PACIFIC SALMON COMMISSION

ESTABLISHED BY TREATY BETWEEN CANADA
AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
MARCH 18, 1985

600 - 1155 ROBSON STREET
VANCOUVER B.C. V6E 1B5
604-684-8081
www.psc.org

Northern Fund: Guidelines for completing the Stage Two Detailed Proposal

Outline of information to be submitted by those proposals that are short-listed for further consideration.

For information purposes only: The 2027 Northern Fund process involves two stages. Project Concepts (stage one) approved by the Northern Fund Committee (NFC) will be invited to submit a Detailed Proposal (stage two). This document describes the **second stage** application process and outlines some of the evaluation criteria that will be applied during the detailed review process.

These instructions are updated annually.

General Instructions

- The deadline for submitting a stage two application will be communicated to applicants who are successful at stage one. Stage two applications are generally due at the end of November.
- Detailed Proposals must be submitted online through the grantee portal and the individual application link provided.
- The initial administrative short-answer questions mirror the Project Concept and is completed online. For the long-answer questions, Parts 1-6 (questions 1-18), you have the choice of completing the remainder of the questions directly online or downloading the application form and uploading it once complete. If you need to include tables, figures, or images, we recommend using this option.
- If using the word document, the minimum font size is 11 pt. Please use Calibri font and do not change page margins or otherwise adjust the formatting in a way that reduces the consistency of formatting between applications.
- There is a maximum combined 10-page limit. Limit does not include acknowledgement letters.
- The associated detailed budget must be provided in MS Excel or PDF format.
- All budget information and project descriptions must be entered directly. Do not refer to attachments or links for information that is requested to be filled out.
- Any supporting documentation/attachments must be submitted at the same time as the application.
- Only project proposals submitted in the format stipulated will be considered for funding.
- Project proposals that are incomplete or late will not be considered.

Background Information

Vision and Mandate of the Fund

Adoption of abundance-based management of the salmon fisheries in 1999 marked a turning point in the relationship between the United States and Canada under the Pacific Salmon Treaty (PST). By creating a system in which both Parties share responsibility for our salmon resources, and both can benefit from the full range of enhancements to the salmon stocks and their management, the parties set the stage for a level of co-operation that was not possible under management for catch ceilings and disputes about interception balancing.

The NFC envisions a vibrant Pacific salmon resource supporting healthy fisheries in Canada and the United States, managed within a scientifically sound framework based on bilateral cooperation, efficiency, and long-term stability.

The 1999 Agreement specifies that the proceeds from the Northern Fund shall be used to support the following activities:

a) development of improved information for resource management, including better stock assessment, data acquisition and improved scientific understanding of limiting factors affecting salmon production in the freshwater and marine environments;
b) rehabilitation and restoration of marine and freshwater fish habitat, and improvement of habitat to enhance productivity and protection of Pacific Salmon; and
c) enhancement of wild stock production through low technology techniques rather than through large facilities with high operating costs.

Guiding Principles/Scope

The following principals will guide the NFC in achieving its mandate:

Conservation: projects should contribute to the protection, maintenance, and rehabilitation of Pacific salmon resources and their habitats to ensure ecosystem sustainability and biodiversity.
Relevance: projects must be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Fund and should contribute to the goals and objectives of the PST.
Partnerships: collaborative projects that foster a broader sense of stewardship and increase the economic and social benefits of the Funds are encouraged.
Comprehensiveness: projects contributing to multiple objectives are encouraged.
Technical Merit: projects should be designed and conducted in accordance with sound scientific principles.

Efficiency: projects should provide the greatest long-term benefits to the resource and resource users for the dollars spent.
Effectiveness: projects should achieve measurable results.
Mutual Benefit: in the long-term, the fund should provide equitable benefits to the Parties.

