



NORTH PACIFIC RESEARCH BOARD

"Building a clear understanding of the North Pacific, Bering Sea, and Arctic Ocean ecosystems that enables effective management and sustainable use of marine resources."

1007 West 3rd Avenue, Suite 100 | Anchorage, AK 99501 | tel 907.644.6700, fax 907.644.6780

North Pacific Research Board Meeting Summary September 18 – 20, 2017 Cordova, Alaska

The North Pacific Research Board met from September 18 through 20, 2017, in Cordova, Alaska. In attendance were Dan Hull (chair), Tara Riemer (vice chair), Capt. Patrick Barelli, Forrest Bowers, Bill Britt, Dorothy Childers, John Gauvin, Becca Gisclair, Katrina Hoffman, Jan Jacobs, Doug Mecum, Mike Miller, Bradley Moran, Cheryl Rosa (as alternate for the US Arctic Research Commission representative David Benton), and Dee Williams. Heather Mann and Gerry Merrigan were absent. Seats for representatives from the Department of State and the Office of Naval Research are vacant. The meeting was staffed by Betsy Baker, Matt Baker, Danielle Dickson, Susan Dixon, Jo-Ann Mellish and Brendan Smith. Chris Siddon (Science Panel chair) and Nagruk Harcharek (Advisory Panel vice chair) also attended. Seth Danielson and Ed Farley attended parts of the meeting, including Agenda item 6 (Arctic Program), and Scott Pegau of the Oil Spill Recovery Institute joined the meeting for Agenda item 8 (Core Program Partnerships).

Monday, September 18, 2017

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The Board Chair welcomed everyone to Cordova and Board members and staff introduced themselves. New Board member, Commander Patrick Barelli of the U.S. Coast Guard, was introduced. A safety briefing was provided by staff.

MOTION: Approve agenda
Action: Passed with no objection.

MOTION: Approve minutes of Spring 2017 meeting
Action: Passed with no objection.

The Science Panel (SP) and Advisory Panel (AP) Chair were invited to provide key outcomes of their fall meetings. The SP Chair noted that the panel moved efficiently through revising the 2018 RFP largely due to the streamlined format adopted last year. He expressed SP concerns about how some of Board's Core Program 2017 funding decisions – fewer Arctic proposals, not funding a Tier E proposal, and the higher than advertised funding for the Fishes & Invertebrates category – reflected on NPRB. He emphasized SP support for an NPRB-hosted session at AMSS to gather ideas from the scientific community for Integrated Ecosystem Research Programs (IERPs) and Focus sections, and for adding the category of Interdisciplinary Studies (formerly proposed as Multispecies and Ecosystem Studies) to the Core Program RFP. The AP Chair reported that seven new members joined the AP this fall and that the AP minutes capture all strong sentiments of the AP in motions.

Staff reminded the Board of travel regulations and provided travel claim forms.

2. Budget Overview

Staff presented an overview of the NPRB budget, including projections through 2023 based on a 2.1% interest rate on the ten-year treasury notes in which the Environmental Improvement and Restoration Fund (EIRF) is invested. The interest rate is not expected to rise significantly anytime soon and projections are for level funding or modest increases in grant funds received. Staff reported that the first year of Grant 8 is approximately \$500 K higher than expected because NPRB funds were not sequestered as had been projected at the spring 2017 board meeting. Given the projections, NPRB will need to decide how to balance funding the various programs that NPRB supports during the discussion of strategic planning later in the meeting. Staff reminded the Board that it committed to provide \$1-2 M for the Arctic IERP synthesis but has not yet obligated the funds, which should occur in time to begin the synthesis in 2021.

3. Communications and Outreach (C&O)

Staff provided a brief history of NPRB support for outreach and presented proposed improvements to the process for soliciting companion outreach proposals. Staff suggested soliciting companion outreach proposals only from proposers whose Core Program projects were funded, with a July submission and fall evaluation by the Board and panels. The Board supported that approach. A Board member agreed with the AP comment that the July deadline could be problematic for subsistence communities, particularly if proposers need letters from communities, and suggested a faster timeline for the companion outreach proposals.

The Board considered raising the proposal cap and total amount of funding for companion outreach proposals, a change that the AP supported. The Board postponed its decisions on the proposed changes to outreach funding and timing until the Core Program discussion under agenda item 5.

