

Pribilof Islands Collaborative Steering Committee Meeting
October 6, 2004 10:00AM teleconference
Planning Workgroup for next PIC Meeting on Northern Fur Seals
and Steering Committee meeting
Agenda and meeting summary

NOTE: Action items are highlighted in yellow

**NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING:
October 13, 2004 10:00AM Alaska time**

Present: Max Malavansky, Jr., Andy Malavansky, Dennis Lekanof, Meg King (note taker),
Debbie Lestenkof, Phil Zavadil, Lisa Butzner, Tim Remick, Evie Witten

Meeting summary:

1. Date of next PIC meeting.
Week of Jan 17 not good because of PCCRC and other meetings.
Week of Jan 24 not good because of Marine Science Symposium
Feb 6th NPFMC meeting in Seattle
January 7th: Russian Orthodox Christmas
January 14th: Russian Orthodox New Year
January 11-13: MCA annual retreat

After quite a bit of discussion and considering the latter part of February due to the length of the NPFMC, most of those on the conference call honed in on dates in January as preferred meeting times. Specifically, dates to look at are January 12 -15 or January 29 – February 2. These timeframes are over weekends. **Evie will contact steering committee members not present today about meeting dates and ask for their input.** The planning committee will continue and try to finalize this discussion next week.

2. Lisa Butzner requested the Steering Committee meeting agenda be sent to all stakeholders and alternates. Evie explained it is not sent to all at present in an effort to reduce the volume of email.

It was suggested to put a draft agenda for the weekly meetings in the weekly update, and to ask that those who want to get the full agenda for the weekly meetings let the PIC office know. (Denise/WWF)

3. **In order to address defining meeting outcomes and identifying meeting elements and speakers, it was agreed that a subgroup should work on this and make a recommendations to the Planning and Steering Committees.**

Those identified for this work group are:

Heather McCarty, Randy Hagenstein, Max Malavansky, Debbie Lestenkof, and
Evie Witten.

The steps to address these items are:

By end of October 12 (Tuesday) Denise will go back through previous meeting summaries (e.g. January and August) as well as notes from the planning subgroup

from the August meeting, and the Planning/Steering Committee conference calls since then. She will summarize which presenters made what presentations on which topics and send the summary those the work group. This will help the group to not duplicate information previously presented.

At 3 pm on Friday, October 15, this group will meet via conference call to discuss the issues. It may be that more than one meeting is needed.

If others are interested in participating in this workgroup, please let Denise know at WWF.

4. In previous conference calls there had been questions about what the next PIC meeting outcomes should be, how to minimize duplication, and how to address issues effectively. In order to address these, Meg created some templates (questions) for PIC participants to answer. Those were discussed and that conversation is captured below.

**Steering Committee Outcomes and Success Working Document:
Outcome of PIC Fur Seal Meeting**

1. The next meeting has been characterized as Fur Seals and Fish 101, yet there is a push to “do something.” What do we believe would be useful outcomes of this meeting?
 - a) Not just presentations/lectures
 - b) By the end of the meeting, that everyone has the same level – base of information – on fur seal status and how fisheries operate in the Bering Sea.
 - c) Have dialogue with experts
 - d) Have data layers – spatial information
 - e) Preliminary ideas/sketches of how basic interaction of fish and prey for fur seals works - nature of interactions
 - f) Identify additional information needed
 - g) Brainstorm ideas and concepts of what to do:
 - Research
 - Beyond research – if fishing affects fur seals, if fishing doesn’t affect fur seals – what are options to address declines?
 - Advance decision making when we don’t know all the answers that takes into account ecosystem interactions.
2. How will the GIS layers be used? Will the GIS be available by the time the meeting is held, or should an outcome of the meeting be to determine the type of GIS information that is needed and a clear process to develop?
 - a) There should be some spatial data available. WWF is working on compiling layers on the distribution of prey species (from NMFS trawl surveys and catch data) and will use the PIC’s protocols/guidelines for presenting data. This info should be available for the PIC meeting. (Data guidelines need to be in the meeting notebook.)
 - b) Socio-economic data from Ecotrust, some preliminary data will likely be available (Evie will check with Ecotrust on their schedule).
 - c) Hone in on specific information still needed, the desired format of the information, and how it will be used to make decisions.
3. Should an agreed upon list of research issues be an outcome? If so, there will also need to be a process (beyond the next meeting) to reach agreement on those research (and other) issues that the group was unable to agree upon.

