

BEST-BSIERP Science Advisory Board teleconference

Agenda and Meeting Notes

Tuesday, 26 May 2009, 1000-1200 Alaska time

In attendance:

Carin Ashjian, Rodger Harvey, Mike Lomas, Jeff Napp, Clarence Pautzke, Mike Sigler, Phyllis Stabeno, Tom Van Pelt, Francis Wiese, Bill Wiseman.

Agenda:

1. AGU meeting, approve draft session description (Rodger):
2. PI meeting:
 - * balance of presentations and integration (50:50?)
 - * identify PIs who need to coordinate with other PIs in other projects- consider making time at PI meeting to coordinate datasets
 - * Also consider Henry's point re. discussing LTK interview "data" with BEST-BSIERP collaborators outside the LTK project.
 - * And Mike Lomas' point re. work groups (could continue formal and ad hoc groups from 2008 PI meeting)
 - * discuss media presence at PI meeting-- Sigler thinking that media OK during presentations but not breakout group and side mtgs
3. Data policy addition to website (circulated by Tom)
4. For website: call for informative, newsy items re. NOAA work and other non-Healy/Knorr work within BEST-BSIERP project. Need logbooks, field updates, photos, etc.- alternatives to routine trip reports... NPRB staff ready to help distill or otherwise package material for web.
5. Cruise planning
6. 2011 ESSAS Open Science Meeting: What is the amount of interest in BEST and BSIERP PIs to have a day or day and a half. The meeting is tentatively planned for June 2011 and the venue is likely Hawaii.
 1. Discussion about AGU Ocean Science special session proposal; need for the proposal to be broad enough for acceptance and to bring in useful parallel or related work, while at the same time narrow enough to ensure that our program has good representation. Agreement to broaden the title and text to emphasize ice cover and to generalize out to polar seas. Rodger circulated a fifth version incorporating changes suggested by SAB prior to and during the meeting (here as Appendix 1).

2. Considering best approaches to balance adequate detail at the individual project 'grain size' while at the same time driving process of active integration... need to both support the existing, organic collaborations as well as motivate new collaborations.

Agreement to rely on poster presentations for project detail; will encourage all projects to prepare posters (even if they don't plan to attend the meeting).). Allow posters to remain up for entire meeting.

Moving up in the 'integration pyramid', we considered asking for 10-20 presentations that provide synthesis. Presenters would be charged with giving not only results (don't lose "nuggets") but also telling us their perspective on horizontal and vertical integration -- "how do those results fit into the big picture?"

Modelers will present model predictions that observationalists will review in small groups (e.g., NPZ modeler working with chemical oceanographers and plankton biologists).

We'll also accommodate 'work groups' that will have a more mechanistic role.

Need to build in plenty of free time, for informal discussion, reference to posters, etc.

Need to accommodate side meetings (retrospective, fish, cruise planning, etc.) without swamping the free time.

Action items:

- a. as a primary tool to help structure the groupings, Tom will develop a survey to ask PIs with whom they want to meet and/or on what topic they want information to provide opportunities for data exchange
- b. Mike and Rodger will draft a straw man plan for the PI meeting based on this initial discussion and building on experience of last year's PI meeting.

3. Based on circulated document, the SAB agreed to the data policy statement for display on the BEST-BSIERP data portal website. See Appendix 2 for statement.

Note for next meeting's agenda: Carin raised the issue of keeping the BEST-BSIERP data portal current and practical as primary resource. Is the data portal getting bypassed or outdated, with collaborators sharing datasets that are not available on the web portal?

4. Reinforced call for colorful stories from BEST-BSIERP projects other than the Healy cruises, which have been well-covered. For example, news items detailing an unexpected finding while at sea, or a report from the field that tells how and why work gets done (even if it's not a 'news' item). NPRB staff ready and eager to help. Jeff and Phyllis agreed to help encourage NOAA folks.

And note that this applies to all dimensions of the project, not only NOAA cruises—we want reports from the field, whether the “field” is a lab, a seabird colony, a model output, or a ship’s working deck...

5. Rodger brought up the issue of chief scientist responsibilities and expectations in context of broad needs for overall program. Deferred discussion to SAB discussion at PI meeting.
6. Agreement that ESSAS is a valuable opportunity to interact with international colleagues, and the timing of 2011 meeting is good with respect to BEST-BSIERP synthesis and model development. Mike will respond to George that BEST-BSIERP would like half a day and up to a full day depending on interest at the ESSAS Open Science meeting in 2011, and that we also suggest scheduling a work session providing for discussion with other subarctic system scientists to compare notes.

NEXT MEETING scheduled for 30 June, 1000-1200 Alaska time.

Appendix 1:

Draft Session Proposal for Ocean Sciences 2010

Interdisciplinary theme

Climate Change Impacts On the Bering Sea and Related Polar Seas: From Observation to Prediction

The Bering Sea and related polar oceans have experienced recent changes in climate, ice cover, ocean dynamics, biotic community structure and ecosystem function. Several large programs have been initiated to provide the fundamental observations and information needed for vertically-integrated syntheses of climate-mediated oceanographic drivers and trophic interactions in polar marginal seas. Collaborating modelers are using these observational data to model and predict the impacts of changing seasonal ice cover on ecosystem dynamics, commercial fisheries, and subsistence harvest. This session will provide a forum to discuss recent field observations gained from ongoing programs, the application of these data to prognostic models, and their linkages to other polar oceans in pursuit of improved stewardship of marine resources in the 21st century.

Session Conveners

(lead contact) H. Rodger Harvey, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, Box 38, Solomons, MD 20688

harvey@cbl.umces.edu ; 410-326-7206

Michael F. Sigler

NOAA Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Juneau, Alaska 99801 USA

mike.sigler@noaa.gov

Appendix 2:

Text to be posted at the top of BEST-BSIERP “data portal” webpage:

http://bsierp.nprb.org/data_portal.php

Prepared by Tom Van Pelt and Mike Sigler; reviewed by Ken Coyle (BSIERP data manager) and Jim Moore (BEST data manager).

“The data policy that all BEST-BSIERP PIs agreed to stipulates that you submit your data and accompanying metadata to the data managers within one year of collection-you can view the full text of the policy /here/ (~link to full data policy text from Project Mgmt Plan~).

But we want to re-emphasize the intent of centralizing data and making it accessible to other BEST-BSIERP participants. The intent is to allow colleagues to learn more about other participants’ data, to evaluate the data and begin thinking about how the data could be collaboratively used. However, if you move beyond that stage and want to actually *use* other investigators' data for *any* publication, you ****must**** have explicit written permission from the investigator who collected the data prior to circulation of draft manuscripts or results that include the data. And that permission should be requested at an early stage in your analysis, to give your colleagues every opportunity for collaboration and participation in the analysis and publication process.

We want all BEST-BSIERP participants to feel comfortable sharing their data per the data policy. We see this as a critical factor in our mutual goal of achieving integration across project components. The BEST and BSIERP data managers are ready to support you and make this process as painless as possible. If for any reason you are not comfortable with the data policy, or if you have suggestions to improve the data management support, please raise the issue with members of the Science Advisory Board, the Data Manager, or the Program Manager. We will only get out of this project what we are all willing to put into it.”