

CMER Ground Rules, Section 3.3.2 –

New section: CMER Voting Member Participation Expectations and Responsibilities

CMER Meeting Attendance

Regular attendance (may be in person or virtual) and participation at CMER meetings by CMER voting members is crucial to ensure help facilitate the smooth execution the of AMP priorities are executed smoothly and to maintain the integrity of the process by which important decisions are made at each meeting. CMER voting members are expected to attend (without proxy) at least 75% of CMER meetings on a rolling annual basis (9 of 12 meetings from the date of the current meeting). If a CMER core member is unwilling or unable to meet the 75% attendance threshold, he or she should inform the AMPA and volunteer to step down as a voting member. If meeting absences persists, the AMPA may will request to the FP Board the removal of voting privileges of that CMER voting member. If poor attendance continues, a request will be made to the appropriate caucus representative to recommend a new CMER representative for Board approval with a person who can and will attend meetings regularly, as described above. When a CMER voting member cannot attend a meeting, the member must notify the AMPA, CMER Co-Chairs, and the CMER Coordinator at least one day in advance of the meeting or as soon as is possible given the circumstances, and they are strongly encouraged to designate a proxy who can speak on their behalf at said meeting.

CMER Participation

Meetings

CMER voting members agree to follow CMER ground rules (3.3.2), including adequately preparing for meetings. Adequate preparation ensures facilitates that participation that is meaningful, informed, and relevant. CMER meeting materials are sent out one week prior to the CMER meeting. CMER participants are expected to review all materials related to action items on the CMER meeting agenda prior to the meeting and come to the meeting with clarifying questions and comments and prepared to take action on all action items that are identified on the meeting agenda and in the SAG requests. When CMER voting members are unprepared (e.g., have not read meeting materials or are not familiar with agenda items), they will refrain from using the CMER meeting time to familiarize themselves with aspects of a product, discussion, or item that they should have prepared for in advance. CMER voting members will not hold up a decision item due to being unprepared. In the event that a CMER voting member is unprepared, they shall abstain from the vote or vote "sideways" (Section 3.3.3) rather than hold up a decision.

CMER members who fail to follow the ground rules will be subjected to the following:

- 1) CMER cochaIRS meet with AMPA to discuss the issue.
- 2) CMER cochaIRS have a private verbal discussion with the recalcitrant in order to establish a consensus agreed action.
- 3) CMER cochaIRS and AMPA have a private verbal meeting with the recalcitrant to discuss specific contract compliance issues with a verbal follow up discussion between the AMPA and the caucus principal(s) that signed the contract.

- Commented [JM1]: Reminder: Only rules can be ...
- Commented [C(2R1)]: True. Yet the PSM is CMER's ...
- Commented [JK3]: Red: After reading this and trying ...
- Commented [C(4R3)]: The Board asked the AMPA to ...
- Commented [JK5]: Red: Using the Current version of ...
- Commented [HB6]: This document is a good start but ...
- Commented [C(7R6)]: The point of this document was ...
- Commented [JM8]: Some of the comments under my ...
- Commented [JM9]: This should define attendance as ...
- Commented [JM(10)]: nothing we can do will ensure ...
- Commented [HB11]: Does proxy count as attending? ...
- Commented [C(12R11)]: per the paragraph above, no. ...
- Commented [DK13]: People occasionally attend half ...
- Commented [C(14R13)]: good question. for CMER ...
- Commented [DK15]: This has always been the purvie ...
- Commented [C(16R15)]: The intention here is that ...
- Commented [JM(17)]: if this language or something ...
- Commented [HB18]: This gives too much control to t ...
- Commented [C(19R18)]: The AMPA ensures the ...
- Commented [C(20R18)]: used this language on the ...
- Commented [JM21]: Is there an appeal process? ...
- Commented [C(22R21)]: The member/caucus would ...
- Commented [JM23]: This step should be done before ...
- Commented [C(24R23)]: The AG confirmed that the ...
- Commented [HB25]: Sorry, I normally don't like to ad ...
- Commented [C(26R25)]: This text is the intent of this ...
- Commented [JM27]: I would change must to should. ...
- Commented [JM(28R27)]: if we add this caveat, see m ...
- Commented [JM(29)]: we've had the ground rules a lon ...
- Commented [C(30R29)]: consider added language. ...
- Commented [JK31]: Red: this language is redundant f ...
- Commented [C(32R31)]: It is referencing that adhering ...
- Commented [JM33]: We have circled this topic many ...
- Commented [C(34R33)]: What about CMER members ...
- Commented [HB35]: Who monitors and decides this? ...
- Commented [C(36R35)]: CMER co-chairs ...
- Commented [HB37]: What are the expectations for ...
- Commented [JK38R37]: The PSM timeline for ...
- Commented [C(39R37)]: The PSM (8.3.1) says "As a ...
- Commented [HB40]: CMER by consensus, not the ...
- Commented [C(41R40)]: Is there a suggested edit? I ...
- Commented [JM42]: How would this be measured or ...
- Commented [C(43R42)]: I think it is apparent when ...
- Commented [JK44]: Red: covered in existing languag ...
- Commented [JK45R44]: CMER should discuss how v ...
- Formatted