Strategic Objectives / Goals

The Funds shall be employed as a long-term and stable monetary base that supports efforts to conserve and enhance Pacific salmon populations. The strategic objectives of the Funds are as follows:

1) To acquire data which improves the ability to manage the Pacific salmon resource and helps achieve the goals of the PST. The NFC will support projects that include but are not limited to;
    - developing a better understanding of and identification of factors that limit or restrict salmon production in either the freshwater or the marine environment.
    - acquiring information that could aid in overcoming factors that limit or restrict salmon production in either the freshwater or marine environment.
    - improving the Parties ability to better manage the stocks and fisheries in the region (e.g., by developing methods to more accurately estimate in-season run sizes; to improve stock assessment capability; and to acquire necessary information in a timelier fashion).

2) Recognizing that protection and restoration of salmon habitat and maintenance of adequate water quality and quantity are vital to achieving improved spawning success, safe passage of adult and juvenile salmon and therefore, optimum production of important naturally spawning stocks; the NFC will support projects that are designed to:
    - restore or rehabilitate salmon producing freshwater or marine habitats
    - enhance or improve the productivity of salmon habitat, either freshwater or marine
    - conserve such habitat and its capacity to produce salmon.

3) Recognizing that a carefully designed enhancement program would contribute significantly to the restoration of depressed natural stocks and assist the Parties in achieving optimum production; the NFC will support projects that are designed to:
    - enhance the productivity of specific stocks of “wild” salmon through artificial propagation that does not involve the construction of new facilities or significantly increased operating expenses over the long term.
    - provide technological refinements to existing enhancement facilities that will improve productivity in a cost-effective manner.

Geographic Area Covered

The Northern Fund's primary geographic area is from Cape Suckling, Alaska in the north to Cape Caution, B.C. in the south. This encompasses areas of relevance to the PST in the Alsek River drainage, Southeast Alaska, and Northern and Central British Columbia. Projects that provide benefits within this geographic area are eligible for consideration for funding by the NFC subject to the purpose, principals and procedures set forth herein.

Note that proponents whose projects are physically located outside the Northern Fund's primary geographic area, but that will provide benefits to the fisheries within that area are also eligible to apply.

Reporting

If a project is approved for funding, a technical report and financial statement must be submitted upon project completion.

Project Selection

The Pacific Salmon Commission's (PSC) Panels and Technical Committees are well placed to identify the priority stocks, the priority habitats and the information needs of the Parties and the PSC. Their advice will be sought and accepted through the PSC process and provided to the NFC to assist them in determining funding priorities for the coming year.

PROJECT REVIEW

A Technical Review Committee will review all detailed project proposals. The NFC will determine membership of the Review Committee.
PSC staff will initially review short-listed proposals to determine:

- If the project as described in the second-stage application form is consistent with the project concept as originally submitted.
- If the second-stage application is complete.
- If the submission of the application is timely.
- If the proponent is eligible to do business in the jurisdiction in which the project will take place.

Those judged to be complete and accurate will be forwarded to the Technical Review Committee where they will be scrutinized to assess their relevance and significance to the Northern Fund; their technical feasibility; the competence and experience of the proponents; the nature and extent of the benefits that can be expected with successful

completion of the project; and their cost effectiveness. The application will describe in detail the information that proponents must provide.

TECHNICAL REVIEW CRITERIA

Project selection criteria consistent with the Northern Funds guiding principles and considering the longer-term priorities identified by the PSC have been developed. These criteria will be reviewed annually and include:

- Relevance and Significance to the Northern Fund
- Technical Feasibility
- Human Resources
- Expected Benefits
- Cost Effectiveness
- Progress Update

Part 1: Relevance and Significance to the Northern Fund

Reviewers will evaluate whether the proposal corresponds with the Northern Funds mandate and current funding priorities.

i. Is there a clear and sound rationale that demonstrates the proponents understanding of the issue to be addressed, objective to be achieved, or problem to be solved? Questions to consider include:
   - Is there a comprehensive description of the issue to be addressed, objective to be achieved, or problem to be resolved?
   - What will the emphasis of the project be?
   - What is the present status of knowledge in this area?
   - Do we already have answers to the questions proposed or will the project create new knowledge?
   - What new opportunities / insights is the proponent trying to create?
   - What will we be able to do at the completion of the project that we cannot do today?
   - What specific hypothesis will be tested?
   - What specific resource need is being met?

ii. In the context of present knowledge or status of fishery resources and habitat, and the funding priority being addressed, what is the scope of the project? Questions to consider include:
   - Where applicable, how will genetic sample collection and analysis be coordinated between Canadian and US agency labs?
   - Is there knowledge of and coordination with other work being done in this area?

