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###

### Day 1: Monday 26 April 2021

## **Opening**

Toste Tanhua, co-chair of the GOOS Steering Committee, opened the 1st session of the online meeting, and co-chair Anya Waite opened the 2nd session on Monday 26 April. The meeting was held in two sessions daily, from 6-8:00 UTC and from 13-15:00 UTC, in order to accommodate participants distributed around the world. Each session repeated the same agenda items. Each substantive agenda item below captures the main points of discussion in each session. One single set of decisions / actions / teams was then established as a result of the two discussion sessions, presented at the end of each agenda item and in the summary table.

Recognition of intersessional work and presentation of meeting goals (short *presentation* *by T. Tanhua and A. Waite*)

## Ocean Decade Implementation

Albert Fischer gave a [presentation](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1hxwi3sjvZ-aqAsTBtfb79by-GJN9fY66/view?usp=sharing) with news from the interim Decade Advisory Board, proposed branding elements, and draft factsheets for the GOOS Ocean Decade programmes: *CoastPredict* ([website](https://www.coastpredict.org/), [proposal](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1NEJz1MQVrNkvR94x8mdqLdtjEFKSl1Md/view?usp=sharing)), *Ocean Observing Co-Design* (ObsCoDe, [proposal](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ZbTzZRZh1n2Q5-t58x0zmN_YZyLgsQC7/view?usp=sharing)), and *Observing Together* ([proposal](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uturRoFf5UHUOMSmy_l6kJrnJbCFYULY/view?usp=sharing)). He informed the steering committee that endorsement decisions are expected in late May. A GOOS Steering Committee special topic meeting on the three programmes in March put emphasis on communicating about the package of programmes and the position of GOOS in support of the Ocean Decade. These three programmes will be part of a larger ‘*community of practice’* of programmes and projects focused on the Ocean Decade infrastructure challenge of a sustained ocean observing system. A communications consultancy, Wolf & Player, has worked to draft this positioning and branding, which were mocked up in [draft factsheets](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1bHOFAqHxo4rQL0kcO63YS30UhYO13-R2/view?usp=sharing), placing GOOS “At the heart of the Ocean Decade.”

Key questions posed for discussion were:

* Do the proposed communications around the GOOS Decade programmes hit the mark for a target audience of the GOOS implementing community and potential programme sponsors?
* How can investable projects be developed and submitted to potential funders?
* How should other relevant programmes and projects under the Decade be engaged, creating synergy and avoiding parallel structures?
* Should GOOS play a leading role in an observing community of practice, and what are the resource implications?

**Session 1**

The participants responded positively to the GOOS Ocean Decade branding options with a general preference for the option that included the GOOS modified logo with the text. Additional input and comments to recall or consider are:

* Are we sufficiently considering ways to differentiate or identify funders (make them ‘special’)?
* Work is needed in how to locate/engage the funding community and clarification and/or development of mechanism for funding proposals
* Need to further define management structure for Observing Together
* Further consideration and/or work on websites for Ocean Observing Co-Design and Observing Together like that of CoastPredict as communication and funding go hand in hand
* Clarification on connection between the decade programmes, Decade National Committees and other UN bodies
* Consider the importance of consistency in terms of the logo and balance that against benefits of the proposed decade programme logo
* Awareness of the potential of GOOS and observing networks being in competition within the scope of the Ocean Decade programme proosals
* A minimum go/no go amount in terms of resources needed to push a programme forward and avoid “ghost programmes”
* A possible ‘hidden’ document that lays out all the arguments that need to be developed if we have contact with the sponsor or donor, i.e. what is the benefit?
* Better interaction between the programmes as well as GOOS is needed (e.g. CoastPredict needs more guidance from GOOS as well as contact with the other 2 programmes) - continued focus on the joint projects is important.
* Need to learn from previous projects (e.g. TPOS2020, DOOS, GODAE) about launching a self-supporting project with connections back to GOOS
* How to ensure a legacy or return into GOOS for projects/programmes
* A balance between focusing on what is needed to develop GOOS and how to support these three programmes (i.e. don’t put all our eggs in one basket)

**Session 2:**

The participants for the afternoon session also responded positively to the GOOS Ocean Decade branding options with a general preference for the option that included the GOOS modified logo with the text. Additional input and comments to recall or consider are:

