

North Pacific Research Board Request for Proposals Research Commencing in 2004

INTRODUCTION

The North Pacific Research Board (NPRB) was created by Congress in 1997 to recommend marine research activities to the Secretary of Commerce, funded through a competitive grant program using part of the interest earned from the Environmental Improvement and Restoration Fund (EIRF). In the enabling legislation, Section 401(e) Marine Research Activities stipulates that EIRF-based funds shall be used "...to conduct research activities on or relating to the fisheries or marine ecosystems in the north Pacific Ocean, Bering Sea, and Arctic Ocean (including any lesser related bodies of water)." (§401(e)(1)) Further, NPRB must strive "...to avoid duplicating other research activities and shall place a priority on cooperative research efforts designed to address pressing fishery management or marine ecosystem information needs." (§401(e)(2))

The North Pacific Research Board has adopted the following mission statement:

Build a clear understanding of the North Pacific, Bering Sea, and Arctic Ocean ecosystems that enables effective management and sustainable use of marine resources.

To achieve this mission, NPRB supports high quality research projects that will improve the:

- Understanding of the dynamics of the North Pacific marine ecosystem and use of the resources;
- Ability to manage and protect the healthy, sustainable fish and wildlife populations that comprise the ecologically diverse marine ecosystems of the North Pacific, and provide long-term, sustained benefits to local communities and the nation; and
- Ability to forecast and respond to effects of changes, through integration of various research activities, including long-term monitoring.

Since being organized in 2001, NPRB has funded over \$8 million in new research supported by EIRF funds in 2002 and 2003. Project descriptions are available at www.nprb.org. NPRB currently is engaged in a science planning process with the National Research Council which will provide a comprehensive, long-range science plan and associated research priorities in 2005 (also described on the web site).

PURPOSE

This notice announces a new marine research opportunity in the North Pacific Ocean, with emphasis on the Bering Sea, Aleutian Islands, and Gulf of Alaska, including any lesser related bodies of water. The emphasis and research priorities identified herein are specific to this year's request for proposals. They may be revised and refocused in next year's RFP for research starting in 2005. Proposals may include retrospective studies, field studies, observational systems, and modeling, beginning May 1, 2004, or soonest thereafter. Proposals which include collection and use of indigenous traditional ecological knowledge also will be considered. Approximately \$3 million may be made available based on earnings of the Environmental Improvement and Restoration Fund. NPRB anticipates funding 10-20 studies based on EIRF funds. Additional funding may be made available through congressional appropriations.

DESCRIPTION

In the 2002 and 2003 requests for proposals, NPRB published a list of research priorities to guide proposal preparation. This year, NPRB has separated the RFP into two major components. The first component is an invitation for individuals or teams of researchers to respond to specific project needs identified by the Board. Approximately \$1.2 million has been set aside for this first component. The second component is an invitation for proposals that respond to a more general list of research priorities, similar to, but more focused than, priorities in previous RFP's. Approximately \$1.8 million in EIRF funds has been set aside for this second component, and may be supplemented by additional congressional appropriations.

A. Component 1: Specific Project Needs (~\$1.2 million)

Based on recommendations from its Science Panel, NPRB is inviting proposals to address specific project needs that will help lay the foundation for future integrated ecosystem studies and help build infrastructure for future research and reporting. NPRB intends for project results to apply to marine resource management in all areas under its purview. This first component has three main goals with the specific project needs and targeted funding amounts as follows:

GOAL 1: Develop methods for an integrated BSAI ecosystem study to assess the following important understudied taxa often characterized as forage fish which play a critical role in the ocean ecosystem as food for upper trophic level fishes and marine mammals. (\$500,000)

Proposals are invited to produce a synthesis of the present state of knowledge and develop methods for assessment of forage fish and diurnally migrating mesopelagic species in the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Island waters (BSAI). Taxa of interest to NPRB include squid, capelin, eulachon, sandlance, herring, bathylagids, and myctophids. Emphasis is on: (1) developing and testing techniques/strategies for better assessing and monitoring populations and their role in the marine ecosystem, (2) a discussion of physical and biological factors affecting fluctuations in population size and/or range, and (3) development of a strategy for filling information gaps. Field operations could also be undertaken to test various techniques for assessment, to examine food web relationships and/or to commence a potential monitoring program. NPRB may fund one or more projects for one year to address as many as possible of the taxa of interest identified above, up to a total overall amount of \$500,000 set aside for Goal 1 research.

