



www.nprb.org

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 April 30-May 3, 2018 NPRB Conference Room Anchorage, Alaska

The North Pacific Research Board met from April 30 through May 3, 2018 in Anchorage, Alaska. In attendance were Dan Hull (chair), Tara Riemer (vice chair), CDR Patrick Barelli, Forrest Bowers, Bill Britt, Dorothy Childers, John Gauvin, Becca Gisclair, Katrina Hoffman, Jan Jacobs, Gerry Merrigan, Mike Miller, Bradley Moran, Cheryl Rosa as US Arctic Research Commission alternate for David Benton, Brad Smith, and Dee Williams. Doug Mecum joined the meeting May 1. Heather Mann was 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, Jo-Ann Mellish, Danielle Dickson, Brendan Smith, and Crystal Benson-Carlough.

Panel member attendees for parts of the board meeting were Tuula Hollmen (Science Panel vice chair), Chris Siddon (Science Panel chair), and Ruth Christiansen (Advisory Panel chair).

Also attending for some public sessions of the board meeting was Ernie Weiss, Natural Resources Director, Aleutians East Borough.

Monday, April 30, 2018

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda

Chairman Dan Hull called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m. and it was determined that a quorum was present. Staff provided a safety briefing.

MOTION: Elect Dan Hull chair and Tara Riemer vice-chair.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

MOTION: Approve agenda with amendment to address panel nominations on Tuesday afternoon and Board nominations for the fishing industry seat on Wednesday morning.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

MOTION: Approve the minutes of the fall 2017 NPRB meeting and the December 13, 2017 NPRB teleconference.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

Staff provided a summary of NPRB's travel reimbursement regulations.

The AP Chair provided a summary of the panel meeting. A board member asked if AP stars for Core Program proposals are determined by panel consensus. The AP Chair explained that individuals provide justification for awarding a star each proposal is then discussed by the full panel, and ultimately star designations are determined by consensus. Another board member asked about the AP comments on the GSRA Program and the AP Chair explained that the panel suggested some edits to the instructions to applicants in the Request for Proposals (RFP) to emphasize the importance of including a detailed engagement strategy.

The Executive Director provided an overview of the NPRB Conflict of Interest Policy, which board members received before the meeting to prepare their conflict declarations as they reviewed proposals. Board members signed and submitted their annual statements of receipt and review of the policy. It was agreed that the motion to accept declarations as submitted would be entered after the Board had reviewed all GSRA and Core program proposals, in case additional conflicts were identified during the meeting. That motion appears on page five below.

2. Budget Overview

The Executive Director (ED) discussed her March 2018 meeting with the Denver-based Office of Natural Resource Revenue (ONRR) of the Department of the Interior. ONRR manages the Environmental Improvement and Restoration Fund (EIRF), the interest on which generates funds from which NPRB grants are derived before being awarded through the Department of Commerce. By law, the EIRF may only be invested in interest-bearing obligations of the United States. ONRR invests the EIRF in ten-year treasury notes, on which the yield has increased significantly since the fall 2017 board meeting from roughly 2.1% to just over 3.0% in April 2018. The ED cautioned that NPRB will not see the effects of any sustained higher yield until several years hence. She presented conservative projections for NPRB grant income through 2025, based on a projected annual yield of 2.25%, drawing special attention to the limited funds available and the need to decide how to allocate funds between NPRB's research programs.

Based on information from ONRR and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)-Alaska Region, NPRB can expect to receive \$6,924,484 as year 2 of Grant 8 in October 2018. That amount is not expected to be subject to sequester, but the projections for future years assume a 6.9% sequester rate under the Budget Control Act of 2011. The ED illustrated ways in which the Board could use the projections to inform their Strategic Planning discussions under agenda item 10 later in the meeting.

The ED explained the staff recommendation to postpone from 2020 to 2021 the start of the Arctic Synthesis phase of the Arctic program, which is funded separately from the Arctic Integrated Ecosystem Research Program (Arctic IERP). The time required to prepare the 2019 cruise data for use in syntheses drives this recommendation. The Board decided to take up the question of timing and amount of

funding for the Arctic IERP Synthesis phase as an action item under the Strategic Planning discussion in agenda item 10.

