

**U.S. IOOS Advisory Committee
Virtual Public Meeting
June 27, 2022
3:00-5:00 PM ET**

Notification and Availability of Meeting Materials

The Integrated Ocean Observing System Advisory Committee (IOOS AC) was announced to the public by [Federal Register Notification](#) and on the [IOOS Advisory Committee Website](#). Meeting presentations and background material are posted on the IOOS website. All attendees participated virtually by Google Meet.

IOOS Advisory Committee Members Present:

Scott Rayder, Alabama Water Institute, University of Alabama (Chair)

Sara Graves, Ph.D., University of Alabama in Huntsville (Co-Chair)

Catherine Edwards, Ph.D., Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, University of Georgia

Eoin Howlett, Trinnex

Molly McCammon, Alaska Ocean Observing System (AOOS)

Julio Morell, Caribbean Coastal Ocean Observing System (CARICOOS)

Robert “Bob” Winokur, Independent Consultant

Jennifer Hailes, Naval Meteorology and Oceanography Command (ex officio)

Susan Yee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (ex officio)

Carrie Schmaus, Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management (ex officio)

IOOS Leadership and Staff in Attendance:

Krisa Arzayus (DFO), IOOS

Becca Derex (Alternate DFO), IOOS

Schuyler Nardelli, IOOS

Laura Gewain, IOOS

Fawwaz Hafizh, COL

Jane Candy, COL

Public Observers:

Clarissa Anderson, SCCOS

Emily Landeen, IOOS

Michael Foster, Moss Landing Marine Lab

1. **Meeting Welcome and Roll Call** (Krisa Arzayus)

K. Arzayus welcomed the Advisory Committee to the meeting and L. Gewain took roll. K. Arzayus outlined the objectives for this meeting which were to deliberate on the refreshed IOOS Strategic Plan, get updates from Preparatory Working Groups, and to discuss and agree on objectives for the fall in-person public IOOS Advisory Committee meeting. She acknowledged that Dave Easter from the IOOS Office was going to provide a budget update but this agenda item will be skipped because they can't publicly share IJA info yet and Dave Easter is out sick. The IJA spend plan was approved by the Hill, but IOOS still has not received allotments, which will be announced via formal roll-out activities. K. Arzayus mentioned that agenda times are approximate, and the meeting will include a public comment period. The meeting will not be recorded, and copies of documents and public comments are on the IOOS Advisory Committee website. Minutes will be uploaded as well when available.

S. Rayder thanked the committee for attending. He was not able to attend the May public meeting but was updated by S. Graves and K. Arzayus. The key for this meeting will be updates from the Preparatory Working Groups on base recommendations so we can begin to develop a skeleton for a recommendations report moving into the Fall Public Meeting.

2. **Revised U.S. IOOS Enterprise Strategic Plan** (Krisa Arzayus)

K. Arzayus shared updates and content about the revised Strategic Plan. The IOOS Five Year Strategic plan was published in 2018 and expires at the end of 2022. The IOOS Strategic Plan is receiving a 'light refresh' because the goals and objectives outlined in the current plan are evergreen and still reflect IOOS' priorities. However, the IOOS Office is updating the plan to reflect the current status of ocean, coasts, and Great Lakes observations, as well as the societal needs of our Nation. The IOOS Program Office has convened a small writing team (Krisa Arzayus, Becky Baltes, Kate Culpepper, Schuyler Nardelli, and Melissa Zweng) to refresh the Strategic Plan and draft an approach for implementation. K. Arzayus thanked Thrivner (Emily Landeen and Emily Wallace) for their support.

K. Arzayus described that the Core Writing Team is considering moving away from a 5-year Strategic Plan with a hard expiration date. This traditional approach often leads readers to discount the value of the plan in later years because it seems 'stale.' IOOS is committing to an annual review and refresh of a 3-year Strategic Plan as part of an iterative and agile approach. This and future Strategic Plans will include a 3-year window and a date when they were last updated. K. Arzayus described the benefits of this revised approach, including: better, more consistent focus on big-picture goals; the ability to more quickly and consistently metabolize changes in authorizing legislation and appropriations as well as technical capabilities; and stronger leadership within NOS, NOAA, the IOOC, and around the world because we will have more clarity on what's happening (and when) and, crucially, what's not happening.