GOAL 2: Build infrastructure for NPRB (\$525,000)

1. Develop methods for remote sensing of upper trophic level abundance in the context of long-term monitoring of ecosystem structure and functioning (\$100,000)

The proposal would include the production of a synthesis of the present state of knowledge of techniques for remote sensing of the population sizes of upper trophic level animals with the focus being on populations in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. Emphasis would be on the development of new techniques and/or novel applications of existing remote sensing technologies. The approach could include a workshop of regional experts to address the challenge of monitoring populations of upper trophic level animals. This is expected to be a one-year proposal with the amount in the vicinity of \$100,000. Consideration for subsequent years funding for field-testing and evaluation is dependent on the findings and performance of the principal investigators.

2. Evaluation of ocean circulation models (\$75,000)

The products from the proposal would include the production of a report on the present state of ocean circulation modeling of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Island regions. Special attention should be given to evaluating the various pros and cons of the existing models (how they handle shelf basin exchange, shallow coastal waters, flow through both deep and shallow passes, etc.), what the next steps need to be toward developing models that provide useful products to resource managers and users, what/where monitoring of which physical parameters can be used to most effectively nudge the models toward more realistic water velocity and property fields, how can model simulations be verified, etc. This is a one-year proposal with the amount in the vicinity of \$75,000.

3. Evaluate utility of ecosystem indicators in explaining processes underlying marine production (\$150,000)

Processes related to physical (e.g., transport of planktonic life history stages, sea ice extent and duration, cold pool extent, etc.), chemical (nutrient flux into the mixed layer and availability to phytoplankton, etc.), and biological (predation, timing of plankton/zooplankton production for first feeding larvae, etc) phenomena are thought to provide indicators for marine production. The products from the proposal would include the production of a report on the present state of ecosystem indicators in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Island regions. Special attention should be given to evaluating the various pros and cons of the existing indicators, the next steps that need to be undertaken to increase the validity of indicators, and (using hind-casts of indicators and various marine populations) how well the indicators perform. The approach could include a workshop of regional experts to address the challenge of developing indicators and interpreting their utility. This is expected to be a one-year proposal with the amount in the vicinity of \$150,000.

4. Education and Outreach (\$100,000)

The products (e.g., videos, displays, Powerpoint presentations, slide shows, web site presentations, written informational materials, and other media) from this proposal are intended to clearly communicate and disseminate improvements made by NPRB-funded research to the state of knowledge and development of techniques to better understand our living oceans and their resources. The primary audience is the press and general public, although all products must adhere to high scientific quality. Informational materials must be easily understood and tailored to local languages as appropriate. Under the program envisioned here, the successful applicant would be tasked to work with principal investigators in developing materials for interpretation of the project and research results. This is a one-year proposal with the amount in the vicinity of \$100,000 to work with investigators performing research under the current RFP as well as past ones. Consideration for subsequent years funding to continue the education and outreach process is dependent on the findings and performance of the Principal Investigators.

5. Alaska Marine Information System (\$75,000-100,000)

Develop a system for the long term data archive of marine data for Alaska and the North Pacific Ocean, Bering Sea and Arctic Ocean. Design a system for the retrieval of these data by the science community and public. Carry out quality control of all data gathered under NPRB support. This needs to be a continuing program at the \$75,000-100,000 level. It needs to be coordinated with Gulf Ecosystems Monitoring Program (GEM), Oil Spill Recovery Institute, NODC and the North Pacific Metaphysical Data Base to avoid duplication of efforts.

