

**NPRB Advisory Panel Meeting summary
Anchorage, 11-12 September 2006**

The Advisory Panel meeting was held on 11-12 September 2006 at the NPRB in Anchorage. Present were Patricia Cochran, Shirley Kelly, Frank Kelty, Arni Thomson and Gale Vick. The meeting was staffed by Clarence Pautzke, Francis Wiese, Carl Schoch and Nora Deans.

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

Clarence Pautzke gave a safety briefing and updated Panel members about the new staff situation – Nora Deans as new Outreach Coordinator, Carolyn Rosner, Assistant Program Manager, Carl Schoch on staff ½ time to help plan the GOA IERP

a. Approve agenda

‘AP member attendance’ was added to the Agenda under Other Matters. The rest of the Agenda was approved.

2. Budget Review

a. Status of EIRF funds and appropriations (with new MMS estimates)

The Executive Director presented a budget summary and indicated that \$2M for appropriations remains undecided. The AP asked whether there were plans to get additional funds to help supplement a now lower non-IERP budget. The ED indicated that we are looking for collaborations with OSRI, AOOS and NSF, explained further in the appropriate sections below.

3. 2007 Request for Proposals

a. Science plan research themes and other bases for research priorities

Staff presented an overview of the RFP evolution since 2002 and explained the basis for the current proposed research priorities.

b. Overview of other agencies/entities doing research in Bering Sea

A document was provided which summarizes different programs planned by members of the Bering Sea Inter-Agency working Group. It was highlighted that even though many of these plans fit well with NPRB objectives, funding for these programs has a high degree of uncertainty. As a result, NPRB has developed their BSIERP as a self-supporting vertically integrated program. We are however working on a possible collaboration with NSF (see below).

c. Potential NPRB-NSF Partnership

Last year’s call for proposals for BEST lead to only four funded projects: three in the area of chemical oceanography and one in the human component. They did not put together an ecosystem program as intended in the BEST Implementation Plan. As a result, a new announcement for \$10M + \$2M (ship time) plus \$.5-1M per year for HBEST is planned for 15 December, with potential language for coordination with NPRB.

The AP was given a synopsis of Science Panel recommendations on a potential NSF-NPRB partnership plus an update from a recent teleconference with NSF staff.

The AP supported this initiative indicating that for too long, different organizations have funded projects independently from each other. Staff pointed out that the long-term plan is to seek opportunities with other organization such as the AFSC, to link with the NSF-NPRB core partnership if it gets off the ground. The AP cautioned that all concerns raised by the Science Panel must be addressed and that principles and credibility of NPRB must be maintained. Main issues to be worked out are joint decisions, a joint science panel, and an agreement that needs to have safe guards if a program is not delivering. There was concern that NSF bureaucracy might become an issue. The AP also asked whether this would also include collaboration with HBEST. This latter portion has not been explicitly explored with NSF. AP also is concerned about data transfer from NSF. NPRB is asking for data transfer within 2 years of each field season. NSF would have to ask for something similar so that it may inform future modules.

The AP recommended also that NPRB should explore the option of getting a seat on the OPP Advisory Board and make a presentation at their next meeting.

Motion to proceed with caution in a potential partnership with NSF. PASSED unanimously.

d. 2007 RFP Part 1 - Bering Sea and Aleutians Integrated Research Program

i. Overview of BSIERP and implementation plan

Francis Wiese gave an overview of the BSIERP RFP and Implementation Plan.

ii. Science Panel recommendations

AP reviewed SP comments on NSF collaboration as well as the new information provided based on a follow up phone call between NPRB staff and NSF.

iii. Develop AP recommendations

AP discussed concerns that a partnership with NSF would limit the area covered by NPRB and that climate change would be primarily focus on loss of sea ice – NPRB needs to consider these issues. AP also suggested coordination with ACIA (Arctic Climate Impact Assessment). AP discussed concerns with data management and how NSF and NPRB should coordinate – need for a data management plan.

LTK: Motion to make LTK mandatory as part of BSIERP with 5-10% funds allocated to it. Refer to scope of LTK as defined in Science Plan. PASSED unanimously.

Motion to include LTK language in pre-proposal requirements. PASSED unanimously.

Education and Outreach: The AP supports a minimum of \$60K for E&O, and AP should be part of planning the E&O program of the IERP.

Approach: The AP supports the concept of multi-institutional teams.

Motion to request inclusion of MOU between institutions working together as part of the Full proposal submission. PASSED unanimously. MOU should include identification of types of data and data flow and transfer as part of agreement.

Reference Material: AP suggested including Arctic Climate Impact Assessment in the reference material for the BSIERP.

e. 2007 RFP Part 2 – Non-BSIERP RFP

Staff provided an overview of the Non-IERP RFP as put forward by the Science Panel.