4) [Written request from AMPA to the caucus principal to replace the recalcitrant due to specific contract performance failures.](#)

5) [If previous steps fail, the AMPA will present the situation to the FPB for discussion.](#)

Document Review

It is important that all CMER voting members participate in reviewing documents through the formal CMER review process. Every representative should volunteer to review at least one document annually, although more is encouraged and may be necessary at times when a lot of products are coming through CMER for review. If a CMER voting member does not feel that they have the proper expertise to review a document, they can designate an expert to represent their caucus for the review. Failure to review any documents within a calendar year can also result in contract penalties, as outlined in contract language.

When choosing to review documents, CMER participants will provide their comments to the appropriate person, in the agreed upon review timelines, in the agreed upon format/method (Section 8). If they cannot provide their comments within the agreed upon timelines, they will notify the Project Manager as soon as possible and before the review deadline, to agree on a review extension timeline, if possible. There is no guarantee that a request for an extension will be granted. If a reviewer cannot comment within the agreed-upon review timeline, and an extension is not requested and approved in advance, the reviewer relinquishes their role as a CMER reviewer. As such, they will not delay the document from moving forward through the review process as outlined in the PSM.

Non-voting CMER participants

Engagement and participation in CMER meetings and business by non-voting CMER participants is encouraged and valued. Such participation includes but is not limited to joining in discussions that occur during CMER meetings, commenting and asking questions of CMER guest speakers, and reviewing and providing comments on CMER documents. Non-voting CMER participants are expected to have read and reviewed relevant meeting materials prior to engaging in CMER discussions. Non-voting CMER participants may participate in dispute resolution processes but may not formally initiate disputes.

Non-voting CMER participants are expected to behave courteously, professionally and follow all CMER ground-rules while participating in CMER meetings.

7.4.1 Project Team Overview

Scientific Advisory Groups (SAGs) and CMER work with the AMPA to assemble and maintain Project Teams to implement CMER research and monitoring projects. Project Teams report to the oversight committee (typically a SAG but can also be CMER) and are responsible for completing all project tasks and milestones, with support from the Project Manager (PM).

Project Teams can be assembled in several ways and typically include a PM along with some combination of SAG members, CMER members, CMER staff (including scientists), outside

Commented [HB51]: Can this expert participate in the CMER meeting discussions?

Commented [C(52R51)]: For CMER discussion. I expect that if a CMER member designated an expert to represent the caucus review that the person would be welcome to participate in the discussions. Do we need to add language here?

Commented [DK53]: Contract penalties become complicated with tribes. Since tribes use their participation grants for many different kinds of tasks, ...

Commented [C(54R53)]: agree. each contract is a ...

Commented [JM55]: This is not a contract, it is a ...

Commented [C(56R55)]: AG reviewed this. The PSM is ...

Commented [HB57]: What and where is this? Who ...

Commented [C(58R57)]: CMER review folder. AMP sta ...

Commented [HB59]: An extension for a specific pers ...

Commented [C(60R59)]: CMER co-chairs do not have ...

Commented [JM(61)]: Should extensions granted to or ...

Commented [C(62R61)]: Good point. CMER should ...

Commented [JM63]: Who makes this decision? This ...

Commented [C(64R63)]: It is not a decision. This ...

Commented [HB65]: What about voting and non votir ...

Commented [C(66R65)]: I read this section to mean a ...

Commented [JM67]: Just because a reviewer was ...

