdLife International
ACAP 09-01	Development of ACAP database-generated Implementation Reports	5,000	5,000	ACAP Secretariat
ACAP 09-02	Improving Waved Albatross Conservation: Monitoring Changes in Population Size and Vital Rates	16,950	16,950	Kate Huyvaert, Colorado State University
ACAP 09-03	Evaluación diagnóstica del grado de implementación de registro de captura incidental de aves marinas en pesquerías de las aguas jurisdiccionales argentinas	42,683		Fabián Rabuffetti, Aves Argentinas (AA), Guillermo Caille, Fundación Patagonia Natural (FPN)
ACAP 09-04	Responding to the evolution of Peru's artisanal longline fleet: characterising fleet mechanisation and introducing weighted swivels	16,890	20,974	Pro-Delphinus, Peru
ACAP 09-05	Seabird interactions with trawl fishery for Peruvian hake in northern Peru	25,512	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	18,216	Ben Sullivan, BirdLife International
ACAP 09-07	State and conservation of the Southwest Atlantic Ocean and Antarctic Albatrosses and Petrels populations: Effects of fisheries and climate change on populations	9,619		Tomás José Luis Orgeira – Diego Montalti
ACAP 09-08	Development of Tools to Guide the Reduction of Seabird Bycatch	20,000		Johanna Pierre, Department of Conservation
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	10,000	Instituto de Fomento Pesquero, Chile

<b>Project #</b>	<b>Project title</b>	<b>Requested (AUD\$)</b>	<b>Granted (AUD\$)</b>	<b>Project leader, affiliation</b>
ACAP 09-10	Regional workshop “Improving data collection on incidental mortality of seabirds from South American Observer Programmes”	23,000	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	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)	24,940	13,000	Pro-Delphinus, Peru
ACAP 10-02	The Albatross and the Fish: Linked Lives in the Southern Ocean. Book forthcoming from the University of Texas Press in fall 2011.	26,636		Robin Doughty & Virginia Carmichael, USA
ACAP 10-03	Evaluating alternative approaches to predicting at-sea distributions and fisheries overlaps of ACAP species in Ecological Risk Assessments	7,200	7,200	Richard Phillips, British Antarctic Survey
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	14,500	Johanna Pierre, DOC, New Zealand
ACAP 10-05	Including ACAP species in IUCN/SSC ISSG IBIS [Island Biodiversity- the threat of Invasive Species] database- an awareness raising tool and a platform for exchange of best practice in the management of invasive species on island ecosystems.	12,140		Shyama Pagad, IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group
ACAP 10-07	Mentoring the Development of New Fishing Practices and Technology that Reduce Seabird Deaths	20,000		Janice Molloy, Southern Seabird Solutions
ACAP 10-08	Monitoring Bycatch in Peruvian Artisanal Longline Fishery applying three methods	30,031		Liliana Ayala (APECO)

Project #	Project title	Requested (AUD\$)	Granted (AUD\$)	Project leader, affiliation
ACAP 10-09	Internal Consultation Process for the Consolidation of the National Plan of Action for the Conservation of Seabirds in Peru	15,400	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?	14,000	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	17,000	10,000	Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Perú and Uruguay
ACAP 10-12	The influence of local climate variability on the reproductive success of the waved albatross <i>Phoebastria irrorata</i>	27,588		Gustavo Jimenez-Uzcategui, Charles Darwin Foundation
ACAP 10-13	Final on-shore development of 'hook-pod' to reduce seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries	35,000	25,000	Ben Sullivan, BirdLife International
ACAP 10-14	Incidencia de aves marinas en las pesquerías artesanales en el Ecuador: Caso de Estudio caleta pesquera de Santa Rosa (Provincia de Santa Elena)	32,500		Marco Herrera C., Instituto Nacional de Pesca
ACAP 10-15	Estimates of the Waved albatross mortality in artisanal fisheries during the critical period of incubation	24,950	15,000	Jorge Samaniego, ATF Ecuador, Aves & Conservación
<b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>		<b>650,103</b>	<b>363,063</b>	