K. Arzayus noted that even though IOOS will review the Strategic Plan annually, the Writing Team recognizes that a deeper review and possible overhaul of the Strategic Plan may be needed at some point in the future. Significant events that may trigger this include: a new IOOS director; new Presidential Administration, consistent with the GRPA Modernization Act of 2010 requiring every Federal agency to produce a new Strategic Plan within one year of the start of a presidential term; significant changes to the IOOS budget (+/- 20%); and/or major changes to IOOS authorizing legislation. K. Arzayus asked the committee if there were any other significant events she missed?

Committee Feedback:

- B. Winokur noted that everything on this list is driven by policy activities, and that changes in technology and/or requirements could also be cause for a deeper review. He suggested that the Strategic Plan should include metrics for success, which would provide the opportunity for a deeper review based on annual analysis of whether the plan is meeting those metrics. He also noted that the update of the Strategic Plan on an annual basis is confusing with the Annual Guidance Memo and the Implementation Plan - IOOS would need to be careful that these documents don't blur together. Strategic Plans typically have 3-5 year durations, and he is worried about too frequent updates.
 - K. Arzayus asked B. Winokur to elaborate on performance metrics and how they could be used as criteria for a major refresh.
 - B. Winokur suggested that a plan that is not addressing or meeting metrics says that the plan is either too ambitious or that the metrics are too ambitious, and that something is not gelling between what you are trying to do and what you are doing. He was not sure how the metrics feed into this, but suggested that they are an element of what you are trying to achieve and whether you achieve it.
- M. McCammon noted that another trigger for a major refresh is some major change in the ocean or an environmental issue that we were not aware of before. For example, ocean acidification was not addressed in one of their 5-year proposals, and during that duration suddenly ocean acidification emerged as a very important issue. Examples like this could require an adjustment of priorities in the Strategic Plan.
 - B. Winokur agreed, and suggested this might fall under requirements or under a changing ocean. He also gave plastics as another example of a big issue that gained importance quickly.
- S. Rayder asked if Dr. Spinrad is refreshing the NOAA Strategic Plan?
 - K. Arzayus responded yes, and noted this effort is in progress and near the finish line.
 - B. Derex added that DOC is also working on their Strategic Plan, so NOAA can't get ahead of it.
 - S. Rayder noted that we might want to align these Strategic Plans timewise.

K. Arzayus continued her presentation on the IOOS Strategic Plan. She mentioned that one thing the Core Writing Team did with the help of Thrivner was conduct an analysis of what has changed since the 2018-2022 IOOS Strategic Plan was written, and assessed the current state of our Nation's oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes. This analysis included: 1) IOOS's budget history; 2) Federal legislation; 3) Executive Orders; 4) Biden Administration Priorities; 5) cross-Line Office efforts at NOAA; 6) NOAA's Science Advisory Board Efforts; 7) National Academies publications; 8) updates around data, science, and technology; and 9) international efforts.

K. Arzayus noted that the IOOS Program Office wants to make sure the refreshed Strategic Plan is as effective as possible at helping IOOS work better internally, as well as coordinate and collaborate better with our interagency partners. The Core Writing Team held over 30 individual interviews with IOOS Program Office staff, RA Directors, and the Executive Director of the IOOS Association. We have also briefed and received comments on the refreshed Strategic Plan from the IOOC, and DMAC group, the IOOS Business Team, and now the IOOS Advisory Committee. The Core Writing Team invested this time because we really wanted to hear directly from our staff and partners about what they liked about the current plan and what they would like to see in the refreshed plan. K. Arzayus

described the interview feedback received. Interviewees agreed that the goals and objectives outlined in the plan continue to reflect the IOOS Enterprise and are evergreen. Interviewees mostly supported the idea of an annual update, noting that: 1) a frequent change in priorities would be disruptive to program's planning efforts; 2) an annual-ish update is too frequent to capture scientific and technical advancements; and 3) someone in the Office will need to be accountable for refreshing the plan; 4) an annual-ish refresh should not be an onerous task; and 5) there needs to be a tripwire for a deep review of the plan. Additionally, many RA Directors would like to see more involvement, coordination, and collaboration from non-NOAA Federal Enterprise partners.

Committee Feedback:

- B. Winokur noted that some Advisory Committee members sent in comments, and asked if there was an adjudication matrix of changes?
 - K. Arzayus responded that yes, there is a detailed change log and a summary of changes on a slide later in this presentation.

