

**NOAA Science Advisory Board
Teleconference Meeting
January 31, 2011
10:00-11:00 AM**

Presentations for this meeting will be posted on the Science Advisory Board (SAB) website at <http://www.sab.noaa.gov/Meetings/meetings.html>

Attendees

SAB members in attendance: Mr. Raymond Ban, Chair and Consultant, Weather Industry and Government Partnerships, The Weather Channel; Dr. Eric Barron, President, Florida State University; Dr. Heidi Cullen, Director of Communications and Acting CEO, Climate Central; Dr. Frank Kudrna, Kudrna and Associates; Dr. Eve Gruntfest, Director, Social Science Woven into Meteorology, University of Oklahoma; Dr. Peter Kareiva, Chief Scientist and Director of Science, The Nature Conservancy; and Dr. Jerry Schubel, President and CEO, Aquarium of the Pacific.

NOAA senior management and Line Office representatives in attendance: Dr. Larry Robinson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Conservation and Management; Ms. Mary Glackin, Deputy Under Secretary of Oceans and Atmosphere for Operations; Dr. Paul Sandifer, Senior Science Advisor; Dr. John Hayes, Assistant Administrator, National Weather Service (NWS); Dr. Paul Doremus, Acting Assistant Administrator, Program Planning and Integration (PPI); Ms. Judy Gray, Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR); Mr. Lewis McCulloch, National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service (NESDIS); Dr. Tom Karl, Climate Program Office

Staff for the Science Advisory Board in attendance: Dr. Cynthia J. Decker, Executive Director; Marcey Guramatunhu, Mary Anne Whitcomb.

Ray Ban, SAB Chair, thanked everyone for taking the time with the call. The primary topic on the agenda was the work of the SAB Working Group subcommittee on the alignment of Working Groups. The second agenda item is a discussion about the SAB process for NOAA responses to SAB recommendations.

Revised Proposal from the Working Group Subcommittee on alignment of SAB Working Groups

Eric Barron, Chair of the Working Group Subcommittee, reviewed progress to date on the proposal since the November SAB meeting. After that meeting, there was a revised proposal

sent to the Working Group Chairs that incorporated the comments received. The Subcommittee also added a rationale for why the SAB is aligning the Working Groups to the strategic plan. There was discussion about whether all the new working groups recommended in the proposal had to be formed immediately or if this was an evolutionary process. The Subcommittee agreed that additional working groups should be established when NOAA was ready for them. The Ocean Exploration Working Group was concerned about initial wording in the proposal that appeared to state that its interests didn't align with the Strategic Plan. The Subcommittee changed the wording to simply state that the duration of the OEAWG was limited. There was discussion about the notion of creating task forces and whether or not they can respond rapidly to NOAA needs. The Subcommittee added wording recommending two specific pilot task force proposals to see how quickly these groups can provide advice. There was discussion about whether annual review of Working Groups was going to be a burden; the group changed the wording to an annual review or an update to focus on seeing what groups were doing. The Subcommittee noted that the Working Group Concept of Operations (CONOPS) document lacked a definition of the role of the SAB liaison to Working Groups. Finally there was a suggestion to add an organization chart for the proposed Working Group alignment with the NOAA Strategic Plan.

Ray Ban said that was a good summary of actions that culminated in the current proposal and asked other members for comments.

Jerry Schubel and Frank Kudrna agreed that Eric Barron captured the discussion on the proposal to date.

Ray Ban asked if there were any questions on the proposal. He said his sense is that the SAB Subcommittee is proposing to move toward a structure to have Standing Working Groups aligned with the NOAA Strategic Plan Goals, while acknowledging that there are Enterprise Working Groups that would require SAB attention. The concept of the Task Force is that these groups could respond quickly to the NOAA needs with a turnaround of six months.

Larry Robinson concurred with the approach and said the SAB would help NOAA with an evaluation with what NOAA has accomplished on Strategic Plan actions. This approach to SAB Working Groups is timely and could work well in NOAA.

Mary Glackin agreed with Larry Robinson's points but also wanted to be sure that the concept allowed for other working groups to be created, if necessary. For example, one of the comments NOAA received from the NESDIS is that that Line Office would like to establish a Working Group on spaced-based observing. Does such a group fall under the Enterprise Objectives? Eric Barron responded that nothing prevents any Working Group from being formed if the decision is made that NOAA needs it.

Larry Robinson said that Task Forces should not have a duration or timeframe.