GOAL 3: Bring Arctic Ocean scientific background up to the status of other Alaskan waters by completing a synthesis of biological and oceanographic information, including Russian research (\$75,000)

The proposal would focus on the production of an integration and synthesis of the present state of knowledge of biology and oceanography of the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas. Compared to the eastern Bering Sea and northern Gulf of Alaska, the scientific knowledge has not been summarized, synthesized or integrated. Emphasis would be on how climate change might impact biota through its influence on: sea ice extent/characteristics, shelf currents and transport through Bering Strait, coastal currents along Alaska's north coast and their relation to various biological processes and life histories, etc. The approach would include a workshop of regional experts, including Russian and Canadian scientists, some of whom would give presentations (to be compiled into a book or special issue of a journal), followed by breakout groups to determine such topics as what are the most crucial information gaps, (or those topics that might be potentially most fruitful research endeavors) what are 'pulse points' in the biological/physical environment that require monitoring, etc. This is a one-year proposal with the amount in the vicinity of \$75,000.

GOAL 4: Bring Southeast Alaska scientific background up to the status of other Alaskan waters by completing a synthesis of biological and oceanographic information (\$75,000)

The proposal would focus on the production of an integration and synthesis of the present state of knowledge of biology and oceanography of Southeast Alaska south of Cape Suckling. Compared to other areas such as the eastern Bering Sea, the scientific knowledge has not been summarized, synthesized or integrated. Emphasis would be on biological processes and life histories and their relationship with the region's oceanographic features and weather patterns. The approach would include a workshop of regional experts (including international scientists as appropriate), some of whom would give presentations (to be compiled into a book or special issue of a journal), followed by breakout groups to determine such topics as what are the most crucial information gaps (or those topics that might be potentially most fruitful research endeavors), what are 'pulse points' in the biological/physical environment that require monitoring, etc. This is a one-year proposal with the amount in the vicinity of \$75,000.

B. Component 2: General Research Priorities (~\$1.8 million)

The North Pacific Ocean and waters off Alaska are among the most productive marine regions in the world and support abundant populations of fish, seabirds, and marine mammals. Components of the marine ecosystem and their environment vary over time, and improving the understanding of their dynamics will enhance the ability of resource managers to protect the healthy, sustainable fish and wildlife populations that comprise these ecologically diverse marine ecosystems. NPRB is seeking research proposals that fall within its legislated criteria and address one or more of the research priorities identified below, with no priority implied among the categories. In the priorities below, the term "fish" includes mollusks and shellfish as well as finfish.

a. Marine ecosystem structure and processes

1. Climate variability and other factors that affect benthic and pelagic marine productivity, including nutrient transport and availability, water column stability, and the role of sea ice.

2. Long term monitoring of biophysical parameters and phytoplankton and zooplankton.

b. Marine mammals and seabirds

Factors, including fisheries, that affect the population dynamics of pinnipeds, seabirds (including sea ducks), and cetaceans. (Note: Research focused primarily on Steller sea lions will be deferred until future RFP's because of availability of other funds.)

c. Fish habitat

1. Habitat mapping and substrate classification, including documentation of the presence of corals or other sensitive substrates, studies of factors affecting habitat including physical forcing, variations in energy flux, and overwintering conditions.
2. Impacts of fisheries and other human influence on habitat and its capacity to support communities of organisms, including adaptive management research.
3. Impacts of fisheries on prey abundance and distribution and the effects on predators in the ecosystem.
4. Fishery management tools to facilitate fish habitat protection.
5. Evaluation of fish/habitat associations at multiple spatial scales with emphasis on managed fish species throughout their bathymetric range.

d. Fishery management and economics

Social and economic implications of fishery management approaches, including rights-based allocation systems, fishing capacity reductions, and habitat protection initiatives.

e. Bycatch

1. Studies that assess the impacts of, or lead to reductions in, bycatch, especially in the groundfish fisheries, and including gear designs to improve selectivity.
2. Stock composition research on bycatch species, including salmon, in GOA and BSAI groundfish fisheries.
3. Improve methods of estimating bycatch mortality.
4. Studies that improve information relative to lesser known non-target finfish species that are taken as bycatch in commercial fisheries.

f. Stock assessment and recruitment processes

(Note: In the 2003 RFP, this research priority included “studies of factors affecting salmon stock dynamics, mortality and migration throughout their range and life cycle, particularly for Western Alaska salmon stocks.” In this 2004 RFP, based on recommendations from its Science Panel and Advisory Panel, the Board is deferring these types of salmon studies, except as they relate to stock boundaries in item 4 below. The Board agreed with its Science Panel that significant funding already has been allocated to salmon research and there are efforts underway to develop science and restoration plans that will guide future research. The Board also will launch a major initiative over the coming year to describe the full scope of current and planned Alaska salmon research and funding and identify gaps that need to be addressed.)