A Board member asked if NPRB tracks outreach success metrics. Staff said that, since 2015, proposers have been asked to identify and track metrics specific to their projects. The AP chair noted the AP recommendation that NPRB implement more sophisticated metrics to evaluate outreach impact.

Staff presented the proposed new Engagement Strategy for Core Program proposals. Beginning in 2018 all Core Program submissions would be required to include an engagement strategy. The Board agreed with this general approach. The AP Chair noted that, in exercising its role of evaluating community engagement efforts, the panel would be unlikely to flag a proposal for stronger consideration if its engagement strategy was inadequate.

A related proposed change is to replace the requirement that each Core proposal contain a small outreach component with one that all funded proposals send a project team member to science communication training. A Board member, observing that NPRB is considered a leader in fostering scientist outreach, asked what might be lost with the proposed changes. Staff explained that many proposers currently offer outreach ideas that are inadequate. The Board agreed that outreach should be part of the process in developing a proposal for the Core Program to help Principal Investigators (PIs) think about relevance of their proposed science to communities and plan accordingly.

Staff described C&O activities since the spring Board meeting, including redesign of the Alaska Marine Science Symposium (AMSS) website. The C&O Director participated in the spring research cruise for the Arctic IERP, as part of the science crew and as photographer and videographer. He described his experience, showcasing images and the blog for the program.

4. Graduate Student Research Awards

Staff summarized the Board's decision to support two Master's and four Ph.D. students with 2017 Graduate Student Research Awards (GSRAs). The staff memo for this agenda item provides more detail, including updates on prior awardees' activities and publications.

5. Core Program

DRAFT 2018 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

Staff summarized the Board's spring 2017 decisions to fund 28 proposals totaling \$4.6 M, which included \$100,000 from the Oil Spill Recovery Institute. Four out of five Tier E proposals, 21 Tier 1 proposals, and three Tier 2 proposals were funded in 2017.

The Draft 2018 Request for Proposals (RFP) was introduced for Board discussion. Staff explained how NPRB solicited community input that serves as the basis for developing the 2018 RFP, then asked the Board to discuss the bullets under "Issues of Particular Interest" in each category, the topic for a Focus section, and the category funding targets.

CATEGORIES

➤ *Fishes and Invertebrates Category*

MOTION: Under Issues of Particular Interest, remove the second and third bullets that emphasize interactions between wild and hatchery fishes and the integration of fresh & saltwater ecology of anadromous fishes; move the remaining items (1, 4, & 5) to the static General Topics of Interest; and eliminate Issues of Particular Interest under the Fishes & Invertebrates category.

Amendment 1: Keep bullets 1, 4, and 5 under Issues of Particular Interest and remove bullets 2 and 3.

Action on 1: Passed with one objection.

Main Motion Action: Passed with no objection.

MOTION: Under General Topics of Interest, add a bullet on ocean acidification impacts on fishes & invertebrates.

Action: Passed with no objection.

➤ *Marine Birds & Mammals Category*

Staff pointed out that the draft 2018 RFP merges the Seabirds and Marine Mammals categories to create a single Marine Birds & Mammals category.

MOTION: Under General Topics of Interest, change "industrial" to "anthropogenic maritime" in the bullet that deals with interactions with industrial activities.

Action: Passed with no objection.

➤ *Human Dimensions Category*

MOTION: In the first bullet under Issues of Particular Interest, change "industrial" to "anthropogenic maritime".

Amendment 1: Remove "maritime".

Action on 1: Passed with no objection.

Amendment 2: Include the same parenthetical examples under Marine Birds & Mammals as are included in the Human Dimensions category.

Action on 2: Passed with no objection.

Main Motion Action: Passed with no objection.

MOTION: Under Issues of Particular Interest, remove "analyze" from the bullet on co-production of knowledge.

Action: Passed with no objection.

A Board member suggested returning to the discussion of co-production of knowledge during discussion of the Focus Section.

MOTION: Change the language that referred to mixed methods for policy analysis that integrate quantitative and qualitative approaches to "quantitative and qualitative policy analysis using integrative approaches such as 'mixed methods' analysis".

Action: Passed with no objection.

➤ *Focus Section Category*

The Board discussed the Interdisciplinary Studies draft language that would be recommended if it was treated as a separate funding category. It also discussed three potential topics for the Focus Section of the 2018 RFP: Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands, Bogoslof Island Ecosystem, and Interdisciplinary Studies. The SP recommended including Interdisciplinary Studies as a separate category in the RFP rather than as a Focus Section. The SP and AP Chairs shared the views of their respective panels on all three proposed Focus Section topics.