- Is the project consistent with existing management goals and resource conservation policies?
- Is the project one component of a larger undertaking and is it necessary to successful completion of the larger undertaking?
- Is the project spatially / temporally linked to other projects in the area i.e., were previous projects conducted which provided background for the project or are there future projects anticipated to follow the completion of the proposed project?
- Is the project part of a significant multi-project interdisciplinary study?

Part 2: Technical Implementation Details (Technical Merit)

The Review Committee will assess the technical quality of the proposed project including the soundness, accuracy, thoroughness, novelty, validity and reliability of the ideas and methods presented. Evaluation will include consideration of the following:

i. Are the projects expected goals and objectives specifically described? Questions to consider include:
   - Are the projects objectives / outcomes clearly defined?
   - Are there multiple objectives?
   - Is there a likelihood of unanticipated or unstated benefits or consequences?

ii. Is the project design and methodology appropriate, demonstrating a logical, feasible and technically appropriate approach? Questions to consider include:
   - Is it clear how the project will be executed?
   - Are the methods to be used in completing the project clearly stated in the proposal?
   - Is there a sound rationale for the methods proposed?
   - Have alternate methods been considered and a rationale provided for selecting the proposed method?
   - Is it clear that the project design, methods, and techniques are understood and technically sound?
   - Are the proposed techniques / methodologies the most appropriate to obtain the objectives?
   - Are these standardized methods?
   - Is the information to be collected or other products of the project appropriate?
   - What data sets will be generated and what statistical procedures are to be used?
   - Are the methods proposed for analyzing the data appropriate?
   - Has the pertinent literature been considered and interpreted appropriately?
   - Are there errors of fact, calculation, or interpretation?
   - Are there risks or factors that may affect the project or reduce its chances of success?

iii. Considering project timelines are the objectives attainable on schedule? Questions to consider include:
   - How will the proponent organize project delivery?
   - Are the key activities and timelines defined?
   - Is the timeframe realistic and achievable?
   - Are the goals and milestones appropriate and achievable?

Note: guidance relevant to proposals involving genetic analysis:

- Proposals involving genetic analysis should provide details on:
  - the baseline and genetic markers being used,
  - Genetic Stock Identification (GSI) performance for reporting groups/stocks of interest (citation is fine),
  - sample sizes for mixtures and/or target precision and accuracy targets, and
  - any collaboration between labs for tissue sharing and marker development to foster development of coastwide baselines for use by both Parties in their respective fisheries.
- Proposals involving genetic mark-recapture should address:
  - potential biases in the initial sampling event relative to the escapement (i.e., fishery, fish wheel, etc.),
  - potential uncertainty in stock enumeration in the second sampling event (i.e., sonar, weir, etc.),
  - the relative proportion of the drainage-wide escapement represented by the stock(s) of interest (>15-20% is needed for precise expansions), and
  - genetic identifiability of the stock(s) (does it meet precision and accuracy guidelines).

Part 3: Human Resources

The Review Committee will evaluate whether the team of people proposed to conduct the project has, as a collective, the skills necessary to successfully accomplish the work; the steps they have taken to consult with others and the extent to which the project is coordinated with other efforts in the field.

i. What are the skills needed to successfully conduct this project and does the proposed team have these skills? Questions to consider include:
   - Who will participate in conducting the project and what do they bring to the project?
   - What are the qualifications of the proposed principal investigator and key staff or consultants?
   - Are these the appropriate skilled personnel needed to successfully conduct this project?