Contaminants:

- AP does not support funding a contaminants panel for \$20K at the 2007 marine science symposium this coming January.
- Funds would be better invested to write a current assessment based on past efforts (e.g. Alaska Contaminants Program, AMAP, Science Plan, etc.) to focus a NPRB contaminant research program. Direct fund at a suggested level of \$20-35K. A team of experts would be expected to report back in spring 2007 for possible inclusion of contaminants priorities in the 2008 RFP.
- Re-insert a general contaminants section into RFP for \$100K.

i. Collaborations with AOOS and OSRI

Molly McCammon gave an update on AOOS activities and explained how this collaboration fits in with the regional and national plan

- ii. Cooperative research priorities for fishing industry and oil and gas industry
- iii. Community involvement
- iv. Graduate fellowship program

GFP: The AP was supportive of the program for inclusion into this year's RFP. A possible restriction to only AK students was discussed. It was decided to leave the competition open for any student working on science in Alaska, and thus put the emphasis of rewarding the best student.

f. Science Panel recommendations

AP reviewed in detail the SP recommendations, especially those relating to the BSIERP and RFP.

g. Develop AP recommendations

PI evaluation: AP recommends using whether or not PIs have handed in their data to NPRB for past projects (if ended > 2 years ago) as a criterion for PI evaluation.

Synthesis projects: Staff explained what was originally intended with synthesis projects. The AP agreed with the SP that staff should work up the topics of interest, but pointed out that any synthesis effort should also include E&O. It continues to be critical for NPRB to let people know how the Board is contributing to the incremental increase in knowledge of the ecosystem.

Fish and Inverts:

Motion to keep current categories, and add back in a crab component from last year:

Life history, ecology and fluctuations in BSAI crab stocks: King, Tanner and snow crab are a major resource in the Bering Sea and Aleutians and yet there is much uncertainty about their current stock assessments. The NPRB is seeking proposals to develop and improve current stock assessment methodologies, and understanding of life history, ecology, and fluctuations in crab stocks. Individual

proposals should not exceed \$250,000.

Increase total amount to \$1M. Add language that any proposals in this category has a \$250K cap.
Motion PASSED unanimously.

4. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

Carl Schoch gave an overview of the current status of development of the GOAIERP

AP was supportive of the approach the GOAIERP Science Team has taken. It was indicated that an interesting issue is that whales and seals are increasing but that SSL are not. Also, it was pointed out that GOA waters have had many human impacts, and the AP felt the human element is not currently well or explicitly defined.

MOTION to explicitly include into the GOAIERP socio-economic adaptations of coastal communities to ecosystem responses as a result of changes in the environment. Also, LTK should be made an integral component of such a program. Motion PASSED unanimously.

5. Education and Outreach

Nora Deans gave an overview of current and planned E&O activities.

AP was very supportive of the planned efforts, especially the research summaries, which could be distributed electronically and sent out to organization members, school districts, etc. A recommendation was made that it would be attractive to include some individual quotes linking the topic to communities (e.g. picture of an elder with a quote on the given subject).

AP commented that ANSC is working with several partners (UAF, WGBH/Boston, KUAC, ASDN) to develop an on-line Arctic teacher program focusing on Arctic issues (e.g. climate change) The AP recommended that the NPRB should talk to UAF about their work and partnership with teachers (cooperative extensions). Paula Cullenberg has already been contacted.

AP also suggested doing something during the AFN Annual Convention in Anchorage (October 26-28), as well as at AK Native Heritage Center. Another E&O option to explore would be doing something similar to the ARCUS lecture series and their meeting of the PIs with K-12.

The AP also recommended that staff should consider giving presentations in National and International Symposia on the NPRB programs (e.g. D.C. Managing Our Oceans meetings) to increase visibility.

6. Community Involvement

The Executive Director gave a status report on community workshops, indicating that NPRB needs to be clear of its objectives to get a product. Timing is currently planned for the fall of 2006, but the question was raised whether we should wait until we know what IERP invited proposals are (about Feb 2007). The ED further indicated that the issues pointed out in the provided document need to be dealt with in detail perhaps with help of a contractor or team.

The AP indicated that holding successful workshops is difficult. The ANSC gives elders honoraria (\$25-50/day), provide food, give door prizes, etc. and the crucial thing is that people need to know who you are for them to show up. Just relying on one contact in a community, especially if these people are already very busy with their own activities, is not a successful strategy.

The ED indicated that the meetings need to be focused, but recognized that it may take a lot of leg work to set everything up. At the very least a pre-meeting may be needed.

In terms of timing, the AP indicated that the best timing in general to hold these meetings is Nov/early Dec, as well as mid Jan-April. It was pointed out that staff should consider taking Hooper Bay off the list given the recent devastation from the fire in the village.

MOTION to recommend hiring a knowledgeable contractor to help set up these workshops to help ensure success. Past experience has shown that a meeting of 1-2 days would cost about \$10-20K. Motion PASSED unanimously.

7. Other Matters

- a. January 21-24, 2007 Marine Science Symposium – mark your calendars!

AP was invited to attend the meeting using NPRB funds.

- b. Future meeting schedule

Spring meeting was scheduled for 23-24 April, the same week as the Board meeting.

- c. Attendance

The question was raised whether there is a protocol to deal with attendance. The ED indicated that the Board may consider attendance during the reappointment process but may not be inclined to take people off the Panel before their term is up. Present members of the AP suggested that the AP chair write a letter to the whole AP stressing the importance of attendance, pointing out meetings are only twice a year.

Also the AP requested from Staff that they produce an attendance record for the next meeting.