



Evaluation and ranking of nominations for SC representatives to be financially supported to participate in relevant scientific meetings

At SC-05, Members recommended that the Commission provide financial support for three members of the SC or its subsidiary bodies to attend the PICES-ICES small pelagic fish (SPF) symposium (NPFC-2020-SC05-OP04). The SC also recommended that the Commission financially support the travel of two members of the SC or its subsidiary bodies to participate in the PICES Annual Meetings in 2021, if financial support was necessary.

At SC-06, Members recommended that the Commission financially support the travel of one member of the SC or its subsidiary bodies to participate in the PICES Annual Meeting, if financial support was necessary. During the same meeting, the SC agreed that Members would provide nominations for NPFC representatives to be supported financially to participate in those meetings. Nominations would specify the scientific meeting in question, the name of the proposed participant, and one or two sentences about how the participant meets each of the six criteria endorsed by the SC. Those criteria are:

- part of a member's delegation to NPFC
- anticipated contributions
- expertise
- financial need
- early career scientist
- willingness to report back to the SC on key meeting outcomes of interest

In this information paper, a method is proposed to evaluate and rank nominations for SC representatives to be financially supported to participate in relevant scientific meetings.

Step 1

The SC Chair and the Secretariat receive nominations by a date agreed by the SC. If no nominations are received by the agreed date, the SC Chair may extend the deadline.

Step 2

The SC Chair evaluates and scores nominees according to Table 1 below. Nominees are ranked according to their total score such that the nominee with the highest score is offered financial support first.

Table 1. Six selection criteria and description of scores assigned to each criterion.

| Criterion | Score = 1 | Score = 2 | Score = 3 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Part of a Member's delegation | No | Invited expert or other relevant colleague | Yes |
| Anticipated role / contribution | One point for each role or contribution (to a maximum of 3) | | |
| Expertise | One point for each relevant subject matter of expertise (to a maximum of 3) | | |
| Financial Need | Would be able to participate without financial support | Alternative funding may be available | Would not be able to participate without financial support |
| Early Career Scientist | >5 years since PhD | <5 years since PhD | PhD in progress, or no PhD |
| Report back to NPFC | Unwilling / unable to report back to the NPFC's SC | No experience reporting back to the NPFC's SC | Experience reporting back to the NPFC's SC |

Step 3

The SC Chair works with the Chairs of the SC's subsidiary bodies (currently the SSC PS, the SSC BF-ME, and the TWG CMSA) to review assigned scores and rankings, and agree on one or more SC representatives in the order of the summed scores. If the Chairs differ in their assessment of nominees, each Chair shall score the nominee using Table 1. Then the scores from all Chairs shall be summed, and nominees ranked according to their summed scores.

Step 4

The rankings are shared with the Secretariat who contacts the successful nominees and arranges for financial support, if it is needed by the nominees. In the case that a nominee declines the financial support, then the support is offered to the next most highly ranked nominee.

Below is an example of scores for two potential SC representatives nominated to participate in the PICES-ICES SPF symposium: Nominee A (Table 2) and Nominee B (Table 3). These scores are simply meant to illustrate the method of evaluating and ranking nominees.

Table 2. Potential scores assigned by the SC Chair to each criterion for Nominee A to participate in the SFP symposium.

| Criterion | Score = 1 | Score = 2 | Score = 3 | Score |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Part of a Member's delegation | | | Yes | 3 |
| Anticipated role / contribution | Representing the NPFC's SC | | | 1 |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| | | | | |
| Expertise | Knowledge of the ecology and stock assessment of the NPFC's small pelagic fish | | | 1 |
| Financial Need | | Alternative funding may be available | | 2 |
| Early Career Scientist | >5 years since PhD | | | 1 |
| Report back to the NPFC | | | Experience reporting back to the NPFC | 3 |

The total score for Nominee A would be 11 out of a potential 18.

Table 3. Potential scores assigned by the SC Chair to each criterion for Nominee B to participate in the SPF symposium.

| Criterion | Score = 1 | Score = 2 | Score = 3 | Score |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|
| Part of a Member's delegation | | | Yes | 3 |
| Anticipated role / contribution | Member of the SPF symposium's Steering Committee Member of joint PICES/ICES WG43 on Small Pelagic Fish Representing the NPFC's SSC PS Representing the NPFC's SC | | | 3 |
| Expertise | Ecological research on small pelagic fishes Stock assessment and management advice for pelagic fishes Knowledge of or research on NPFC's pelagic priority species | | | 3 |
| Financial Need | | Alternative funding may be available | | 2 |
| Early Career Scientist | >5 years since PhD | | | 1 |
| Report back to the NPFC | | | Experience reporting back to NPFC | 3 |

The total score for Nominee B would be 15 out of a potential 18.

In this example, all Chairs of the SC subsidiary bodies agree with the SC Chair's scoring and ranking of the two nominees. Nominee B ranks more highly than Nominee A to represent the NPFC's SC at the SPF symposium. Therefore, they would first be offered financial support. If they accepted the financial support and the Commission had adopted a recommendation from the SC to financially support the travel of more than one SC representative to the SPF symposium, Nominee A would also be offered financial support. If the Commission had only agreed to support one SC representative, Nominee A would only be offered financial support to participate in the meeting if Nominee B declined the offer of financial support from the NPFC.