- Is the project teams' roles and responsibilities clearly defined?
- **Include a brief acknowledgement of participation from any partners or affiliated organizations with personnel involved in the project. Where there are personnel from Federal or State/Provincial agencies involved, acknowledgements should be from the Director/Area level for Canada, and the Regional Administrator/Commissioner level for the U.S. Attach as an appendix and not included in the overall 10-page limit.**

ii. Does the proposed project team have capacity to deliver the project as outlined? Questions to consider include:
- How will the project be managed when there are competing priorities?
- Is there mitigation strategies in place should there be shortages in personnel?
- In the case where a proponent is awarded funds for multiple projects, how will those be prioritized?

iii. Does the proposal demonstrate thorough project planning; appropriate consultation and collaboration; recognition of and compliance with all regulatory requirements? Questions to consider include:
- Will the project coordinate with respective fishery management and research agencies and local communities?
- Were relevant agencies, including First Nations, consulted at the project planning stage?
- Will the project coordinate funding with resources available from applicant organizations or other funding sources?
- Has a feasibility study or pre-assessment been done for this project?
- Does the proponent have the appropriate permits and authorizations; can these be obtained within the time frame outlined for the project?
- Do the proposed activities involve other agencies and organizations, including the involvement of local community groups as partners or collaborators?
- Have letters of support been provided? (Refer to Human Resources for acknowledgement of participation letters)
- Is the proponent attempting to coordinate with complimentary and or competing interests?
- Will traditional and local knowledge be incorporated into the project?

Part 4: Benefits

The Review Committee will evaluate the benefits of the proposed work for the Pacific salmon resource and users of that resource. Evaluation will include assessments of the adequacy of the performance standards against which to measure success; the strategy for ensuring that the anticipated results are communicated to all end-users; and whether the potential benefits will be monitored and assessed over the short and long-terms.

i. Does the proponent provide details of how this project will be measured for success? Questions to consider include:
   - Are any deliverables specified – are they "hard" deliverables?
   - Is progress towards these deliverables quantifiable?
   - Can the results be measured?
   - What are the indicators of success?
   - Are any measures specified for project Quality Assurance/Quality Control?

ii. Does the proponent describe how the short-term and long-term benefits to be derived from the project will be monitored and assessed? Questions to consider include:
   - Is there to be an evaluation of project benefit?
   - Is there a monitoring and maintenance component?
   - Are there likely to be long-term maintenance and service costs?
   - Is there evidence of enough commitment to support future project requirements?
   - Will long-term projects be maintained and protected?

iii. Does the proposal include a prescribed methodology to ensure that the projects results are communicated to all the potential end-users and beneficiaries? Questions to consider include:
   - Is there a clearly described communication component of the project with a target audience identified?
   - Are all the potential end-users of the information adequately identified?
   - Is the methodology to ensure that the projects results are communicated sound and appropriate?
   - Does the described methodology ensure timely communication of results?
   - Does the plan for communicating the results to the end-users adequately consider the needs of the various end-users beyond those directly involved in developing and implementing the project?
   - How will affected communities be informed about the project and provide their input?
   - How will research findings and other project information be communicated in non-technical language to local communities?

- Will the execution of the project result in any transfer of skills and knowledge to end-users beyond those directly involved in developing and implementing the project?
- Will the project provide a catalyst for further related activities?

Part 5: Cost Effectiveness

The Review Committee will evaluate whether the budget requested for the work proposed is reasonable and justified. They will seek evidence of a suitable plan for financial administration and will judge if the proposal represents good value for money. Committee members should recommend any changes to the budget that are necessary to ensure cost effectiveness. Questions to consider include:

- Does the budget provide detailed costs of the project with itemized amounts?
- Are the funds requested reasonable and realistic for the project to be completed on time and on budget?
- Has the proponent made a significant effort to keep project costs to a minimum?
- Does the proposal capitalize on existing research information and activities?
- Does the proposal leverage other funding sources?
- Are additional joint funding or in-kind contributions anticipated?
- Are the project budget and /or in-kind rates realistic?
- Are the benefits as described in the project in line with the cost of the project?
- Are there enough deliverables for the cost of the project?
- What procedures will be used to ensure the project is completed on budget?

Part 6: Progress Update (Ongoing or Multi-Year Projects)

This section only needs to be completed by proponents of ongoing or multi-year projects. If this applies, please provide a succinct update on progress achieved to date towards the overall project objective. The Review Committee will evaluate how experience gained in prior project years and results (to date) have been used to inform or adjust the project design within the proposal.