MOTION: Remove a Focus Section from the 2018 RFP, without prejudice to possibility of future focal sections.

Action: Passed with no objection.

MOTION: Include Interdisciplinary Studies as a category in the 2018 RFP with new wording to be approved in subsequent motion (See below under Interdisciplinary Studies Category).

Action: Passed with no objection.

➤ *Cooperative Research with Industry Category*

MOTION: Add "Projects that use fishing industry expertise to develop methods to deploy mark-recapture archival tags in the Aleutian Islands State and Federal waters Pacific cod fisheries" as an Issue of Particular Interest.

Action: Passed with no objection.

➤ *Technology Development Category*

A Board member raised a question about the language under Technology Development that targets marine plants and animals as sentinels to collect environmental data and suggested that it needed correction. The language was changed to "marine plants and animals as sentinels of environmental conditions."

MOTION: Add a bullet under Issues of Particular Interest for technology to conduct and improve winter fish surveys for Arctic cod.

Action: Passed with no objection.

➤ *Interdisciplinary Studies Category*

MOTION: Adopt the revised introductory language for the Interdisciplinary Studies category as drafted by staff (see final RFP).

Amendment 1: Add co-production of knowledge under General Topics of Interest, using language similar to that under the Human Dimensions category.

Action on 1: Passed with no objection.

Main Motion Action: Passed with no objection.

TARGET FUNDING AMOUNTS

Staff presented the target funding amounts for 2017 as a starting point for the discussion of 2018 target amounts.

MOTION: Advertise the same target amounts in the 2018 RFP as in the 2017 RFP and carve \$45 K out from some categories for funding companion outreach proposals.

Amendment 1: Adjust the target funding amounts as follows: Oceanography & Productivity \$500 K, Fishes & Invertebrates \$1.2 M, Marine Birds & Mammals \$900 K, Human Dimensions \$500 K, Cooperative Research with Industry \$300 K, Technology Development \$300 K, Data Rescue \$150 K, Interdisciplinary Studies \$600 K and save \$50 K for outreach.

Action on 1: Passed with no objection.

Amendment 2: An amendment was introduced to shift \$100 K from Interdisciplinary Studies to Fishes & Invertebrates.

Action on 2: A roll call vote was taken and Amendment 2 failed.

Main Motion Action: Passed with no objection.

Staff reminded the Board that, in the 2017 RFP, proposal caps were removed for all categories except Fishes & Invertebrates, which had a \$500 K proposal cap. The Board would need to add proposal caps for other categories if it so desired.

MOTION: Keep the proposal caps in the 2018 RFP as advertised in the 2017 RFP.

Amendment 1: Raise the proposal cap for Fishes & Invertebrates to \$600 K.

Action on 1: Passed with no objection.

Main Motion Action: Passed with no objection.

MOTION: Raise the cap for individual companion outreach proposals to \$20 K.

Action: **Passed with no objection.**

OTHER CORE PROGRAM MATTERS

Responding to Board member comments at the spring 2017 meeting, Staff described the Core proposal review process and invited Board suggestions during and after the meeting for improving efficiency of their spring meeting proposal reviews. The Board did not indicate the need to provide further input or change the process at this time.

The Board reviewed the language for the new Engagement Strategy section of the Core Program RFP.

MOTION: **Add a sentence to the Engagement Strategy language to state that "engagement strategies may include, but do not require, co-production of knowledge processes".**

Amendment 1: **Instead add "but not required" to the end of the sentence that reads "Innovative approaches to the inclusion of local and/or traditional knowledge, communities and/or stakeholders in project planning is encouraged".**

Action on 1: **None**

Main Motion Action: **The motion was withdrawn.**

The Board discussed whether it intends to fund Arctic projects via the 2018 Core RFP or not. Staff reported that the Board funded four Arctic projects in 2017 but decided not to fund any Arctic projects in the oceanography category. The Board acknowledged that during BSIERP and GOAIERP it continued to fund projects in the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska via the Core Program. The value of leveraging Arctic IERP investments was also discussed. Board members stated that if the Board does not intend to fund Arctic projects because of their ongoing investment in the Arctic IERP then the RFP should clearly send that message to proposers. The Board concluded that, without further action needed, Arctic projects will be considered for funding in 2018.

