

U.S. Integrated Ocean Observing System Advisory Committee (IOOS AC)

Inaugural Meeting
Washington, D.C.
29-30 August 2012

MINUTES

All meeting documents and presentations can be found on the IOOS AC website:
www.ioos.gov/advisorycommittee

Attendees (29-30 August): R. Spinrad (Chair), C. Beegle-Kraus, T. Browne, T. Gulbransen, A. Jochens (via phone), V. Klump, L. Leonard, T. MacDonald, J. Manley, C. Ostrander, E. Pidgeon, L. Ragster

Absent: E. Terrill

WEDNESDAY, 29 AUGUST

Introductions

Z. Willis, Designated Federal Official (DFO), began the meeting with welcome and introductions of IOOS Advisory Committee (Committee) members and support staff. Dr. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Environmental Observation and Prediction, was introduced as first speaker.

Oath and Charge to the Advisory Committee (Dr. Sullivan)

Dr. Sullivan administered the oath of office to Committee members (A. Jochens via phone; E. Terrill absent). Dr. Sullivan then delivered the charge to the Committee and outlined several challenges on which the Committee may want to consider providing advice to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Administrator. Dr. Sullivan urged the Committee to take advantage of the first 100 days of the upcoming Administration as a time when unusual traction may be gained for IOOS. The Committee should think ambitiously and prepare well-composed messaging for use during this time (communicate how IOOS is an example of 1+1=3). Dr. Sullivan also encouraged the Committee to review the IOOS business model. It may be time for analysis and revision to better serve the future operations and growth of IOOS.

HIGHLIGHTS from discussion:

- Focus Committee efforts on messaging IOOS in first 100 days of next Administration.
- Review IOOS business model.
- Bowtie business model: if IOOS sits at the knot of the tie with the research community and decision makers to opposite sides, is IOOS able to act as a broker between these two communities?
- Work to clarify the value of IOOS, make that value easily recognizable through branding, and engage more communities in supporting and building the System.

U.S. IOOS Program
1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

- Change is coming with regard to public/private ocean observing-related services; what are common standards for data and services both public and private sectors can live with?

ICOOS Act Background (Z. Willis)

Z. Willis provided an overview of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observations System (ICOOS) Act. The overview provided context for how the Committee intersects with other bodies and other actions described in the Act.

HIGHLIGHTS from discussion:

- Committee reports to both the NOAA Administrator and the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee (IOOC).
- There are three primary challenges from the IOOS Program perspective:
 - IOOS has a broad mission; we need to message IOOS without overstating its role,
 - The IOOS Regional Associations (RAs) are a strong part of the IOOS network; we need to better articulate the RAs' importance to our Federal partners, and
 - IOOS is not funded at a level sufficient to meet its mission.

Ethics Briefing (R. Hermanowicz)

Rebecca Hermanowicz, Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) Ethics Attorney for the Department of Commerce (DOC), provided ethics guidance to the Committee. Members were given a handout with guidance for Special Government Employees and are encouraged to contact R. Hermanowicz with any questions (RHermanowicz@doc.gov; 202-482-0640).

HIGHLIGHTS from discussion:

- Members should be aware of rules surrounding: use of government, acceptance of gifts, involvement in political activities, personal conflicts of interest, personal representation, and access to confidential government information.
- When contacting R. Hermanowicz by email, also copy R. Spinrad (Rick.Spinrad@oregonstate.edu) and J. Snowden (Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov) as others may have the same question.

ACTIONS:

- Distribute R. Hermanowicz's contact information to Committee.
- Ensure all members have met DOC ethics briefing requirements.

Vision and Expected Outcomes (Rick Spinrad)

R. Spinrad presented both the historical vision for IOOS and thoughts for a forward look at what the vision for IOOS should be. Historical vision came largely from the 2006 IOOS Development Plan, which included the Seven Societal Goals of IOOS. These goals continue to be priorities for IOOS. Members also reviewed the guiding principles of IOOS from the Development Plan. Work toward these principles has led to a set of "givens" for IOOS; in short, that over the past 20

U.S. IOOS Program
 1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
 Silver Spring, MD 20910
 Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

years much planning and some executing has been done, but there still remains significant work from both Federal and Regional partners to make IOOS a successful national endeavor.

