

Draft Summary

North Pacific Research Board
Advisory Panel Meeting
NPRB Conference Room
Anchorage, Alaska
September 27-28, 2004

The Advisory Panel (AP) met on September 27-28, 2004. Present were Heather McCarty (Chairman), Patricia Cochran, Shirley Kelly, Simon Kinneen, Paul MacGregor, Arni Thomson, Gale Vick (by phone), and Jon Warrenchuk. Michael Bradley and John Gerster were absent. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke and Misty Ott.

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m. The meeting agenda was approved with minor additions. The Panel postponed approval of the summary of their July 2004 meeting. The Advisory Panel heard status reports from Molly McCammon, Director of the Alaska Ocean Observing System, and Mike Illenberg, Alaska SeaLife Center, who is working on education and outreach for the Board.

2. Review Revised Draft Science Plan

The Advisory Panel reviewed the draft science plan and believes that it is ready for submission to the NRC committee for review, with the changes suggested below. The Panel noted that the general implementation strategies described in various sections of the plan will need adjustment after the Board determines its next steps in implementing the plan and drafting the 2005 RFP.

Chapter 1 – Introduction (No Changes)

Chapter 2 – Scientific Foundations

2.2.2.4 Human Impacts (p. 26, line 47): Add aging of coral citation. (p. 27, line 2-3): Strike species listed as examples, or add citation supporting the list.

2.2.2.5 Intersection of Impacts (p. 27, line 16): Add after “influence”, the phrase “and be impacted by”.

2.2.3 Human Dimensions (p. 27, line 44): add halibut to list of species.

Chapter 3 – Research Themes

3.1 Introduction

3.1.2.1 Monitoring (p. 34, lines 23-25): Change first sentence to read: “The biota, including humans themselves, can provide clues of ecosystem change. A network of local inhabitants, commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishermen could be established to report observations of changes in local ecosystem (e.g., marine bird die-offs, changes in species, habitats, sea ice, etc, see 4.1.3). Begin new sentence: “Biological sentinels may also serve as indicators of ecosystem productivity.”

3.2 Lower Trophic Level Productivity

3.2.5 Implementation Strategies (p. 44, line 14): Revise to say: "...the Board will have the advantage of having funded the following projects over the past three years..." This language should also be used in other implementation strategy sections of chapter 3.

3.3 Fish Habitat

3.3.1 Introduction (p. 46, line 55): Revise sentence to read: " In making funding decisions, the Board will consider the issues raised by the NRC and the U.S. Ocean Commission, in the context of existing legal mandates."

3.3.4 Research Needs (p. 55, line 19): Add "part of" after "as".

3.4 Fish and Invertebrates

3.4.3.4 Human Factors Affecting Fish Populations (p. 68, line 38): delete (5).

3.4.4.1 Stock Assessment Research and Development (p. 70, line 12): Greenland turbot, not halibut.

3.4.4.2 Change heading to Alternative Harvest Strategies (p. 70, line 24): Add "may be needed" after "research". (Line 29): Strike: "Moreover, consideration needs to be give to" and add "Additionally, there are". (Line 35): Add "and/or commercial" after "recreational".

3.4.4.4 Reducing Catch of Unwanted Species (new heading): (p. 71, line 10): Change sentence to read: "There are continuing needs to improve mitigation measures designed to reduce catch of certain species. Incidental catch of endangered (e.g., short-tailed albatross), or bycatch of prohibited ..." (Line 13): "At a minimum, incidental catch..."

Table 3-4 on page 74: Change second group to "Alternative Harvest Strategies", and last item under that category to "Review of spawning stock biomass per recruit harvest strategies." Change fourth group to "Reducing Catch of Unwanted Species" and third item to "Survival studies of discards."

3.5 Marine Mammals

Table 3-8 (p. 84): Delete "pressing" in table legend.

Table 3-9 (p. 85): Add "High frequency sonar" under Other Human-related Impacts. Accept revisions offered by Don Bowen on reducing table. Under last heading on Long-term Climate Change, revise first item to read: "Impacts of reduced sea ice cover and other climate-related changes on ice-related populations."

3.6 Seabirds (No changes)

3.7 Humans

Table 3-13 on p. 104: Under "Improving Management Decisions and Institutions", in line with "Case studies" add at end: ", including quota based management."