* The final fact sheets should be visually rich, with graphics and images, especially some that include people as beneficiaries
* Possibility of more color (orange or other) in the logo and not just blue
* The possibility of creating fact sheets for different audiences and including this in a communications strategy in addition to logo
* Need to have a clear vision of the intersection and synergy between the GOOS UN Decade programs and the GOOS IP Actions
* Need to better define and position ourselves in order to appeal to philanthropic donors
* Need to better define and position ourselves as an infrastructure to achieve the Ocean Decade objectives
* The sheets should not only aim to touch potential funders, but other types of supporters and stakeholders that will implement the programme and invest their own resources
* The importance of focusing on the full value chain of addressing ocean observing issues and needs and not just answering to the decade

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision: Ocean Decade**The Steering Committee:1. **Thanked** the programme proposal leads for their work in engaging partners and designing compelling programmes.
2. **Agrees** to advance with the joint branding and positioning of the three GOOS Ocean Decade programmes for potential supporters and contributors.
3. **Asks** the three programmes to convene their management structures by September 2021.
4. **Agrees** to use a portion of GOOS Covid-19 savings at IOC (from lack of meetings in 2020-21) to support a consultant to help organize the three programmes and broader GOOS Ocean Decade coordination with input from programme leads on initial work, and a fundraising consultant to work on GOOS resources across the programmes and the GOOS Implementation Plan
 |

## GOOS Sponsors

Presentations were given by the GOOS co-sponsors: [ISC](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1kQ0BztjlxV6kKy5wUF438-tCcaZasRLr/view?usp=sharing) (M. Denis by video message), [IOC/UNESCO](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1pZ2drsqXqYqB7mc_JBO7jJmye8I66f7j/view?usp=sharing) (V. Ryabinin), [WMO](https://drive.google.com/file/d/12QCbcrjxToy9oiKoU_S57QEZLUek6m_Q/view?usp=sharing) (A. Rea), and [UNEP](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1CM3h0lABRSG0XcnKOAWKlFlsbjZsYwDy/view?usp=sharing) (H. Kremer) that covered the sponsor’s role in sustained ocean observations, a focus on what GOOS does now for the sponsor, and what the sponsor would like GOOS to do in the future. Both IOC and UNEP emphasized GOOS responding to the needs of ocean and marine management. WMO was increasing its staff investment in GOOS with the new OceanOPS lead as a long-term funded position. ISC offered engagement on communications that was positively received by the Steering Committee.

## Governance and Structure

Toste Tanhua introduced this item with a [presentation](https://www.goosocean.org/index.php?option=com_oe&task=viewDocumentRecord&docID=28212).

“Championing effective governance for GOOS” is one of the Strategic Objectives adopted in the GOOS 2030 Strategy. In the lead-up to OceanObs’19 GOOS held a governance workshop and led a session at OO’19 on governance which requested GOOS to continue on this work in line with our Strategy. Last year, GOOS commissioned a [report by consultant Neville Smith](https://drive.google.com/file/d/13SLTbUgikcOYhQc1XSJU9JpKWSpEkHEz/view?usp=sharing) on the support structures for sustained ocean observing systems, including but not limited to support for the GOOS core team components. As part of this work he conducted a survey of major stakeholders of GOOS (major funders of support structures and major users). Recommendations include a GOOS focus on sustained ocean observations with the establishment of a distinct value chain including an information system, and a data processing, modelling and forecasting system; rejuvenating national engagement; planning user engagement and showcasing; and the development of a rejuvenated, investable, hub and spoke model for global and regional support.

**Session 1:**

The steering committee generally welcomed the a restructuring of GOOS as a positive step and made comments and provided input to the Zero Draft Decisions proposed as follows:

