


Ranking Guide - Maintenance Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Biological Sampling	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.
Catch and Effort	0 – 8	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	
Social and Economic	0 - 6	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to the 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 1 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 reflect 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 – 5 0 – 4 0 – 3 0 - 3	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 as specified in the proposal.
Impact on management	0 - 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved management as specified in the proposal.

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines


Merit	0 - 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness
-------	-------	---------------------------------------

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

Other 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
Biological Sampling	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.
Catch and Effort	0 – 8	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	
Social and Economic	0 - 6	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to the 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).
Contains funding transition plan / Defined end point	0 - 4	Rank based on funding transition 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 reflect 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 – 5 0 – 4 0 – 3 0 - 3	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 as specified in the proposal.
Impact on management	0 - 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved management as specified in the proposal.

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Innovative	0 - 3	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.

Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 - 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness