

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

Denver, CO
6 February 2013

MINUTES

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

Attendees: R. Spinrad (Chair), T. Gulbransen (Vice-Chair), C. Beegle-Krause, T. Browne, A. Jochens, V. Klump, L. Leonard, T. MacDonald, J. Manley, C. Ostrander, L. Ragster, E. Terrill, D. Legler (Ex Officio), B. Melzian (Ex Officio, via phone)

Absent: E. Pidgeon, L. Lillycrop (Ex Officio)

Welcome by Chair and Expectations for the Day

R. Spinrad called meeting to order at 8:00 am. Members introduced themselves, including new Ex Officio members from the Integrated Ocean Observation Committee (IOOC) (D. Legler and B. Melzian). R. Spinrad reviewed the finalization process for August minutes, noting “no affirmation necessary” today. R. Spinrad then outlined expectations for the day, beginning with a review of significant events and changes from the past five months, including addressing several challenges the committee faces in light of these changes.

HIGHLIGHTS from Discussion:

- There are major Administration changes (Congressional, Federal Agency level); therefore many new people are in the “system.” This is an opportunity for us to engage new potential champions in Congress.
- Fiscally, times are challenging. The Advisory Committee (AC) should be aware of this in the context that as we engage with audiences, they (Congress, Feds, etc.) may be pre-occupied with budget drills and uncertainties and less focused on audience concerns.
- The IOOS Summit was a success, and an effective exercise in community development. AC attendance also helped to drive/shape the business model dialog.
- The Oceans 12 meeting was a successful exercise in creating conversation between regional members and decision makers at the state government level.
- Regarding Superstorm Sandy; thanks to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Marine Technology Society, a one-day workshop was held to evaluate the value of IOOS. A couple of case studies are in final stages of development (evacuation of elderly, sortie of commercial fleet). One will be used to craft the vignette for the “150 Day” Statement.
- The National Federation of Regional Associations (NFRA) is now the IOOS Association. This might sound small, but is a significant, positive change toward unifying IOOS.
- Administration changes mean we need to get new staff members on board. Who do we want to target in the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Office of Management

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

and Budget (OMB), and what do we want to share with them (the federal message, or other)? As another example, how does the AC feel about Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System (ICOOS) Act reauthorization?

- The committee will work to build a new vision for a resourcing model. The AC is well positioned to provide new thinking on this. We should consider this new type of investment perspective, and consider speakers from the industry to come to summer meeting and speak.
- R. Spinrad concluded the introduction with the goals for the day (keeping in mind Z. Willis' quote that "IOOS is an integrating source for good").
 - Come close to completion on "150 Day" Statement; and
 - Begin and make progress on business model discussion.

ACTION:

- Evaluate collaborative tools for AC use under FACA.

Finalize "150 Day" Statement

R. Spinrad noted that the vignette on IOOS support during Hurricane Sandy is almost finished. The following discussion focused on refining the vision statement and the expanding the vision section, and included AC work in three break-out groups. Break-out groups each developed suggested improvements to the statement, and presented their group's outcomes to the committee. Members each commented on a word or phrase they felt strongly should remain in the statement, resulting in a common way forward to revise the statement.

HIGHLIGHTS from Discussion:

- C. Beegle-Krause and J. Manley voiced concerns over attribution and consistency of facts in the vignette. R. Spinrad agreed, and noted that the group developing the vignette will adhere strictly to credible citations.
- AC felt the statement should make clear that "IOOS is here, now" yet has a long way to go to reach its full potential. However, the existing IOOS is already greater than the sum of its parts.
- AC agreed that the statement should reflect that IOOS offers "one measurement, multiple applications."
- C. Beegle-Krause and L. Leonard felt the "expanding the vision" section lacked a human component.
- Other themes raised by members were: lack of ocean leadership (along the lines of ADM Watkins), and awareness that new leadership should be identified and educated in IOOS; concerns over vision scope creep; and a lack of vision understanding even within the IOOS community.
- B. Melzian noted that there is an existing body of IOOS literature. R. Spinrad agreed that new documents need to complement existing information.
- Once finalized by the committee, next steps for the statement include: publication in the Federal Register as means to inform the public including the Regional Associations;

developing a marketing plan for disseminating the statement, including recommending that NOAA and the IOOC use this statement in their missions and program development; and requesting a formal response from the NOAA Administrator and the IOOC to the statement.

