

**U.S. IOOS Advisory Committee  
Administrative Virtual Meeting  
February 5, 2021  
12:30-2:00 PM ET**

---

**Conference Information:**

**Meeting ID**

[meet.google.com/vhy-zcyf-orx](https://meet.google.com/vhy-zcyf-orx)

**Phone Numbers**

(US)+1 405-373-6694

PIN: 352 002 467#

---

**Attendees:**

Scott Rayder, Krisa Arzayus, Becca Derex, Carl Gouldman, Catherine Tobin, Daniel Rudnick, Dick West, Doug Vandemark, Jan van Smirren, Jen Read, Jennifer Hagen, Josie Quintrell, Kruti Desai, Laura Gewain, Laura Lorenzoni, Molly McCammon, Nick Rome, Stephanie Murphy, Robert Winokur, Ruth Perry, Sara Graves, Tom Curtin, Oscar Schofield

- I. Meeting Welcome and Roll Call (Krisa Arzayus) (5 minutes)  
K. Arzayus convened the meeting and previewed the agenda.
  
- II. Approve Minutes from 1/22 Admin Call (Scott Rayder) (5 minutes)  
S. Rayder thanked the committee for attending and the support staff for their behind-the-scenes work.  
B. Winokur moved to approve the minutes. No objections were raised. Minutes from the January 22 meeting were approved.
  
- III. Transition Memo Draft - Final Deliberations (Scott Rayder) (70 minutes)  
S. Rayder noted that he would like to ensure the IOOS FAC is able to communicate to the current and incoming Biden transition team.  
S. Rayder summarized feedback on the letter. The original goal of the letter was to be more ambitious than in previous times. The committee provided robust feedback, including:
  - The letter needs to have specific requests
  - Better introduction of FAC to the incoming Biden team
  - Be more inclusive of other agencies: do we need two letters?S. Rayder opened up the discussion to other feedback from FAC members.  
  
L. Lorenzoni provided feedback on behalf of the IOOC co-chairs. There is concern that the letter is too narrow, and there is not enough representation for agencies outside of NOAA. The letter is very focused on NOAA authorizations, NOAA work, etc. While this focus is important, it is too narrow a scope. The IOOC would like to see a broader area of

interest covered. Particularly given the OSTP talk by Kei Koizumi at the UN Decade meeting, it would be beneficial to reframe the letter in terms of new administration priorities.

S. Rayder thanked L. Lorenzoni for the feedback and asked others to weigh in. He suggested evaluating the infrastructure piece as a starting point.

B. Winokur commended L. Lorenzoni for raising the important point of the audience. He suggested that the letter should be addressed to NOAA leadership—that NOAA is in fact the correct audience. The letter should introduce the FAC Committee, its charter, members, etc. Then, it should focus on what the FAC has accomplished and what the plans are going forward.

K. Arzayus clarified that the committee does provide advice to both NOAA and the IOOC. It is up to FAC members if the audience should be just NOAA or both bodies. Topics of relevance to the IOOC can be factored in if the committee so chooses.

B. Winokur stated that from his perspective, this committee is chartered by the NOAA Administrator. If trying to address two audiences at the same time, the letter will become too broad. If need be, there could be a separate letter to the IOOC to avoid confusing messages.

R. Perry noted that after reading the Federal Register Biden Roadmap, she believes the committee needs two separate letters:

1. The IOOC letter should be focused on the integration of NOAA into climate activities. IOOC messages should highlight how observations serve climate initiatives.
2. The letter to the NOAA administrator should explain how ocean observations can fit into data assimilation and integration. IOOS can serve as the lead here.

R. Perry noted that she believes the letters should be very narrow and targeted and resonate with the executive order.

J. Hagen expressed that the committee should identify the FAC and its purpose, as well as the IOOC. She noted disappointment that the committee has not been more engaged with the IOOC.

J. Read agreed with the points made by J. Hagen. She suggested making very clear the connection between the FAC and the IOOC. She recommended using the new administration as an opportunity to build that relationship.

O. Schofield noted that he agrees with the two-letter approach. The committee has been very focused on IOOS.

S. Rayder asked for agreement on the two-letter strategy. No objections were raised.

B. Winokur added that he agreed with the two-letter strategy, but that the letter to the NOAA Administrator should also note the relationship to the IOOC.