1. Studies to develop or improve abundance estimation and fish stock assessment techniques.
2. Studies of factors affecting fish and invertebrate stock dynamics, recruitment, mortality, and

distribution.

3. Effects of fishing on fish and invertebrate life history traits and genetic composition.
4. Delineations of stock boundaries for groundfish, salmon and shellfish.

g. Contaminants

Studies of sources, transport, effects, and accumulation of contaminants in subsistence, recreational, and commercial species, and other ecosystem components, including salmon throughout their life cycles.

C. Research Program Structure

Total Funding and Duration. Approximately \$3 million may be made available based on earnings of the Environmental Improvement and Restoration Fund. The Board anticipates funding 10-20 studies based on EIRF funds. Additional funding may be made available through congressional appropriations. Unless otherwise noted, award periods may range up to two years. Applicants must demonstrate they can achieve an outcome and product within the requested award period, including data analysis, submission of draft final reports, and, after peer review if so requested by NPRB, the final report of research results. The exact award period will depend upon the duration of funding requested by the applicant, the decision of the NPRB on funding amount, the results of post-selection negotiations between the applicant and NPRB officials, and review by NPRB and DOC officials.

Eligibility Criteria. All Federal, State, private or foreign organizations or individuals are eligible.

Community Involvement. Researchers should recognize that local community knowledge of, and interest in, natural resources extend beyond physical boundaries of the communities themselves to harvest areas and beyond. Furthermore, researchers should advise communities and people involved or affected by the studies of the purpose, goals, and time-frame of the research and its potential positive and negative implications. Inclusion of traditional ecological knowledge and wisdom is encouraged. Proposals for research on specific Alaska Native communities or health issues must have a letter of support from appropriate community and tribal governing bodies.

Outreach and Education. The principal investigator(s) shall cooperate with the NPRB and its assigned education and outreach contractor in developing materials for interpretation of the project and research results to the public, and also must include a minimum of \$2,000 for such activities in each proposal budget.

Confidentiality of Proposals. If a proposal is submitted, but not funded, only the following information will be released to the public: Proposal title, names of principal investigators, funding amount requested, duration, and the proposal summary page which is generally limited to 250 words or less. If a proposal is approved for funding by NPRB and the Secretary of Commerce, then the full proposal will be released to the public.

Statement of Non-discrimination. NPRB conducts all programs and activities free from discrimination based on race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, marital status, pregnancy, parenthood, or disability, in accordance with federal law.

D. Proposal Review Process

Initial Screening of Applications. Upon receipt, the NPRB staff will screen applications for conformance

with requirements set forth in this notice. This review will consider not only whether the proposal meets the format and structure requirements in this RFP, but also whether it is responsive to NPRB enabling legislation and criteria and adequately addresses one or more of the research priorities and program needs listed in this notice. Those that do not comply may be rejected without further processing.

Consultation with Interested Parties. NPRB may consult with NOAA and other Federal and State agencies, the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, and other entities, as appropriate, who may be affected by or have knowledge of a specific proposal or its subject matter.