In continuing to build IOOS, R. Spinrad highlighted several “unknowns” regarding the System, including: best operating model, political capital of IOOS, financial commitments across the board, optimal governance structure, infrastructure capitalization priorities, and risk tolerance of partners in IOOS. These unknowns lent themselves directly to discussion and identification of questions the Committee may want to keep at front of mind if not directly address in the coming months and years of their tenure. The question list generated (at least one question from each member) was refined and circulated to all members to have close at hand as they begin their Committee work.

HIGHLIGHTS from discussion:

- There was rich discussion considering what the best business model would be for IOOS. This includes aspects such as sustainability, cultural identity, accountability, and diversity of funding. This topic will continue to be discussed and analyzed over the next year.
- Members focused on the need for IOOS to more nimble; to flex to changes in funding priorities, as well as adjust to evolving mission and user needs.
- Members focused on the “How” of IOOS, not the “Why.” The Committee recognizes there is adequate justification for the endeavor, and that recommendations are needed to move the system forward.

ACTION:

- Distribute Committee member-generated questions to all members and post on Committee website.

Review of Draft Bylaws (R. Spinrad)

R. Spinrad led discussion with the members of the draft bylaws. The bylaws describe how the Committee will function, and include direction from the ICOOS Act and IOOS Advisory Committee charter. If FACA dictates a timeframe regarding time required for members to be notified of bylaw changes, the bylaws will be amended during the next Committee meeting to reflect this rule. Four edits were identified: Article 5(G), insert sentence “Draft minutes shall be made available to Committee members within 30 days of the meeting.”; Article 7(C), insert “in consultation with the full Committee”; Article 7(E), insert “including subcommittee meetings”; and Article 9, delete last sentence.

MOTION recommended by R. Spinrad: Approve the bylaws with four edits.

Motion made by T. Gulbransen; second by V. Klump.

YEA: R. Spinrad, L. Ragster, T. Browne, T. Gulbransen, V. Klump, L. Leonard, E. Pidgeon, C. Ostrander, C. Beegle-Kraus, J. Manley, T. MacDonald, A. Jochens

NAY: 0

Abstain: 0

U.S. IOOS Program
1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

HIGHLIGHTS from discussion:

- Members may be permitted to virtually attend a Committee meeting under extenuating circumstances. This will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the Chair and DFO.
- The lack of member term staggering is an unresolved issue, which will need to be addressed during ICOOS Act reauthorization, or through other identified means.
- Note that if a member's affiliation changes, this may negatively affect the balance of the Committee and may be grounds for termination of membership on the Committee.
- Minutes and votes will reflect attribution.
- Regarding attribution in voting, if a member feels uncomfortable or unable to participate in a vote, they may recuse themselves, abstain, or raise a motion with a second for a secret ballot.
- Ties in voting will be dealt with on a case by case basis.
- Members may come forward to form subcommittees, which may be established after virtual notification of the full Committee. Careful consideration should be made regarding which external experts are asked to participate on subcommittees.

ACTION

- Distribute revised bylaws to Committee and post on Committee website.
- Determine FACA rules for timeline of member notification regarding bylaw changes.
- Identify ex officio members to the Committee.
- Distribute guidance on uniform labeling of confidential information provided to the Committee.

IOOC Co-Chairs Panel (B. Houtman, D. Legler, E. Lindstrom)

The three Co-Chairs of the IOOC (B. Houtman, National Science Foundation (NSF); D. Legler, NOAA; E. Lindstrom, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)) provided a history of the IOOC as established by the ICOOS Act. The IOOC and the IOOS Program Office work closely to meet requirements in the ICOOS Act, including implementing certification for Regional Information Coordination Entities, completing an independent cost estimate for IOOS, and completing a gaps assessment.

The primary challenges as identified by the IOOC are: defining IOOS and creating a shared vision, diversifying funding sources yet maintaining management and budget control, defining and encouraging integration, implementing data management practices across federal and non-federal partners, and encouraging a community modeling enterprise that exploits IOOS and addresses user needs.

HIGHLIGHTS from discussion

- L. Ragster asked why communication wasn't listed as a challenge. E. Lindstrom noted that while it is a challenge, in some ways that challenge is being met by the IOOS Summit planned for November 2012. Co-Chairs later discussed the need for a communications plan that identifies products, as well as spreads the word and expands the audience for IOOS.