6. Arctic Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Staff reviewed how the Integrated Ecosystem Research Programs (IERPs) differ from Core Program projects and introduced the Arctic IERP. Drs. Seth Danielson and Ed Farley, the Chief Scientists for the spring and summer/fall surveys, respectively, presented updates from the 2017 field season and the progress of the program overall. They reported that the Arctic IERP is ambitious and energizing and provides a unique opportunity to leverage resources, noting that NPRB's initial investment of \$7 M has resulted in a >\$18.6 M research program. International collaborators participated in the 2017 research cruises; the spring cruise included a colleague from Hokkaido University in Japan and the summer/fall cruises included three Russians from TINRO and VNIRO.

Staff reported that the 2017 field season has been very successful thus far and no subsistence conflicts with local communities have been identified, thanks in large part to an effective communication strategy. A report that presented preliminary results from the spring cruise was provided, as well as a separate report prepared by the community observer from Little Diomedes who participated in that cruise. The summer/fall cruises were still underway at the time of this meeting.

Staff explained the intent to communicate with Appendix A project representatives following the 2017 field season to explore specific ideas for collaboration. A Board member asked if the Arctic IERP PIs have

mapped out plans for developing papers that integrate the work of the ASGARD and Arctic IES projects and staff explained that discussion at that level of detail has not yet taken place.

7. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Staff updated the Board on the Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program (GOAIERP), currently in the synthesis phase. Outcomes of a February synthesis workshop included examples of how GOAIERP results are being applied to fishery management in the Gulf of Alaska, from influencing the decision to split the Ecosystem Considerations chapter of the SAFE report into separate sections for the Eastern and Western Gulf of Alaska, to providing data for improving stock assessments for several ground fish species.

Staff explained plans for a special session and workshop at the 2018 Ocean Sciences Conference to highlight the results of GOAIERP and organize Principal Investigators (PIs) from several recent projects in the Gulf of Alaska to discuss recommendations for future research in the region and opportunities to leverage investments like the recently-funded NSF Seward Line Long-Term Ecological Research (LTER) site.

Staff Tasking: A Board member suggested that it would be useful for NPRB to receive a report from such a workshop.

8. Partnerships in the Core Program

[This agenda item was discussed on Tuesday morning but appears here to reflect the printed Agenda.]

NPRB has partnered with the Oil Spill Recovery Institute to fund research through the Core Program and NPRB is considering expanding that model to pursue partnerships with other entities. The Board discussed the development of a formal structure for establishing additional partnerships.

In fall 2016, the Board directed staff to explore mechanisms for formalizing partnerships with other entities for the Core Program. Staff requested Board input on the proposed approach and timeline, appropriate level of partner engagement in developing research priorities, appropriate level of partner input on funding decisions, approaches for identifying and evaluating partners, and/or means of offsetting administrative costs. Staff presented options for identifying appropriate partner institutions, including the consideration of compatible mandates and missions, absence of conflict of interest, relationship to the Board, and ability of NPRB to accept funds. Staff further suggested options for soliciting and evaluating partnerships.

Staff reminded the Board that during past meetings NPRB discussed a desire for potential partners to commit a minimum of \$100 K given the additional administrative burden associated with each new partnership. The Board also raised questions about how to align funding cycles with other institutions.

The SP Chair reported that the SP supported partnerships and urged the Board to require that partners provide funds to support administrative costs. The AP Chair reported that the AP made a motion to suggest that NPRB establish a working group to develop partnerships.

A Board member commended the staff on the draft MOU because it ensures that NPRB maintains control over its process. While it may limit partnership opportunities initially, this more restricted process is a prudent starting point. Another Board member suggested that, rather than predefine criteria for identifying partners, the Board establish a process for evaluating potential partners case by case. This approach would allow NPRB flexibility to consider models that it may not anticipate.

Scott Pegau of the Oil Spill Recovery Institute (OSRI) reported that OSRI revisits its partnership with NPRB annually. OSRI appreciates the broad range of potential proposers that the NPRB Core Program RFP reaches. The funding process provides insulation; the NPRB SP decides which proposals are in competition and OSRI simply identifies which they are willing to contribute to; OSRI maintains control over where their money goes to ensure that the research addresses the OSRI mission. OSRI looks at whether the NPRB RFP maintains sufficient overlap with the OSRI mission to justify contribution on an annual basis. NPRB should make sure partners get recognition for supporting a given project, and therefore, NPRB should consider which organizations the Board is willing to share recognition with when it considers appropriate partners. An NPRB Board member asked whether OSRI actively solicits partners and Dr. Pegau reported that OSRI targets individual organizations regularly.

