

ISAP LESSONS LEARNED

(Source: USIECR-initiated interview with TPSN Robb Turner; self-initiated input from Dennis Murphy)

A. MODE OF ENGAGEMENT:

1. As we move into AM implementation, ISAP should shift to **more / deep “front-end”** engagement (vs. review of draft documents and webinars) – i.e., attending work group meetings where science-based products are being developed. Not working shoulder-to-shoulder to develop them (agencies should pull in appropriate technical experts from USGS and USFWS to be part of the tech team) but identifying “what” is needed, and then observing, commenting on, & lubricating “how” the tech team plans to achieve that goal. ISAP maintains its independence, so it is not commenting on its own work product. This will be the most cost-effective way to use ISAP, & ISAP input will be timely.
 - a. **Applies to development of research agenda, monitoring plans, and modeling approach** (3 legs of science stool)
 - b. Need to **make this shift now, not just with next panel**. This should happen for development of monitoring plans this spring (e.g., in 2-day charrette-type workshop)
2. **Assign specific panelists to specific charges**, depending on nature of charge.
3. **Look at annual cycle of AM steps & determine critical points for ISAP input**.
 - a. At minimum, **attend FSM & spring AM workshop**.
 - b. Ensure timely distribution of materials to Panel to **review in advance**.
 - c. Give further thought to **how ISAP & MRRIC should interact**.

B. PANEL STRUCTURE & COMPOSITION:

1. Should have just **1 panel** going forward, combining social and natural science expertise (so social science doesn't take back seat to natural science).
2. Should have **5-7 core members, with others available ad hoc**.
3. Should have a way of adding (ad hoc) **unanticipated forms of expertise**.
4. Panelists should be analytical people who have **applied knowledge and experience** – i.e., applying their disciplinary expertise to practical / policy problem solving & program needs (vs. purely academic orientation).

5. **Desired scientific expertise**: quantitative ecologist, biostatistician, experimental design, conservation biology, pallid sturgeon specialist, sociologist type who can help bridge human considerations and species' needs

B. APPROACH TO FORMULATING CHARGE / QUESTIONS:

1. ISAP needs to be able to engage with **less lead time**.
2. Provide for **way for ISAP to stay up-to-speed** without attending all plenaries, e.g.:
 - a. TPSN tasked to attend all plenaries, write periodic emails / memos to ISAP to explain context, issues, what subset of materials are key to read
 - b. Task ISAP to read and attend to such communications.
3. Need to **refine / clarify who is involved at which points** in developing charge (MRRIC, lead agencies, TPSN, ISAP) to avoid unnecessary conflict.
 - a. **MRRIC & lead agencies could both initiate questions**, depending on context, topic, & goal.
 - b. **Both should get opportunity to weigh in** on questions initiated by the other.
 - c. **Panel should have opportunity to provide feedback** on the draft questions to help frame them in a way that will achieve desired goal.