

**NOAA Science Advisory Board  
Teleconference  
June 23, 2014  
3:30-4:30 PM Eastern Daylight Time**

Presentations for this meeting have been posted on the Science Advisory Board (SAB) website:  
[http://www.sab.noaa.gov/Meetings/2014/june/june\\_23\\_2014.html](http://www.sab.noaa.gov/Meetings/2014/june/june_23_2014.html)

**SAB Members in attendance:** Mr. Raymond Ban (Chair), Ban and Associates Consulting LLC; Dr. Susan Avery, Director and President, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution; Dr. Eric Barron, President, Pennsylvania State University; Dr. Heidi Cullen, Vice President for External Communications and Chief Climatologist, Climate Central; Dr. Mike Donahue, Vice President, Water Resources and Environmental Services, URS Corporation; Mr. Walter Faulconer, President, Strategic Space Solutions; Dr. David Lodge, Professor, University of Notre Dame; Ms. Jean May-Brett, STEM Partnership Coordinator, Louisiana Department of Education; Dr. Molly Macauley, Vice President for Research and Senior Fellow, Resources for the Future; Ms. Lynn Scarlett, Managing Director for Public Policy, The Nature Conservancy; Dr. Jerry Schubel, President and CEO, Aquarium of the Pacific; Dr. Marshall Shepherd, Professor, University of Georgia; Mr. Bob Winokur, private consultant; and Dr. Dawn Wright, Chief Scientist, Environmental Systems Research Institute

**NOAA leadership and Line Office representatives in attendance:** Dr. Holly Bamford, Assistant Administrator, National Ocean Service; Dr. Richard Merrick, Chief Scientist, National Marine Fisheries Service; Dr. Paula Davidson, Assistant Department Administrator, Office of Science and Technology, National Weather Service; Dr. David Hermreck, Senior Programs Advisor, National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service; and Rear Admiral David Score, Director, Marine and Aviation Operations Centers, Office of Marine and Aviation Operations

**Staff for the Science Advisory Board in attendance:** Dr. Cynthia Decker, Executive Director; Mary Anne Whitcomb; Anna Hermes; and Tony Marshak

**Call to Order**

Ray Ban, Ban and Associates and Chair, SAB

Summary

Ray Ban thanked everyone for being on the teleconference. He reviewed the teleconference agenda, highlighting that there were two topics arising from the April 2014 SAB meeting. First, Dr. David Fluharty presented a report, Ecosystem Based Fisheries Management from the Ecosystem Sciences and Management Working Group (ESMWG) at the April 2014 SAB meeting. The SAB agreed that revisions should be made before it could accept the report and transmit to NOAA. Second, Dr. Dawn Wright presented the External Review of the Cooperative Institute for Marine Ecosystems and Climate (CIMEC). CIMEC was awarded an “Outstanding” rating, but the SAB had some concerns about aspects of the review. It agreed to discuss these before accepting the review and drafting a transmittal letter to NOAA. These issues and the draft

transmittal letter are to be discussed. Finally, NOAA is seeking an SAB member to lead the review of the Cooperative Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Studies (CIMAS), to be held in Fall 2014.

**Revised Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Report from the Ecosystem Sciences and Management Working Group (ESMWG)**

David Fluharty, University of Washington, and Co-Chair, ESMWG  
(ESMWG members invited to call in.)

Summary

The purpose of the presentation was to present the revisions to the Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management (EBFM) report. If the revisions are approved by the SAB, the report will be transmitted to NOAA. Dr. Fluharty thanked the SAB for the discussion during the April 2014 meeting; the comments helped the working group improve many aspects of the report.

Highlights of the comments received from the SAB were to review the discrepancy between the executive summary language, the report content, and the recommendations presented; clarify when a needs assessment ought to be performed; inclusion of a recommendation to include the Comparative Analysis of Marine Ecosystem Organization (CAMEO) program; and a request to include examples of EBFM on a species-by-species basis. In response to these comments, the ESMWG reviewed the entire report to ensure consistency of messaging throughout the report.

Recommendations were revised for clarity, and wording was modified between “ancillary,” “primary,” and “principal” recommendations. The “primary” recommendations are those that reflect the working group’s support of ongoing practices that need to be continued short-term, and include needs assessments. The “principal” recommendations are less prescriptive in how the recommendation should be executed.

The CAMEO program was cited as a type of ecosystem program for implementing EBFM, and the report points out that it is unfortunate that CAMEO is no longer funded. The working group assessed whether NOAA NMFS and the National Science Foundation could reinstitute CAMEO, but the working group was not optimistic that this could happen.

In citing examples of successful EBFM on a single species basis, the revised report showed that it is difficult to attribute ecosystem measures to actions taken by regional centers unless causality was demonstrated through monitoring. If stocks have a positive trend in areas where EBFM was implemented, it could be fair to attribute the positive trend to the actions of Fisheries Management Councils, but there may be other contributing factors. A few additional references were added to the report, citing studies that have looked at various species in terms of United States EBFM.