Independent Technical Evaluations. All proposals will undergo independent, anonymous, technical peer review, conducted by regional and national experts. They will be asked to provide comments and qualitative assessments of the following technical aspects for each proposal, and an overall summation (percentages indicate the weight that the subsequent review by the NPRB Science Panel will give to the criteria):

- a. Project Responsiveness to NPRB Research Priorities (5%): Does the project clearly respond to the legislated criteria and research priorities? Applicants must identify one primary and one secondary research priority if applying under Component 2 – General Research Priorities.
- b. Soundness of Project Design/Conceptual Approach (60%): Applications will be evaluated on the applicant's comprehension of the problem(s); the overall concept proposed for resolution; whether the applicant provided sufficient information to evaluate the project technically; and, if so, the strengths and/or weaknesses of the technical design relative to securing productive results. Particular attention will be given to the inclusion of a clear statement of hypothesis to be tested or objectives to be addressed, the presence of a detailed experimental design, and a list of data sources or requirements. The Science Panel will give the following approximate weights to components within this criterion: 10% for Background and Need; 10% for statement of problem or question, 20% for study design, and 20% for analysis.
- c. Project Management (25%): The organization and management of the project, and the project's principal investigator(s) and other personnel in terms of related experience and qualifications will be evaluated. Applicants must demonstrate how they will coordinate and collaborate with other projects, and leverage their proposals with support from other sources. Applicants must seek to avoid duplication of other research efforts. How the applicant plans to disseminate the research results also will be considered.
- d. Project Costs (10%): The justification and allocation of the budget in terms of the work to be performed will be evaluated. Unreasonably high or low project costs will be taken into account.

Science Panel Review. All proposals and their accompanying technical evaluations will be submitted to the NPRB Science Panel for review and quantitative scoring based on the above criteria and weightings.

Board Review. The North Pacific Research Board will review responsive proposals, consider technical evaluations, panel recommendations, and other factors as appropriate, and decide which proposals to fund. Public comment will not be taken from current applicants for research funds when the Board makes final funding decisions at its March 2004 meeting.

Secretary of Commerce Review. By law, the Secretary of Commerce must approve all recommendations of the Board, while ensuring that there is no duplication with other projects funded by NOAA or other Federal organizations, and that the projects selected for funding are those that best meet the objectives of this

solicitation.

E. Tentative Schedule

The tentative schedule is as follows (except for the proposal deadline, dates are subject to change):

Release of RFP	October 7, 2003
Deadline for Proposals	December 5, 2003
Technical Evaluations	December 2003 – February 2004
Science Panel Review	March 2-4, 2004
NPRB Selection	Mid to late March 2004
Preliminary Notification of PIs	March 31, 2004
Submission to NMFS	March 31, 2004
Final Notification of PIs	April 2004
Grant Arrangements to PIs	April 2004
Possible Commence Research	May 1, 2004

The exact amounts of funds awarded to a project will be determined in pre-award negotiations among the applicant and NPRB. Projects should not be initiated in expectation of Federal funding until a Notice of Award document is received. Applicants should not request a project start date before **May 1, 2004**.

F. Proposal Submission Deadline and Address

A signed paper original of the complete proposal package must be delivered to the Anchorage office of NPRB by 5 p.m., Alaska time, Friday, December 5, 2003, at the following address:

**North Pacific Research Board
1007 West 3rd Avenue, Suite 100
Anchorage, AK 99501**

An electronic WORD document of the Research Plan must be emailed to mistyott@nprb.org by the above deadline. In the interest of fairness, no proposals received after the deadline will be considered for funding in this RFP cycle. Please note that courier and express deliveries to Anchorage, Alaska, normally require a minimum of two days for delivery.

PROPOSAL PACKAGE

A. General Instructions

All applicants should refer to www.nprb.org for a copy of proposal application materials. Please contact the NPRB office by phone at (907) 278-6772, or by email to Clarence Pautzke (cpautzke@nprb.org) or Misty Ott (mistyott@nprb.org) if you need further information or clarifications.

Proposals should be paper-clipped (not stapled) in the upper left-hand corner, but otherwise unbound, and have 1-inch margins at the top, bottom and sides. The font and size must be Times New Roman 11 point. Except for

the electronic WORD document of the Research Plan, only a signed original of the full proposal package is required. (Copies or electronic versions of the full proposal package should not be submitted, as they will just be discarded.) The signed original must be printed on one side of each sheet only. No page in the proposal and supporting material may be physically larger than 8.5x11 inches and no accordion or fold-out sheets are allowed. Any page that is larger than 8.5x11 inches and cannot be run through a standard letter size copier will be discarded. Color graphics are allowed, but may be reproduced in black and white and should be sufficiently descriptive.