3. Graduate Student Research Awards

Staff reported a total of 36 applications submitted for the 2018 GSRA program, 16 at the Master's level and 20 at the PhD level. The awards are for \$25,000 each. The Board heard Science Panel summaries of the eleven GSRA applications recommended by the panels, and a twelfth application identified by a board member. For student ability and research quality, the MS students discussed by the SP had achieved a minimum SP ranking of two very goods or one excellent or higher, and the PhD students one excellent or higher. One Master's student and four Ph.D. candidates received a flag from the Advisory Panel.

MOTION: Award applications 1755, 1742, 1743, 1748, 1753, and 1771.
Action: Motion passed with no objections.

The motion for the 2018 GSRA program results in granting one MS-level awards and five PhD-level awards, for a total of \$150,000.

Task for the 2019 GSRA process:

- Staff will provide metrics for the number of MS and PhDs funded over time.

Tuesday, May 1, 2018

4. 2018 Core Program

The Program Manager provided an overview of the 2018 Core program review cycle and a refresher on how the Board would discuss and vote on those proposals at the meeting. The 2018 RFP was released September 27, 2017, with a funding target of \$4.55 million. One hundred and fifty-two proposals were submitted by the deadline of December 15, 2017, requesting a total of \$42.4 million; almost ten times the available funds.

The Science Panel ranked three proposals as Exceptional. Thirty-one proposals were highlighted for stakeholder relevance by the Advisory Panel. The Prince William Sound Oil Spill Recovery Institute (OSRI) expressed interest in supporting three of the proposals, should the Board recommend them for funding. Science Panel members and Advisory Panel members provided a brief description and panel summaries of each of the Core Program proposals that had been ranked by the Science Panel as either Exceptional or Tier 1. Tier 2 titles were noted, and summaries read in full upon request. Proposals ranked as Tier 3 were not described or discussed. The Board discussed proposals of interest as each was presented.

MOTION: Accept all Tier E proposals.
Amendment: Remove 127.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Add all Tier 1 proposals.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposals 111 under Cooperative Research with Industry and proposal number 128 under Data Rescue.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposals 116, 118, and 122.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposals 4 and 12.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposal 7.
Action: Amendment withdrawn.

Amendment: Remove proposals 89 and 80.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposal 77.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposal 98.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposal 71.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposal 79.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposals 67, 90, and 91.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposals 78, 83, 96.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposal 105 and replace it with proposal 104.
Action: Amendment withdrawn.

Amendment: Remove proposal 105.
Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Add proposal 102.

Action: Amendment failed.

Amendment: Remove proposals 133 and 148.

Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposal 150.

Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposal 144.

Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposal 137.

Action: Amendment passed, noting two objections.

Amendment: Remove proposal 43.

Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Remove proposals 17, 42, and 46.

Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Add proposal 40 (Tier 2 proposal).

Action: Roll call vote was taken, the amendment failed.

Amendment: Consider the proposals in the Cooperative Research Category and add proposal 111 instead of 40.

Action: Roll call vote was taken, the amendment failed.

Amendment: Add proposal 91.

Action: Amendment passed with no objections.

Amendment: Add proposal 90 instead of 91.

Action: Amendment withdrawn.

MOTION: Approve the Core Program proposal package.

Action: Motion passed, as amended, with no objections.

MOTION: Accept the declarations of conflict of interest.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

Combined, the Board selected 21 projects to recommend for funding totaling \$4,604,330, including \$109,820 through the Oil Spill Recover Institute. Two Tier E (Exceptional) and 19 Tier 1 proposals were funded. The net effect was a recommendation to the Department of Commerce to approve funding of \$4,604,330 million to be distributed among 21 specific projects in NPRB's 2018 Core Program.

Tasks for the 2019 Core RFP process:

- Staff will add a field requiring submissions to specify:
 - under the Interdisciplinary Research category why PI's consider their proposal to be interdisciplinary; and
 - under any of the "approaches" how the proposal addresses the approach chosen.
- The Science Panel will consider the pros and cons of double-blind reviews.
- Staff, the Science Panel, and interested board members will refine the language of the interdisciplinary research category.

5. Panel and Board Nominations

In closed session, the Board unanimously approved appointments to the science and advisory panels.

- **Science Panel.** Reappoint Milo Adkison, Courtney Carothers, Lloyd Lowry, Phil Mundy, and Suzann Speckman to a second four-year term on the NPRB Science Panel, expiring in May 2022. Appoint Josep Planas to a four-year term on the Science Panel, with consideration for renewal in May 2022.
- **Advisory Panel.** Appoint Verner Stor Wilson to serve the remainder of his current three-year term on the Advisory Panel representing the Arctic region, with consideration for renewal in May 2020; and appoint Dave Gaudet to represent the Gulf of Alaska region and Caitlin Yeager and Ernie Weiss to represent the Bering Sea region, all for three-year terms, with consideration for renewal in May 2021.

Wednesday, May 3, 2017

5. Panel and Board Nominations (continued)

In closed session, the full Board considered a number of candidates for nomination to the fishing industry seat on the Board. Until 2015 this nomination had been provided by the Executive Committee without consultation with the remainder of the Board. At this meeting as in 2015, the Executive Committee sought the input of the remainder of the Board and both groups agreed on the choice of nominee. The Executive Committee will forward the nomination of Matthew Robinson for appointment by the Secretary of Commerce to serve as the 20th board member in the special fishing industry seat and member of the Executive Committee, for a non-renewable three-year term beginning July 21, 2018.

6. Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

The Senior Program Manager provided an update on the Gulf of Alaska Integrated Ecosystem Research Program (GOAIERP), noting that the synthesis is scheduled to conclude July 31, 2018. Staff provided a list of publications currently in progress. Staff also provided a report summarizing the outcomes of a workshop held in conjunction with the 2018 American Geophysical Union Ocean Sciences conference in which the scientific community recommended avenues for future research in the Gulf of Alaska and identified additional ways that data collected by the GOAIERP could be leveraged. Staff explained that

during the workshop participants discussed the results of recent research and identified anomalous events at various trophic levels that were likely affected by anomalously warm water conditions in the region that the research community has termed “the blob”. A board member asked if one of the Core proposals submitted in response to the 2018 Core RFP was a direct outgrowth of the GOA IERP, and the Program Manager confirmed that it was. Another board member noted the importance of funding IERPs going forward.

7. Arctic Integrated Ecosystem Research Program

The Senior Program Manager provided an update on the Arctic IERP, noting that 2017 cruise reports are available on the Preliminary Results page of the Arctic IERP website. She also reported on the very successful 2018 Principal Investigator meeting that occurred in Anchorage in March 2018. Representatives of several Arctic communities actively participated throughout the meeting. All participants discussed anomalous conditions that were observed in 2017 and their predictions of the potential for even more extreme anomalies in 2018 given the sea ice conditions during the winter of 2017-18. The Science Director shared information on NPRB collaborations in Northern Bering Sea and Chukchi Sea, including data sharing and involvement of Russian scientists, some of whom participated in the 2017 IERP cruises. One example of coordination with Canadian scientists involved complementary preliminary findings on the fate and location of age-zero and adult Arctic Cod.

The Senior Program Manager provided budget detail for the Arctic IERP, discussing partner contributions, uses of the contingency funds to date, and demonstrating how NPRB was able to leverage its own contribution of \$7 M to attract partner funds and in-kind contributions totaling over \$18.6 million.

In response to a board member’s question about the value of studying a system in flux, the Senior Program Manager detailed how the Arctic IERP is providing critical data at exactly the time it is needed while also building on existing work (e.g., PacMARS synthesis, Distributed Biological Observatory, Bering Strait moorings timeseries, Chukchi Sea Environmental Studies Program, Arctic Marine Biodiversity Observing Network, Arctic EIS phase 1 that sampled in 2012-13) and coordinating with other agency and university researchers, e.g., NOAA surveys in the Northern Bering Sea and other projects listed in Appendix A of the Arctic IERP RFP. Even if the years studied by the Arctic IERP cruises prove to be anomalous, the information will be valuable in examining how environmental processes are affected by anomalously warm conditions.

8. Science Plan Revision

The Science Director provided an overview of the Science Plan draft content and layout with special thanks to the External Review Committee (ERC), Science Plan Working Group, Science Panel input, Advisory Panel input, and staff support. The Science Plan serves as a general source of guidance for research funding decisions. The Science Panel chair commented on the SP’s review and consensus that it is a good working document that can be changed if needed online as a kind of living document. The Advisory Panel chair commented on the favorable AP review, noting the document is top notch and would appeal to a broad audience.