- a) What will research results be used for – what decisions?
 - b) Two levels of research:
 - a. One to inform the collaborative - dialogue with the research community about areas that the collaborative thinks are important and to understand how it fits into the research agenda, and to convey how the collaborative thinks it should fit.
 - b. Second to identify long-term research needs
 - i. Starting point should be the NMFS list, and add to it the other ideas about research on fur seals when they are not on the Pribilof rookeries, co-management, add ideas from the Sea Life Center, A. Trites' group.
 - ii. Need to address #8 on the NMFS list prior to the meeting. Have a work group see if they can find common ground.
4. How can we accelerate learning?
- a. Provide information prior to meeting so participants have a chance to be prepared for the discussions.
 - b. Create a study guide that helps participants review material as it can be overwhelming.
 - i. Guide needs to be well developed and linked to agenda items

#5 below – those present agreed that a subgroup should be formed and address these items.

- 5. Based on the above, how should the Fur Seal meeting differ from the presentations and information the group has already heard?
 - a. What presentations should the PIC review and what new information should be presented?
 - b. Which scientists or others should presenter?
- 6. What other items do you believe need to be addressed?
 - a. Those on the conference call thought there was already enough with what has been discussed on Oct 6 and at previous meetings.
- 5. Goal setting, expectations and success of the PIC. Due to time and that folks had not had much of a chance to think about these items, this discussion will be on the next agenda.
- 6. Draft email protocols (at end of this summary).
In general, those on the conference call thought they were helpful. A few clarifying changes were made.
- 7. Proposal from Data workgroup on protocols. Again, due to time and that folks had not had much of a chance to think about these items, this discussion will be on the next agenda.

Guidelines for Using Email Effectively

Clarify who should be on which email distribution list.

PURPOSE of EMAIL	Email List to RECEIVE
Meeting notifications and meeting summaries.	All interested in the PIC
Steering Committee Summaries and Notices, issue exchanges, and action requests for stakeholders from Steering Committee (e.g., funding)	Stakeholders, Alternates and Steering Committee members
Recommendations to develop process and strategies, and address funding needs	Initially Steering Committee and then to Stakeholders, Alternates and Steering Committee
Planning for Next Meeting	Fur Seal Co-Chairs and Workgroup Members and Steering Committee

The following draft Email procedures are being developed in recognition that emails are a valuable tool, but are not always a good mechanism to use. Specifically, emails are not a good means to resolve an issue, instead what typically happens when used to convey interests and positions, is that conflict will escalate and relationships will be eroded.

- If there is a fundamental disagreement on an issue – STOP – don't use email to discuss the issue.
- If useful, determine if a subgroup can meet – start with Steering Committee - in person or via conference call – with the purpose of generating options to address the issue, and perhaps agreeing on a preferred option. If key stakeholders are unavailable due to schedules or traveling, wait until they are available.
- If subgroup doesn't seem to be a good idea, email the facilitator that the issue needs to be addressed within the PIC process.
- If there is some deadline the group is trying to meet (imposed by another organization), then it will likely be best for each organization to respond individually.
- If subgroup is successful at developing options then distribute to stakeholders, alternates and steering committee members via email, with a clear process for responding. Put a firm deadline on this process. The rationale for this is that if agreement isn't easily achieved, then email will not be satisfactory for working out an agreement.