U.S. IOOS Program
1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

- R. Spinrad asked if the IOOC sees a need for a revised vision, or an “IOOS Next.” Co-Chairs were in agreement: yes. We would benefit from a new vision, and the Committee has the correct charter to tackle such a task.
- Note that to develop a new vision there must be a clear consensus definition of the system and its boundaries. You need to be able to identify what is and what is therefore not part of the system.
- R. Spinrad asked the Co-Chairs for IOOC near term priorities they would like the Committee to address, noting ideally products produced for the IOOC would also be of use to individual IOOC agencies. IOOC Co-Chairs stressed Committee involvement during and after the Summit is highest importance.
- T. Gulbransen asked the co-chairs if they thought they have a good read on the needs of IOOS regional stakeholders. Co-chairs indicated that they were comfortable that needs have been surveyed and reported adequately.

IOOC Seniors Panel (M. Freilich, NASA; R. LaBelle, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM); D. Conover, NSF; W. Curtis, United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); J. Haines, United States Geological Survey (USGS); H. Bamford, NOAA; K. Curry, Oceanographer of the Navy; J. Berkson, United States Coast Guard (USCG))

R. Spinrad recapped the guidance provided to panelists to discuss successes and challenges their agencies face with regard to implementing IOOS. Key points from each speaker follow:

- M. Freilich (NASA): NASA has a commitment to understanding the ocean, with focuses on geography, thermodynamics, and economic and social benefits. NASA is increasing their ocean observations, specifically with respect to ocean acidification and on campaigns in the ice free arctic. NASA has a strong data system for research, and makes all measurements and metadata freely open and available.
- D. Conover (NSF): NSF meets its mission through a merit based system for funding research, and supports the infrastructure to carry out this research. NSF is very engaged in ocean observing, and is pleased to be a part of IOOS. One of their primary challenges is executing a science budget that is constrained resulting in underutilization of the infrastructure.
- H. Bamford (NOAA): First, recommended that NOAA Federal Advisory Committee Chairs meet to discuss leverages. She sees first-hand value in that. IOOS successes from a NOAA perspective are through the strengthening of the RAs and NOAA’s relationship with the RAs. It is visible in the regions that users value IOOS. There are several challenges: better defining the value of being a part of IOOS (defining the “IOOS umbrella”), better defining roles and responsibilities within IOOS (federal and non-federal), and revising the current vision and priorities of IOOS.
- W. Curtis (USACE): USACE has been a supporter of IOOS for over a decade through IWGOO/IOOC support, as well as through placing a detail in the IOOS Program Office. USACE also sees the RAs as a success of IOOS, and the USACE works well with many of the RAs through their districts. USACE district participation in IOOS continues to grow as the

U.S. IOOS Program
 1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
 Silver Spring, MD 20910
 Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

value of IOOS is realized. As Major General Walsh says, make a friend before you need a friend; IOOS embodies this sentiment. USACE with IOOS developed the National Waves Plan. Challenges are to do a better interagency job of identifying observing priorities. Ideally, we want to be at a point where agencies can't function without IOOS. To that end, IOOS should consider broadening its range of users; the more who are involved, the more sustainable IOOS will be.

- W. LaBelle (BOEM): BOEM's mission to manage energy resources on the outer continental shelf is informed by ocean observations and models. BOEM has had a long relationship with IOOS, which they expect to continue as they are a consumer of ocean data. BOEM scientists serve on RA boards and committees, have membership on the Data Management and Communications (DMAC) Steering Team, and regularly attend IOOS and IOOC meetings. One specific challenge BOEM faces is integrating needs for all decision making, observing, and modeling as the agency works to regulate renewable offshore energy. BOEM will need to communicate clearly with stakeholders in the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, and Arctic regions. They would like the Committee to assist them with communications in these regions if possible.
- J. Haines (USGS): The coastal/marine portfolio at USGS is 10% at most. As a science agency, priorities for USGS are to ensure their science has value to policy and decision making. IOOS provides the opportunity to ensure just that. There are three areas where IOOS and USGS clearly intersect. The first is water quality and hydrological sciences. There is a whole community, distinct from IOOS, whose mission is water quality and coastal impacts, the National Water Quality Monitoring Network (NWQMN). This presents an opportunity – how do we get IOOS more engaged with NWQMN? The second intersect is geospatial information. IOOS will fail if we don't include this data. IOOS needs to think strategically about how we can better interact with the Interagency Working Group on Ocean and Coastal Mapping. The third area is the biological community. IOOS needs to convince this community that working together will get us all further down the road. IOOS needs to share more of the ownership of ocean observing beyond the marine community.
- W. Curry (Oceanographer of the Navy): Navy has a long history in the development of IOOS and is a user of IOOS products. Navy doesn't have a true ocean observing program; the closest area related to this is their developing ocean glider fleet. The fleet will have approximately 150 gliders, of which around 50 at a time will be deployed on national security missions. Others in the fleet could be used for contingent issues, during events such as the Deepwater Horizon (DWH) oil spill. Navy has concerns over potential proliferation of cabled ocean observing systems, but feels they can work through problems related to them. Challenges for the Navy include sea level rise over the next 30 years. There will need to be significant infrastructure revamping. A challenge Navy sees for IOOS is the significant lack of marketing for IOOS. IOOS needs a communications plan and marketing strategy to advertise its capabilities; the revised vision statement could serve some of these advertising needs. IOOS should approach not only agencies and regions, but reach into schools to educate students early on IOOS.