K. Arzayus walked through the goals and outcomes outlined in the refreshed IOOS Strategic Plan. The first goal is focused on observations. This is one of the key foundational parts of IOOS, and includes collecting ocean observations, leveraging investments to improve system efficiencies, supporting a regional network, assessing gaps, and incorporating sustainable and innovative technologies. The second goal is about data - the observations are nothing without the data that come out of them. This goal focuses on increasing data access, promoting standardization, strengthening data stewardship, improving data infrastructure, supporting ongoing maintenance and operations of data management systems, and expanding the capacity of data assembly centers. The third goal is about supporting model predictions that address a wide range of user requirements. This goal includes promoting numerical modeling, developing and sustaining community-based modeling to tap into expertise by regional stakeholders, helping transition partner models from research to operations, assessing model skill and advancing data assimilation, and advancing modeling approaches to inform decisions. The fourth goal is about providing integrated, user-driven products and tools. This goal includes translating observations into meaningful information products, developing regionally-relevant products and tools, generating and disseminating pan-region products and tools, creating national products that incorporate cross-disciplinary data, promoting IOOS products on international and cross-institutional scales, and understanding the economic value of IOOS data. The fifth goal is about how we increase the reach and effectiveness of IOOS through partnerships and stakeholder engagement. This goal focuses on governance, how we engage with stakeholders and underrepresented communities, increasing the operational efficacy of Federal, state and other partner investments, expanding and strengthening partnerships, empowering communities of practice, fostering the next generation of STEM specialists, and elevating outreach to engage new audiences. K. Arzayus asked the Committee if they had any comments or feedback on these goals and objectives, and whether anything was missing?

Committee Feedback:

- S. Rayder asked if the IOOC is mentioned in the Strategic Plan?
 - K. Arzayus replied that they are mentioned in terms of interagency partners, but maybe not by name.
 - S. Rayder responded that they should probably be named explicitly.
- S. Rayder asked who else has seen this version of the Strategic Plan to date?
 - K. Arzayus responded that IOOS briefed the IOOC and received comments, talked with RA directors, and talked with internal folks in the IOOS Office including program

- managers and the business team. She noted that this has not been brought to NOS yet, which is one of the next steps after getting Advisory Committee input.
- S. Rayder asked if after the Strategic Plan goes to NOS, if it will go for a public comment period?
 - K. Arzayus responded that no, this will not go for public comment because it is a lighter refresh.
 - B. Winokur suggested adding a separate goal that deals with DEIA rather than mention within different goals. DEIA should be elevated in importance.
 - K. Arzayus responded that the Core Writing Team had a lot of discussion about this and discussed this with the IOOS Association DEIA fellow, Ashley Peiffer. She wanted a DEIA goal to be well thought out, so suggested waiting until her efforts were further developed. A. Peiffer is developing her own strategic plan for DEIA, and this could be useful for developing a DEIA-specific goal in a future refresh of the IOOS Strategic Plan.
 - B. Winokur agreed with A. Peiffer's suggestion to wait on a specific DEIA goal. He also added that maybe something useful will come from the DEIA Preparatory Working Group. He emphasized that DEIA is still important to incorporate in this update of the Strategic Plan, and suggested maybe adding something to Goal 2 regarding providing accessible data to everyone, including underrepresented communities.
 - K. Arzayus noted that the Core Writing Team did some light text revisions to sprinkle diversity language throughout because diversity was not even included in the current version of the Strategic Plan. She agreed that something could definitely be added to goal 2.
 - B. Winokur suggested developing a matrix of goals and objectives in terms of developing metrics for tracking success.
 - J. Hales noted that for the Navy it has been helpful to have an Implementation Plan to accompany their Strategic Plan that outlines tasks or things they want to accomplish to meet the goals or objectives from the Strategic Plan. The Implementation Plan should be utilized to identify things to fund and things that line up with the Strategic Plan. This inherently links up with metrics to help assess how you are meeting objectives and goals.
 - S. Rayder asked about how IOOS Enterprise data architecture is tied into NESDIS? He noted that there is immense value in the data, and there are lots of data mausoleums across NOAA. We do not want IOOS to fall into this category.
 - K. Arzayus responded that IOOS data gets archived into NCEI. She is not sure if the data directly goes into CLASS, or whatever that platform has evolved into. She will gather more information about this from the IOOS DMAC folks.
 - M. McCammon noted that her largest issue with the IOOS Strategic Plan is that it is not very strategic, it is just an outline of the program. She suggested thinking about where IOOS wants to be in 3 years and what the goals are to achieve this. The Implementation Plan will show how we get there. IOOS needs to think about this at a higher level.
 - B. Winokur agreed with M. McCammon that the Strategic Plan needs to be more strategic in terms of where IOOS wants to be in the future. He suggested thinking at either a 3 or 5 year window.
 - M. McCammon noted that she made the same comment for the 2018 Strategic Plan and asked if at some point there will be a real strategic vision?

