



NFRA Annual Meeting Agenda
November 12, 2012 from 10am to 5pm
Layton Room, Dulles Hyatt, Herndon, VA
Minutes: Draft for approval

All materials available here: [http://nfra.gmri.org/meetings/NFRA Annual Meeting](http://nfra.gmri.org/meetings/NFRA_Annual_Meeting)

Attending: Molly McCammon (AOOS), Jorge Corredor (CaRA), Roy Watlington (CaRA), Julio Morell (CaRA), Leslie Rosenfeld (CeNCOOS), Frank Kudrna (GLOS), Jen Read (GLOS), Bill Boicourt (MARACOOS), Jan Newton (NANOOS), Ru Morrison (NERACOOS), Malcolm Spaulding (NERACOOS), Chris Ostrander (PacIOOS), Heather Kerkering (PacIOOS), Julie Thomas (SCCOOS), Ralph Kudela (SCCOOS), Eric Terrill (SCCOOS), Danielle Williams (SCCOOS), Dan Rudnick (SCCOOS), Libe Washburn (SCCOOS), Debra Hernandez (SECOORA), Dick Dodge (SECOORA), Josie Quintrell (NFRA), Megan Treml (NFRA), Michelle Hohensee (NFRA)

Meeting called to order at 10:05 by Julie Thomas.

Motion: To approve of Minutes from September 2012 (Debra Hernandez)

Moved: Molly McCammon
Seconded: Malcolm Spaulding
Vote: Approved, unanimously

Motion: To approve the Final Operating Budget for FY 13 (Chris Ostrander)

Moved: Debra Hernandez
Seconded: Malcolm Spaulding
Materials: Finance report
Discussion: Chris noted that NFRA is billing two years in this fiscal year to bring the billing in line with the current fiscal year. Jan noted she was having difficulty in getting approval from financial officer.
Vote: Approved, unanimously

Director's Report (Josie Quintrell)

- NFRA has switched from contracting services and now has two employees on payroll, Josie Quintrell as Executive Director and Michelle Hohensee as Program Coordinator.
- NFRA continued to work with Administration, federal agencies, and strategic partners to promote IOOS. Josie is on the Board of Consortium of Ocean Leadership. and networking helps to keep the RA message getting out.
- NFRA has its first formal meeting with Dr. Jane Lubchenco, the NOAA Administrator. One of the goals of the meeting was to establish annual briefings with the NOAA Administrator to inform them of the progress IOOS is making.
- NFRA meetings over the last year including several meeting with Holly Bamford and David Kennedy at NOS, Department of Energy and the IOOS FAC.
- Significant time has been devoted to the IOOS Summit that will be setting the course of the program for the next decade.
- Time has been spent on setting up NFRA office administration, including finalizing the 501c3 status and an updated version of the website that will be easier to navigate and easier to update.
- One challenge that has shifted lately is the relationships between NFRA, the RAs and the IOOS office; we are hearing more about working together, and have had several discussions with the IOOS office about how to move forward with increased communication.
- The major focus for next year is going to be securing funds for IOOS in the face of continuing budget crisis.
- Feedback? Malcolm: you didn't mention Hurricane Sandy, which caused more damage than any other hurricane in history and is a signature of what to expect in the future.

New Name NFRA (Chris Ostrander)

The NFRA Board of Directors has discussed for the past year options for a new name for the organization. NFRA is a cumbersome name that does not reveal what the purpose or intent of the organization. The two names that have risen to the surface as the most suitable options are: "IOOS Association" and "Regional IOOS".

Materials: Considerations for names, sample logos

Discussion:

- Jorge is concerned that it is not just a name change but a fundamental change for the organization. Because our charter is to advocate for regions, he would not be happy about seeing others joining the organization. He could live with either option, especially "Regional IOOS."
- Malcolm does not care for Regional IOOS because it is too restrictive, it is best if our work is done with partnerships and widening the base of support for activities makes us stronger. He likes IOOS Association because it's inclusive and built on Sea Grant, it allows us to go after other funding, and does not think it has to mean changing the makeup of the Board.
- There was concern that changing our name would change the makeup of the organization. Josie clarified that right now, the only thing being decided on is a name change. This will not affect our bylaws or mission. It is agreed upon to keep these two issues separate, and only decide on if we should change the name of the organization.
- Jan strongly favors IOOS Association because it will be more powerful.
- Eric is opposed to Regional IOOS because it is the same name as the budgeting line NOAA.
- Frank thinks we need a name change, and another thing to talk about at a later date is changing the names for individual RAs to IOOS Alaska, etc. Ru agrees and thinks it will help to show we're all part of the same system
- Roy likes Regional IOOS because it keeps us separate from the IOOS office and is concerned with how the IOOS Office feels about IOOS Association. Josie said Zdenka was fine with it.
- Bill likes IOOS Association because it separates us a little from NOAA
- Dick suggests IOOS Federation