U.S. IOOS Program
1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

- J. Berkson (USCG): USCG has been a long-time supporter and user of IOOS. USCG has three primary roles: safety, security, and stewardship. Most aspects under these roles relate to IOOS. USCG contributes to and uses both observations and platform support within IOOS. USCG challenges are fiscal; budget reality may result in potential impediments to making/continuing to contribute to IOOS. Another challenge will be expanding USCG capabilities to the Arctic in response to increased human traffic.

Once each panelist presented, discussion was held between the panel and Committee.

HIGHLIGHTS from discussion

- R. Spinrad asked the panelists to describe their perspectives on interactions with the private sector with regard to their agencies mission.
 - H. Bamford answered absolutely yes, noting that the private sector comes to IOOS with a “what’s in it for me” perspective. We need to work together to identify a common end product. When we look at societal issues, we can bring a large number of private sectors to the table.
 - M. Freilich noted that the private sector is a source of creativity and innovation.
 - D. Conover suggested the Committee could look at using merchant marines to place sensors on vessels. He had this discussion with the Subcommittee on Ocean Science and Technology regarding this topic. He also suggested using ships of opportunity and leveraging cabled systems already in place.
- L. Leonard noted that there had been significant discussion on branding. Is there an expectation within the IOOC agencies that when we undertake partnerships, that these partnerships are formally accounted for or reported on?
 - J. Haines answered first that, no, that expectation does not exist. However, we should find a way to capture these partnerships without creating a large and burdensome data call.
 - W. Curtis noted that while IOOS is national, higher levels within USACE do not perceive it as such. W. Curry pointed out that from meetings such as the Committee, results often don’t reach further into his agency, rather stay within the ocean observing community.
 - R. Spinrad replied that perhaps the Committee can do something to remedy that issue.
- T. Gulbransen noted that research and development (R&D) is “sexy.” Should the Committee spend time facilitating R&D, or do the agencies feel that they have a good handle on it?
 - J. Haines replied that we should focus the IOOS discussion on maximizing the framework already being supported and for which there is already demand. For example, DMAC is a key component; if we can’t translate and integrate it, it’s worth little. Highlight R&D, but ultimately we need a healthy framework that is sustained and sustainable to succeed.

U.S. IOOS Program
 1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
 Silver Spring, MD 20910
 Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

- M. Freilich commented that the federal government has been fairly successful at developing strong research programs. The Committee should consider how we might demonstrate that IOOS products can't be produced without sound research investments from the federal agencies.
- D. Conover suggested that the Committee could consider how IOOS balances challenges, for example those related to R&D and infrastructure.

Public Comments

Josie Quintrell (National Federation of Regional Associations for Coastal and Ocean Observing (NFRA)) made the following comments:

- Provided background on NFRA, including their support and role in advocacy with Congress for IOOS.
- NFRA and the RAs work closely with federal agencies as well as The Ocean Conservancy, The Nature Conservancy, and the Consortium for Ocean Leadership, and have reached out to port associations.
- Specifically identified the Regional Build-Out Plans, which provide a 10 year outlook for the RAs:
 - One of NFRA's concerns with the Plans is that they "oversell" IOOS; we should be careful not market IOOS in ways it cannot produce
 - Plans identify four themes: navigation and safe marine transportation, climate, environmental water quality, and hazards.
 - In synthesizing all 11 Plans, approximately 30 common products were identified. However, nothing further was done as we aren't able to separate out the Regional contribution from National IOOS.
- Requests three pieces of advice from the Committee:
 - IOOS Act reauthorization: requested Committee input on the Act over the next several months.
 - Next Administration: requested Committee draft a white paper to use in messaging.
 - Priority focus areas for IOOS: requested input from the Committee on identifying the critical base or capacity IOOS needs to sustain so that it may continue to grow.

