

Meeting Summary
NPRB Advisory Panel meeting
April 26-27, 2011
NPRB Conference Room Anchorage, Alaska

The Advisory Panel met on April 26-27, 2011, in Anchorage. In attendance were Helen Chythlook, Gary Freitag, Mike Miller, Jeff Stephan, Mark Gleason, Dan Falvey and Michael Macrander. Absent were AP members Vera Metcalf and Rex Snyder. The meeting was staffed by Katie Blake, Nora Deans, Carrie Eischens, Tom Van Pelt, and Francis Wiese. Tara Riemer Jones (Alaska SeaLife Center) joined the meeting for the first day. Cynthia Suchman (incoming Executive Director) was also present as a visitor throughout the meeting, and Board Chairman Ian Dutton was present during the first morning of the meeting.

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 am by NPRB Science Director Francis Wiese who introduced the Board Chairman, Ian Dutton and the new AP members Dan Falvey, Michael Macrander and Mark Gleason, as well as introducing NPRB's fiscal agent Tara Riemer Jones and incoming Executive Director Cynthia Suchman.

Staff noted that there are three AP seats (all Bering Sea seats) which are currently vacant, and proceeded to give a brief overview of the NPRB and the role of the AP to the new members. Dutton followed with a welcome from the Board and underlined the important role of the AP to bring stakeholder and community views to the process.

The first order of business was the election of a chair and vice chair for the Advisory Panel.

MOTION: Nominate Jeff Stephan as Chair

Maker: Mark Gleason

Second: Dan Falvey

Motion: passed

MOTION: Nominate Mike Miller as Vice-Chair

Maker: Helen Chythlook

Second: Gary Freitag

Motion: passed

Following the election, staff passed the gavel to new Chair Jeff Stephan. The AP noted that six members of the current AP will end their terms 3/31/2013. Two members will end their terms 3/31/2012, and four members will end their terms 3/31/2014. These terms dates reflect the policy to stagger terms to always keep old and new members on the Panel together.

The AP was given a safety briefing.

MOTION: Approve minutes from September 2010 meeting with no amendments

Maker: Mike Miller

Second: Dan Falvey

Motion: passed

MOTION: Approve minutes from January 2011 joint meeting with no amendments

Maker: Gary Freitag
Second: Mike Miller
Motion: passed

MOTION: Approve agenda
Maker: Mike Miller
Second: Dan Falvey
Motion: passed

2. Budget Report (for information only)

Alaska SeaLife Center (NPRB fiscal agent) Chief Operating Officer Tara Riemer Jones presented a thorough budget report, describing history of Grant 2 funds, current Grant 3 and 4 funds, and proposed Grant 5 funds. This was an information-only item.

3. Proposal Review for 2011 (for information only)

a. Overview of current research funded by NPRB.

Carrie Eischens provided a brief review on the status of previous and current projects funded through NPRB's annual RFP process. There was discussion about metadata and data transferred from the PIs of completed projects; staff highlighted the improved status of metadata and data, with new functionality on the NPRB project browser (<http://project.nprb.org/>).

b. Overview of 2011 Request for Proposals and proposals received.

Carrie Eischens noted that this year's RFP received a high response; incoming proposals totaled around seven times the \$3.55 million target funding level. Two proposals were withdrawn by the applicants. The action memo describes four further proposals which were rejected for non-compliance in formatting for various reasons. There were 11 proposals identified as non-responsive which went to a subcommittee of the Science Panel for review; that subcommittee concluded that eight of the 11 should not be carried forward, leaving 102 proposals that went through the peer review process. On April 4th the submitting scientist for proposal 35 withdrew their proposal, leaving 101 that went before the Science Panel. The standard review process that incoming proposals undergo, culminating in "Tier 1", "Tier 1 minus", "Tier 2", or "Tier 3" summary rankings by the Science Panel, was described.

After the Science Panel review of scientific merit, \$4.69 million in Tier 1 and Tier 1 minus proposals were forwarded to the Board.

Advisory Panel members requested that for the September meeting, staff provide a summary of the requested funding versus available and approved funding for all categories for previous RFPs. Staff agreed to provide this.

The Advisory Panel engaged in an extensive discussion at this point of the meeting, focusing on the role of the Advisory Panel in evaluating proposals. The discussion evolved to an emphasis on how the AP could provide an additional layer of "societal and stakeholder relevance" information to the Board, as an aid to their deliberations in making funding decisions among the pool of highly scientifically-meritorious proposals that the Board is faced with each year. The Advisory Panel agreed to sketch out a message to the Board to convey their discussion (see Addendum).

4. Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Program (for information only)

Tom Van Pelt gave a review of the history and current status of the Bering Sea Program, including the results of the March 2011 PI meeting held in Anchorage.

Staff also discussed the first special Bering Sea Project issue, currently in production and slated for publication in *Deep-Sea Research Part II* in late 2011 or early 2012, and presented plans for subsequent special issues. This first special issue will focus on early findings, mostly at the individual project or the meso-scale level, not the full synthesis that is eventually expected. The plan is to announce invitations for the second special issue around June which would put us at an annual tempo for special issues. Van Pelt is working on this as managing guest-editor together with SAB members serving as guest-editor team: Carin Ashjian, Mike Lomas, Roger Harvey, Mike Sigler, Phyllis Stabeno, and Jeff Napp.

In response to AP questions, staff provided further detail on the program management planning for synthesis. The AP suggested that program managers track public presentations (in addition to scientific publications).

The history and current status of Bering Sea Project modeling work was presented by Francis Wiese. The Advisory Panel asked about absence of management-limiting species such as crab, salmon or rockfish in the modeling work, and expressed desire to be informed about and invited to the stakeholder/Management Strategy Evaluation meeting to be held in the fall (schedule and location to be determined).

5. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program (for information only)

Francis Wiese provided a review of the history and a summary of the current Gulf of Alaska IERP, referring to items detailed under Tab 5 of the meeting binder. The AP asked questions about the fish species included in the study, and recommended consideration of pink and chum salmon as big predators of YOY fish. While acknowledging that the basic study design is completed, especially for the first field season already underway, staff noted that adjustments can be made mid-stream as necessary and that a comprehensive retrospective part of the program will try to address factors not specifically included in the field program.

Staff further reported on the outcomes of February's PI meeting in Seattle and April's Science Panel meeting. This was an information only item; no motions were brought forward.

6. Graduate Student Research Awards

a. Carrie Eischens gave an overview of the GSRA history and process, and then provided a review summary of the applications received and an explanation of the Science Panel's ratings system.

The AP discussed the SP process and briefly discussed inclusion of other applications for consideration (outside of the SP first level subset of 13).

MOTION: Accept SP process (and first subset of 13 proposals) and limit discussion to the 13, then proceed through Masters first and PhD second.

Maker: Mark

Second: Dan

Motion: passed

AP members had a detailed discussion on the criteria they should use when formulating their recommendations to the Board regarding the GSRA applications. The group concluded that they would examine the 13 top applications selected by the SP from the perspective of societal and stakeholder relevance when forming their recommendations. Based on these criteria, the AP selected applicant #414 and 431 from the Master's level applicants. These were the same two proposal put forward by the Science Panel from the Master's level. Ph.D. applications were much for varied and numerous. Individual AP members were asked to speak to the group on any individual application that they felt were most important from a societal and stakeholder perspective. Five applications were championed, however only three could be recommended to the Board for funding. To narrow down their recommendation, the AP voted on the five applicants by secret ballot. This vote resulted in applications #409, 428 and 424 being recommended to the Board for funding from the Ph.D. level applicants.

b. The motion was followed by discussion about the merits and faults of individual projects. Staff emphasized that the core purpose of the GSRA program is to foster up-and-coming young scientists, so review of the applications should focus on the student's qualifications in the first instance. The AP suggested that a tie breaking mechanism would be to grant awards based upon the Stakeholder relevance.

Staff asked if there was anything they could do to help the AP with their GSRA review process. After discussion, the AP noted that they would prefer if staff could provide all of the applications earlier. Staff answered that this would not be a problem, but that they could not expect to receive the SP rankings until the typical timing, which is about a week and a half before the AP meeting.

7. Arctic Strategy for NPRB

Francis Wiese provided a status update of the evolving Arctic Strategy and reviewed the results of the December 2010 meeting, referring to the materials included in the AP binders under Tab 7 and noting that the strategy's scope and timeline is still to be determined. It was also noted that the intent is to have a strategy drafted before the end of this calendar year.

8. Other Matters

a. Alaska Ocean Observing System status report

This item was presented in the form of a written report in the binders.

b. Education, outreach, and communication: status report

Nora Deans provided a review and status update of education, outreach, and communication, cutting across all elements of the NPRB programs and including 2009-2010 report review and comments. The Advisory Panel expressed their appreciation of and support for the NPRB communication, education and outreach efforts.

c. Photo contest

The AP judged the annual photo contest.

d. Outside funding requests for meetings, books, etc.

The AP did not address this item due to time constraints.

e. Plan next AP meeting

The AP supports holding their next meeting in conjunction with the Board meeting, contingent on Board decisions on date and location for the September Board meeting. Details will be fleshed out by staff and communicated back to the AP.

Following the Other Matters section, the AP followed up on earlier discussion about proposal review, and took up additional items not on the agenda.

The Advisory Panel had extensive discussion focusing on the potential for a constructive, supporting role in the NPRB proposal review process. This discussion culminated in a document (see Addendum) to be presented to the full Board in their subsequent meeting by AP Chair Jeff Stephan. The statement presented in that document is couched in full awareness of previous discussions on this topic (as detailed in the NPRB Foundational Report on pages 191-192), the AP terms of reference, and other NPRB procedural standards.

MOTION: Adopt the proposal review statement (presented here as Addendum) for presentation to the Board.

Maker: Gary

Second: Michael

Motion passes unanimously.

MOTION: The AP sends greetings and recognition of service to the outgoing AP members Gale Vick, Arni Thomson, Ron Hegge, Kim Williams, Shirley Kelly, and Frank Kelty.

Maker: Dan

Second: Mark

Motion passes unanimously.

Addendum to Advisory Panel Meeting Summary

April 26-27, 2011

Document presented to the Board on 27 April for inclusion in the Board subcommittee on Proposal Review working materials:

NPRB Advisory Panel Role In RFP Project Selection

In discussing the COV recommendations and the Board-appointed task force's response, the Advisory Panel noted the potential that future RFP's may be ranked for scientific merit by the Science Panel without attempting to fit the tier ranking into the budget. If the Board decides to adopt this type of approach, the Advisory Panel believes that it may be able to provide additional advice and information on proposals which have been deemed by the Science Panel to have high scientific merit and are responsive to the RFP (e.g., tier 1 proposals) which may assist the Board in making their final decisions.

As envisioned, the Advisory Panel Review would consider the stakeholder, community and other societal relevance of such proposals and provide their perspective to the Board in achieving a balance between base line and applied research needs. Advisory Panel members believe this type of input could serve the public interest, add value, and an important dimension to the process.

The Advisory Panel does not intend or wish to comment on the scientific merit of the proposals that result from SP Review Process, or to otherwise address the alignment of such proposals with category budgets.