Standard indirect cost statements, cover sheets, and transmittal letters may be included, but should not be integrated into the proposal materials. These materials will be held on file and not sent with proposals to technical review. Do not attach letters of endorsement or agreement to cooperate from other agencies and entities; a binding signature page, is used to warrant that all participating entities have been notified that they are included in this proposal and have agreed to participate in the proposed research.

B. Sections of the Proposal Package

The proposal package must include the following sections, described in more detail below. Only sections 1-4 will be sent out for technical reviews.

1. [Proposal Summary Page](#) (1 page)
2. Research Plan (max 12 pages) (Also submit as WORD document by email)
3. Resumes (max 2 pages per person)
4. [Budget Information](#)
5. Possible Peer Reviewers
6. Current and Pending Support Form
7. [Binding signature page](#)
8. Letters of support from Alaska Native community and tribal governing bodies (if required)
9. [Data Management and Quality Assurance/Quality Control \(“QA/QC”\) Statement](#)

1. [Proposal Summary Page](#) (1 page max)

The proposal summary page includes a title, project period, names of applicant and principal investigators, legislative criteria and research priorities addressed by proposed research, a summary of work (250 words or less), requested and matching funding by year, and the signature of an official authorized to legally bind the submitting organization. This page is not confidential and will be made available to the public. Do not add your social security number.

Proposals submitted in response to [Component 1 – Specific Project Needs](#) must identify which need is being addressed. Proposals submitted in response to [Component 2 – General Research Priorities](#) must identify one primary priority and one secondary priority addressed by the proposed research. This is a critical decision for the applicant because the Board may wish to balance research among categories and the applicant must choose a category in which to group the proposal.

The completed proposal summary page must list the full address and contact information for each agency or entity that will be legally bound to perform the research if funded. The applicant also must provide the names of each principal investigator that will be associated with the project and their agency/organization affiliation

and email address. (Full contact information for all PIs must be available in their resumes in Section 3). The proposal summary page is not a numbered page in the proposal package.

2. Research Plan (12-page maximum; continuous line numbers; submit electronically as WORD document)

The main body of the proposal must be a research plan, limited to 12 consecutively numbered pages formatted as required in section A above. The page limit is inclusive of figures, tables, and literature citations. The research plan (and only the research plan) must have continuous line numbers from beginning to end to facilitate review.¹

- A. Project Title. Include the long title, and provide a suggested short title of up to five words.
- B. Proposal Summary: Briefly explain the project goal and value, and why NPRB funds should be committed to this project, in language understandable by individuals not familiar with the specific subject area, such as Congress and the public. The 250-word summary from the [Proposal Summary Page](#) would suffice.
- C. Project Responsiveness to NPRB Research Priorities or identified project needs. State what the project will accomplish and why it is important. Identify the specific project need to which it responds (Component 1), or the specific legislated criteria and NPRB research priorities being addressed (Component 2). Applicants must identify one primary and one secondary research priority addressed by their proposed research, but may discuss how the proposal addresses other research priorities.
- D. Soundness of Project Design and Conceptual Approach. Demonstrate an understanding of the problem being addressed, the present state of knowledge in the field, the project relation to previous work and work in progress by the principal investigator(s), and the measurable benefits which will result from the proposed research. If this builds on a project previously funded by NPRB, describe your progress to date and the objective of the next funding period. Describe the conceptual or statistical model underlying your experimental work. Present a clear hypothesis and describe the experimental design and the analytical approach, including assumptions required, sample size, other relevant information needed to determine the utility and technical feasibility of accomplishing your research, and the expected outcome.
- E. Project Management. Describe the organization and management of the project and the experience and qualifications of the principal investigator(s). Demonstrate how they will coordinate and collaborate with other projects, and leverage their proposals with support from other sources. Applicants must seek to avoid duplication of other research efforts. Describe the schedule you will follow and include measurable milestones that can be used to track and evaluate your project performance through the entire award period. Describe the product or result that may be used to measure your success (e.g., report, published paper, etc.) and how you plan to disseminate the research results. (If there is more than one principal investigator involved, the applicant must clearly identify which one will be responsible for the overall work and whether there is only one binding contract envisioned, or separate ones for each principal investigator. Principal investigators are those that

