The following public comments were received by Clarissa Anderson, Director of the Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System (SCCOOS).

Some questions for the FAC to ponder regarding modeling and planned consolidation efforts:

1) What do we gain with R2O from IOOS regions to NOS that we don't already have with running sustained models in the region? Ist it just greater "reliability" or is it perceived to be more "efficient?" What do we lose by moving models away from their regional operators and the close community feedback/nimble response times that come with regional ownership?

2) We should wonder if the desire for moving all models towards operations at NOS is an inherent manifest destiny for all useful regional models since that is the overwhelming mantra coming from leadership, or if we can broaden the scope of the term "operational" to include certified RA involvement...

3) Perhaps a better goal would be to: (a) improve community model code (e.g. ROMS, FVCOM, ADCIRC), (b) let those improvements feed back into a finite suite of physical models and physical-biogeochemical coupled models run operationally at NOS (e.g. WCOFS, NECOFS, etc.) that rely on community model code bases, and c) then set up incentives for IOOS RA model practitioners to make use of the regional NOS models (either *as is*, or via regional downscaling) as the underlying physical components to their user-driven solutions (e.g. HAB forecasts). This will, of course, marginalize academics using their own bespoke instances of ROMS, for instance, rather than using the ROMS-based WCOFS (e.g.), as their preferred circulation model. In order to not lose capacity in the regions, a lot of thought needs to be put into evaluating what you gain or lose when you swap one instance for another. Anecdotally, via a COMT project, we tested how the downstream HAB forecasts in C-HARM would be impacted if we moved from using our regional California instance of ROMS to the NOS WCOFS ROMS products that supply the physical fields in C-HARM. We found out that because WCOFS does not assimilate subsurface glider data (but our California instance did), we were getting very poor salinity estimates, which had critical downstream impacts on C-HARM predictions of domoic acid. This is just one type of consideration that NOS must make when talking about "consolidation."