Staff asked for clarity from the Board about whether staff is directed to talk further with the entities that have recently approached NPRB about partnership in the Core Program. The working group established below will address this.

MOTION: **Establish a working group to work with staff to explore NPRB's objectives with respect to partnership, define criteria for identifying partners, determine how funds would be administered, integrate discussions with those of the strategic planning working group, identify legal requirements, describe best practices, and articulate policy recommendations.**

Action: **Passed with no objection.**

A member of the strategic planning working group will participate in the Core Program Partnerships working group and serve as a liaison. The working group on Core Program Partnerships could also help address cooperative research with industry questions.

Staff reported that the proposal submission system has a check box feature for proposers to self-identify which groups they are willing to allow NPRB to share their proposal with and NPRB must identify which partners should be included in the list.

Tuesday, September 19, 2017

9. Science Plan Update

Staff discussed the timeline for updating the NPRB Science Plan and reminded the Board of the advice provided by the External Review Committee (ERC). Staff explained that the Science Plan is intended to be descriptive, not prescriptive, and relevant on a timescale of five to ten years.

A Board member noted the ERC endorsement of IERPs and asked staff to summarize the ERC discussion. Staff explained that the ERC recognized the unique strengths of the IERP approach that distinguishes NPRB from other funding organizations. The ERC suggested that IERPs could focus on specific processes rather than geographic areas and further suggested that IERPs could be designed to address management questions.

A Board member suggested that the Science Plan Update include reference to current funding constraints as compared to the earlier years of NPRB.

A Board member asked how the research priorities articulated in the updated plan were determined and staff explained that the RFP evolution was the basis for that information with the addition of input from experts on the Science Panel.

A Board member asked staff to summarize the purpose of the Science Plan and staff explained that the plan should articulate a framework for NPRB's interest in funding research, including geographic boundaries. A Board member suggested that "framework" would better characterize the aim of the document than "science plan", particularly if it is not going to articulate specific research priorities. Other Board members suggested the document be titled "Scientific Foundations" instead of "Science Plan."

MOTION: Task staff to take into consideration Board discussion and suggestions under the Science Plan agenda item in working with the Science Plan Working Group and Panels to prepare a document for the Board's consideration at the May 2018 meeting.

Action: Passed without objection.

10. Operations Update

Staff explained that NPRB is making every effort to reduce administrative expenses and detailed some examples, including a recent renegotiation of the lease for NPRB office space that achieved substantial savings. The Board was reminded that NPRB has a 15% cap on administrative expenses and is currently operating very close to that cap. The Board commended these efforts.

NPRB has contracted a law firm to provide advice on the governance of NPRB, including its 2001 MOU with NOAA and the Alaska Sea Life Center (NPRB's fiscal agent), and relationship to the North Pacific Marine Research Institute. NPRB will also receive advice regarding its capacity to develop partnerships with other entities.

11. Strategic Planning

Staff provided background on the Board's recent and planned strategic planning discussions, including how to structure the Core Program RFP, how to balance funding among the various programs that NPRB supports, and the consideration of the idea of a rolling submissions process for the Core Program. The working group did not make any recommendations to the Board because three members were absent from the one meeting that occurred since the spring Board meeting.

Rolling Submissions Process for the Core Program

Staff presented detail on the Science Panel's suggestion to shift the Core Program to a rolling submissions process to increase the Board's flexibility and reduce the burden on peer reviewers, Panels, and Board. Staff discussed the rolling submissions process that National Science Foundation (NSF) has implemented and the benefits that they have realized.

The AP Chair reported that the panel also supports a shift to the rolling submissions process. The Chair of the strategic planning working group reported that the WG was intrigued by the idea and asked staff to present additional details to the Board.

The Board and Staff discussed many aspects, pro and con, of adapting rolling submissions for NPRB. Those discussions will be distilled in a memo for the Board prior to the fall 2017 teleconference meeting described following the motion below.

[The Board turned to other strategic planning agenda items for the remainder of its Tuesday session, then returned to rolling submissions on Wednesday morning. The notes from that Wednesday discussion appear below for ease of reference.]

