

## **CIOSS Local Council of Fellows Meeting – May 5, 2006 Summary**

Ted Strub sent all five local members of the Council of Fellows a 4-pg summary of the issues to be discussed on April 28. Mark Abbott could not attend and gave written responses; all others (Chelton [Chair], Freilich, Samelson, Letelier and Strub [ex-officio]) attended on May 5, as did Amy Vandehey. The discussion covered the following points:

### **1) Proposals:**

Four proposals are working their way through GMD (the annual omnibus, the GOES-R3 and two GLOBEC proposals [covering 4 GLOBEC projects] are working their way through GMD. Three R&O proposals (representing four projects) will be submitted within 1-2 weeks. The total amount of proposals in the FY06-07 year (CIOSS' fourth year) will be approximately \$3.6M. The past totals for years 1, 2 and 3 were \$0.9M, \$0.9M and \$2.1M, respectively.

### **2) Evaluation of CIOSS Research – Internal Review:**

Two types of evaluation were discussed: (a) Evaluation of proposed projects and the selection of those to be funded each year; and (b) Evaluation of the research that has been conducted with partial or complete CIOSS funding. The first type of evaluation has been accomplished by using the local Council members as a review panel, followed by additional reviews at NESDIS/STAR/SOCD by Eric Bayler and his Branch Chiefs. The second type of evaluation, that of the work that has been completed, has consisted of the submission of short progress reports as part of the annual proposal process, for those projects seeking continuing support. This year that occurred in January, 2006, to allow submission of the annual omnibus proposal in February. This was made more difficult by the fact that funds for these projects did not arrive until late September or early October 2005, three months before the request for the next year's proposals. All projects have also submitted additional progress reports that became part of the CIOSS Annual Progress Report. This year that occurred in April, in order to put together the annual report as early as possible (although not due until July 1). The local Council members will read and evaluate the individual progress reports by 1 June 2006. Their comments will be included in the annual report that will go to NESDIS in June.

Council members thought that a more natural process would be for projects to submit annual reports in January, at the same time as proposals for the next year. An evaluation of progress would then inform the selection process for the next year's projects. A suggestion was made that a one-day CIOSS Symposium be held, in which all projects funded during the previous year and/or proposed for the upcoming year would make oral presentations summarizing progress in the projects and proposed work (similar to the old ONR site reviews). This would need to occur during the second half of January, if the annual proposal is to be submitted by February 1. CIOSS will institute this procedure starting in January 2007.

As an intermediate step, CIOSS should hold a one-day, "CIOSS Symposium" this summer, during which the funded projects would present progress to date and plans for

the coming year of research. This will constitute an “Internal Review,” in preparation for the formal Five-Year Review, which will occur in October or November. Each project would have approximately 15 minutes for its presentation. Council members will meet after the presentations and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the projects and of the overall CIOSS research program, as it has developed over the first 3+ years of CIOSS operations. There are 12-15 projects to present, so that would occupy a morning and part of an afternoon for presentations, followed by Council discussions. We would like the NESDIS members of the Council to participate, so they can provide their ideas on additional NOAA collaborations that might strengthen the projects in the future. Since their physical attendance for one day is logistically difficult, their participation could be accomplished by sending them the powerpoint files for the presentations and then allow them to listen in on a telecom, while they view the PPT files at their own locations. The 1-day CIOSS symposium might be held in August or early September (before classes). Materials prepared for the Symposium (visuals and posters?) could be used again in the 5-year Review, during which there will be more condensed summaries of CIOSS projects.

### **3) Directors’ and Administrators’ Meeting, June 20-22:**

Most of this meeting (two days for Directors and two days for Administrators, with one day of overlap) consists of discussions between Directors, Administrators and Program Managers. The host CI, however, usually has a poster session and/or a tour of facilities. Mike Freilich made the point that we should use our position as host to emphasize our strengths. One theme that could be emphasized is our combination of remote sensing, modeling and in situ observations. The GOES-R field work is an obvious example from the ocean color aspect. A related theme is our role in the emerging IOOS and OOI observing systems, with additional synergy from the STC program. To demonstrate this, presentations by PI’s involved in these programs could take the place of a poster session, or be combined with a poster session. Would a tour of any facilities showing gliders, optical instruments, etc. be useful? This is only a month away, so plans need to be solidified quickly. A final topic that might be stressed while the Directors and Program Managers are here is the failure of NOAA to seriously address the creation of procedures and standards to create Climate Data Records from different satellite sensors.

### **4) Formal Five-Year Review: late October?:**

We will have a list of questions to guide our presentations. I will distribute the agenda for the CICS review, which was held last December. Mike F. suggested asking and answering (in the affirmative) the question, “Is NOAA/NESDIS better off with CIOSS in place? If so, how?” Mike also suggested organizing our contributions into 3 topics, representing (1) Scientific contributions; (2) New or improved products; and (3) Support for NOAA education, training and planning. We can highlight our contributions in all three of these areas. Scientific contributions come from a number of our funded projects, some with NOAA collaborators (such as the Barth-Castelao-Mavor frontal analysis). A number of NOAA contacts could provide examples of how CIOSS has helped them (Dick Reynolds, Laury Miller, Dave Foley, Cara Wilson, Stan Wilson, Paul Chang, Marilyn Moll, ...). Examples of products and ideas for products transmitted to NOAA

include the wind climatology (Chelton-Risien-Foley) , the archive of west coast SST images (Strub-Foley), improved 12.5km winds (Freilich-Chang), etc.