Motion: To agree to change the name of the organization

Moved: Roy Watlington

Seconded: Jan Newton

Vote: Approved, unanimously

Motion: To put forth name options from the floor

Moved: Roy Watlington

Seconded: Leslie Rosenfeld

Vote: Approved, unanimously

Options put forth:

- Regional IOOS
- IOOS Association
- IOOS Federation
- Discussions on implication of the term "federation"- both structurally and politically

Non-binding regional votes for these options:

- Regional IOOS: None
- IOOS Association: AOS, NANOOS, NERACOOS, GLOS, PacIOOS, SCCOOS
 - IOOS Federation: CenCOOS, SECOORA, MARACOOS, CariCOOS

Motion: To adopt IOOS Association as the new name for the National Federation of Regional Associations for Coastal and Ocean Observing.

Moved: Chris Ostrander

Seconded: Molly McCammon

Vote:

- AOS – yes
- CaRA – yes
- CeNCOOS – no
- GCOOS – not present

- GLOS – yes
- MARACOOS - yes
- NANOOS – yes
- NERACOOS - yes
- PacIOOS – yes
- SCCOOS-yes
- SECOORA-yes

Motion Carries.

Motion: To recommend that regions include a tagline that identifies the region as part of IOOS such as IOOS Southeast, IOOS Alaska, etc., as appropriate to the region.

Discussion:

- Jorge believes everyone already has IOOS in their titles
- Leslie doesn't think regions should be required to do so, CeNCOOS is trying to put together funding not just from federal level and fears this would limit their appeal.
- Roy believes it should be left up to the regions
- Molly states that this is just to begin the branding process
- Eric doesn't believe it is within the jurisdiction for NFRA to tell the regions what to do
- Jan states that NANOOS often takes credit for things and IOOS is left off, which she feels bad about and Zdenka notices. Trust yourself when to do it, but if we all do a better job of branding with IOOS, it will help everyone.
- Ru thinks it's important we promote ourselves as a national system. We need to be part of the bigger IOOS, no matter what your funding model is, you have a stronger case to make if you're part of a national system. It will strengthen us across the board.
- Debra agrees with Ru. IOOS is more than the program office.
- Frank doesn't think Congress identifies with our current names, and names such as IOOS Northeast would make more sense to them
- Molly states Zdenka recommended we change our names to IOOS Alaska, which she opposed, but a tagline accomplishes the same purpose
- Ru thinks the taglines should be consistent

Moved: Molly McCammon

Seconded: Jan Newton

Vote: Approved, unanimously

Discussion Item: Nominations for NOAA's Science Advisory Board

Frank Kurdna served on it for the Great Lakes. He thinks it is important for us to have representation. Zdenka has offered to put forward names through the internal NOAA process (deadline is Thursday Nov. 15). The formal deadline for names is Nov. 29. Julie suggests we send Josie the names and she can send them in from NFRA. Frank suggests it is helpful to call the candidate first to see if they're interested in serving. Good candidates are a blend of those with a strong science background and those that are well connected.

Discussions with the Dr Lubchenco and the IOOS Program Office (Molly McCammon, Debra Hernandez)

On September 20th, a small group of NFRA representatives met with the IOOS Program Office to discuss how to improve coordination and planning between the Office and the regions. It was a fruitful discussion.

Materials: Memorandum of Optimizing Planning, Synchronized Planning Proposal by Charly Alexander

Attendees: Zdenka Willis, Scott Kuester, Josie Quintrell, Julie Thomas, Ru Morrison, Gerhard Kuska, Frank Kudrna, Molly McCammon

- Molly said it was a good meeting with Dr. Lubchenco, the first in 4 years and she had clearly been well prepped. She challenged NFRA to improve on the stories that show regional benefits and value
- NFRA also met with the IOOS program office to discuss joint planning, how the regions can feed into national priorities and how we work together. The IOOS Office mentioned that they were wondering if they should require that each RA have a full time director was brought up. They were concerned about the timeliness of the regional responses to requests from the IOOS Program Office. The Office will head the region's desire to be involved and yet when material is sent out, nothing is heard back from the regions. Clarification around what needs approval vs. informed consent would be helpful. Even if you don't have time to respond, writing back to say you received the request and don't have time to respond is better than nothing.

- The idea of Joint Planning (see memorandum) between the regions and the Program Office was discussed as a mechanism for improving coordination.

