



Request for Workshop Proposals

Chesapeake Bay Program's Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee

The Chesapeake Bay Program's (CBP) Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) is accepting proposals for STAC-sponsored workshops for the STAC fiscal year 2018 budget cycle (beginning June 1, 2018). Workshops are convened to gather critically needed scientific or technical information related to protection and restoration of Chesapeake Bay and its watershed. Workshops funded through this RFP must be convened by May 31, 2019.

I. Funding Eligibility

As an independent advisory committee to the entire Chesapeake Bay Partnership, STAC reserves funds for both proactive and responsive workshops. Applicants should clearly indicate the category (i.e., proactive or responsive) the submitted proposal falls under.

Proactive workshops may be proposed by individual STAC members in collaboration with any CBP partner or research institution or STAC workgroups.

Responsive workshops may be proposed by any CBP partner or committee. Potential partners include: New York; Pennsylvania; Maryland; Delaware; West Virginia; Virginia; District of Columbia; any CBP-GIT (Goal Implementation Team) or Workgroup; Local Government Advisory Committee; Citizens' Advisory Committee; Chesapeake Bay Commission; Management Board; and Executive Council. Proposals must be made in collaboration with a current STAC member.

II. Requirements for Funding

Proposal Format

Refer to the [STAC Workshop Protocol](#) for all guidelines and specific proposal requirements listed for either Proactive or Responsive Workshops. A successful proposal should adhere to all guidelines outlined in the Workshop Protocols and be no more than three (3) pages in length.

- Responsive workshop proposals also require an individualized letter (not included in the three-page limit) in support of the proposed workshop activity, degree of urgency, anticipated products and estimated delivery dates. The letter should be endorsed with signature(s) of lead representatives of the group or agency that will benefit directly from the activity – e.g. the Chair of any CBP committee or GIT, jurisdiction's governor or mayor, or by a state agency staff/deputy secretary. Proactive proposals do not require a letter of support.

Steering Committee

A steering committee, not to exceed ten individuals, must be identified by the workshop requestor(s) with at least one current STAC member identified as part of the steering committee. Applicants must obtain consent that the identified STAC member(s) agree to serve on the steering committee and fulfill the accompanying responsibilities. The STAC representative may

serve as chair of the steering committee, but it is not required. Additionally, if the workshop topic or resulting product will be of relevance to a particular entity, requestor(s) are encouraged to consider including a representative from that entity on the steering committee.

Commented [DR1]: Added from the workshop protocols – belong in the RFP?

Workshop Planning

Successful applicants will be required to work with STAC Staff to plan the workshop. STAC Staff will provide assistance with workshop logistics (planning calls, venue contracts, etc.). STAC Staff **must** be included in all workshop planning meetings, teleconferences, email correspondences, and other communication related to the workshop. **For planning purposes, STAC workshops typically require at least three months to organize and convene.**

Commented [DR2]: New addition

Workshop Products

Following approval for funding by STAC, it is the responsibility of the workshop steering committee to complete the workshop and any product(s) listed in the proposal adhering to the guidelines in the [STAC Publications Protocol](#). It is incumbent upon the workshop steering committee to identify the time sensitivity for convening the workshop and the delivery of its products, and the steering committee is solely responsible for meeting these deadlines. STAC requires that each steering committee complete a final workshop report (or other product) **within 90 days** following completion of the workshop. Final review, distribution, and online posting will be completed by STAC within six weeks of receipt of a workshop product. The STAC Executive Secretary will have final editorial discretion prior to publication or distribution.

III. Evaluation Criteria

STAC seeks creative proposals that address critical elements of effective Bay protection and restoration, including workshops that will stimulate new lines of thought or serve to enhance the science and tools used to advance Bay research and management. STAC members support proposed workshop topic that are relevant to Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) science and management needs ~~including but not limited to: current CBP Management Strategies, Workplans, 2017 Mid Point Assessment goals, outcomes, Decision Framework, and/or other STAC activities and priorities.~~ Applicants should make a strong case as to the importance/relevance of their topic for the current funding cycle and why the workshop should be viewed as a priority for STAC. **Failure to adequately justify the workshop and its product(s) as an appropriate activity for STAC support, and as a reasonable next step in the development of management in the region could lead to return of the proposal without further action.**

Commented [DR3]: Added from the workshop protocols – belong in the RFP?