Wrap Up – Day One

R. Spinrad concluded day one by summarizing five key thoughts, then shared three main issues and related products for continued Committee discussion on day two.

Five Thoughts from Day One:

- National Ocean Policy Implementation Plan: do not distribute draft, For Official Use Only.
- IOOS Independent Cost Estimate (ICE): request that the Committee receive document as soon as possible.

U.S. IOOS Program
 1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
 Silver Spring, MD 20910
 Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

- Committee Vice Chair: taking nominations (noted that there will be immediate work and an active role for Vice Chair).
- Committee-generated questions: revise and have Executive Secretary distribute for Committee reference into the future.
- Day two: identified three issues for discussion time.

Three Issues for Day Two:

- Vision for IOOS
- IOOS business model review
- Communications/engagement/outreach strategy

Products:

- “150 Day” Statement
- IOOS Summit engagement plan
- Work plan for the Committee (Plan of Actions and Milestones)

Committee members discussed the above thoughts/issues/products. T. Browne, T. Gulbransen, J. Manley, and C. Ostrander all raised points related to addressing details of the IOOS business model (sustained operations, priorities identification, public private partnerships). C. Beegle-Kraus suggested that one thing the Committee did not hear about was the use of social media and leveraging of tools that are rapidly evolving. E. Pidgeon and L. Leonard both expressed an interest in hearing more details from the regions, specifically how the regions are meeting stakeholder needs.

Chair adjourned the meeting until 8:30am 30 August 2012.

THURSDAY, 30 AUGUST

Review Day One and Adjust Vision and Expected Outcomes

R. Spinrad led day two by framing topics and an associated timeline for the next 24 months. The rest of the discussion focused around the following four topic areas:

1. Developing a “150 Day” Statement
2. Developing a strategy for Committee presence at the IOOS Summit
3. Discussing and voting on Committee Vice Chair
4. Bring Committee into alignment on IOOS:
 - a. Vision statement
 - b. Business model
 - c. Engagement
 - d. Sustainability

HIGHLIGHTS from discussion

- There was agreement on the above topics for discussion.
- Members were interested in an outline containing key IOOC and NOAA events or deliverables to which the Committee may want to time their input.
- Regarding the Summit, it was agreed that the Committee should have a strong presence, though the specific type of engagement still needs to be determined.
- Different means of engaging during the Summit were discussed, including an offer by Josie Quintrell (NFRA) for time on the agenda.

ACTION

- J. Snowden will determine allowable interactions under FACA for IOOS AC during the Summit and promulgate guidance to the Committee.

U.S. IOOS Program Office – State of Play (Z. Willis)

Z. Willis’ presentation covered the current state of IOOS, including the structure of the endeavor (national and regional, federal and non-federal), as well as the role of the IOOS Program Office. Z. Willis noted specific challenges the IOOS Program faces in building a national IOOS: leveraging resources, managing multi-sector engagement, and maintaining fiscal, scientific, and operational interdependence. Needs addressed in the presentation are for a unified portrayal of the importance of ocean observing, coordinated messaging, and continued mutual engagement in IOOS.

HIGHLIGHTS from discussion

- Significant discussion focused on aspects of branding or messaging IOOS.
 - L. Leonard felt the power of interconnections needs to be communicated better.
 - T. Gulbransen noted that branding differs from labeling, in that a brand speaks to a reputation. We want to build a reputation for IOOS and avoid the “sticker price”; for example, make the benefits of IOOS clear before the ICE price tag.
 - A. Jochens stressed that IOOS really does work (DWH as example). The full story related to the DWH/IOOS success has yet to be shared.

U.S. IOOS Program
1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

- T. MacDonald stated that it's part of the Committee's job to make Z. Willis' presentations easier to deliver; presentations need to be developed for specific audiences.
- Members discussed the challenge of funding IOOS, specifically:
 - V. Klump offered that leveraging is important, and that message needs to more widely reach the non-federal community to succeed; a 10% reduction in budget results in greater than 10% reduction in system outputs.
 - J. Manley stated that IOOS will be sustainable when it is no longer a funding program. IOOS needs to be recognized as indispensable to those in a fiscal position to support the endeavor.