There was a question regarding whether there was sufficient funding to support EBFM. The working group does not think there are enough resources for EBFM, but progress can be made at regional levels by doing needs assessments and prioritizing needs.

Lastly, socio-economics were integrated into the report text and recommendations. A recommendation was added to continue international efforts to promote the US approach to EBFM in regional fisheries organizations and other places.

### Discussion

Dr. Lodge commended the working group and the report writing team for their great responsiveness to the concerns expressed by the SAB. He thanked them for their excellent work.

Dr. Schubel motioned for the SAB to approve the revised EBFM report, which was seconded by Dr. Lodge. The report was approved unanimously without any objections or abstentions.

Action 1: The ESMWG EBFM report will be transmitted to NOAA. NOAA will respond within one year of the transmittal.

### **Proposed Language for the Transmittal Letter for the Review Report on the Cooperative Institute for Marine Ecosystems and Climate (CIMEC)**

Ray Ban, Ban and Associates and Chair, SAB

Dawn Wright, ESRI, Member, SAB and Chair, CIMEC Review Committee

### Summary

Dr. Wright said the purpose of the presentation during the teleconference was to look at the proposed language for the CIMEC transmittal letter, and if approved, the letter will be transmitted to NOAA. The language of the letter reflects the concerns raised by the SAB about some aspects of CIMEC raised at the April 2014 Sab meeting. Briefly in review, Dr. Wright mentioned that CIMEC is a seven-member consortium and the external review panel determined that it is an important member of the Cooperative Institute community. The review panel awarded CIMEC an “Outstanding” rating primarily because of the excellence of its scientific research and impact of its education and outreach activities. However, the review panel was concerned that CIMEC does not have a formal Strategic Plan. At the April 2014 SAB meeting, the SAB decided that the CIMEC review transmittal letter should have clarifying language about the Strategic Plan and the “Outstanding” rating. A draft transmittal letter was provided on the SAB website prior to the teleconference.

The transmittal letter highlights that CIMEC is a valuable member of the CI community and is “Outstanding” in its scientific research and outreach and education. However, the review panel (and SAB) is concerned about the lack of a Strategic Plan. The SAB recommends that NOAA should require CIMEC to develop a strategic plan within six months before CIMEC receives additional funding.

Dr. Wright concluded by welcoming additional thoughts and comments on the transmittal letter language. She also suggested that the SAB may want to consider revising the CI review rankings from “Outstanding,” “Satisfactory,” and “Unsatisfactory,” and recommended the following categories: continue support with no conditions, continue support with conditions, hold support for a designated period, or remove support.

## Discussion

Mr. Ban reminded the SAB that the April 2014 SAB meeting had an action to discuss the CI review process and review ratings during the July 2014 SAB meeting. Dr. Decker confirmed that this discussion is indeed on the July 2014 SAB meeting agenda. Mr. Ban said that the July 2014 meeting will be the time for a thorough and complete discussion on the topic of CI reviews but the task at hand is to address the language of the transmittal letter for the CIMEC review. Dr. Wright proposed that though CIMEC lacked a strategic plan, the SAB could include a specific recommendation that NOAA requires CIMEC to complete a strategic plan within a given time frame in order for continued financial support.

Dr. Schubel said that he agreed with the language in the transmittal letter, except that he would strengthen the language from “suggest” to “urge” or “recommend.” Dr. Wright replied that the review panel would have no problem using “urge,” as they felt strongly that CIMEC should convene its Council of Fellows for strategic planning.

Dr. Avery expressed some concerns about requiring CIMEC to have a strategic plan. Her main concern was that not all CIs are alike, and perhaps a strategic plan is not the best thing for CIMEC given its consortium status. Different types of CIs bring unique partnerships and work to NOAA. For example, the consortium CI at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution provides a wide range of research to NOAA’s Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, but a single institution provides targeted research where a consortium cannot. Dr. Avery asked what would be the purpose of the strategic plan for a large CI consortium when the CI lacks any discretionary funding. Large CIs have substantial discretionary funds, and are more integrated with funding from the partner university; in this case, strategic planning is important for outlining how the funding is to be used, how it will be distributed, etc. Moreover, how would a consortium strategic plan interface with NOAA’s goals? Dr. Avery suggested that a strategic plan may not satisfy the requirements the SAB is looking for.

Dr. Barron said that he was not sure how NOAA could fund, and continue to fund, an organization that does not clearly state what it plans to do with the funding and how it will interact with NOAA. NOAA should be blunt about the fact that if there is no planning, the CI is not really a CI, but is, rather, a vehicle for funding universities with a reduced competitive review process. Dr. Barron added that it was not clear whether a CI could be considered “Outstanding” without evidence of this strategic planning.