MOTION: Adopt the rolling submissions format for the 2018 RFP funding cycle and authorize staff to develop the logistic details and coordinated roll-out procedures for approval by the Executive Committee.
Amendment 1: Change 2018 to 2019 and strike everything after "roll out procedures".
Action on 1: A roll call vote was taken and the amendment failed.
Main Motion Action: A roll call vote was taken on the main motion and the motion failed.

MOTION: Approve staff tasking of the logistical details and roll out procedures specific to rolling submissions for the 2019 RFP for approval by the Board.
Amendment 1: Change the language to "adopt rolling submissions for the 2019 RFP and authorize the staff to develop the logistical details and roll out procedures specific to rolling submissions for the 2019 RFP for approval by the Board."
Action on 1: Passed without objection.
Main Motion Action: Passed without objection.

The Board decided to hold a fall 2017 teleconference to review and approve the details for introducing rolling submissions prior to AMSS 2018.

Staff Tasking: Prepare background materials for the Board's fall 2017 teleconference meeting.

The Board tasked the Strategic Planning Working Group to present a category structure option for the 2019 and 2020 RFPs that considers the impact of rolling submissions.

Staff tasking: The Working Group Chair requested information from staff on how rolling submissions might affect category structure.

Core Program RFP Funding Categories and Funding Cycles

The Chair of the Strategic Planning Working Group identified three funding category options for Board discussion. He reminded the Board that the Science Plan External Review Committee (ERC) recommended that NPRB focus on problems of pressing concern and areas where NPRB has unique strengths (e.g., funding interdisciplinary science or IERPs), and sustain that focus from year to year so that funded projects build towards a greater understanding of the large questions facing Alaska's marine resources and the use thereof.

The SP Chair reported that the SP recommended Option 2 described in the action memo as follows.

- *Five Categories:* Oceanography & Productivity, Fishes & Invertebrates, Marine Birds & Mammals, Human Dimensions, and Interdisciplinary Studies.
- *Three New Approaches:* Cooperative Research with Industry (CRI), Technology Development (TD) and Data Rescue (DR) would be eligible for funding in all categories, joining Community Involvement which is already an approach.

The AP chair reported on the panel's motion to support the SP's recommendation, which includes a statement that it is critical to identify a mechanism for adding weight to CRI proposals during the review process, based on the existing review criteria. The industry members on the AP felt that applying CRI across all funding categories opens the door to more opportunities for those proposals.

A Board member questioned why the SP didn't recommend applying Interdisciplinary Studies as an approach rather than a separate funding category. The SP Chair explained that the intent of the category was to provide a category for research that doesn't fit well within one of the other categories because it crosses disciplines.

A Board member suggested that NPRB needs to research why NPRB is not effective in soliciting strong CRI proposals. NPRB could host a workshop at Fish Expo, attend the NOAA workshop on CRI planned around the time of Fish Expo, and a planned 2019 Wakefield Symposium session on the issue.

Staff Tasking: Prepare information for the Board about past proposals considered under the CRI category.

Staff summarized how shifting to a rolling submissions process might address the following points raised during the discussion of RFP category structure:

- Treating Cooperative Research with Industry as an approach would not put those proposals at a disadvantage because targets might not be advertised for any category.
- Categories would not rotate.
- Proposal quality would improve.
- If proposals in one cycle are not strong the Board can defer some funding for the next cycle.

Scenarios for Integrated Ecosystem Research Funding

Staff provided figures illustrating the historic allocation of funds between the Core Program and IERPs and scenarios for balancing funding among the programs in the future, for discussion the next day.

Wednesday, September 20, 2017

11. Strategic Planning, continued

[The Wednesday morning discussion of rolling submissions appears on pages 9-10 above.]

IERP topic workshops

Staff reported on the SP suggestion that NPRB host a no-cost session at AMSS to ask the scientific community to brainstorm ideas for IERP topics. It could be open to anyone and each presenter asked for a short presentation. This approach would also address NSF's stated interest in collaborating only on community driven projects and leave open the door for a possible future IERP partnership with NPRB. NPRB could select one or two topics from the AMSS workshop to be fleshed out at a later NPRB-funded A robust workshop report could inform the development of an IERP RFP and possibly serve as a pre-synthesis report. The SP Chair explained the challenge of generating IERP or Core Focus Section ideas during the panel's fully scheduled meetings. The AP Chair reported AP support for a session at AMSS and its motion recommending that the Board begin setting aside money right away to support a future IERP.