Discussion of Four Topic Areas (R. Spinrad)

The remainder of day two was spent in open discussion of the four topic areas identified by R. Spinrad. The following are highlights and actions from those discussions.

1. "150 Day" Statement

- Purpose to be explicit statement, using vignettes, focusing on the benefits of IOOS over the next five years.
- Statement must be short, readable, get at the concerns of the Administrators, Secretaries, Congressmen, but also specific enough so that it is credible.
- R. Spinrad noted one challenge is to be specific and offer recommendations, but to also remain broad enough to speak to national audiences.
- R. Spinrad will draft an outline on which Committee may comment.
- Committee must be prepared to answer the question "What does IOOS need?" in response to the statement.

ACTIONS

- Share "150 Day" Statement outline with Committee and request input from specific Committee subject matter experts.
- Provide content for draft statement.
- Finalize document and share with full Committee.

2. IOOS Summit

- All Committee members will be invited to the Summit. R. Spinrad is also on the Summit Steering Committee.
- Committee members feel it is important to have a presence at the Summit, and to begin to transmit some of the new vision/tone that will have been developed in the "150 Day" Statement.
- Members strongly supported holding a listening session; however, this may not be allowable under FACA.
- R. Spinrad noted that in his role as Committee Chair, he may announce what the Committee is working on, and can introduce members to the Summit audience.

U.S. IOOS Program
 1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
 Silver Spring, MD 20910
 Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

- In addition to attending the Summit, members requested a means for the public to submit comments to the Committee, which could then be announced during the Summit.

ACTIONS

- Identify options for accepting public comments through the Committee website and make recommendations to the Committee.
- Establish approved means for accepting and response obligation to public comments per outcome of previous action.

3. Vice Chair Discussion

- One individual, T. Gulbransen, came forward as a nominee.
- T. Gulbransen stated that he would welcome the chance to serve, and would be willing to lead development of the vision with strong support from the Chair.
- MOTION recommended by R. Spinrad: Nominate T. Gulbransen as IOOS AC Vice Chair. Motion made by V. Klump; second by L. Ragster.

YEA: R. Spinrad, L. Ragster, T. Browne, V. Klump, L. Leonard, E. Pidgeon, C. Ostrander, C. Beegle-Kraus, J. Manley, T. MacDonald, A. Jochens

NAY: 0

Abstain: 0

4. General Alignment (Vision, Business Model, Engagement, Sustainability)

- Investing in IOOS was a main area of discussion.
 - We should identify areas of mutual financial interests in IOOS growth, including insurance and investment industries (J. Manley specifically suggested venture capitalists who may be interested in the inherent risk of their investment in IOOS).
 - Members discussed investing; how to get an “angel investor” interested in IOOS.
 - We also need to be prepared to offer investors at various funding levels opportunities for different scales of involvement.
 - J. Manley felt that we should steer away from traditional funding acquisition methods and focus instead on emerging communities such as Kickstarter. The future of IOOS lies in the hands of citizens and individual stewards.
 - C. Ostrander suggested we consider crowd sourcing as a way to generate revenue as well as data, with Weather Underground as an example of crowd sourcing observations.
 - R. Spinrad asked, with regard to the business model, how much does the Committee want to consider new investment paradigms? For example, is there a model where intellectual property could stimulate revenue going back into IOOS?
 - C. Ostrander noted that PaclOOS is already doing this through licensing software developed internally and providing perpetual data services for external research

U.S. IOOS Program
 1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
 Silver Spring, MD 20910
 Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

- programs (ie meeting federal data management plan requirements for extramural research programs).
 - Several members supported the idea of charging user fees for IOOS services.
 - E. Pidgeon voiced concern that investor discussion is premature; we first need to a clearer message of exactly what IOOS produces.
- Regarding investing as well as messaging IOOS, members felt we need to reach a broader audience.
 - R. Spinrad requested the Committee target stakeholders outside those who already support IOOS to engage at the Committee meeting in summer 2013.
 - The vision for IOOS needs to read at the “kingdom” level, rather than “species” level for all audiences.
 - How do we reach communities who are unaware that they are users of IOOS
- R. Spinrad asked the Committee to consider research to operations, and whether it should be a part of the vision.
 - V. Klump stated that operations are important for sustainability, and should therefore be in the vision and in the business model.
 - E. Pidgeon noted that research to operations is part of a culture shift presently underway. Academic institutions are beginning to make decisions about engaging in operations.