Commented [C(68R67)]: Per the language above, ...

Commented [JM69]: It seems CMER/SAG workloads ...

Commented [C(70R69)]: Is there a suggested edit? ...

Commented [DK71]: Do we define this term anywher ...

Commented [C(72R71)]: check 3.2.1 to see if we need ...

Commented [JM73]: Would need to verify that this ...

Commented [C(74R73)]: verified.

Commented [JM75]: Why does this only apply to non ...

Commented [JK76R75]: Agreed, this is already cover ...

Commented [C(77R75)]: It does apply to all members ...

Commented [C(78)]: Existing section. Only red text is ...

Commented [HB79]: Sorry, there is some stuff in here ...

Commented [JM80]: Why are these changes being ...

Commented [C(81R80)]: The reason is that PTs are sti ...

Commented [HB82]: What does "report to" mean? ...

cooperators and/or contractors. Project Teams shall include members with appropriate technical expertise about the project topic. The DNR will manage the contracts of Project Team members who are brought onto a team as paid consultants. The AMPA evaluates the possibility of a conflict of interest when a Project Team member is contracted for a project.

All members of the Project Team are expected to commit to the timely success of the project, and as such will provide reasonable alternatives and make recommendations for pathways to consensus when raising concerns. Project Team members are expected to work in a cooperative and committed manner to complete identified tasks and resolve issues as they develop, while providing solutions to problems/issues that both they and Project Team other Project Team members raise. Prospective Project Team members should realistically assess whether they realistically have the time and capacity to fully engage as a Project Team member, including meeting deadlines for specific tasks and review. Significantly missing significant deadlines causes project delays that reverberate throughout the project timeline and budget, resulting in shortened timelines in future phases of the project (e.g. forcing resulting in the need for concurrent reviews) and budget adjustment requests that span biennia, which could result in the project losing funding or preventing funding of other important projects and budget adjustment requests that span biennia, which could result in the project losing funding or preventing funding of other important projects.

The Project Charter provides the names, affiliations, and roles of the Project Team members

and notes the tasks expected from each member. The Communication Plan section of the Project Charter (section 7.7.14) includes guidance on Project Team member roles and responsibilities related to communication.

Participation in a Project Team gives team members access to unpublished data – the expectation is that CMER and Project Team members will not present or publish these data in advance of final project approval without the approval of the CMER committee and the AMPA (per Section 10). Agreements should be put in place to ensure that data collected in cooperation with private entities is jointly available to CMER and its participants.

Members of the Project Team may change as project milestones are met and different skills and expertise are needed with new project tasks, when individuals retire, or Project Team members are not fulfilling their obligations. Generally, the Project Team consists of the following:

(7.4.2-7.4.3 is existing language for roles of PMs, PIs)

7.4.4 Other Project Team Members

Project Teams typically include members who are not the PM or the PI who provide specific skills that contribute to the success of the project. Other Project Team Members can include CMER and SAG participants, volunteer (non-CMER) experts, paid consultants/contractors, and CMER staff. The PM and PI in association with the SAG and/or CMER will help identify additional personnel with the skills and expertise needed to successfully complete the project. All Team members require CMER approval for participation and shall be approved through the Charter development and approval process. As Project Team membership changes, the Charter should be updated to reflect the current participants and forwarded to CMER for approval.

Commented [HB83]: We need to be clear, when a PT member who participates in scoping, study designs, analysis, reporting or changes in any of these, can then contract to do the actual work. The AMPA needs to keep CMER, SAGs, and PTs informed as to what meetings and discussions potential contractors can attend.

Commented [C(84R83): CMER should discuss and language can be added. However, this is existing CMER approved PSM language.

Commented [HB85]: Do PTs need consensus before SAG's consideration? Consensus by who?

Commented [C(86R85): yes, consensus by the PT. however, this does not always happen, and it should not hold up progress for too long. if it cannot be worked out, the PT should bring it to the SAG for discussion.

Commented [JM87]: What happens with problems that the SAG brings forward?

Commented [C(88R87): this section is not under review. CMER reviewed/approved that section in 2022/2023.

Commented [JM89]: This language is very telling. CMER review of documents are not to be held hostage by project team deadlines or progress. Illustrates the staff's desire and priority to meet deadlines over quality products. Primary reason why CMER sets these and not staff.