* For GRA’s, ranging from regional to national, there is not a preconceived role, but must acknowledge the need to improve impact and engagement at the national level
* In terms of the graphics missing from the feedback loop, there is recognition and connections across the pillars of coordination activity and the planning and design is part of that.
* Operations should drive our actions; We need to get the best benefit from what GOOS has done in the past toward building the operational infrastructure that would produce the data required for SDGs, etc.
* An aim should be to strengthen countries’ operational capacity in oceanography through guidance as it is the right level for oceanography to work in management and this can be helped by working closely with GRAs.
* If the areas of data management, production and application are separate fundable activities then it would make sense to support them to develop their own identity, leaving more resources (time, money, manpower and thoughts) to focus on observations
* GOOS has a large desire, but small recognition and we must improve awareness of the brand to advance. It may be useful to let stakeholders (sponsors, etc) guide us to tie things together to come up with a larger global ocean observing system
* This seems positive as GOOS is in line with GCOS and WCRP which are under review in terms of governance. However the wording in Point 3 “individual or joint ways of examining and evolving their GOOS governance” is concerning as we need to find one way, that is agreed upon by all the co-sponsors.
* Development or clarity is needed on the process for determining governance and the example of GCOS having established ToR for a separate study group that reports to the steering committee may offer inspiration.
* Further discussion and clarification is needed on how to successfully separate the three elements (observations, data, forecasting) as observations are much more than taking measurements. While it is possible, others have taken the opposite approach (e.g. IOCCP/BGC).
* It is crucial to take the full value chain and societal benefit into consideration and the key question is “Does GOOS add value” and could it partner better at some of these areas at the edge perhaps of what we do
* Related to Pt 3, clarification needed regarding a clear definition of the cosponsoring role in the context of deciding “their GOOS governance” and this is a discussion that may have to happen internally within the sponsor organizations
* Reminder to think in terms of not just just GOOS delivering to the co-sponsor but vice versa
* Possibility raised of eventually being pointed to a model with a larger set of sponsors
* Advisory and operational might meen different governing structures
* For Pt 3 the suggestion that the JCB will do this for WMO and IOC limits the IOC interests only to the JCB and doesn’t encompass the full interest of GOOS or the IOC

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision: Governance and Structure**The SC **thanked** Neville Smith for his extensive and insightful report.GOOS core team elements at present cover observations, the interface to and from data systems, and operational ocean forecasting systems. The GOOS SC **reaffirmed** the importance of integration of this value chain infrastructure, and also **recognizes** that each of those areas requires focused hubs of activity for coordination and partnership.The SC **decided** to advance on three tracks:1. Lead the formation of a small team among stakeholders to guide the initial steps in a process of change (as suggested in Recommendation 9’s roadmap)
* This team will need to create a process with clear objectives and reporting lines; that addresses fundamental questions about the scope of GOOS, who the governance serves, and clearly defines stakeholder desires (observing community, funders of support structures, the intergovernmental processes)
* It should create a process that includes major funders of the present support structures and other key stakeholders
* Membership of this small initial team of about 10 people should be proposed by the GOOS co-chairs based on experience with strategic thinking and change processes and in consultation with major stakeholders, should include some SC members and some outside, and be approved by the SC by e-mail.
* The team should report to the SC in September 2021
1. Re-start the GOOS Structure task team of Steering Committee members and ‘superpartners’ identified in the Implementation Plan (WMO, IODE, OceanPredict, IOC), to articulate the architecture(s) of a desired future state, optimizing the functions of GOOS, consulting to identify its scope and unique offer, and making recommendations about the start or discontinuation of functions; as input to the change process, and with necessary touch points with the Implementation Planning process.
2. Request the co-sponsors IOC, WMO, UNEP, and ISC to design individual or joint ways of examining and evolving their GOOS governance that would lead to improved advice and operational support to the co-sponsors, be inclusive of additional stakeholders, and be open to receiving the recommendations of the process of change designed by the group in item 1 above.

 This decision will modify Actions 11.1-3 in the GOOS Implementation Plan. |

### Day 2: Tuesday 27 April 2021

## **GOOS** **Implementation Planning**

Emma Heslop [presented](https://www.goosocean.org/index.php?option=com_oe&task=viewDocumentRecord&docID=28243) progress and analysis from the GOOS Implementation Planning process, where the overarching aim is to provide a process for GOOS to manage and track implementation towards the 2030 Strategy, and to support resource planning and facilitate engagement of external partners. The presentation focused on elements of the [*GOOS Implementation Plan: 1-5 year actions integrated across GOOS, analysis towards the implementation of the 2030 Strategy*](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sKhjf43FvIoaFrWKTGMhzI40Zo4-qJM8/view?usp=sharing).

The Steering Committee was asked to discuss gaps, priorities, process for ongoing actions and tracking, and resource mobilization.

*[discussion points to be inserted]*

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision: Implementation Planning** The SC **agreed** with the action and development priorities, and planning process identified below. The following were highlighted as important for the next steps:* communications (SO2) are a priority, as is Partnerships for Delivery (SO1)
* communicate about what GOOS is in a way that is understandable to those outside GOOS core team, what it does, its structure, roles and how to engage (a charge for SO2)
* being inspirational around what we are trying to achieve in the messaging for a big ‘ask’, change the narrative (charge for SO2)
* cross-GOOS actions
* finding a practical way to integrate Decade programmes and communicating this through visualisations
* finding a suitable consultant to support seeking funding