Motion: To approve the concept of the joint strategic planning process

Moved: Jen Read

Seconded: Jan Newton

Discussion:

- Eric doesn't want to constrain what the regions are doing.
- Julie indicated Zdenka wants to focus on strategy during the spring meeting rather than on the RAs review, which is fulfilled by the written progress reports.
- Debra believes that working together will express the value of the partnership. Is there an idea/issue/topic that we would want to collectively advance (RAs and national office) to improve our impact? Do we have a year of the turtle? This is more about marketing our ability to have great impact together than it is about creating a joint bureaucratic process
- Eric thinks NFRA is overstepping our boundaries in what we can tell the regions what to do, and wants to be cautious not to constrain the regions.
- Jan sees it differently. Is there something we're all working on that we can pull out and highlight as our overall turtle of the year?
- Malcolm would be excited to see one example of a true national system. It's a shame we can't provide that currently. For example, you can't log on to the RA websites and watch a storm travel through the different RAs.
- Ru thinks if we can't integrate across the regions now, it will become a problem for us in the future and we won't be sustainable
- Debra thinks it's hard for the layperson to see buoys on each RA site and connect the dots. Maybe we have a storm button that looks similar on each page.

Vote: Approved, unanimously

Discussion: Linking and leveraging among the regions (Jan Newton)

Many RAs are developing similar products, is there a way we can pool our resources to learn from one another and to share successful products. Is there a product or project that all the RAs can focus on in the coming year that could pool our resources to develop a common product that is relevant to the full system?

- How do we share with each other and what can we do nationally as an integrated system? What are some ideas of things that all 11 of us can do?
- Ru says we have different technologies in each region and that's always going to be a barrier. But as technology improves, it will be less and less of a problem in the future.
- Chris thinks it would be useful to measure web traffic in the regions to see what is actually getting used instead of sharing things that aren't necessarily used .
- Debra questions what is our hallmark? What is our niche?
- Bill noted that MARACOOS has been working with the National Weather Service on surface temperature.
- Malcolm thinks it is important to talk about the questions that demand answers such as "How can I tell the surface temperature anywhere I look?" instead of "Do you have a glider here or there." That would meet a clear user need. What are people asking for?
- Ru believes our strongest story is truly end-to-end. Surface temperature is not end-to-end. We need to develop something that gives us a unique foothold, such as storms.
- Eric suggests a national HABS plan and a national ocean acidification plan.
- Debra suggests we ask the IOOS office to weigh in on what we should focus on
- Jan says most are already involved with ocean acidification, and the NOAA office already sees us as help in this area
- Chris prefers ocean acidification, the islands don't have HABS and neither does the Caribbean
- Jen prefers storms because ocean acidification might not be an issue in the Great Lakes
- Eric says storms are not a new issue with the National Weather Service
- Julie thinks there is something that we're all already working on. Perhaps we can focus on one of the priorities under the West Coast Governors Alliance

Jan suggest we do a survey to see what topics would be best, and then approach the IOOS office for feedback

Advocacy for 2013 (Josie Quintrell and Frank Kudrna)

2013 will be a busy year for NFRA advocacy. We will need to work hard to ensure level funding for the regional systems and the ICOOS Act is up for Reauthorization.

Materials: ICOOS Reauthorization Act, FY 14 Preliminary Ask, Samples of Materials used by RAs in 2013.

- Sequestration is in place for January 1, 2013. Congress may make a deal before sequestration but if not sequestration would lead to an 8.2% overall reduction in the federal budget. This would apply across the board to all programs.
- NOAA's has a \$5 billion budget. \$1 billion is for satellites, the unionized weather service is another big chunk, which leaves: 1) federal employees, 2) expenses associated with operations, 3) grants and contracts. In the federal government, you have to go through Congress to reduce federal employees so the most likely option remains grants and contracts.
- One suggestion is to team Ocean Leadership to advocate for equity in reductions to ensure that extramural programs do not get hit harder than other programs. Also a Congressional letter to NOAA to that effect would be helpful but timelines would be tight – needs to be in to NOAA by January 1.
- FY14 Budget request to Congress. This year we are not asking just for level funding but to restore the competitive regional line to \$20m. In addition, we are asking for \$5 m for surface current mapping and \$10m for the technology innovation grant.
- IOOS Act is up for Reauthorization in 2013. NFRA has been working on this with the Program Office, NOAA Legislative Affairs Office and Consortium of Ocean Leadership since June. A fundamental question has been whether we submit the current legislation, as is, or submit an amended version. The risk of opening the legislation is that any member can add amendments to the bill. The Act will likely need to be amended since the current language regarding appropriations (such sums as may be appropriate) is no longer allowed in the House.
- NOAA released independent cost estimates on Friday- \$54.2b total for 10 years. \$534m per year for non-feds (RAs) and \$65m for central functions (IOOS program office). Based on current levels of funding, how much of this is new money?

Discussion: Update on the Glider Strategy (Dan Rudnick, SCCOOS, Scripps)

See power point for complete presentation.

- Questions: How much do they cost? \$150k is what it costs us now, but that does not include replacements. And we have economies of scale otherwise it would be more. A new one is \$100k-\$150k
- Scott Glen states that they are trying to get profile data to improve models and efficiencies.

Motion: To adjourn the meeting at 4:58pm

Moved: Jan Newton

Seconded: Ru Morrison

Vote: Approved, unanimously