ACTIONS:

- Revise “150 Day” statement: edit vignette using AC’s recommendations and boundaries; revise statement body based on output from working session at meeting. Share with AC for concurrence.
- Publish final “150 Day” statement in Federal Register.
- Clarify reporting method for recommendations to NOAA Administrator and IOOC.

Working Lunch (Discussion/Summary from IOOS Summit and ICE)

Many AC members attended the IOOS Summit in November 2012. Overall thoughts and impressions from that four day meeting were shared with the full committee. In conclusion, R. Spinrad noted that the AC will move in a manner complementary to post-Summit recommendations, including potentially advising NOAA and the IOOC to broadly distribute the Summit results as a basis for a communications campaign.

HIGHLIGHTS from Discussion:

- T. MacDonald and J. Manley felt the IOOS community should focus on new opportunities and expanding the “IOOS Nation.”
- E. Terrill noted that IOOS is still not being recognized by agency senior leadership.
- T. Gulbransen feels that too much IOOS work is done on hand shake and in-kind agreements, which is an unsustainable way of doing business.
- R. Spinrad noted that the National Ocean Partnership Program (NOPP) has been successful; how does IOOS get to that point? For example, should we consider recommendations through the ICOOS Act reauthorization to make joint federal funding easier?

MOTION recommended by T. MacDonald: Deliver request to IOOC requesting they brief the AC on how the IOOC works with agencies to identify commitments and track progress to implement IOOS Summit recommendations and other system priorities of the IOOC.

Motion made by A. Jochens; second by C. Ostrander.

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

NAY: 0

Abstain: 0

Framing the Vision for the IOOS Business Model

T. Gulbransen led the business model discussion using slides he developed (available on the IOOS Advisory Committee website). The discussion focused on two sections: framing the vision for a business model, and what should the AC role be in such framing? Overall, the committee focused on what a financial business model might mean for IOOS, including how to identify and attract new investors to support IOOS, either through specific areas of interest, or at a national level. The committee also plans to generate a virtual list of successful business model case studies to consider in light of IOOS.

HIGHLIGHTS from Discussion:

- Multiple AC members noted the importance of flexibility and diversity in considering business models to accommodate the existing diversity in the Regions, agreeing that while there needs to be a level of standardization, there must be options for customization.
- T. Gulbransen state that the AC should focus on the financial (versus process) model, keeping in mind that value proposition is the unifying principle.
- J. Manley reminded the AC that business models need to be assessed at multiple scales, from use of specific data types to the overall proposition of a national, collaborative construct.
- R. Spinrad and J. Manley noted the need for IOOS investors. From a balance sheet perspective, IOOS presently is all costs and no revenue centers.
- To that end, IOOS needs to identify where value is created (e.g., intellectual property or decreasing liability risks) and make it clear what exactly in what investors are investing.
- E. Terrill noted that IOOS is moving from a collection of regional projects to national efforts which could provide definitive areas for attracting industry. E. Terrill also highlighted the layers of participants in some IOOS business practices, i.e. data consumers, widget/device makers, system operators, and value-added providers. R. Spinrad agreed, suggesting that the AC invite investors to provide their perspectives to the committee. This could help IOOS connect specific investor types to different aspects of IOOS.
- T. MacDonald noted that as we move toward new value propositions beyond the classical federal ones, this evolution will be disruptive and may prompt varied replies by existing participants.
- L. Ragster commented that the AC will need help identifying business model needs, and to that end might need to consider an investment in a new skill set to do so.
- T. Gulbransen suggested the committee review successful “case studies” or other successful business models, including understanding what was the value proposition for each case. It is this level of detail the committee needs to understand what works.
- J. Manley expressed concern that the committee will need outside input to understand such case studies, e.g. expert input. The committee agreed to invite investment speakers for the next meeting.