Wrap Up Day Two

- Action items were reviewed.
- Chair thanked the Committee for intelligent discussion and an enthusiastic first meeting.

ACTIONS

- Seek collaborative meetings with other federal advisory committee Chairs within the first 150 days.
- Distribute the following documents/URLs to the full Committee: National Ocean Policy draft Implementation Plan, Independent Cost Estimate, E Lindstrom’s “Nine Dimensions of Integration”, revised Ocean Research Priorities Plan and Implementation Strategy, Regional Build-Out Plans, and Regional Planning Document.
- Post all Committee meeting presentations on the Committee Website.
- Schedule next Committee meeting.
- Initiate virtual discussion on invitations for future meetings.

Public Comments

Brian Melzian made the following comments:

- Spoke in support of Z. Willis’ presentation on the state of IOOS, noting that the Environmental Protection Agency contributes significantly to IOOS, but has suffered budget cuts. This is a loss for IOOS.

U.S. IOOS Program
 1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
 Silver Spring, MD 20910
 Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

- As a past ex officio member of the Marine Protect Areas Federal Advisory Committee, B. Melzian stated that his experience was rewarding and that federal advisory committee efforts are important to the federal government.

Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:50pm.

#	Action	Responsible Accountable Consultative Inform	Due Date
082012.1	Distribute AC member-generated questions to all members and post on AC Website.	R: Exec Sec I: AC	09/07/2012
082012.2	Bylaws: Distribute revised bylaws to AC and post on AC Website.	R: Exec Sec A: Chair I: AC	09/07/2012
082012.3	Ethics: Distribute Rebecca Hermanowicz's contact information to full AC.	R: Exec Sec I: AC	09/07/2012
082012.4	Distribute the following documents/URLs to the full AC: National Ocean Policy draft Implementation Plan, Independent Cost Estimate, E Lindstrom's "Nine Dimensions of Integration", revised Ocean Research Priorities Plan and Implementation Strategy*, Regional Build Out Plans, and Regional Planning Document.	R: Exec Sec I: AC	09/14/2012 (*document not yet final /available; to be distributed ASAP once public)
082012.5	Post all AC meeting presentations on the AC Website.	R: Exec Sec	09/14/2012
082012.6	IOOS Summit: Determine allowable interactions under FACA for IOOS AC during the Summit and promulgate guidance to AC.	R: Exec Sec A: Chair I: AC	09/21/2012
082012.7	Identify options for accepting public comments through the IOOS AC website and make recommendations to AC.	R: Exec Sec I: AC	09/21/2012

U.S. IOOS Program
 1100 Wayne Ave, Suite 1225
 Silver Spring, MD 20910
 Ph: 301-427-2453, Email: Jessica.snowden@noaa.gov

082012.8	Schedule next AC meeting.	R: Exec Sec A: Chair	09/21/2012
082012.9	150 Day Statement: Share outline with full AC, and request input from specific AC SMEs.	R, A: Chair and Vice Chair	09/28/2012
082012.10	Bylaws: Determine FACA rules for timeline of member notification regarding bylaw changes.	R: Exec Sec A: Chair I: AC	09/28/2012
082012.11	Ethics: Ensure all AC members have met DOC ethics briefing requirements.	R: Exec Sec A: Chair	09/28/2012
082012.12	Initiate virtual discussion on invitations for future meetings.	R, A: Chair C: AC	10/01/2012
082012.13	Distribute guidance on uniform labeling of confidential information provided to AC.	R: Exec Sec I: AC	10/01/2012
082012.14	Establish approved means for accepting and response obligation to public comments per outcome of Action 082012.7.	R: Exec Sec A: Chair I: AC	10/19/2012
082012.15	Bylaws: Identify ex officio members to the AC.	R: DFO A: Chair I: AC	10/19/2012
082012.16	150 Day Statement: Provide content for draft statement.	R: AC	10/31/2012
082012.17	150 Day Statement: Finalize document and share with full AC.	R, A: Chair and Vice Chair I: AC	12/14/2012
082012.18	Seek collaborative meetings with other Federal advisory committee Chairs during first 150 days.	R, A: Chair	12/14/2012