3.8 Longer Term Issues

On p. 106, change heading of section to “Other Prominent Issues”

3.8.2 Contaminants (p. 109, line 17): After “...Natives.” Add new sentence: “Studies are needed on cumulative affects on humans of a subsistence diet of several species with known contaminant levels.”

3.9 IERPs (No changes)

Chapter 4 – Other Research Approaches and Partnerships

4.1 LTK

Accept explanatory changes suggested by Henry Huntington (see attachment)

4.2 Coordination (No changes)

4.3 Cooperative Research (p. 130, line 21): Revise sentence to say: “One purpose for this can be to improve on methods or assumptions affecting stock assessments or other scientific reports relevant to the fishery management decisions.”

4.4 Education, Outreach, and Community Involvement (No changes)

Chapter 5 – Policies and Procedures

5.1 Scientific Quality and Integrity (No changes)

5.2 Data Management (No changes)

5.3 Other Policy Issues (No changes)

5.3.3 Protection of Intellectual Property Rights (p. 145, line 13): At end of sentence, replace “knowledge” with “proprietary interests”.

3. Draft Implementation Plan and 2005 Request for Proposals

The Advisory Panel reviewed the draft implementation plan and the 4-year schedule, and the draft request for proposals developed by the Science Panel. Suggested revisions to the RFP are shown in italics in the revised draft document and revised 4-year schedule, and are generally self-explanatory as far as the need for research.

The Advisory Panel recommends several activities that would not be run through the RFP. This direct approach would be responsive to the Board’s desire to reduce the volume of proposals:

a. LTK

The Advisory Panel recommends hiring a contractor/consultant to organize workshops (2 or more) that would help develop research hypotheses that would actively engage LTK holders in thinking analytically and creatively about what should be studied and how. The resulting

hypotheses could then be addressed by further LTK research, by other scientific research, or a combination of both. (see section 4.1.3, p. 126, line 14 of science plan, and contract language drafted by Two Crow) (\$200,000)

The Advisory Panel also recommends an LTK committee with a possible makeup of 2 AP, 1 SP, 1 Board member, 2 elders, and 1 local fisherman, to oversee and evaluate the LTK effort and perform the following activities: (\$50,000) (see p. 16 of draft implementation plan, item 4a)

- 1) Review the need for specific guidelines or protocols to clarify the relationship between researchers and holders of LTK. Potential topics include the role of various community organizations in that relationship (e.g., tribal councils, fishermen's associations, etc.), acknowledgment of intellectual property rights, compensation of participants, how LTK information is to be used (e.g., use of data, access to data, ownership of data, etc.), and other topics that might be part of an agreement between the researcher and a community or other holders of LTK.
- 2) Consider the LTK projects underway or under consideration to determine if there are major gaps that should be filled. If such gaps are identified, the committee should recommend ways to fill them.
- 3) Follow the progress of LTK projects to ensure that the projects remain on target. If projects appear to be failing, the committee may recommend steps to remedy the situation.
- 4) Assess the relative funding levels allocated for different parts of the LTK effort and recommend adjustments as appropriate.
- 5) Evaluate the success of various approaches. Considering the overall goal and objectives of the LTK effort, and the various projects that contribute to it, the committee can assess which approaches seem to be most successful and why. This assessment, as an ongoing process, can be used to revise LTK implementation steps.

b. Cooperative Research

The Advisory Panel recommends funding the AFS workshop on cooperative research at a level of \$10,000. The Panel recognizes that other projects already funded by the Board have elements of cooperative research.

c. Education and Outreach

The Panel recommends continuing funding of the Alaska SeaLife Center for one more year to perform education and outreach for the Board and continue the current program selected competitively through the 2004 RFP. This would be at the level of \$100,000.

The Panel recommends adding \$100,000 for education and outreach products that would be generated by the E and O project coordinator for Board projects. For example, videos and other documentaries can be very expensive.

d. Community Outreach

The Panel recommends setting aside \$100,000 for community outreach activities every year to be responsive to activities suggested on p. 134-135 of the draft science plan. The Panel would like to be involved in development of models for the community involvement program. Experts on community involvement should be consulted and perhaps a consultant should be hired to help with this task.