Suggested Process Improvements for the CFLRP

The below suggestions do not necessarily represent a consensus opinion of the panel. They are a list of suggestions gathered over the three day meeting that will be considered when the panel meets again.

1. Make upfront guidelines more clear to the proposal submitters and panel.
    a. How multi-year budgets are factored into the panel's decision.
    b. Define collaboration.
    c. Provide a description of the collaborative process (who and what each group's role in the process is. If a well known group in the region did not sign onto the collaboration, why not?).
    d. Whether or not the regions rank the proposals before sending them in.
2. Consider a co-chair model.
3. All fifteen panel members score all proposals.
    a. Do not use the Olympic average in scoring.
4. Give at least one month for the panel to review the proposals.
5. Clarify financial information needs/ definitions.
    a. If partners' in-kind contributions can count toward regional offices 50% match
    b. Definition of 'partnership in-kind services'; how will this be calculated.
6. Local jobs calculations- provide more clarification as to the processes used to come up with the numbers.
7. Created clearer scoring and prioritization guidelines.
8. Require that the proposal denote whether a professional grant writer was hired for the effort.
9. Enhance cost estimation guidance.
10. Provide more details on the economical and social context of the project.
11. Use the life line process more consistently.
12. Give more thought to how to utilize regional lifelines. Is it possible to have a regional representative standing by?
13. Revisit recusal guidelines and make the rules very clear. If there is a COI, the panel member must recuse themselves but if there is not, they should be allowed to fully engage in the discussion.
    a. If a panel member chooses not to comment on a proposal, allow them to suggest asking the regional office about specific topics.
14. Find a way to enable all proposal submitters to have their five minutes of air time with the panel (in person, video conference, teleconference, etc).
15. Future guidelines should ask proposal authors to say whether road decommissioning is in compliance with their travel management plan.
16. Is it possible to allow the panel to obtain supplemental information from disinterested 3rd parties?
    a. Have ecologists available for questioning by the panel.

    b. Assign due diligence step to the process, assign panel members to serve as technical advisors to the rest of the panel.
    c. Make science advisors available but proposal authors could also provide details if they were able to come to the meeting.
    d. Allow for proposal presentations with the opportunity for panel to ask questions.
17. Require that the regions use the eligibility checklist next year.
18. Next year, have period for public comment before the prioritization process.
19. Have the prioritization process take place in the morning after discussions are held so that panel members have additional time to consider the proposals.
20. Consider whether it would be helpful to provide back-up options for the Secretary. E.g., proposals ranked eleventh through fifteenth.
21. Revisit scoring/ voting guidelines. Panel would prefer an anonymous process.
22. Consider holding the meeting in a centrally located area or moving the meeting location for each meeting.
23. Have presentations at the outset on regional ecology, use of fire, use of pesticides, etc.
24. Require that the proposals include an abstract detailing funding requested for current year, initial actions to be taken, number of collaborators, etc.
25. Specify new formatting requirements for the proposals.
    a. In the RFP, provide a detailed summary as to what the proposal should include in that section.
26. Be clear in the RFP how the proposals will be scored by the panel.
27. All proposals should include a lead contact and a backup in case a 'lifeline' inquiry has to be made.
28. More clarification was needed from the proposals on the utilitization/ restoration portion.
29. Identify priority threshold and screening factors that give the panel more structure to their discussion.
    a. How does the panel weigh each evaluation criteria, are some more important than others?
30. Ensure that the panel gives more attention to the scientific aspects of each proposal.
    a. Many panel members do not fully understand the utilitization/ restoration/ collaboration link. Is there a need for the panel to educate themselves more on the linkages?
31. Would like written guidance on how to handle ethics of being actively involved in a proposal.
32. A code of conduct is needed for the panel; outside perceptions of the panel are important.
33. Propose that the 'caucusing' process used was ineffective and should not be used again.
34. Look at other ways to score the proposals. E.g., Mr. Schulke's proposed 1,2,3 process where proposals would initially be given a 1 if they meet all of the criteria, 2 if they meet some of the criteria, and 3 if there are reasons the proposal cannot be funded. Use this to initially sift the proposals
35. RFP should ask proposals to explain why certain aspects of their project are important and/or essential.
36. Panel will also be allowed to send Lauren Lesch, USFS, suggestions for the process.