Ms. Scarlett said that not all CIs are similar in size and scope, and the same could be said for strategic plans. A strategic plan could describe how the participants of the CI are going to work together to enhance coordination, and could describe how the CI will advance NOAA’s goals. Ms. Scarlett expressed concern about giving CIMEC an “Outstanding” without requiring any planning, but believes the CIs should have the opportunity to tailor their strategic plan to what works for their size and funding level. Dr. Avery replied that she thinks of a “strategic plan” as something that is supported by a formal investment strategy and business framework. Requiring a strategic plan without the discretionary funding to implement it would not be useful for the CI.

Dr. Wright acknowledged the good points of discussion all around, and brought the discussion back to the CIMEC review at hand. The review panel recommended that CIMEC develop a strategic plan based on Ms. Scarlett's definition: the unfunded and funded partners of the consortium need to think strategically as to how they will work together. Guidance along these lines could be added to the transmittal letter. The original CI proposal to NOAA was already quite formal in its planning, but when it did not receive all the funding, did not extend that to all seven of the consortium partners. However, based on Dr. Avery's comments, Dr. Wright acknowledged that it was possible that the request for CIMEC to have a strategic plan may be unwieldy. Dr. Wright said that she could not identify any other strategic plans on other CI websites; instead the CIs have progress reports or annual reports. Dr. Wright expressed concern about requiring CIMEC to do something that other CIs have not had to do.

Mr. Winokur said that the SAB should not hold up the completion of CIMEC's review with the recognition that there are larger issues at hand that are the topic of future discussions. Dr. Schubel added that having a strategic plan is often overstated, while strategic thinking is undervalued. The transmittal letter language could be reworded to suggest that CIMEC produces a plan that captures strategic thinking, rather than requiring a formal strategic plan. Dr. Avery said that the planning will lead to strategic thinking of how CIMEC is going to develop and work with NOAA.

Dr. Avery added that CI proposals for a regional consortium are not funded at the level advertised by NOAA, which is problematic as the CIs write their proposals to the advertised funding level. Dr. Avery asked whether the problem is that the CI has not done any strategic planning since their proposal, or whether the CI has not conducted any strategic planning at all? Dr. Wright said that they have been doing strategic thinking, but that this could be put into a document. Dr. Schubel said that strategic thinking could be captured in a few pages; the document would not have to be extensive. Dr. Wright added that the SAB would be recommending that CIMEC should put their strategic thinking in writing. Additionally, it should be recognized that the other part of the recommendation is to convene CIMEC's Council of Fellows more often to engage in strategic planning. Mr. Winokur supported Dr. Schubel and Dr. Wright's recommendations.

Mr. Ban said that the next to last paragraph of the transmittal letter could replace "formal" with "viable" strategic plan, with the added language that a "viable plan outlines how the CI plans to be of strategic value to NOAA." The transmittal letter could request this plan within six months. Dr. Wright said the letter could list what was stated in the review report by requesting that CIMEC develop an integrative and thoughtful strategic plan that will provide a framework to work with all its partners. The specifics of the language could be clarified and agreed upon outside of the teleconference via email.

Mr. Ban requested approval from the SAB to transmit the CIMEC review report to NOAA given the incorporation of the language discussed during the teleconference. Dr. Schubel motioned for the report's approval, and the motion was seconded by Dr. Avery. The motion was passed unanimously without any abstentions or objections.

Action 2: The CIMEC Review transmittal letter language will be revised by Dr. Wright, incorporating comments from the teleconference and any additional comments via email. The CIMEC review will then be transmitted to NOAA.

### **NOAA and Member Updates**

None

### **CIMAS Review**

Ray Ban noted an SAB member is needed to chair the review team for the review of the Cooperative Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Studies (CIMAS). Ideally, the review will be conducted in-person in September 2014. Any interested SAB members should contact Lynn Scarlett and Cynthia Decker if interested in doing this. The SAB members requested a list of upcoming CI reviews in order to consider who can do these. The SAB Office agreed to send this out to the members.

Action 3: An SAB member will contact Lynn Scarlett and Cynthia Decker to volunteer to chair the review panel for the CIMAS review.

Action 4: The SAB Office will provide a schedule of all of the upcoming cooperative institute reviews to the SAB.

### **Public Comment Period**

There were no public comments.

### **Meeting Adjourned**

This meeting was adjourned at 4:36 PM EDT.

### **List of Meeting Actions**

Action 1: The ESMWG EBFM report will be transmitted to NOAA. NOAA will respond within one year of the transmittal.

Action 2: The CIMEC Review transmittal letter language will be revised by Dr. Wright, incorporating comments from the teleconference and any additional comments via email. The CIMEC review will then be transmitted to NOAA.

Action 3: An SAB member will contact Lynn Scarlett and Cynthia Decker to volunteer to chair the review panel for the CIMAS review.

Action 4: The SAB Office will provide a schedule of all of the upcoming cooperative institute reviews to the SAB.