The recommendations from the Implementation Plan are in the Annex to this decision.The GOOS SC **decided** to advance with the Implementation Planning Process.**Annex****Priorities for GOOS implementation:*** Increase focus and resource for SO1 Partnerships for delivery:
	+ Actions to be assessed, few and none 5 year
	+ TT to define role more clearly
	+ Link with SO7 Data
	+ Assess gap between impacts and Roadmap outcomes
* Increase focus and resource for SO2 Communications:
	+ Communicate on the importance of sustained observing/sustained funding, AND on how GOOS processes/structures work and our outputs have impact
	+ Many outputs highlighted in the actions, connect these to to comms activity
	+ Communicate on funding for GOOS Implementation and Decade Programmes
* GOOS Projects to be represented, plus description of aim/role in GOOS
* SO7 Data work to connect the many single actions, a more strategic approach
* SO9 Capacity Development review the number of long term plans, single elements, and address the gap between impact and Roadmap outcomes, perhaps partnership
* SO4 Services and local uptake, and SO8 New Technology review long term plans
* Assess the gap between impact and outcome, across the SOs where this is large:
	+ Does this require revised actions, additional actions, or partnership
	+ SO10 Human impacts cannot be undertaken by GOOS alone, what is the plan to engage with partners in this area, what is the long term strategy?
* Integrate the Ocean Decade Programs with the Implementation Plan as they develop, these programmes will need communications (part of overall Communications Plan), fundraising and programme management support, this structure is not defined in IP
* Assess boundaries of GOOS value vs. successful partnership. Some new actions are within the realm of ocean data, products and market development, GOOS expertise obviously adds value and there are gaps to be filled, however there are also existing organisations and ecosystems. What is GOOS unique role in working in these areas? Can some action or parts of actions be better undertaken in partnership, or by partners? Should GOOS stretch to fill all gaps or work with partners to do so, is GOOS role as a catalyst?
* Develop a more complete view of partnerships in achieving the strategy and the boundaries of GOOS value add
* Revise the Roadmap in 2022 to be more inclusive of ocean observing and forecasting (ETOOFS), partner roles and recognising support

**Resources*** Communicate on the big ‘ask’ to potential funders, sponsors this will help drive clarity of messaging internally and externally around structure/impact/investability
* Employ support for fundraising. Focus on reaching out, marketing and exploring investing options, informing on the interplay between ‘big’ ask and practical reality. Funding is sought for Implementation Plan and Ocean Decade
* GOOS will need to work to be ‘investable’, this may involve some of the following elements; a clear structure, defined timelines and outcomes, trust in the teams ability to execute (for the funds provided), accountability and governance/oversight.
* Nations may find it easier to invest nationally and so GOOS may need to consider what this could look like, e.g. developing new ‘centres of excellence’ for aspects of the plan
* Staff that can work ‘anywhere’ could be provided in-kind by countries, worth considering additionally as it is also a method for; training new leadership, capacity development, and communicating and connecting countries and organisations to GOOS activities.

**Review GOOS structure:*** BioEco network, data and metadata development resource needs, how does this scale? Is the infrastructure sufficient? Do we need to signal with structure e.g. BioEco OCG, Super OCG, BioEco OceanOPS, OceanOBIS? Do we need agreements with partners re role/expectations?
* Focus point/structure is needed to overview SO7 Data and to manage data interface
* Focus point/structure is needed to manage modelling interface (ETOOFS/Partnership for Delivery TT?)
* Recognise the support GOOS receives for its core work. Develop some specific actions around recognition for funding and in-kind support
* Assess roles, responsibilities and interplay between regional bodies, including GRAs, GOOS Projects (AtlantOS/TPOS2020), and national bodies such as GOOS National Focal Points/or committees, and major national systems, plus IOC, Argo Focal Points
* Focus point/structure is needed for oversight of superpartners multiple connections, to support efficiency, communications, agreements
* SC members to consider designated interest areas or SOs, and role in seeking funding
* Reassess resource configuration across GOOS for big ‘ask’

**Management process:*** Implementation Plan Task Team persists, start work on priorities
* Regular (bi-monthly?) meetings of the Implementation Plan Task Team
	+ discuss cross-GOOS actions
	+ review for specific SOs
	+ bring larger decisions to the GOOS SC
* GOOS invests in project management online software tool so actions in this document are placed where GOOS elements can access and update, tracking and analysis can be undertaken
* Report out regularly (6 months) to GOOS SC
 |

##  **Value of ocean observing data**

Emma Heslop and Anya Waite gave a [*presentation*](https://www.goosocean.org/index.php?option=com_oe&task=viewDocumentRecord&docID=28242) on several streams of work in the value of ocean observing data.