- K. Arzayus suggested this might be a good topic for the committee to dig into to give more detailed advice on what this vision should look like.
- B. Winokur suggested coming up with quantifiable ways to track progress and work on achieving goals, for example, providing data to increase the ability to increase forecasting skill by 30%. The budget could also be directed to improve something that could be measured.

K. Arzayus walked through the major updates that were made to update the Strategic Plan. The IOOS Strategic Plan has been updated to include feedback from interviewees as well as language around NOAA's and/or NOS priorities, including [diversity and inclusion](#), [climate change](#), the New Blue Economy, the [Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act](#), [America the Beautiful Initiative](#), and the [NOAA Service Delivery Framework](#). For the New Blue Economy, objective 4.5 was added to "Understand the economic value of IOOS data and information to enable communication of the benefits of the observing systems and tools." This is an active area of work within IOOS, including the Ocean Enterprise Studies. Other changes in the refreshed Strategic Plan include moving the 33 core variables to Appendix A, revising the Letter from the Director, and adding a page listing the IOOS Enterprise partners and their associated logos in the Acknowledgments section in response to comments from the IOOC.

Committee Feedback:

- S. Rayder asked if there are any major updates in the Strategic Plan regarding data buys as a way to supplement the data that NOS collects? He asked how IOOS is going to interact as part of that model?
 - K. Arzayus responded that there is nothing currently in the revised Strategic Plan about data buys. She suggested considering this in a future refresh as we do not have IOOS's role flushed out yet.
 - S. Rayder emphasized that this is coming and there is a huge void there currently. He suggested embracing the concept sooner rather than later, as data buys will come into favor in roughly November. For example, he suggested working with other industry partners to improve forecasting skill. This is a major change that is coming within private sector markets that could disrupt the public sector.
 - K. Arzayus asked if we could lend a nod to this in goal 2?
 - E. Howlett seconded S. Rayder's suggestion and agreed that it could fit within goal 2. He volunteered to think about this further and get back to the IOOS Core Writing Team.
 - B. Winokur noted that one issue with respect to data buys is the ability to actually provide no-cost data when it's coming from the private sector. This would be something for lawyers to look at or it could be included in agreements with private vendors. He explained that it will be important to understand the issues regarding redistribution of data and what the limitations are.
 - S. Graves agreed with exploring data buys and what the other components are.
 - E. Howlett agreed that IOOS is better off acknowledging and owning its role with data buys rather than letting this organically happen. He noted that he does not fully understand the route where IOOS becomes a broker for private data, and that this would be doable but very complicated.
 - B. Winokur explained that if data is purchased from vendor ABC, then the government owns that data and can redistribute it without constraints. However, if the private sector provides the data at no cost but is also selling it, then the

government could run into legal issues with data coming in from an outside source. He noted that this has been an issue with satellite data.

- M. McCammon noted that this is an issue with Sairdrone data as well.
- S. Rayder noted that this is something that Mesonet has dealt with, where there is a negotiation that takes place for who uses your data. This allows for more people collecting data that has value.
- S. Graves added that NASA and other agencies are working on this as well. She agreed that IOOS should own whatever we want to put as a goal so that we're not left in the dust in regards to data buys.
- K. Arzayus suggested that this could also be a good topic for the IOOC to consider. There will need to be some level of coordination.
- B. Winokur provided the example of companies developing wind farms and collecting in situ data that they may be willing to provide to the government but not to competitors. We will need to consider how we protect that data, or deal with "hidden data."

