

Repository of comments received to the zero draft proposal

Document Name Draft proposal for revised GOOS structure_Deliverable 4

Slide #	Slide content	Comments	Name of Reviewer	representation
0	Introduction	Need for a front page simple "elevator pitch" of process and document. to provide simple message to Member States / others - why, what,who, how to help bring the message of this document across in a simple way	Joanna Post	Secretariat
0	Introduction	I miss very very much a definition of GOOS at the beginning of the document. Otherwise the reader can imagine very many different things	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
1	Title slide	Draft proposal for revised mission, scope, structure	Joanna Post	Secretariat
2	Purpose of the document	which Executive Committee is being referred to under Governance?	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
3	Exec summary	"across the GOOS network" --Z I would avoid using that word, GOOS network generally means OCG	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
4	Proposal on a page	This is v nicely put together summary - i would keep this as it is - however can we add an additional page - indicate things to think about/address in regards to moving forward/implementation.. What are the showstoppers / hurdles in getting it agreed and in getting it done? What is the order of implementation - this is what we are going to do 1,2,3 and why a,b,c. Are the 8 key changes of equal priority - can we prioritise operation to benefit ease of implementation?	Joanna Post	Secretariat
4	Proposal on a page	Governance. OceanOPS is already managed under OCG for its operations, IOC and WMO manage HR and finance - together we have a management Board. It is already an integral part of the OCG Exec and OCG Team - it is already embedded in OCG. What you need to address is what OceanOPS reports into - SC or OCG? If SG, how is it managed? and how do the networks have a say over the funds supplied to OceanOPS - currently the 3 long term funders manage OceanOPS.	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
4	Proposal on a page	It's not clear if you are talking about the value proposition of the global coordination structure or of global ocean observations. These 2 things have very different value propositions. I don't think anyone doubts the value of a global system; the question at hand is what does the GOOS secretariat do to deliver this? This is important to set the scene for all the discussions to follow, and in fact, starting on slide 7, this distinction is clear (GOOS secretariat functions). Note also: Member States are not only beneficiaries of the observing system, but they are the ONLY CONTRIBUTORS to infrastructure. As currently written, the statement sounds as if GOOS headquarters is providing the world with observations, which is not accurate and potentially insulting for major national infrastructure operators and funders. Value added of GOOS for Member States is that they get back more than they put in: they contribute some infrastructure, get access to a global system and influence in its development.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
4	Proposal on a page	In the structure section of slide 4, #8 strengthen NFPs interaction model should be at the top of list and Member States should not be relegated to reporting duties. It is the combined priorities and investments of the Member States who determine what the global system will look like and any global coordination should start here. This also needs to come out more strongly in the Governance section. Member States are well positioned in the Accountability Mechanisms section, but this is lost in the Governance section ... how can you be accountable if they are not a key part of governance (and beyond simply linking to IODE for data exchange issues ...)	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
4	Proposal on a page	Mission: resilient ocean observing system for thriving communities..... To me, this reads as it's only for the thriving communities. How about adjusting it toresilient ocean observing system for a healthy ocean and to thrive communities.	Champika Gallage	WMO
4	Proposal on a page	Similar comment on Value proposition : Users of ocean observation Data:support thriving ocean economies via smarter, data-driven decisions. Additionally, I feel we provide a scientific basis for decision-making, therefore it is good to include ... smarter, scientific data-driven decisions.....	Champika Gallage	WMO
4	Proposal on a page	VALUE PROPOSITION: The statement "We provide a globally integrated, responsive, and resilient ocean observing system" does not ring true to me, as GOOS does not collect observations but rather we facilitate and enable a globally integrated and responsive observing system by connecting the observing communities, fostering collaboration and cooperation. I also have issues in the emphasis given to economic, science and security but nothing on sustainable use, conservation or improving ocean health. We have big problems with tipping points reached, we should be positioning GOOS to face these challenges, our wellbeing depends on the ocean. The focus seems very economically driven and a re-focus away from ecology/ecosystems	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel

