

**JSOST Gulf Coast Briefing
Stennis Space Center
September 7, 2006**

Comment: You mention MMS and USACE, how have they been involved?

Response: These agencies are on the JSOST. We set up writing teams with the federal representatives and these two were involved.

Comment: Based on the outline, it looks like the issue of governance is not addressed specifically in the document. Will this be in the Implementation Strategy?

Response: Yes. The Implementation Strategy will not lay out a governance structure but will lay out a strategy. Under the JSOST we have 6 interagency working groups so we will be taking advantage of these. A lot of the interagency governance will be worked out in these groups.

Comment: Admiral West was here when NOAA was having budget problems. We still have not signed off on the Law of the Sea. There seems to be a rift in the Administration when it comes to realizing the ocean has an important impact on humans.

Response: Not clear how much the Administration buys into these oceans concepts. We have lost some key proponents on the hill and there is a lack of basic understanding in the Administration. We will be doing a briefing in DC so it will be interesting to see who shows up.

Comment: Is it good enough to have education just as a cross-cutting theme and not a priority?

Response: Education is part of everything we do and needs to be in this plan. However, education is not necessarily a research requirement so we are treating it that way.

Comment: I'm an advocate of non-formal and formal education since there is not enough science in education. These research priorities are important to the average citizen. We should elevate education to an ocean research priority. We want ocean literacy to be promoted – especially within basic research.

Response: We have tried to capture this idea. Take a look at the way we have captured this and provide any recommendations.

Comment: There is a lack of people going into the science and engineering fields which means the people who will have an appreciation for these priorities is getting less and less; we need to take this into account. When we try to sell these priorities, we need to remember this.

Response: Your statement is getting at the audience of the plan. We have tried to make the plan applicable to many audiences (folks on the hill, universities, industries, etc). We also want to make the document a piece of education material. We need to make people understand that we are not necessarily just educating people directly on ocean sciences, but rather stress that it is a wonderful tool to demonstrate the fundamental science concepts.

Comment: Within the Implementation Strategy, there should be a focus on the evaluation mechanism so that we as a community can buy into it. Propose that we gather and come up with some simple tools and performance metrics so that we can go on to the hill and show that we have had direct results.

Response: Agree. Next step is making this a meaningful document. We need help with specific examples.

Comment: Would you like to see an IWG develop out of this?

Response: We would like to use the existing structure. We need to involve other sectors (such as human health) to make real progress. We are doing this a little bit now. Several folks are being invited to give presentations to other groups (i.e. GEOSS to public health folks).

Comment: What sort of “organization of research” will come out of this? One of things about oceans is that it is a highly multidisciplinary science. However, organizations such as the universities, funding agencies, and government are not organized in a multidisciplinary way. One of the sectors missing is applied mathematicians and applied economists. As we create research programs, can we encourage bringing these departments into ocean sciences.

Response: We specifically need to involve these folks. The focus of this document will help align existing elements so that folks are on the same page.

Comment: I’m afraid this document will drive behaviors in academic communities. I think you should encourage funding agencies to look at these problems differently as well. The behavior of the funding agencies will affect the behavior in academia.

Response: We hope that agencies will align their research priorities according to this document and we hope academia builds these elements into already existing structures.

Comment: A common theme of this document is predicting and forecasting. However, in the near term priorities, nothing is mentioned of the prediction capability. How did this concept not find its way into the near term priorities?

Response: Forecasting is included within all of the themes. Your question merits more on the treatment of how these general topic definitions will translate into calls for specific research elements. The thinking is in there, but we may have not captured this; suggest taking a look at the plan and providing comments.

Comment: The societal themes for research and IOOS are very comparable. There are initiatives under way trying to get the Administration to give us new money for an IOOS/Ocean initiative. How does this fit into the IOOS initiative?

Response: Observations is an overarching theme and we can translate the priorities into specific observational needs, which all can be met at different levels of requirement. This is the sort of drill we would love to have. We should be able to go theme by theme and pick out the observations needed and these should go along with IOOS.

Comment: There is a fear that IOOS will get funded and then someone will think this has taken care of everything and we didn't tell them everything.

Response: Fair fear. We need to make statements that IOOS is just part of the solution and does not cover all of the ocean science research priorities.