GOOS and OECD have worked on a joint project to 1) survey of flow of data within an economy, through survey of main oceanographic data centre and their users (initial survey with UK MEDIN, to be expanded), 2) evaluation of methods for measuring the value of ocean observations, best practice recommendations. There has been related work across GOOS to identify successful use cases, as well as work to engage the WMO in the identification of requirements for ocean data collection and exchange for its priorities.

The Steering Committee was on communicating this work, identifying objectives, and assessing what ongoing actions should be.

*[discussion points to be inserted]*

|  |
| --- |
| The Steering Committee **enthusiastically supported** the collaborative work with OECD, and its foreseen expansion into a second stage focused on economic valuation best practices. It also **supported** the initiatives led by the OCG, MTS, Ocean Frontiers Institute, Kongsberg to explore the developing and improving the science/industry/operations interfaces, through the 3 initiatives the identification of value to the private sector, and dialogues with industry through the MTS. |

### Day 3: Wednesday 28 April 2021

## **GOOS Projects**

*[introduction and discussion elements to be inserted]*

*Presentations*: 3 slides from each GOOS project focusing on their main asks of GOOS

* Tropical Pacific Observing System in 2020 (TPOS 2020) (see also [webinar](#ohdzdb69bmzf))
* Deep Ocean Observing Strategy (DOOS) (see also [webinar](#dggi0s7h9b14))
* Ocean Best Practices System (OBPS) (see also [webinar](#bqiefrc4ue8h))
* AtlantOS (see also [webinar](#mctiw06ouonk))

*Background documents*:

* [OBPS Implementation Plan](https://www.goosocean.org/index.php?option=com_oe&task=viewDocumentRecord&docID=28057)
* [OBPS Strategic Plan](https://www.goosocean.org/index.php?option=com_oe&task=viewDocumentRecord&docID=28058)
* [AtlantOS Programme Development Plan](https://www.goosocean.org/index.php?option=com_oe&task=viewDocumentRecord&docID=28104)

*Discussion*: Looking across the GOOS Projects, their role, how GOOS supports them, their long-term evolution, relationship with GOOS core team components, and with the GOOS Implementation Plan.

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision: GOOS Projects** The SC **decided** to:1. **Confirm** its approval of AtlantOS as a GOOS Project (approved ‘in principle’ at GOOS SC-9 part 2).
2. **Approve** the OBPS Strategic and Implementation Plans, and to promote OBPS as a resource and repository.
3. **Request** that Projects work in the GOOS planning process to capture key actions, intersections, and boundaries with Core Team components in the GOOS Implementation Plan, identifying outputs, impacts, and resourcing needs; and that these identify they key value and plans for how the projects innovate, changing and improving GOOS. [do projects need a forum as ongoing touchpoint for engagement with the rest of GOOS?]
4. **Work** with the Projects that have a regional scope (TPOS 2020, AtlantOS) and the GRAs to define the best levels of interaction with global observing networks and national systems, starting with workshop, and feeding into the structure/governance evolution work. Include some consultation with other regional governance systems: Regional Seas, LMEs, RFMOs, IOC and WMO regional structures].
 |

## **GOOS Core Team**

Albert Fischer gave a [presentation](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BlzJgEdcWHK5ozFXb4DmnGHy9jgVMhrs/view?usp=sharing)synthesizing some key takeaways and common issues raised in the GOOS Core Team [webinars](#fe7g7cvnbp8x).

* *Discussion*: Advice on the main points raised.

*[discussion points to be inserted]*

|  |
| --- |
| The Steering Committee **emphasized** the importance of prioritizing, clear messaging around functions, supporting cross-GOOS actions, and **committed** to change of internal and governing structures to have a better fit for purpose, while in parallel advancing with implementation. [capture from Anya in chat for pm session] |

### Day 4: Thursday 29 April 2021

## **Short reports**

* EOV-TT
* Data Mapping
* National Focal points
* GOOS Communications
* G7 FSOI

## Closing

The SC briefly reviewed the main Decisions of this session, and agreed to complete their review with comments in a shared document by Wednesday 5 May 2021, for iterative finalization of the meeting report.

## **New Horizons**

An open session that will be constructed around Steering Committee suggestions, focused on foresight, new horizons, and emerging issues. *5 min presentation and 10 min discussion each.*

* “Integration” (J. Tintoré)
* Odyssey Ocean Decade Instrument Support Initiative (M. Belbeoch and Venkatessan)
* Polar services (A. Scardilli and S. Grimes)

## **Closing**