- C. Beegle-Krause suggested the committee consider models where more charges are applied to decision-support services in contrast to science-based investigations. She also suggested the committee consider different funding scales such as microfinance.
- L. Leonard expressed possible concerns with branding of IOOS value relative to value added propositions (VAPs), noting the need to ensure attribution of value is clear. The AC also needs to ensure VAPs can recognize the opportunities to become an IOOS partner.
- R. Spinrad highlighted the need to tailor business models based on the maturity phase of respective value propositions because early stage efforts warrant different approaches.
- In response to E. Terrill's suggestion that we consider a user tax business model, A. Jochens replied that there would be significant work to re-educate Regional Associations to a fee-for-data/services model, as the entire premise of IOOS has been to offer free, non-proprietary information. C. Beegle-Krause noted the European community is intrigued by how much data are apparently offered for free in US.
- T. MacDonald suggested an IOOS integrating role may be to help bundle causes in order to create and market more powerful, far-reaching value propositions such as inundation.
- C. Beegle-Krause reminded the AC to not lose sight of the importance and vulnerability of rare data streams in light of possibly focusing on large impact value propositions.
- Z. Willis expressed the need for methods that could better "unit-ize" the value created by deployed funds/assets. Concern exists about support for some assets cannibalizing other asset needs.
- R. Spinrad asked the committee to focus on recommendations, not taskings, to the NOAA Administrator and the IOOC. If we make recommendations that can't be implemented, allow the agencies to explain to Congress why they aren't able to do so.
- For example, while the AC may want OMB to be aware of their recommendations, the AC does not advise OMB. However, through the FACA public process and making public recommendations to NOAA and the IOOC, IOOS constituents may discuss the AC recommendations with others, including Congress and OMB.

ACTIONS:

- Identify potential speakers for summer 2013 AC meeting to discuss "What is the value proposition that motivates (or would motivate) your investment in IOOS?" and "Are there key factors that would enable a partnership with IOOS to be especially attractive to you?"
- Develop questionnaire for identified summer meeting speakers.
- Build an inventory of business models worth considering, such as In-Q-Tel (may be web links).

Public Comment

No members of the public were in attendance or provided written comments during this meeting.

Adjourn

R. Spinrad adjourned the meeting at 4:45pm.

Report out of Actions and Assignments

#	Action	Responsible Accountable Consultative Inform	Due Date
022013.1	Post February AC meeting presentations on the AC Website.	R: Exec Sec	03/01/2013
022013.2	Revise "150 Day" statement: edit vignette using AC's recommendations and boundaries; revise statement body based on output from working session at meeting. Share with AC for concurrence.	R: Chair C: AC	03/01/2013
022013.3	Evaluate collaborative tools for AC use under FACA.	R: Exec Sec I: AC	03/15/2013
022013.4	Schedule next AC meeting.	R: Exec Sec A: Chair	04/01/2013
022013.5	Identify potential speakers for summer 2013 AC meeting to discuss "What is the value proposition that motivates (or would motivate) your investment in IOOS?" and "Are there key factors that would enable a partnership with IOOS to be especially attractive to you?"	R: AC	04/01/2013
022013.6	Publish final "150 Day" statement in Federal Register.	R: Exec Sec I: AC	04/05/2013
022013.7	Develop questionnaire for identified summer meeting speakers.	R: AC	05/01/2013

022013.8	Clarify reporting method for recommendations to NOAA Administrator and IOOC.	R: Exec Sec I: AC	05/01/2013
022013.9	Build an inventory of business models worth considering, such as In-Q-Tel (may be web links).	R: VC	06/30/2013
022013.10	Deliver request to IOOC requesting they brief the AC on "how the IOOC works with agencies to identify commitments and track progress to implement IOOS Summit recommendations and other system priorities of the IOOC."	R: Exec Sec I: AC	Within one week of publicly posting 02/06/2013 mtg minutes