

DRAFT Summary
North Pacific Research Board
Advisory Panel
March 14, 2005
NPRB Conference Room
Anchorage, Alaska

The Advisory Panel (AP) met on March ~~15-16, 2004~~^{14, 2005}. Present were Heather McCarty (Chair), Patricia Cochran (Vice-chair), Mike Bradley and Gale Vick. Absent were John Gerster, Shirley Kelly, Simon Kineen, Arni Thomson and Jon Warrenchuk. 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. A quorum was not established, but the members in attendance approved the agenda with the addition of Advisory Panel membership under Other Matters. All recommendations made by the AP were consensus rather than formal vote.

2. **Proposal Review for 2005 (Information Purposes Only)**

The AP noted that the Science Panel did not recommend any Northern Fur Seal proposals involving local people for funding. It was also noted that in general, LTK is not addressed in most of the projects.

3. **Budget Review (Information Purposes Only)**

The Advisory Panel made the following recommendations:

- Include one year administrative contingency as a line item in the administrative budget.
- Appropriations should be allocated to the maximum extent possible to the Science portion of the budget, rather than 15% to administration as a policy.
- Look into the possibility of negotiating indirect cost rates.
- Additional funds that could be allocated for outreach would be well spent.

4. **Draft Science Plan**

Regarding the NRC comments, the AP commented:

- Chapter 2, page 3. Agree with the Science Panel's recommendations regarding the NRC recommendation to rearrange chapters 2 and 3. If it makes sense, do it.
- Chapter 2, page 14. Focus on one or two geographical regions could be problematic. The program needs all three.
- Chapter 3, page 16, line 21 recommendation is not an acceptable change as it seems to weaken the legislative mandate.
- Chapter 4, page 19. Agree with the second paragraph regarding LTK.
- Chapter 5 recommendations: Look at NSF requirements for guidance.
- Chapter 5, page 19 recommendation 1: Agree with the recommendation that members recuse themselves by leaving the room when they have a conflict of interest.
- Judging the efficacy of LTK proposals should not depend on publishing results in peer-reviewed journals. Criteria for these proposals will be undertaken by the LTK Committee.

The AP recommends that the NPRB move ahead with LTK pilot projects this year with or without NSF, beginning with the following:

- Establish the LTK Committee
- Committee should meet as soon as possible with direction from the Board to develop a plan for the workshop.

Possible workshop goals:

1. Tell us something specific that we don't know.
 2. Give specific direction (AP and Board) to the LTK Committee.
 3. LTK Committee could have their first meeting concurrent with the LTK workshop, or possibly starting the day before.
 4. Lay out previous experience and figure out direction, i.e. What do we know? What do we want to learn? Should we do these pilot projects?
- Collaborate with NSF if an opportunity exists.
 - Something that everyone can use, is opportunistic, but will show changes over time.

LTK should be separate from, not included in collaboration.

The AP recommends May 9-10 or the following week, as tentative dates for the LTK Committee meeting/workshop.

7b. Review statement from International Bering Sea Forum

The AP recommends no involvement in the International Bering Sea Forum

7c. Status reports on AMIS and Education and outreach programs

The AP did not have time for status reports on AMIS or Education and outreach programs.

7e. Advisory Panel Memberships The AP recommends appointing:

- Industry members to replace Cora Crome and Paul MacGregor.
- Native/CDQ representative to replace Simon Kineen.
- An additional seat for an environmentalist.

The Advisory Panel adjourned at 4:50 p.m.