MOTION: The Board approves promulgation of the revised Science Plan on the website by August 15, 2018.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

9. Long-Term Monitoring

The Senior Program Manager explained that the three LTM projects that the Board funded in 2014 will be due for renewal in 2019 and asked the Board to review interim reports provided by the Principal Investigators (PIs) and decide if funding for these projects will be renewed. The Board provided \$400,000 year and a total of \$2 million for the first five years of the LTM Program, and was also asked to confirm its intent to maintain that level of funding for the next five-year cycle. Staff played brief recorded presentations prepared by each of the three lead PI's (Sonia Batten, North Pacific Continuous Plankton Recorder Survey; Seth Danielson, Chukchi Ecosystem Observatory; and Russ Hopcroft, Seward Line). The Board appreciated the format of the presentations and emphasized the importance of the projects. One board member noted that the National Science Foundation designation of the Seward Line as a Long-Term Ecological Research Site represents a significant honor and will raise the visibility of NPRB. The Science Panel and Advisory Panel representatives summarized their respective positions in support of renewing funding for the three LTM projects currently funded by the Board.

MOTION: The Board will commit to \$2 M over five years for the three existing LTM projects.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

Task:

- Board to receive periodic updates over the next five years.

10. Strategic Planning/Rolling Submissions

The Executive Director thanked the Strategic Planning Working Group for its numerous meetings since Fall 2016 focused on how best to respond to the declining grant funding projected for NPRB through 2025. The working group addressed multiple fiscal options and scenarios.

The Strategic Planning discussion was spread over two days and structured to allow full discussion before voting on how to allocate funds between the Integrated Research Programs (IRP), the Core Program and the Arctic Synthesis for the next few years. IRPs were distinguished from IERPs to allow scaled down and non-geographically focused studies while emphasizing integrated research.

Funding Allocations

The session opened with a clear understanding that current funding levels required a decision on how to allocate the lower anticipated grant levels of \$4M/year between programs (down from \$4.5 M/year), and with the assumption that the next IRP would launch no earlier than 2023. The Strategic Planning Working Group consensus reported from its April 2018 meeting recommended two funding scenarios

that set aside \$1M for IRPs starting in Fall 2018, allowing a \$3M Core program in 2019-2024, and the chance to revisit the allocation in 2024. The Chair of the Strategic Planning working group reiterated that IRP set asides could be redirected to the Core if no satisfactory IRP topic were identified in time for a 2023 launch.

Board members expressed a general sense that a \$3M Core program would be too small, especially if rolling submissions were adopted, but did not detail why the amount was insufficient. The Science Panel chair said that researchers depend on a reasonably-sized annual opportunity, noting that fewer Core proposals were anticipated with rolling submissions. Linkages between the Core and IERP programs were briefly mentioned, the ED noting that some 25% of Core proposals incorporate past IERP results.

NPRB has funded IERPs since 2006 and the Annual/Core program since 2002 – it was renamed “Core” in 2017 to notify the community that it may not be available every year going forward. In response to questions, the ED and Science Director detailed the how IERPs and interdisciplinary Core research differ, the latter being intended to capture research that does not logically fit in other Core categories. Several board members noted that IERPs are a hallmark of NPRB, provide a “big bang for the buck,” and what sets NPRB apart from other funders. The SP working group chair heard “loud and clear” that the Board does not want to preclude another IERP. Voting on funding allocations took place the next day.

Research Categories and Approaches

The Science and Advisory panel chairs reiterated their panels’ full support for treating cooperative research with industry (CRI), technology development (TD), data rescue (DR), and community involvement (CI) as approaches rather than categories. A board member suggested applying CRI as an approach if no pressing need is seen but leaving room to apply it as a category in future years. Another board member expressed concern that, as an approach, small discrete TD proposals would dwindle and be replaced by larger proposals, making them harder to fund.

MOTION: Treat cooperative research with industry as an approach in 2019 and include guidelines on criteria for the approach.