The letter was shared on the screen. S. Rayder started by examining the introduction. The new administration provides an opportunity to exercise leadership. He suggested including a line indicating the committee “looks forward to a robust budget submission from the new administration at the authorized level.”

R. Perry suggested weaving the blue economy language with climate infrastructure, climate resiliency, etc. It is important to note that research, technology, etc. are needed to build climate infrastructure.

B. Winokur suggested beginning the letter by introducing the FAC. It would be valuable to state right up front who the FAC is and why we are writing this letter.

S. Rayder agreed with that approach.

D. West noted that new leadership is receiving many transition letters. The introduction should be brief, display expertise, and then outline three key priorities the FAC is working on. Too much detail may lose the message. D. West also mentioned that the hill climate is currently the best it has been in many years for a NOAA Organic Act. The committee may consider how to push that along.

T. Curtin added that observations are the focus at the end, and the committee should be able to articulate how to integrate observations with climate, infrastructure, modeling, etc.

J. Hagen suggested pointing out that the FAC isn't duplicating anything but complementing existing activities. IOOS is a data service, and it makes data usable to users in real time around the country. Integration includes data integration in addition to interagency integration; the FAC is part of a larger network.

S. Graves notes agreement with comments. She suggested including the term “partnerships” in the letter.

D. Vandemark agreed with the two-letter approach, each a single page. The key points may differ between two letters—tailored to each audience.

S. Rayder noted that there is a little bit of time before department heads come into place. He suggested putting the budget requirements for the program in the letter.

J. Quintrell agreed that the letter should be a one-pager. The letter should still be aspirational. For example, the letter could state “we just got authorized by Congress...”

this is how we can help administration address climate priorities...” The authorization sets up a framework within NOAA that can help address climate priorities. While this won’t address everything, IOOS can certainly help with the coastal piece of climate.

S. Rayder noted it is difficult to get specific but suggested tightening up the sections that currently stand in the letter. There will be different introductions for the IOOC letter and for the NOAA letter. In the chat, a member suggested including the need for a sustainable blue economy.

L. Lorenzoni remarked that the IOOC would welcome feedback on communication strategies and needs. The IOOC staff is currently putting together a two-pager on the IOOC and its purpose.

D. Vandemark commented that there isn’t full understanding of where the IOOC sits and how it can pull levers to garner more interagency collaboration within IOOS.

N. Rome noted that the National Ocean Council is now the Ocean Policy Committee, which is synonymous with the Subcommittee on Ocean Science and Technology (SOST). This is the parent body of the IOOC. Deerin Babb-Brott (OSTP, IOOC Co-chair) is involved in these activities and wants to see the community be ambitious in this arena.

S. Rayder suggested that the ocean observing community needs a higher-level political ally to champion the role of observations in addressing climate needs.

B. Winokur suggested being cautious to avoid putting too much in the letter. Considering Kei Koizumi’s comments at the UN Decade Meeting, the committee should let the leadership get settled and potentially send a follow up letter later with some of these broader points.

S. Rayder agreed and expressed that he is pleased about Kei Koizumi’s current role, indicating he is very knowledgeable about the budget.

D. West cautioned pushing the budget issue too much. Verifying the authorization level is fine. He also suggested including more information on the FAC members.

S. Rayder suggested including member bios in the appendix of the letter.

J. Quintrell suggested S. Rayder connect with members of the transition team to talk through these recommendations.

B. Derex noted that internally NOS is working on setting up such meetings.

S. Rayder encouraged conversations with the career officials temporarily in charge during the transition. He also suggested connecting with Kei Koizumi if possible; Kei will do an excellent job of integrating research for the committee.

IV. *Public comment Period* (Krisa Arzayus) (5 minutes)

K. Arzayus opened the meeting for public comment. No comments were raised.

V. *Closing remarks* (Scott Rayder) (5 minutes)

S. Rayder noted the team is working on dates for a March meeting. He thanked Krisa and her team for addressing administrative hurdles for the committee.

K. Arzayus noted they are working on filling the two vacancies on the committee. They are hopeful that process will move forward soon. Additionally, they are working on renewing the charter. Over the summer, those who are completing their second of two terms will rotate off the committee, leaving three new vacancies. Other members will have to be reappointed.

S. Rayder thanked all.

K. Arzayus also thanked all and closed the meeting.