STAC's membership will evaluate the proposals based on the criteria listed below and determine which proposals to fund at its spring quarterly meeting (March 13-14, 2018). Successful applicants will be informed shortly after the March meeting, and funding will be available on June 1, 2018.

1. Demonstrated relevance to the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem: ~~Are the proposed scientific/technical objectives and products clearly relevant to current and/or future conditions of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem?~~

Commented [DR4]: Per discussion at March 2017 meeting, STAC members suggested rephrasing evaluation criterion #1.

2. Scientific and technical appropriateness for CBP: Are the proposed scientific/technical objectives and products clearly linked to CBP goals, outcomes, and Decision Framework?

3. Clearly organized plan: Does the proposal include a plan and timeline that clearly demonstrates that the workshop will likely achieve the stated objectives and complete the proposed products?

4. Steering Committee qualifications: Does the proposed workshop steering committee include the appropriate mix of qualified individuals to conduct the workshop, achieve the stated objectives, and complete the proposed products?

5. Effectiveness as a workshop: Is a STAC workshop, rather than some other kind of activity (e.g., a review, literature synthesis/white paper, or factsheet), the appropriate vehicle for the proposed project?

1. Merit and relevance: Are the workshop’s objectives relevant to the current state of the knowledge of the topic to be addressed? Does the workshop have the potential to make a positive contribution to the understanding of the current and/or future conditions of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem and its management?

2. Scientific and technical appropriateness: Are the workshop’s objectives and products clearly linked to science and management needs related to CBP goals and outcomes?

3. Organization and planning: Does the proposal include a plan and timeline that clearly demonstrates that the workshop will likely achieve the stated objectives and complete the proposed products?

4. Steering Committee composition: Does the proposed workshop steering committee include the appropriate mix of qualified individuals to conduct the workshop, achieve the stated objectives, and complete the proposed products?

5. Suitability: Is a STAC workshop, rather than some other kind of activity (e.g., a review, literature synthesis/white paper, or factsheet), the appropriate vehicle for the proposed project? Will the proposed product(s) help the workshop outcomes to reach the intended audience in the best format for their effective and timely implementation?

IV. Timeline for Proposal Submission

To submit a proposal, visit the STAC website and Apply for Assistance at <http://www.chesapeake.org/stac/assistance.php>. For all inquiries related to this RFP, contact:

Primary Contact: Rachel Dixon, STAC Coordinator
 Telephone: 410-798-1283
 E-Mail: dixonr@chesapeake.org

Dec 8, 2017	RFP is distributed to Partnership
Jan 26, 2018	Preliminary Draft Proposals due
Jan 29 – Feb 2, 2018	STAC Staff and membership voluntarily pre-screen proposals and provide comments
Feb 2, 2018	STAC Staff and membership Comments on draft proposals returned
Feb 16, 2018	Final proposals due

Commented [DR5]: The idea behind this step was to help frame the proposals to have a better debate at the March meeting.

From the 10/23 EB Call:
 Suggest removing voluntary pre-screening step, and encourage STAC members on each workshop proposal steering committee help guide proposal development, then comments and feedback from wider STAC membership on approved proposals can be provided between March meeting and start of funding.

If STAC is supportive of this change, language in the RFP will be adjusted to include the need to converse with STAC member identified on the steering committee, and to encourage applicants to contact STAC Chair or STAC Staff with ideas/questions.

Feb 28, 2018	STAC Members submit proposal scores to STAC staff
Mar 2, 2018	Proposal scores distributed to STAC members prior to March meeting
Mar 13-14, 2018	STAC membership reviews proposals at quarterly meeting and select proposal to be funded and determine funding level
Jun 1, 2018	Funds available for approved workshops
May 31, 2019	Workshops must be completed by this date to receive funding

Commented [DR6]: Per discussion at March 2017 meeting, STAC members suggested making a summary of scores available to STAC members well in advance of the March meeting.

Proposals received after the January 26 deadline may be considered, if funding is available.

DRAFT