

MRIP Work Group Chairs Conference Call
10/18/2007

The call convened at 2:00 PM. The following work group chairs were present: Kathy Knowlton, Linda Barker, Ron Salz, Beverly Sauls. Pres Pate and Rob Andrews were present representing the Operations Team (OT).

1. Merge Analysis and Design Work Groups: Overlap among one of the projects. Initially, decision was made to merge project teams, but considering lack of leadership on DWG, it was decided to merge work groups. The decision was approved by the OT and forwarded to the ESC for final approval (no opposition as of yet). Linda Barker will continue to chair the combined group. R. Andrews is developing a project plan to review the way in which discard data are collected. Rob will check with Bob Muller to confirm that he has not been working on this project.

2. Status of Project Plans: To date, the OT has received all of the project plans for the Analysis Work Group and the Design Work Group, 2 of the 3 project plans being submitted by the For Hire Work Group, and 1 of the 4 projects being submitted by the HMS Work Group. Extensions have been asked for and granted for the remaining projects. All project plans should be submitted by November 1. Chairs of the FHWG and DMSWG are aware of overlap between projects and will coordinate efforts to avoid duplication.

3. ST IT Position: ST has filled a position that will support the MRIP effort (Scott Sauri). Scott's time will be divided between the Registry Team and the OT working groups. Initially, Scott will support the DMSWG. R. Andrews will facilitate communication between Scott and the other working groups as needed.

4. OT Feedback to Work Groups: How will the OT provide feedback to the Work Groups? Several options were discussed.

- OT could send suggestions to P. Pate and R. Andrews as projects are reviewed, prior to the November OT meeting. R. Andrews and P. Pate would pass feedback along to WG chairs. This option would likely provide the most timely feedback mechanism but would be difficult to coordinate.
- OT could provide feedback after the November meeting. Suggestions would be summarized and recommendations provided to WG chairs. This option would likely provide the most meaningful feedback and result in less confusion. However feedback could not be provided until early December
- Combination approach – The OT could provide pressing / significant comments to P. Pate and R. Andrews as they review plans. This feedback would be passed to WG chairs who would be able to make revisions and/or provide clarification prior to the November meeting. Summaries of OT comments would be provided to WG chairs following November meeting.

The group decided upon option 3 (combination approach).

5. ST Role in Reviewing Project Plans: P. Pate noted that some project plans do not include budgets. P. Pate is reluctant to send plans back to work groups as it is likely that they have very good reasons for excluding budget information. R. Andrews suggested that ST could review plans as a “reality check” and provide budget estimates and feedback where needed. The chairs agreed that this is a suitable role for ST.
6. A question was raised about the role of ACCSP in the MRIP process. P. Pate informed the chairs that Mike Cahall has been approached about joining the OT and has expressed interest. The ESC will provide a final decision about Cahall’s membership on the OT.
7. Communications among MRIP Parties: F. Darby (Communications and Education Chair) has proposed a conference call with all working group members. The call would provide an opportunity to update work group members on recent activities, as well as provide an opportunity to express appreciation for their efforts. While the chairs agreed that OT feedback to work group members would be appreciated, they expressed some reservation about providing feedback through a conference call; conference calls are often awkward, they do not provide a good forum for discussion, and such a call might be seen as an additional burden. It was suggested that meeting minutes and updates be provided via email, and if a conference is needed, it should take place after the November OT meeting. This will allow for adequate advanced notice, as well as provide an opportunity for meaningful feedback.
8. Second-tier Projects: Includes projects that don’t get funded, projects that were identified as lower priority by the work groups, and projects that build upon first-tier projects. P. Pate and R. Andrews encouraged WG chairs to begin advancing second-tier projects as time allows. This resulted in a discussion about future funding plans. The project planning process was initiated as a means to develop an improved survey program. At some point, funds will be diverted from planning and testing to implementation (i.e. it is not envisioned that MRIP will be a standing RFP process). Results of initial projects will help to dictate future funding opportunities.
9. K. Knowlton requested guidance about how to make Scott Sauri an official member of the DMSWG. P. Pate and R. Andrews will talk to Tina Chang (Scott’s supervisor) about his permanent role on the work group.
10. Pacific RecFIN Technical Committee Meeting: RecFIN assistance will be needed on several AWG projects, and L. Barker requested that this be discussed at the upcoming RecFIN meeting. R. Andrews mentioned that there are plans to discuss MRIP projects at the meeting.