4	Proposal on a page	STRUCTURE: Biodiversity is a pillar for IOC and I think should be for GOOS. Dropping UNEP as sponsor looks like GOOS is re-focusing on climate only, not the message we want of an integrated system across disciplines. UNEP has a very important role in the biodiversity space, so if the decision is to drop its role to a partnership, this should be formalised and entail close collaboration with UNEP improving our ability to connect to initiatives such as IPBES, CBD, World Conservation Monitoring Centre, etc, and the recognition by UNEP of what GOOS does in this space.	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
4	Proposal on a page	ROLES: dropping the GRAs and working instead with NFP will increase the level of work, it is not the same to engage and coordinate 14 than 81. Furthermore, member states appoint the NFP and some times the appointed person is not familiar with ocean observations and may have little influence/interest in trying to organise national committees. GRAs on the other hand are all about ocean observations and systems, they know the space, I would rather we strengthen the GRAs and connect the NFP to them to get a flow of information that goes from national-regional-global.	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
4	Proposal on a page	Value proposition. What GOOs are we talking about here? If OCG networks are part of GOOS, how can we say that GOOS is for suppliers of ocean observations data, aren't the suppliers already part of GOOS? I find this confusing	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
4	Proposal on a page	Governance. I don't think we need many more layers of governance fora. We have a few, and the main reason for which we cannot implement them better is lack of time of resources, so new fora may worsen the problem...	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
4	Proposal on a page	NFP as a name of misleading => National Ocean Observing Coordination Structure (represented by a NFP)	P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France
4	Proposal on a page	The accountability measures are a good start to motivate GOOS action and measure progress.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
4	Proposal on a page	Consolidate sponsorship under IOC and WMO - does this mean GOOS could receive contributions outside of UNESCO to allow for more flexibility?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
4	Proposal on a page	Streamline the reporting structure - what kind of reporting would be requested? What products would the SC need to see to be able to make timely decisions?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
4, 9	Proposal on a page, value prop	Member states are both suppliers and users of obs data and hence have broader interests than resilience and security. There is an assumption that suppliers of ocean data are the science community and users are industry.	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
4,9,23, 55	Proposal on a page, value prop, OKRs	Member States / Suppliers of Ocean Observation Data Similar to the above: Is this distinction really helpful? As mentioned above, Member States are not only the 'decision-making level', but also, for the most part, the suppliers of ocean observation data. An easy fix could be to rename 'Member State' as 'Decision Maker'. However, I am unsure whether this reflects the whole point mentioned above.	Matthias Wunsch, Manfred Zeiler	Member States, Group 1 - Germany
7	Mission statement	GOOS mission vs Secretariat mission - see email	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
7	Mission statement	better on the value to users... ensure ocean data are transformed into actionable insights	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
7	Mission statement	1. Mission statement: 1. (slide 7) good point made on the recent call by Champika (can be read as only for thriving communities)	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
7	Mission statement	2. This is GOOS's mission. It is would be confusing to have a secretariat mission and a GOOS mission (are we going to do different things?), perhaps articulate the secretariats ROLE or WORK in achieving the mission if we want to be more clear on the secretariats role in this in fact on an earlier slide (slide 4) there is written - Secretariat's mission to drive system-wide performance and ensure accountability...	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
7	Mission statement	Support continuous improvement of ocean observing system to meet changing scientific, economic, environmental, and technological needs	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
7	Mission statement	Facilitate worldwide coordination and data sharing for a unified, comprehensive ocean monitoring , forecasting and service value chain	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
7	Mission statement	Really clear articulation of the elements of the mission and related activities.	Michelle Heupel	IMOS

7	Mission statement	Mission statement: "To enable and evolve a globally integrated, responsive, and resilient ocean observing system for thriving communities and a healthy ocean". - This should be revised to kill immediately this ambiguity that greatly penalises GOOS : is GOOS the Observing System itself or the Coordination body ? We should clearly distinguish these 2 notions : having the same "GOOS" for the 2 is a real handicap. - You can not "evolve" something that is not yours. You can provide a framework for the evolution, or promote, coordinate, or inspire evolution. Others, the owners of the systems at the national level, will do the evolution. This is clarified in the additional text explaining the mission: "Support continuous improvement of ocean observing system to meet changing scientific, environmental, and technological needs". But this text is not part of the mission statement, and the mission, as it is, is confusing. Here, to support evolution is more realistic than to evolve.	Pierre Bahurel and Enrique Alvarez Fanjul	ETOOFS
7	Mission statement	The Secretariat cannot (directly) build a robust system, and the Secretariat cannot ensure data are transformed into actionable insights	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
7	Mission statement	Title: Secretariat mission statement or a Programme (seven GOOS components) mission statement?	Albert Fisher	WMO
7	Mission statement	"evolve": technology is a potential driver of needs but also a potential enabler of evolution - not clear	Albert Fisher	WMO
7	Mission statement	"globally integrated": not only the ocean monitoring value chain, but the broader weather and climate intelligence value chain (WMO perspective) and ocean hazard/blue economy/ecosystem services/ocean management value chain (IOC perspective)	Albert Fisher	WMO
7	Mission statement	"responsive": somewhere there is a missing articulation of how to interpret "global" in GOOS - is it responding to global public good needs only (likely no) or also national needs for ocean observing - are the approaches to global needs and regional/national needs different (likely yes), and how would these be articulated as being different in the outputs of GOOS?	Albert Fisher	WMO
7	Mission statement	"thriving communities and a healthy ocean": has resonance with UNEP's "for people and planet" mission, but the "thriving communities" is so general and could use some specificity here or elsewhere as being not only coastal or ocean communities, but global communities needing ocean information for weather, climate, ocean economy, etc.	Albert Fisher	WMO
7-9	Mission statement, from-to, value proposition	Mission and scope Strengthen the link between mission and implementation. The mission is strong, but its connection to concrete Secretariat functions can be clearer. This can be improved adding a short matrix linking mission elements to the Secretariat roles to the governance/structural elements. Slide 9 represents a significant improvement of operational focus.	Luis Menezes Pinheiro	Member States, Group 1 - Portugal
8	From - to	Viewing the scientific community as the primary stakeholder - its been a long time since this was true...	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
8	From - to	Fully support increased emphasis on being responsive to MSs and not driving the system solely from the research community's perspective.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
8	From - to	Viewing the operational and scientific oceanography community as the primary stakeholder	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
8	From - to	UNEP should be considered a key strategic sponsor. Can they be convinced to sponsor GOOS? Otherwise we will continue to struggle in having visibility in the biological space.	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
8	From - to	Include regional organisations and processes as stakeholders to respond.	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
8	From - to	Consider for instance UN financial mechanisms as a source for the implementation of ocean observing systems.	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
8	From - to	It is critical to assess the UN and other international organisations that benefit from OOS and how this will be increasingly important in the context of climate change.	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
8	From - to	Glad to see a wider range of stakeholders being recognized	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
8	From - to	Great, like this	Albert Fisher	WMO
9	Value proposition	The expected outcome for "suppliers of ocean observation data... that..." (advances groundbreaking and relevant global ocean science" is linked more to the users than suppliers conceptually. I think the output of GOOS for the suppliers is advocacy / integration / strategic direction - the things that takes their disparate contributions and makes a unified system.	Albert Fisher	WMO