Commented [C(90R89): edit provided. AMP staff all desire supporting participants with quality products AND meeting agreed upon timelines.

Commented [JK91]: Yellow: Project Team efforts could be allowed to move forward with a quorum or after an agreed upon milestone? What happens when too many deadlines are missed by a team member? are they fired?

Commented [JK92R91]: I see it below...

Commented [HB93]: So, who monitors and takes action when this does not happen?

Commented [C(94R93): PMs monitor this. Do we need to add language about who is the one to ensure accountability?

Commented [JM95]: Agree with Doug regarding concurrent reviews. Concurrent reviews are never a great idea, IMO, and certainly not an appropriate standard protocol for mitigating timeline issues. They may, in some cases, occur with little to no consequences if SAG and CMER reviewers are all in sync with no substantive

Commented [C(96R95): this section is not under review. CMER reviewed/approved that section in 2022/2023.

The PM and PI determine the minimum time commitments necessary for participation as a Project Team member. SAG or CMER members are encouraged to be Project Team members as long as they can meet the work commitments. Requests for CMER staff to be assigned to work on a project as a Project Team member are made to the AMPA.

Project Team Members are expected to play an active role in document writing and project implementation. To that end, the PM and the PI will work collaboratively with other Project Team members to identify specific tasks and roles for project team members. The PI/PM and Project Team members will establish realistic timelines for completion of specific tasks. To ensure timely completion of project milestones, the recommended composition of Project Team members is the PI, PM, and 3-4 other Project Team members (LEAN 2012).

If a Project Team member fails to meet a deadline by two weeks or more, twice, they will be asked to reevaluate whether they have the adequate time to participate as a Project Team member. If another deadline is missed by two weeks or more, the Project Team member will be asked to step down. Depending on the Project Team member and their role in the adaptive management program, there could be contract penalties as well. The oversight committee can help the Project Team replace that member or determine if they have the capacity to continue with the team as is. Additionally, Project Team members commit to communicating about missed deadlines to the PM and/or the PI (when necessary) before the deadline approaches. This will allow for communication with the entire Project Team about changed deadlines if they occur. If a Project Team member fails to notify the PM and/or PI that a timeline extension is requested more than one time, that PT member may be removed.

Other Project Team Members' responsibilities can include:

- Help design and implement projects;
- Provide expertise necessary for successful completion of projects;
- Help write technical documents;
- Assist in communicating with their caucus (if CMER member); and
- Provide constructive and timely feedback.

Project Team members should support consensus decisions when discussing projects at CMER. Project Team members, whether Board-approved CMER members or not, do not have a role in approving project documents.

Commented [HB97]: Who monitors this and what and when is action taken upon failures?

Commented [C(98R97)]: PM monitors. See comment above about CMER discussion and adding accountability, if desired.

Commented [HB99]: Do documents need SAG approval?

Commented [C(100R99)]: this is in a different section that is not under review.

Commented [JK101]: Yellow: Not all voting members are on a participation contract.

Commented [DK102R101]: I second this- also, tribal grants don't require adaptive management participation and many tribes allocate those funds elsewhere, like FPA and WTMF review. This seems like it would penalize the tribes that participate.

Commented [C(103R101)]: understood. the language says "could be". CMER should discuss what accountability looks like for participants that are not under contract.

Commented [HB104]: Will this discussion happen at an oversight committee meeting? What if the PT member is on the oversight committee or CMER? Since CMER approves PT does CMER need consensus to remove a member?

Commented [C(105R104)]: This is covered in other sections in the PSM. CMER discussion if we need to reiterate here.

Commented [JM106]: Similar comments as before; this is a guidance document, not a contract. Project team member may be comprised of folks that are under direct contract, may be a general cmer member that has a particular expertise or even a SAG member that there is no contract. Consider having an agreement as part of management plan for project team members to agree to for participation and enforcement. Would be specific for each project.

Commented [C(107R106)]: agreed. however, this needs to be in the PSM so that all CMER participants are aware...

Commented [HB108]: By who and how?

Commented [C(109R108)]: This is covered in other sections in the PSM. CMER discussion if we need to...

Commented [M(110)]: redundant with last sentence of the previous paragraph

Commented [HB111]: Who are also voting CMER members?

Commented [DK112]: the end of this is missing.

Commented [M(113)]: this is the language that went missing...