Eric Barron said the SAB should take an active interest in Enterprise Objectives, so the formation of separate working groups or task forces to address issues under the Enterprise Objectives depends on what NOAA is looking for.

Mary Glackin said there will be a briefing to the SAB on satellites at an upcoming SAB meeting so she doesn't want to prejudge whether the NESDIS request would be a standing Working Group or Task Force.

Larry Robinson said that in the CONOPS document should spell out how these groups will work.

Cynthia Decker noted that the CONOPS spells out how the Working Groups function but there is a need to go back and provide more details on implementation and spell out things that were not clear. Dr. Decker asked if there will be only Science and Technology (S&T) task forces or whether there are also working groups under the other themes of the Enterprise Objective (Administration, Engagement).

Eric Barron said that crosscutting Working Groups have value as standing groups.

Ray Ban noted that on the Working Group organization chart provided to members, EISWG and DAARWG were placed under the Enterprise Objectives. Under Engagement, S&T, and Administration there may be both Task Forces and Working Groups. The SAB may need to decide after a task force has completed its report, whether it should be disestablished or whether the group should transition to a permanent working group. The SAB and NOAA must manage these decisions within the total number of working groups.

Mary Glackin is comfortable that as the CONOPS document is finalized it will become clear that NOAA and the SAB are in agreement.

Larry Robinson would add to that sentence "as specified in the CONOPS document." Eric Barron commented that everything in the Working Group proposal should follow the CONOPS document. Larry Robinson agreed and said the reference to the CONOPS document should be made in the preamble to the proposal. Ray Ban agreed with the idea to reference the CONOPS in the preamble. Jerry Schubel agreed and added that in item 5 of the proposal, the SAB could note that other Working Groups could be established upon mutual consent of NOAA and the SAB. Eric agreed with this proposed addition to item 5.

Mary Glackin said she feels more strongly to adjust item 6 and put CONOPS reference in preamble. She was concerned that item 6 could be read as limiting working groups.

Eric Ban agreed to revise the document according to the discussion.

Ray Ban said between this teleconference and March SAB meeting, the SAB will circulate another draft of document and revise the CONOPS as appropriate to ensure it reflects the

discussion. At the March meeting, the SAB will review both documents one more time. No final decision on the Working Group proposal is being made at today's meeting.

Tom Karl commented that in the document it was not clear where cross-cutting groups would fit. It is clear for the groups aligned with the Strategic Plan goals; it would be good to make the alignment clear for cross-cutting groups.

Ray Ban restated that the Data Archive and Access Requirements (DAARWG) and Environmental Information Services (EISWG) Working Groups crosscut the NOAA goals. He said if the SAB does not specifically align them with one of the LO functions there could be confusion on both who supports them and what organization is their main gateway for interaction with NOAA.

Frank Kudrna agreed that the issue of alignment of the cross-cutting groups was a good point; that is why he tried to do an organization chart. After listing five groups under the SAB, he took a guess on the Working Groups alignment to start a discussion on this point.

Ray Ban said EISWG has a hybrid role on NOAA Line Offices: as the Terms of Reference document was created, the idea was to focus on the National Weather Service during first few years, and then the SAB needs to decide if it should broaden out across the agency. It makes more sense that it evolve to become more crosscutting through the Line Offices. Ray Ban asked which Line Office maintains the administrative responsibility for DAARWG.

Lewis McCulloch responded that the DAARWG supports the Environmental Data Management Committee (EDMC) so the funding comes from NESDIS. The chair of the EDMC is Helen Wood and she allocated funding but the EDMC and the DAARWG are both looking across NOAA.

Frank Kudrna said the organization chart would be dynamic over time.

Cynthia Decker said the current view of the EISWG and DAARWG as listed under Enterprise Objectives may not show these as crosscutting groups.

Ray Ban thought trying to show administrative linkages may be more complicated; administrative responsibility may not link with the Goals. He asked us if there was usually one Line Office associated with a Working Group. Cynthia Decker responded that is the way it is now but it could change in the future, depending on the interests of the Line Offices.

Ray Ban asked if the SAB should keep work structures at a functional level, that is, Goals and Enterprise Objectives, and not get caught up in how the Working Groups are administrated.

Larry Robinson thought that was a good point; NOAA will have to agree on funding, particularly if the WGs don't sit in one Line Office. It will be up to NOAA to determine how support will be provided.

