

## Summary

North Pacific Research Board  
Advisory Panel Meeting  
NPRB Conference Room  
Anchorage, Alaska  
January 26, 2004

The Advisory Panel (AP) met on January 26, 2004. Present were Michael Bradley, Patricia Cochran, Cora Crome, John Gerster, Shirley Kelly, Simon Kinneen, Paul MacGregor, Heather McCarty (Chairman), Arni Thomson, Gale Vick, and Jon Warrenchuk. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke and Misty Ott. The Board meeting notebooks for January 27-28, 2004 were used as the basis for the Advisory Panel meeting, though the main focus was on the NRC report under Tab 2

### 1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m. The meeting agenda was approved. The Panel approved the summary of their September 29, 2003, meeting.

### 2. NRC Interim Report

The Panel received a presentation from Dr. Lynda Shapiro, Chairman of the NRC committee, and a report from the Science Panel. The Panel discussed the findings and recommendations starting on page 69 of the NRC report, and made the following recommendations:

Recommendation 2-1: The Panel agrees with the Science Panel that the focus of the science plan should be the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands and Western Gulf of Alaska, with the caveat that the existing science and research programs, such as GEM and SEARCH and others, should continue in the Arctic and the eastern GOA.

Finding 4: The Panel wants to make clear that ecosystems studies should not preclude species-specific proposals being funded when appropriate.

Recommendation 5-1: Traditional and local observations should be included in any long-term monitoring programs.

Recommendation 6-3: The Panel recommends that the NPRB charge the AP with developing a plan that would facilitate the incorporation of TEK into research planning. The draft plan should be developed in coordination with development of the full science plan.

Recommendation 7-1: Studies should not only be directed at human impacts on the ecosystem, but, as noted by the Science Panel, impacts of ecosystem changes on human populations, for example, health issues, etc.

Recommendation 8-5: The AP recommends adding a finding and recommendation as follows: Finding: Alaska's communities appear to be under increasing pressure from changes in economics, the marine ecosystem, and social change. Recommendation: Economic and social research is needed to ascertain the long-term viability of communities and changes to these communities as a result of changing management structure and changes to the marine ecosystem. Researchers should be encouraged to work with the rural communities on these types of research projects.

Finding 14: Under this finding, the Panel passed a motion, with one abstention, deleting recommendations 14-3 through 14-5. The Panel concurs with the Science Panel's recommendation in paragraph 14 of their meeting summary. The Advisory Panel considers the Science Panel an effective review body for proposals and believes that a PSC is unnecessary, though outside experts may be invited to sit with the Science Panel on an ad hoc basis as necessary. In addition the Advisory Panel shall provide all aid, assistance and advice in prioritizing scientifically meritorious proposals. The NPRB should ensure that it has a recusal policy for the Science Panel, Advisory Panel and the Board that precludes perceived or real conflicts of interest in reviewing and awarding research grants.

Recommendation 16-3: NPRB should define the role that the Advisory Panel can play in the communications process with stakeholders. It is designed to be a group of stakeholder representatives. They should have a role in developing the communications plan and participating in it.

Recommendation 17-5: NPRB should develop a patent policy for technology developed with NPRB research funds.

Additional Comments:

1. On page 60 of the NRC report, the Advisory Panel wishes to clarify that it advises the Board and the Science Panel, not just the Science Panel, as indicated in the NRC report.
2. Regarding the Science Panel meeting summary, the AP wants to seek clarification of Hypothesis #3 on page 3 concerning anthropogenic mortality and what is meant by it. The AP fully endorses the development of performance indicators as noted in paragraph 10 on p. 3 of the Science Panel report.
3. The Panel will meet next on March 16, 2004, starting in the morning to allow members to arrive in the morning. The Chairman will work with the executive director in developing an agenda specific for the panel and sending it out ahead of the meeting.