Amendment: Also treat technology development and data rescue, and continue community involvement, as approaches in 2019 RFP and require PIs to state why their proposal meets the relevant criteria.

Action: Amendment passed, with one objection.

Action: Main motion passed, as amended, with no objections.

Task:

- The Board asked to revisit at the end of the meeting how the community involvement approach is described and applied, given the sizable number of 2018 proposals claiming that status, the inadequacy of many descriptions of that approach, and the relatively small number flagged by the AP and/or funded by the Board. That discussion appears on page 13 below.

***Photo Contest results were presented to the Board before adjourning for the day.**

Thursday, May 3, 2018

10. Strategic Planning/Rolling Submissions (continued)

Rolling Submissions

The ED recapped the Board's and SP Working Group's discussions of rolling submissions since Fall 2017, the January 2018 special session at the Alaska Marine Science Symposium (AMSS), and the feedback from that session. For all groups – panels, the Board, the science community and staff – questions fell into three general bins:

- 1) how funds would be allocated between the spring and fall review events;
- 2) how and when proposers would be notified of their status; and
- 3) how rolling submissions would be evaluated.

The ED reiterated the SP Working Group's emphasis on continuing transparency.

The Board agreed to proceed stepwise by first considering these three areas, plus additional rolling submissions logistics, before voting on how to implement rolling submissions. It also anticipated needing to vote on funding allocations between the Core, IERP and other programs before finalizing its decisions on rolling submissions. This process allowed the Board to formulate possible language for motions at each phase of the discussion, but to make the formal motions below only after full discussion of all relevant issues.

- *Funding allocations between NPRB programs*

MOTION: The Board will budget to ensure that a minimum of \$1M will be available for the Arctic IERP Synthesis to begin in 2022 and to fund the Core Program at \$4 M annually. The Board will not hold an AMSS IRP session until a credible expectation exists of sufficient funds to mobilize for a future IRP (no earlier than 2020). Any remaining funds will be targeted for a future IERP or IRP.

Amendment: Replace “a future IERP or IRP” with “future IERP or IRP activities”.

Action: Amendment withdrawn.

Amendment: Remove the last sentence “Any remaining funds will be targeted for a future IERP or IRP.”

Action: Amendment passed with no objection.

Action: Main motion passed, as amended, with no objection.

- *Rolling Submissions for the Core Program*

- *Review cycle funding allocation (between spring and fall Core proposal review events)*

MOTION: The Board adopts the “Funding Allocation” recommendations¹ in the Rolling Submissions memorandum (Agenda Item 10.c, page 3) and intends that available funds will be approximately split between the two Core program review events each year.

Amendment: Replace the language after the parentheses with “and intends to distribute the funds over the full year in the published RFP, with the internal intent for roughly 40-60% spending at each meeting.”

Amendment to the Amendment: Revert to the general statement that the Board intends to distribute the funds over the full year in the published RFP.

Action: Amendment to the amendment passed with no objections.

Action: Amendment passed, as amended, with no objections.

Action: Main motion passed, as amended, with no objections.

- *Proposal Status Notification*

MOTION: The Board adopts the “Proposal status” recommendations² in the Rolling Submissions memo (Agenda Item 10.c, page 3), with the modification that the Tier 3 proposals would be removed and Pl’s notified after the Board meeting, as in current practice. The Board directs staff to develop a notification process for all proposals that is fair, transparent and efficient.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

- *Metrics*

MOTION: The Board adopts the “Metrics” recommendations³ in the Rolling Submissions memo (Agenda Item 10.c, page 3), and directs staff to provide additional metrics on staff, panel and Board efforts and proposal dwell time, and to assist the Board in re-evaluating implementation after three Board meetings applying rolling submissions review.

¹ Core RFP Funding Allocation recommendations: “Funding amounts published in the RFP would apply to the full annual cycle, but the Board would allocate funds between the two review events in an internal process; and Per proposal funding caps would be published as needed.”

² Core RFP Proposal Status recommendations: “Recommend submitting proposals 12 months prior to the anticipated start date, and No proposal would be held for more than two Board meetings.”

³ Core RFP Metrics recommendations: “Provide funding by category at each meeting, Track number of high and low Tier proposals received over time and Compare funding success rates over time.”