K. Arzayus continued her presentation looking ahead to the Strategic Plan refresh in 2023. To exemplify why an annual refresh may be beneficial, NOAA and NOS are expected to both release their respective Strategic Plans over the next year. Additionally, the IOOS Program Office is working with RA staff and A. Peiffer to develop a new guiding principle around DEIA, which will be included in the 2023 update. IOOS wants to ensure that its priorities, goals, and objectives remain aligned with NOAA and NOS priorities, and will review these materials and the Strategic Plan again in the spring of 2023 and update any content as needed. This includes implementing any Advisory Committee feedback.

Committee Feedback:

- S. Rayder asked if IOOS will look at the requirements process within a Strategic Plan refresh?
 - K. Arzayus responded that yes, this will be important to do.
 - B. Winokur agreed that requirements should be a driver for a refresh.
 - S. Rayder noted that IOOS could write a plan with no requirements, but that IOOS needs to show what they need data for. He noted that it would be helpful to do this following what has been put forth in NOAA and NOS Strategic Plans.
 - K. Arzayus agreed that in an ideal world these timelines would all align, but noted that we do not know when the NOAA and NOS Strategic Plans are coming out and we need to update our Strategic Plan now.
 - S. Rayder expressed concern that this process is being done in a way that does not make sense.
 - B. Winokur asked if IOOS could delay the 2022 refresh and instead come out with a refresh in 2023? He noted that he did not know what the pressure is to put the refresh out now, but waiting until 2023 would mean that IOOS could align its refresh with NOAA and NOS Strategic Plans.
 - K. Arzayus did not agree with this, and emphasized that there will always be something else that we could wait for to incorporate. IOOS wants to have a more agile process to help with this so that our Strategic Plan is relevant for longer periods of time.
 - B. Winokur highlighted that a Strategic Plan that is changing too rapidly is no longer strategic. He suggested being careful not to confuse a Strategic Plan with an Annual Plan.

K. Arzayus walked through the last slide in her presentation, which had discussion questions that the Committee had already mostly talked through. The first question was what do members think about moving to a more agile Strategic Plan and IOOS' commitment to an annual refresh? K. Arzayus mentioned that the Committees points were noted on trying to get more strategic and not get mixed up with other annual priority setting efforts. The second question was do these updates capture the current state of our Nation's oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes? K. Arzayus noted that this was touched on a bit already as well.

Committee Feedback:

- E. Howlett asked how agile does IOOS think it can be and what is the level of effort involved in an annual refresh?
 - K. Arzayus agreed that this is a good question. IOOS already does an annual review of drivers from a policy perspective. Right now, IOOS has not incorporated this into the Strategic Plan, instead this is incorporated into annual planning. IOOS is trying to merge these two components a bit. IOOS has not previously had a robust implementation plan, and is working with the programs within the IOOS Office to develop multi-year plans to address objectives and what the IOOS Office is going to do. This might help with being more specific and focused on how IOOS is going to address objectives.
 - E. Howlett asked what the timeline of the current annual planning at the program level looks like - does it take a week for program leadership to build the plan for the next year or does it drag out?
 - K. Arzayus responded that the IOOS Office is trying to make this process more efficient. In the past, this has been a 3-4 month process to develop the annual guidance memo and do more planning to come up with the specific tasks. In the past, the IOOS Office has struggled with timing and the way they get work done, as there is not a lot of in-house effort and other groups are funded to do certain things. Between developing statements of work with our partners and the fact that the funding cycle is late, this process gets a bit disjointed. The IOOS Office is hoping that multi-year project plans will help with this process not being tied to a FY timeline.
 - E. Howlett emphasized that the IOOS Office needs to be careful not to get tied to a constant planning cycle.
 - C. Edwards agreed that the constant planning cycle is a concern. A constant planning cycle may lead to a more conservative Strategic Plan that pushes less forward, so it might not change much year to year.
 - S. Rayder brought up the OODA (Observe, Orient, Decide, Act) loop to make decisions and noted that if we do this every year, there might be an execution lag. He suggested that IOOS should make sure that they are not constantly planning and are actually executing their Strategic Plan.
- B. Winokur re-emphasized that in the future doing something more quantitative with the Strategic Plan would be a good idea. He noted that this would help address requirement needs and would help IOOS develop a strategic view of where they want to be.
 - M. McCammon suggested that maybe the Advisory Committee could look at the refreshed Strategic Goals and come up with some big stretch outcomes that IOOS should work towards for each. This would include coming up with metrics to gage how well IOOS has done, which will be useful for telling IOOS's story (e.g., metrics

regarding things like densification of observations, model and forecast robustness, etc.)