Staff explained the unique aspects of IERPs, including careful program management that ensures effective communication and integration of multi-disciplinary research throughout. NPRB staff coordinate monthly teleconferences for PIs, annual in-person PI meetings, and in-person logistics planning meetings prior to each field season. Issuing calls for this type of research separately from the

Core Program RFP sets expectations appropriately because these programs require greater commitment from PIs to accomplish integration across disciplines.

A Board member pointed out that soliciting ideas at AMSS will provide the perspective of the scientific community but not others, and that it is important to also have community input. The SP Chair suggested the Board consider providing funds for a selection of people from communities and industry to participate in AMSS and the workshop. The Board Chair suggested that AP members could serve that role, and the AP Chair concurred.

A Board member observed that, although ideas generated from a workshop may not look exactly like former IERPs, NPRB should parlay the brand to attract attention and be clear about expectations. Ideas should be also solicited outside of AMSS, e.g. online, and at the Alaska Forum on the Environment and similar events. Concerns were expressed over the Board potentially sending the message that it plans to fund an integrated research program and then not acting because adequate funds are not available.

A Board member noted that, if the proven advantageous seven-year spacing between the first field years of GOAIERP and the Arctic IERP is maintained for any future IERP, a new IERP first field year should occur around 2024.

The Executive Director (ED) requested Board guidance with respect to the following:

- Ideas on forums for soliciting IERP and Focus Section ideas.
- Which AMSS year the workshop should occur.
- The Board's position/timeline for setting aside money for a new IERP.

The ED recalled that the Panels supported setting aside money now for a future IERP of whatever scale. If a sufficiently compelling research topic does not materialize, the Board could reallocate money to the Core Program. A rolling submissions process for the Core Program would add flexibility to allow this.

A Board member suggested that next year NPRB could commit to saving for a new IERP, noting that a topic is needed to attract funding partners. Another Board member observed that NPRB should be able explore ideas without committing money immediately, noting that funds could begin to be set aside in 2019 and that NPRB should fund staff travel to various forums to gather ideas.

The ED summarized staff understanding of the preceding discussion: that Board consensus is not to dispense with IERPs but to consider how best to fund integrated studies going forward, perhaps in different forms. The board concurred with the following motion.

- MOTION:** State that the Board is interested in continuing to use its research programs to promote integration, collaboration, and leveraging of resources and tasks staff to provide the Strategic Planning Working Group with examples of how the Board can:
1. Solicit topic ideas for a future integrated science program at the AMSS and other forums (e.g. NPFMC, Alaska Forum on the Environment) beginning as early as AMSS 2018; and
 2. Determine funding cycles, thresholds and limits for allocating funds between the Core, Integrated and other research programs (e.g. LTM).
- Action:** Passed with no objection.

Long-Term Monitoring

MOTION: Continue funding Long-Term Monitoring at present funding levels.
Action: Passed with no objection.

12. Other Matters

a) AMSS update

Staff provided an update on planning for AMSS 2018, and the AMSS website. The NPRB Executive Director has begun reaching out to sponsors. The Board would like to consider capping NPRB's contribution and recommending an increase in registration fees.

b) Staff professional development/activities

The ED summarized staff professional development and activities for the Board.

c) Meeting schedule for 2018

The spring 2018 meeting will occur April 30-May 3 in Anchorage. The ED suggested that the Board hold its fall 2018 in Anchorage as well, to save on administrative costs. The Board agreed.

d) Other Attachment 12.2

The Executive Director summarized the outside meeting requests that have been approved for 2017 and presented two new requests from PICES for 2018.

MOTION: Support PICES' two requests for a total of \$15,000 in meeting support.
Action: Passed with no objection.

Staff Tasking: Ask PICES to support AMSS 2018.

Board members were reminded of working group and committee memberships. An email will go out following the Board meeting to solicit volunteers for some of the working groups. Staff suggested that the Arctic Communications and Outreach Working Group's primary goals have been met and proposed one last meeting to decide if it should be disbanded; the Board agreed.

The Executive Director expressed thanks to Board, SP & AP Chairs, and staff, and to Katrina Hoffman and Dan Hull as Cordova-based hosts. The Board shared appreciation for staff and thanked the SP and AP Chairs for their contributions.

MOTION: Adjourn
Action: Passed with no objection.

The meeting adjourned at 11:57 AM.