¹ In Microsoft Word, on the **File** menu, click **Page Setup**, and then click **Layout** tab. In **Preview**, apply to **Whole Document**. Click **Line Numbers**, and then select the **Add Line Numbering** check box. In the **From text** box, must be **Auto**. In **Numbering**, click **Continuous**.

accept responsibility to ensure that the grant is properly administered and completed. Collaborators obligate themselves to work with a project and complete specific tasks, but are not responsible overall for successful completion of the project.)

- F. Project Costs. Generally describe and justify the budget and any matching requirements. Indicate if additional funds are needed for ship time or whether it is already incorporated in the budget or matching funds. In addition, if you are employed by a government agency that has a legislative mandate for the type of work you propose, explain whether the agency has supported this type of research in the past five years and why the proposed costs are not now being covered by your agency's budget. Additional budget detail and spreadsheets are included in Section 4.

(Note: Line numbers are not required beyond this part of the proposal package.)

3. Resumes (limited to 2 pages per principal investigator)

The resumes of all principal investigators and other senior personnel involved in the proposal must be provided. Each resume is limited to two consecutively numbered pages and must include the following information:

1. A list of professional and academic credentials, mailing address, and other contact information including work phone and email address.
2. A list of up to five of your most recent publications most closely related to the proposed project and up to five other significant publications as appropriate.
3. A list of all persons (including organizational affiliations) in alphabetical order with whom you have collaborated on a project or publication within the last four years. If none, this should be indicated.

4. Budget Information

Attach the standard [Budget Summary Form](#). It includes the following mandatory budget categories: salaries, fringe benefits; travel, equipment, supplies, contracts/consultants, and other expenditures, and indirect (facilities & administration) and matching/in kind cost sharing with other programs. You must include a separate spreadsheet for each year of requested funding, and a summary spreadsheet for all years. A budget narrative and associated spreadsheets are required. Note that your budget must include travel costs to attend one NPRB research review meeting in Anchorage, normally held as a science symposium in mid-January. You also must include costs of preparing all required reports and publication of results in an appropriate scientific journal, and \$2,000 for education and outreach. Additional budget detail should be provided as appropriate for each of the major budget categories. Additional budget guidance is available [here](#).

Matching requirements. Applications must reflect the total budget necessary to accomplish the project, including contributions and/or donations. Cost-sharing is not required for this program. If an applicant chooses to cost-share and if that application is selected for funding, the applicant will be bound by the percentage of the cost share reflected in the grant award. Please be advised that although EIRF-based funds are not appropriated, the U.S. Department of Commerce has made a finding that EIRF funds should be considered to be federal funding since an authorization act creates the "fund" in the U.S. Treasury.

Indirect Costs. The budget form may include an amount for indirect costs if the applicant has an established indirect cost rate with the Federal government. The total dollar amount of the indirect costs proposed in an application under this program must not exceed the indirect cost rate negotiated and approved by a cognizant Federal agency prior to the proposed effective date of the award, or 100 percent of the total proposed direct cost dollar amount in the application, whichever is less. If applicable, a copy of the current, approved, negotiated indirect cost agreement with the Federal government must be included. It will be retained in the office and not distributed to reviewers.

5. Possible Peer Reviewers

On a single and separate page, provide the names and contact information (including current phone numbers and email addresses) for three persons qualified to review your proposal. Please be aware of the NPRB policy on conflicts of interest as it relates to technical reviewers. Also, if appropriate, indicate who you would suggest should not be allowed to review your proposal.

6. Current and Pending Support Form

Any current and pending financial resources that are intended to support research related or similar to that included in the proposal, or that would consume the time of the proposer(s), must be identified for each principal investigator and other senior personnel involved in the proposal. Each proposal must have a section describing sources of current and pending funding, and an explicit statement of present collaborations and commitments. The proposer must also disclose if they have submitted the proposal to other funding sources or if other funds are being used to support the research funded by the Board.

