
The New and Improved Report Time Line

1. All statements of Initiative/Agency monitoring goals and objectives to Bob Szaro by **15 March**.
2. Comments on the handout for the North American, which includes problems and recommendations, to Bea Van Horne by **15 March**.
3. By **17 March** the handout will be completed and available for sharing with the initiatives and others for comment. They will also be handed out for comment at various committee meetings at the North American.
4. We have designated five subgroups to go to work on the report after the North American. Each subgroup will take responsibility for one problem section of the report. **By 28 April**.
 - a. 3-5 pages describe
 - i. The Problem
 - ii. The Recommendations
 - iii. Action Items to implement the recommendations. Who will do it, in what time frame, and using what processes? These can be in bullet form, initially, until the larger group has had a chance to comment.
 - b. Appendix information. Pull out the relevant text from the annotated report. Clean the text by responding to all marked changes (accept or reject) and all comments. Organize this into an appendix for your problem section.
5. Next meeting of the Monitoring Subcommittee will be **week of May 22**.

Problem Area Groups:

Problem 1 – Ken* / Steven / Richard / Dale

Problem 2 – Bob* / John B. / Charles / Mike R.

Problem 3 – John S.* / Mark K.

Problem 4 – Christina* / Debbie / Brad A.

Problem 5 – Bruce* / Bea / Jorge

* Conveners

Notes—NABCI Avian Monitoring Subcommittee Meeting 9-10 March, 2006

Present: Paul Schmidt, Bob Szaro, John Bart, Charles Frances, Ken Rosenberg, John Sauer, Bea Van Horne, Garrett Lowe, Bruce Peterjohn, Christina Vojta, Richard Bishop, Stephen Brown, Jorge Coppen, Seth Mott

9 March

1. We discussed problems with existing monitoring efforts and recommendations we could make based on the information we have assembled. General thoughts included:
 - a. We need to describe process steps for implementation of our recommendations, rather than actual changes that are needed. Who will do it, and for how long?
 - b. The audience for this is administrators, not scientists
 - c. How well does existing monitoring meet agency/initiative needs? Where it does not, what is the problem? Opportunities for improvement?
 - d. The current version is too detailed for administrators, not detailed enough for scientists.
2. We worked on identifying problems and recommendations. Although we have initially lined up recommendations under the corresponding problems, these will be split into separate lists.

10 March

1. We discussed the Northeast Coordinated Bird Monitoring effort that IAFWA has funded.
2. Paul Dressler presented information on the current status of the Natural Resource Monitoring Partnership (NRMP).
 - a. NABCI Monitoring Subcommittee relationship to Locator/Library system development:

We agreed to serve as an “interim” quasi-curator of data/protocols.

 - Individuals within the subcommittee are fully committed to engage in development of NRMP including assistance to establish a bonafide curator of data/protocols.
 - Consult on an as-needed basis to support NRMP Locator/Library development.
 - Assist in developing a process to engage entities in collaboration.
 - Assist and provide data in beta testing at multiple levels/scales.
 - Assist in evolution of query mechanisms to enhance utility.
3. We continued working on problems and recommendations:

4. We discussed the structure of the report. There was consensus that it will not be ready to hand out at the North American Wildlife Conference. A handout that includes problems and recommendations will be handed out at the North American for feedback.
5. We will hold a 2-day meeting the week of 22 May to finalize the Report and explore next steps, including summarizing information on existing monitoring.