- E. Howlett agreed that setting KPIs and metrics is essential. He noted that some could be pretty straightforward, e.g. measure X water level observations. More challenging ones, like supporting the creation of X,000 jobs would be much trickier. Either way, laying out aspirational goals with KPIs is a valuable thing to do.

K. Arzayus thanked the Committee for this helpful discussion.

3. *PWG Report outs* (Becca Derex)

B. Derex invited the three Preparatory Working Groups to give updates from their working sessions since the last public meeting in May. She explained that these Working Groups were designed to split off from the main committee to focus on the three Phase One priorities: 1) Climate Change, 2) New Blue Economy, and 3) Diversity and Inclusion.

The New Blue Economy Preparatory Working Group was the first group to give an update. S. Rayder and E. Howlett reported that the group came up with three areas that made sense to address:

1. Logistics: How can IOOS support the safe and efficient movement of transportation? NOS has the mission of safe and efficient movement on the seas, and there is new information coming from other companies that focus on these issues that suggests it is an area that is important to the American economy.
2. Coastal resilience and the impact of ocean and climate on coastlines and infrastructure has a huge impact on our economy, and there is a role IOOS can play to identify risk and future risk.
3. Renewable energy: Offshore wind is a part of the New Blue Economy, and this is a good issue to champion given it is good for the planet, people, and the bottom line but we need IOOS data to do this. The administration has already put forward goals in this space.

S. Rayer and E. Howlett also reported discussion on the definition of “New Blue Economy” in their working sessions. There needs to be a common, working definition. They felt like this was not worth more of the Committee’s time given IOOS and NOAA already have working definitions. C. Edwards also noted that their group came up with a fourth area of “Life and Property” but that this could overlap with their first area, “Safe and efficient transport.” E. Howlett agreed that if the first area was classified as “Maritime Safety and Logistics” then “Life and Property” is captured within this.

The Climate Preparatory Working Group was the second group to give an update. S. Grave reported that their group reviewed the Coastal Climate Signal paper and think that there are specific things that could be added to this report - For example, in the context of this Federal Advisory Committee, there were things that could be beefed up around technology. M. McCammon reported that their group also discussed the issue of recapitalization and the fact that this is the major focus of infrastructure spending IOOS is getting. Mainly, that IOOS needs to be careful not to recapitalize existing assets that might be changing in the future, and that we should not keep investing in the same things if they are not affordable over the long term or if there is new technology down the pipe that would be cheaper and more robust. M. McCammon also reported that their group discussed standardizing observations across the RAs. For example, glider observations should reflect more of a national coverage rather than region-specific so that these data can be easily synthesized and built

into regional and larger-scale models. S. Graves also emphasized that their group should be thinking of underrepresented communities and how to tie this into climate recommendations.

The Diversity and Inclusion Preparatory Working Group was the last group to give an update. B. Winokur shared that ocean science is one of the least diverse of all the sciences, and expressed hope that the Advisory Committee can make a difference with targeted activities. He reported that their group had met with A. Peiffer a couple times, and that their group supports and endorses her work and thinks her recommendations could provide a basis for higher level recommendations to the IOOS Enterprise. Their Working Group plans to meet quarterly with A. Peiffer to continue these discussions. B. Winokur suggested that one recommendation could be to continue funding a DEIA fellow in the future, since A. Peiffer's work has been very useful. B. Winokur shared that their group was looking for recommendations that would make a difference and do not replicate activities in NOAA, IOOS, or within the RAs. He expressed that in order to do this, we need to understand ongoing activities in NOAA and at other IOOC agencies. Their group does not have time to do a deep dive on all activities, but could target one recommendation to conduct a deeper analysis. B. Winokur presented some potential recommendations, some of which were identified at the last Advisory Committee meeting, that attempt to bring progress without duplication. Some of these included creating a sabbatical and IPA program, developing an investment strategy for the IOOS Enterprise to help make a difference, and understanding the barriers to DEIA. B. Winokur noted that their group needs to understand what the other two Preparatory Working Groups are doing because there could be some overlap, and at some point there may need to be some convergence.

