March 28, 2023 Translation Working Group Call

Attendees: Kira Sullivan-Wiley, Dana Simon, Chris Brown, Melissa Kenney, Charlotte Malmborg, Jody Peters, Alison Gerken, Jessica Burnett, Jonathan Cummings, Michael Gerst

Agenda
1. In case anyone in the group didn't see the note from Whitney Woelmer on Slack: I have been doing a bit of reading on translational science for some of my own research and stumbled upon this paper which seemed quite relevant to some of the topics you all have been discussing in working group time! Barriers and Opportunities for Integrating Social Science into Natural Resource Management: Lessons from National Estuarine Research Reserves; Robinson et al. 2012; https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00267-012-9930-6

2. Reminder of the 3 priorities identified for translation needs
    a. Helping colleagues find collaborators across disciplines (i.e., matchmaking) as well as providing guidance on what makes a fruitful multi-disciplinary collaboration
    b. How to understand stakeholder decision making processes?
    c. How to make data, models, and systems that are documented and reusable (FAIR data, models)
        ■ Jody will keep the group connected with the what the Standards and CI/Methods working group are working on since they are both working on tasks/workshop proposal related to this

3. Next steps for point a: Matchmaking
    a. Jody/Kira were going to connect over the next month to go back through those notes and bring back a recap to the group.
        ■ Compilation of notes from the Social Science and Partners working group calls where matchmaking was discussed
        ■ Summary of those notes:
            ● Database management: We previously discussed keeping a log of individuals, organizations as well as projects/pitches to help with the matchmaking to bring people together.
                ○ Then when we have pitches how do we do the matchmaking across the group
            ● How to identify social scientist to reach out to, how to reach out, and how to bring them into a project
            ● Having a concrete project is important to making connections
                ○ Passive - have people do seminars/be on a panel
                ○ Active - hosting events where people pitch events on an online forum or in person with a list of potential funding sources

- In the past we the have had a lot of ideas about what to do, but no one to take the lead on it.
- Have a list of professional societies and listservs and draft language - so there is a lot teed up.
- Where to think about reaching out directly to get people on board
- 3 main bins - how to identify people and reach out, organization of events, background of database and list management - collection of resources
    - Just need people to say they are happy to contribute and be the lead person
- Chris - doesn't mind being the point person but would like for it to be a team effort. Translational group - frequently asked questions. A list of how to go about doing things or pointing people. By looking at the membership - see where there are connections
    - Fast dating: 2-3 minutes to meet with people that you want to
- Jonathan - FWS is moving towards including traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) in forecasts and including social scientist with expertise in working with the keepers of TEK and translating that into forecasts would be very valuable
- Kira - happy to help with data management
- Alison is available to help as needed to - did something similar to meet people and shared ideas and make connections
- Jessica - would like to be included on the email. Stretched thin on time, but if she sees something where she can help make connections would be interested in helping
- From Jody's experience with a community manager group has participated in activities that bring people together for one on one meet ups.
- Dana is interested in helping when there is a defined task
- Melissa - wants to be looped in on anything related to federal agencies and working on RFP. Has been working on getting funding updated to help with research to operations and include funding for decision making

4. Next steps from Feb call about point b: Decision Making
    a. Michael was going to follow up with Melissa about what she has been working on related to this
    b. Melissa had created some videos with NEON about structured decision making principles. Did it go further? Or were there other ideas to build it out?
    c. Working with NEON to host the EFI NEON Forecasting Challenge. There is not a great opportunity for thinking about structured decision making at the NEON sites since they are at more natural sites where management is not the key priority.

d. Thinking through doing analysis to think about land management agencies or NGOs understanding ecological forecasts and different choices. Combining forecasts with scenarios to look at the consequences of the outcomes.
e. Starting to think more about visualizations for the Forecast Challenge - using the visualizations about learning as a mechanism for forecast improvement
f. For the interviews that were conducted had forecasters who got half way through their project who wished they knew what their partners decision making process was because they may have made different decisions or changes.
   ■ Is there a way to fill this gap? Presentations?
   ■ Structured decision making runs into some issues. There are some hidden objectives
   ■ Using structured decision making as a tool for optimizing choices doesn't play out well with multiple stakeholders and hidden objectives. It might work well in academia, but doesn't work as well in more applied settings.
g. Jonathan's background is in structured decision making. Sounds like trying to match results of academic assessments to decisions. Researchers don't do a good enough job of identifying the decision makers and making decisions for decision makers rather than for funders. One side of the solution is getting researchers in the room when decisions are being laid out. The more you can drive the science by the decision context, the better.
h. Challenge is the environmental decisions being made with multiple stakeholders when there are values that influence decisions that are not being publicly shared.
i. How can we contribute to the process of supporting decision making or helping people learn more about decision making? A workshop? Something else?
   ■ It will take more than a survey of social science to know how to make connections.
   ■ Think it is important to facilitate the conversations
   ■ Natural resource decisions has a set of objectives that are pretty common with then further nuances for each project
j. Think that the researcher/academics don't fully understand the issues involved? Can we put together a tutorial? What should scientists be aware of when they go into conversations? Researchers may not be aware of how decision are made.
   ■ Each situation will be different, but perhaps there is a set of principles that can be applied generally
   ■ Perhaps an hour tutorial?
   ■ Expose to researchers guidelines. Associated with a reference guide that people can refer to
k. As the Translation working we realize researchers/academics/managers don't necessarily speak the same language so we want to help translate
l. Want to make sure people have the same vocabulary so groups don't work
m. Medium/longer term priority - if we want to move the needle on particular sustainability issues and we think ecoforecasting has a role to play, then need to think about some kind of convening that is developed/led by decision making community and bring in academics from interdisciplinary fields to listen and share

some of the opportunities so then can think through where there are places for collaboration.
- If we had the people and the ideas, then Melissa can find the funding.
- This could be another mechanism where we focus on decision makers first

n. From Jonathan: Very generic example template of objectives that pretty much always are valued in natural resource management:
- cost ($, FTE, effort, etc.)
- use (harvest, collection, viewing, tourism, etc.)
- ecological value (ecosystem services)
- inherent value (aesthetics, existence value, etc.)
- sustainability (biodiversity, persistence, etc.)
- equity (distribution of benefits and costs)

o. For Dana - decision makers are the ones who move the money and researchers are trying to get the funds. For example, for water managers - there is not a database where they can put their interests. So perhaps there is a need for a space for decision makers (outside those with funds) where they can put their interests

p. Organize different decision makers - could split it between aquatic and terrestrial and marine

q. Charlotte is working on a NASA grant and needs to find a organization to provide a funding or time match which was a huge hurdle.

r. Who the decision makers are is hard