7. Binding Signature Page

This signed form indicates the willingness to abide by NPRB requirements included in this request for proposals and certifies that all persons and agencies identified in the proposal as committing resources to the proposed project have been contacted and have agreed to participate if the proposal is funded. No additional letters of endorsement are needed, except the letters of support from Native communities and tribal governing bodies if required.

8. Letters of Support from Native Communities and Tribal Governing Bodies

Proposals that deal with research on specific Alaska Native communities or health issues must have a letter of support from the appropriate community and tribal governing bodies.

9. Data Management and Quality Assurance/Quality Control (“QA/QC”) Statement

Any project involving collecting or processing data, conducting surveys, taking environmental measurements, and/or modeling must provide a statement describing the data management and quality assurance/control processes that will be used to ensure the integrity of the data and match data types to project objectives. Requirements for the statement are described [here](#).

GENERAL CONDITIONS

1. This RFP is only a solicitation of offers and should not be construed as an expectation of award, or as

any reasonable basis for detrimental reliance. NPRB is not obligated to award any specific project or any available funds. There is no guarantee sufficient funds will be available to make awards for all acceptable projects, and NPRB may choose to reject all proposals. No oral statement by any person can supercede or modify the terms of this RFP.

2. Responding proposals are firm offers and shall remain open for the NPRB to accept anytime before May 1, 2004 in accordance with a standard NPRB agreement for the performance of the work proposed. A proposal is accepted only when NPRB sends the applicant written approval and has a completed contract. A proposal accepted for funding does not obligate NPRB to provide additional future funding.

3. The applicant is responsible for obtaining all Federal, State, and local governmental permits and approvals for projects or activities to be funded under this announcement. This includes, as applicable, certification under state Coastal Zone Management Plans, section 404 or section 10 permits issued by the Corps of Engineers; experimental fishing or other permits under fishery management plans; scientific permits under the Endangered Species Act and/or the Marine Mammal Protection Act; and assistance to the Federal government in developing environmental impact statements to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. All experiments must be conducted in compliance with law, and only pursuant to mandatory permitting duly granted by the appropriate federal and state agencies. Requirements for special permits, for example, those required for taking marine mammals, should be clearly described and whether the permit is in possession or not.

4. Projects that require at-sea research using research vessels must comply with all research vessel safety standards in accordance with the guidelines for the operation of oceanographic research vessels owned, operated or chartered by members of the University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System (UNOLS), to assure that research at sea is conducted to the highest practicable standards of safety and prudence. Those standards also apply to chartered non-institution vessels.

(See: http://www.gso.uri.edu/unols/saf_stand/contents.htm.)

5. Funded participants are wholly responsible for the conduct of research, submission of required reports, and preparation of the results for publication. Participants will be required to submit a semiannual report not exceeding two pages and a final report to be posted on the NPRB web site and in other databases. Final reports may be submitted for peer review at the discretion of the NPRB. Failure to submit timely reports or to respond to peer review comments on final reports may result in withheld payments. Every effort should be made to submit within one year of the completion of study, research results for publication by an appropriate scientific journal. The NPRB Executive Director may in his sole discretion grant written exceptions if requested timely. All manuscripts shall acknowledge that funds were provided by the NPRB through the U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service.

6. Successful applicants will be required to report their data to an agreed-upon system (NODC or USGS information infrastructure), in accordance with specifications in the project's data management and information transfer plan. The data management and information transfer plan, which will be developed by NPRB, in consultation with the applicant, will specify, among other requirements, the storage media and format(s), month and location for reporting, and other relevant information, such as metadata, that may be required by the circumstances of the project. Each project must have an approved data management and information transfer plan in place prior to receipt of funding. Successful applicants also must supply metadata to the North Pacific Ecosystem Metadatabase.

(<http://www.pmel.noaa.gov/np/mdb/index.html>)

7. In accordance with federal statutes and regulations, no person on grounds of race, color, age, sex, national origin or disability shall be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under this program.