Ray Ban summarized the actions on the Working Group Realignment proposal: there will be edits to clarify item 6 and a reference to the Concept of Operations document added to the preamble. Eric Barron agreed with that summary of the changes to be made.

Ray Ban added then the SAB needs to revise the CONOPs document to ensure that it contains all relevant information related to the proposal, ensuring that the wording is consistent with SAB discussions. The SAB members will also review the organization chart to find a way to illustrate the crosscutting nature of DAARWG, EISWG and any future groups.

Ray Ban said in CONOPS we will deal in more detail with Task Forces, reiterating there is flexibility in working with these groups.

Eric Barron is changing the wording in the preamble and at the end of 6, which may include establishing additional standing working groups with the concurrences of NOAA and the SAB.

.

Frank Kudrna said he will redo the organization chart. He asked for any suggestions or edits to the chart. He will make the changes for the next SAB meeting.

Action 1: The Science Advisory Board Working Group Subcommittee will revise its Working Group Realignment proposal as per comments received at the meeting

Action 2: The SAB Office will revise the Science Advisory Board Working Group Concept of Operations as per comments received at the meeting.

Action 3: Frank Kudrna will revise the Work Group Realignment proposal organizational chart as per comments received on the teleconference and subsequent to the meeting.

Climate Working Group (CWG) and Environmental Information Services Working Group Update

Ray Ban informed the Board that the proposed Task Force on private climate provider interactions is moving forward. This is a small group that will be the joint responsibility of the Climate and Environmental Information Services Working Groups. The chairs of EISWG and CWG and their NOAA sponsors had a meeting the previous week and the plan is to form a task force from a cross-section of EISWG and CWG members and other community experts. The timeline is fast-tracked so that the recommendations come up through the both Working Groups and then to the SAB at the summer meeting. The CWG and EISWG will make recommendations from the task force to the SAB. As the task force proceeds, the SAB will see if the six month timeframe is realistic for producing something useful to NOAA. This Task Force is one of the two pilots proposed in the Working Group Realignment proposal.

Process of SAB Comments on NOAA Responses to SAB Products

Ray Ban introduced the second agenda item—the process of how the SAB provides comments on the NOAA Responses to SAB Products. This issue came up in the recent NOAA Responses to the SAB recommendations on the climate service. At the November meeting, the SAB members were provided all responses to recommendations on the climate service. The process is for the SAB to provide editorial comments back to NOAA on its response reports. To avoid a long process the SAB comments should generally fall into the category of correcting for clarity (what was meant in the response), corrections of terms, or language that may be imprecise. If there are more substantive comments, they will be discussed in ongoing interactions between the SAB and NOAA.

Cynthia Decker said that a NOAA Response includes both a presentation at the SAB meeting and a written response. There has usually not been an issue with the responses, however at the last SAB meeting there were responses to five different reports from the CWG. The CWG wanted an opportunity to look at the material and respond but they wanted to discuss the appropriate process for providing any comments from the SAB to NOAA on these.

Eric Barron said this could be a role of the liaison to the Working Group. He suggested it might be a good idea for the SAB liaison(s) to a working group to look at written reports and flag anything that might be an issue.

Ray Ban said this was a good point and that process is playing out right now. There is a CWG meeting in a few weeks. Heidi Cullen, the SAB liaison to the CWG, will be there. At the March meeting, Heidi Cullen will provide the SAB with the thoughts of the CWG and, if approved by the SAB, these will be transmitted to NOAA.

Heidi Cullen said she sees her role at the CWG meeting is to manage the process so that it proceeds in an expedient fashion. She also noted that in its responses to SAB reports, NOAA may be limited in its actions to comply with the report recommendations.

Frank Kudrna said when the SAB sends a set of recommendations to NOAA; it helps if NOAA responds to each recommendation rather than to a group of recommendations. Such a process for providing responses from NOAA may help with the issue of unclear responses. Ray Ban said he agreed with Frank's comment. He also believes that when the SAB reviews NOAA responses to its recommendations, they should primarily point out issues with the format and clarity of responses.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Actions

Action 1: The Science Advisory Board Working Group Subcommittee will revise its Working Group Realignment proposal as per comments received at the meeting

Action 2: The SAB Office will revise the Science Advisory Board Working Group Concept of Operations as per comments received at the meeting.

Action 3: Frank Kudrna will revise the Work Group Realignment proposal organizational chart as per comments received on the teleconference and subsequent to the meeting.