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

➤ *Additional logistics*

MOTION: Direct staff to develop the draft 2019 Core RFP using the additional logistics in Attachment 10.10 to the Rolling Submissions memo (Agenda Item 10.c) for Board review at the fall 2019 meeting.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

➤ *Other rolling submissions motions*

MOTION: The Board does not wish to fund different sets of categories in the spring and fall 2019 Core review cycles.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

MOTION: The Board adopts rolling submissions for the Core Program starting with the 2019 RFP in keeping with the procedural intent referenced in the preceding motions.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

11. Communication and Outreach

The Communications and Outreach Director presented details on the new Outreach RFP for 2018 and requested Board input on the draft RFP. Only proposals funded through the 2018 Core RFP process at this spring 2018 board meeting will be invited to apply for the Outreach RFP. Up to \$20,000 will be awarded to each successful applicant with an overall program cap of \$130,000. For the fall 2018 meeting the Board will see the same review portal used for the Core Program to capture flags from the Communications and Outreach Director, SP, and AP. Staff clarified that results will be provided via an online Excel spreadsheet instead of the portal.

The SP Chair explained that SP members saw value in reviewing the Outreach proposals to educate themselves about useful approaches to outreach. Some SP members also have valuable experience in conducting outreach in Alaska and could provide useful perspective on the proposed approaches to outreach. A board member suggested the RFP clarify that NPRB does not necessarily expect each proposal to meet all seven review criteria.

MOTION: To approve the 2018 Communications and Outreach RFP.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

12. Partnerships in the Core Program

The Science Director referred board members to the memo on this topic, which was for information only and did not require any Board decision or discussion.

13. Other Matters

The Executive Director presented information on outside meeting support requests; AMSS; the legal work currently underway to clarify NPRB governance documents; and staff development including the Executive Committee's strong endorsement of Danielle Dickson's work on eco-forecasting, and Brendan Smith's participation in the Summer 2018 Arctic IERP cruise aboard the *R/V Sikuliaq*.

MOTION: The Board supports funding the Marine Mammals of the Holarctic conference at the \$7,500 level.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

The Board identified the following dates for its upcoming meetings:

- 2018 Fall Meeting - Week of September 17, 2018. Location Anchorage or Seward.
- 2019 Spring and Fall Meetings - April 29 – May 3, 2019 and September 16-20, 2019. Anchorage or Seward.

The Board revisited the its Core Program discussion and suggested refinement of the definitions of some categories and approaches, and their criteria. The AP Chair asked the Board to clarify whether the AP should review proposals differently when applying approaches for 2019. A board member welcomed AP evaluation of proposals' community involvement details. Another member volunteered to provide guidance to staff on addressing cooperative research with industry, noting that other Board members should comment prior to the AP meeting because the AP will need to review those criteria prior to the next Board meeting. It was agreed that the Executive Committee could finalize input on definitions and criteria for all approaches if need be. The resulting tasks appear below.

Tasks for Board, Panels and Staff regarding definitions of categories and approaches:

- Board members are invited to provide recommended language to staff to incorporate as the draft RFP is developed prior to the fall meeting.
- Staff will draft options for evaluating proposals that claim to apply approaches, in time for the fall AP meeting.
- The SP Chair and panel will also think carefully about how to ensure that proposals are reviewed in-light of the approaches they claim to apply.
- **Staff will circulate the existing review criteria for approaches in a timely manner this month.**

The Board agreed to defer to the Executive Committee to solicit nominations and select an individual to fill the AP seat vacated by Matt Robinson. A board member expressed the importance of AP members maintaining a strong community connection, which should at least be given equal weight to their science background. The Chair reminded the Board of existing criteria for selecting AP members.

Task for the Executive Committee:

- Solicit nominations and select replacement for vacated AP seat.

In discussing the following motion board members noted that IERPs are a critical component of NPRB's legacy and are what make NPRB unique; that Core Program proposals are now being funded that draw on the results of our IERPs, and that the Board intends to make an IERP/IRP possible as soon as funds become available.

MOTION: The Board affirms the value of the Integrated Ecosystem Research Programs and its intent to fund future IERP/IRPs when funds become available.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.

MOTION: Move to adjourn 2:06 p.m.

Action: Motion passed with no objections.