Some of the discussion at the Review will address ways to increase our interactions with NOAA colleagues. Within NOAA, both Marie Colton and Eric hindered some of our attempts to collaborate with NOAA personnel in the past. One example is the lack of support for the visit of Dick Reynolds. They also opposed the idea of bringing NOAA employees to CIOSS for extended visits (months to years). We should pursue greater interactions with our NOAA colleagues now, since both Ingrid and Al support extended visits and improvements in collaborations in general. Mark Abbott noted that the R&O efforts are considered important by Congress and NOAA, but the administration of R&O resources within NOAA has not been very well focused. The satellite component of the IOOS effort is also not well defined. Our connections to the Pacific Northwest Science and Technology Center (STC, funded by NSF), IOOS and OOI efforts might help to form a bridge between research and the operational side of ocean observations, from both in situ and satellite sensors.

#### **5) Education, Training, Outreach:**

Our effort in formal education is represented by our support for SMILE's high school program. Our support for informal education presently takes the form of Molly Phipp's PhD thesis project, to set up an interactive display at HMSC, featuring remote sensing and oceanography. The public wing of the HMSC provides not only a venue for such displays, but a laboratory in which to evaluate different display techniques. Both of these are targeted toward the general public. Education and training for NOAA employees include the annual NWS training workshops, in which Mike Freilich participates, the OVW workshops and an intensive "short course" to train NMFS personnel to use satellite data, which is planned for this summer (Strub-Cara. Wilson).

With regard to helping with NOAA planning, the COAST workshops have helped NOAA in planning for the color sensor on GOES-R. CDR and MOBY-2 workshops also help to educate NOAA with regard to future plans. Likewise, modeling workshops (both coastal and basin-scale) planned for next spring will help NOAA prepare for the IOOS era, as will a workshop to plan a pilot observing/modeling system that will monitor the effects of climate variability on California Current ecosystems (an effort recently led by P. Niiler and now postponed until Autumn). Mark agreed that we have a natural role to play in linking observing systems (in situ and satellite) with modeling of ecosystems in the California Current System. Mark also noted that there are problems in getting NOAA to act on CDR issues. MOBY-2 was something of an obsession with Eric Bayler, which might not be true with Eric's replacement. GOES-R and its sensors are likely to have more and more problems (like NPOESS), as we get closer to their deadlines. Last week at the GOES Users' Conference, we were told that the HES instruments (with the Coastal Waters Imager) would not be on the first GOES-R and so might not launch until 2014 or 2016. This might reduce funding for the COAST team and their preparations for the HES-CW instrument.

An relatively successful (so far) effort to influence the planning for future oceanographic satellite sensors is that of Dudley and Mike F. in drafting a letter to the NRC committee conducting the Earth Science Decadal Survey. Over 750 ocean scientists signed this letter (over 330 from 34 other countries), which was welcomed and discussed very positively by the Survey's Executive Committee during their meeting in early May.

The Council also discussed more formal efforts to educate and train current NOAA employees or students who might become NOAA employees. Al Powell is putting forward a new initiative that would provide each NESDIS CI with funds for integrated research and education/training projects. The three ideas considered by the Council are presented below:

- (1) A NOAA-sponsored REU (Research Experiences for Undergraduates) program. This received the strongest support, for both a summer program with students attending from any University, and for a school-year program for OSU Honors undergrads. CIOSS themes would allow a wide range of topics to be addressed, but connections to NESDIS' efforts in accomplishing NOAA Mission Goals would be emphasized.
- (2) NOAA/CIOSS graduate fellowships. There was support for this mechanism, but details would have to be worked out. These might be general or associated with specific CIOSS projects. They could also focus on senior graduate students, to fund them while they work on their research, after courses and exams are completed. Collaboration with NOAA research scientists could be emphasized, which would introduce the students to opportunities to work in NOAA labs.
- (3) A new MS or Certificate program. Jack Barth has pushed this idea as part of the recently funded (NSF) Science and Technology Center and Mark suggests that Michael Harte might be interested in expanding the Marine Resource Management program to include these new aspects. Training for NOAA "super-Techs" for the IOOS era could be one focus. There was some support for these types of programs by Council members, but also some wariness about their overall effect on the COAS educational program.

#### **6) Action Items:**

1. Request that Laury Miller be added as a member of the Council of Fellows on the NESDIS side.
2. Summarize our Council discussions for Al, Ingrid, Kent, Paul C., Mike O. and Laury M. (revised version of this document).
3. Council members read the progress reports and provided written evaluations of CIOSS research directions.
4. Finish Annual Report and Submit to NESDIS.
5. Request and schedule 1-day CIOSS Symposium for August-Sept (determine best time for CIOSS fellows to present) and arrange with NESDIS Council members to participate via a telecon + PPT files sent to NESDIS.
6. Draft suggestions to Ingrid for the Directors' meeting agenda.
7. Request from CIOSS fellows, posters for the Directors' meeting.

8. Work with Ingrid to set final dates for the formal Review and members of the Review Panel.
9. Pursue the idea of a CIOSS REU program with Bob Duncan and others in COAS. Discuss the REU and Grad Fellowship options with Al Powell, Ingrid Guch and Kent Hughes, as well as CIOSS Fellows.
10. Discuss CIOSS participation in a MS or Certificate program with Jack Barth, Michael Harte and others.