Committee Discussion:

- S. Rayder asked if there will be a NOAA roll up for Diversity and Inclusion?
 - K. Arzayus responded yes, in short. There is not a top-down directive to do this, but NOAA has been an advocate for programs to implement a bottom-up approach to implement this.
 - B. Winokur re-emphasized that there needs to be a holistic approach so that line offices are not duplicating efforts.
 - S. Rayder suggested looking at the demographics of the 135 career SES at NOAA to use as a baseline.
 - B. Winokur noted that this is a good suggestion. As an example, NESDIS had a pretty good track record for male/female diversity, but not so much with other minorities.
 - S. Rayder agreed that we want to create opportunities so that underrepresented communities can succeed.

4. *Public Comment Period* (Krisa Arzayus)

K. Arzayus put out a call for public comments to put on the record, and none were received.

5. *Preliminary Planning for Fall Public Meeting* (Becca Derex)

B. Derex walked through the plan for the Fall Public Meeting. The plan is to hold the Fall Meeting in conjunction with the IOOS Association Fall Meeting during the week of November 7-11 in Puerto Rico. This will allow us to plan joint, in-person sessions between the Advisory Committee and RA Directors, which has huge value for both groups. Because of the pandemic, we have not had the opportunity to do this, although previously this has been something we have routinely done. The

IOOS Office is in the process of creating the agenda, which is contingent on what objectives we want to accomplish. We started a list of these objectives including:

1. Attempting to wrap up the Phase 1 recommendations and getting ready to put pen to paper
2. Beginning work on Phase 2 priorities - What sorts of briefings do you want to see? Are there people you would like to present either remotely or in person? How can we effectively begin work?

B. Derex noted that IOOS wants there to be a significant amount of interaction with the RA Directors. We want to know what the Committee wants out of these interactions, and we will ask the RA Directors as well. We also want to take advantage of the meeting being right next to CARICOOS and share firsthand knowledge of CARICOOS with the Committee and potentially take a deeper dive into CARICOOS topics such as use case development. Other topics to cover would include legislative updates from NOAA/IOOS and budget updates.

B. Derex noted that there is not enough time left in this meeting to obtain feedback from the Committee, so she will send out a survey form in an email after the meeting so that the Committee can submit their input. IOOS will then use this information to craft an agenda.

Committee Feedback:

- M. McCammon suggested that Phase 2 might be a good opportunity to think about the bigger strategic goals. We could have the RA Directors suggest their input ahead of time and bring up any issues we might want to have more discussion on. She also noted another appropriate issue given the meeting location is IOOS's role in hurricane monitoring and forecasting.
- S. Rayder requested a private conversation to gain insight into the budget process.
 - B. Winokur agreed and noted that the Advisory Committee are special government employees and should be able to exchange this information.
 - K. Arzayus noted that the resource/budget information executive session listed in the read ahead is exactly this. A budget session cannot be a deliberative session, just contextual, but the Committee can use this information to inform other strategic recommendations.
 - S. Rayder noted that the House Report language is out, and the Senate is meeting right now, so we might have more information before the August recess. He requested that these numbers get sent to the entire Committee so they can all see this.
- B. Winokur observed that the meeting as laid out is roughly a week, and noted that everyone may not have a week to devote. He also mentioned that he likely will not make this meeting in person and asked if there will be a hybrid component?
 - B. Derex replied that there will absolutely be a hybrid option, and that it is expected that not everyone will be able to participate. This is currently being scoped out with the venue, and the meeting will be planned around this. Priority topics will be covered when members are in attendance, and we will do our best to accommodate as many people as possible.
 - B. Winokur responded that these meetings are normally only 2 full days, and recommended that IOOS focus the important elements for the Advisory Committee within a narrow window so that the Committee can concentrate on 2 days to take maximum advantage.

- K. Arzayus noted that the 5-day schedule includes travel days and an optional field trip. The concentration of the meeting is over 3 days including interaction with RA Directors, but we can try and focus these to an even narrower window.
- C. Edward also noted for scheduling that election day is November 8th.

6. *Public Meeting in Adjourned* (Becca Derex)

B. Derex adjourned the meeting and thanked the committee for their time. She reminded the Committee to keep their eyes out for a follow up email to gather input for planning the Fall Meeting.