9	Value proposition	Suppliers of Ocean Data are primarily Member States. Find a way to make it clear that Member States are not only beneficiaries of the system.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
9	Value proposition	Advances groundbreaking and relevant operational ocean science	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
9	Value proposition	Fuels innovation and supports disaster risk reduction and thriving ocean economies via smarter, data-driven decisions	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
9	Value proposition	"Users of Ocean Observation Data = inaccessible and non-user friendly data, engagement complexity, and lack of co-design involvement". This is not true for what regards ocean prediction, and this is not new. I would add that GOOS suffers from an endogenous vision and "poor knowledge of its actual users and applications". The response "fuels innovation, etc" is ok, although not very concrete. What GOOS can offer here, is help to structure, simplify, organize this vast network of "suppliers". This is what could help value creation but this value creation (blue economy, decision tools, etc etc etc) will be done elsewhere. This should be clear.	Pierre Bahurel and Enrique Alvarez Fanjul	ETOOFS
9	Value proposition	MS Struggle with complex platforms - is this GOOS components or actual observing platforms..? If observing platforms, I think this is a misplaced comment, is	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
9	Value proposition	Again, in the statements in the dark green box ... nothing on healthy oceans or emphasis on environment and sustainability - only economics, security and	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
9	Value proposition	Include global and regional frameworks and organisations in the demand of ocean observations, although identifying that this is also driven by the interest of Member States	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
9	Value proposition	to strengthen national resilience, maritime security and blue economy through data-driven strategic decisions and policy-relevant observations	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
9	Value proposition	VALUES: I am not keen on these statements - they do not match my knowledge of MS, users, suppliers and value gain. MS value is fear and no aspiration - prefer strengthen resilience and security, and build a sustainable and well managed ocean and coast. Suppliers - some in private sector and some not in science... So suggest to advance our ocean knowledge, and support services and data driven decisions. Users - are many and varies but often we talk about fueling decision making - get the ocean information needed to take better decisions, support sustainable ocean economies and ocean health - some ideas anyway	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
11	8 changes	See email and comments on slide 4 STRUCTURE & ROLES above. The following key structural changes are recommended to enhance GOOS success towards its mission. This will help achieve... bullets are all things we have discussed in the past, but will need action to achieve (some are ambiguous as to what they mean) - are these KPIs and how do they relate to KPIs	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
11	8 changes	Same comment as for slide 4bis re strengthening the role of NFPs ... MSs, who contribute most of the infrastructure for observations, need to be one of the main drivers of the global system and not simply given reporting duties.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
11	8 changes	1. Not all the GRAs belong to regions with established IOC Sub-commissions. Subsequently, IOC as part of UNESCO, the recommendations should have universal applications and not discriminatory in the implementation.	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
11	8 changes	2. The GRAs as scientific and operational structures are composed of mixtures of institutions outside the IOC membership	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
11	8 changes	3. IOC Subcommissions are understaffed, weak and lack adequate manpower and resources to take over additional responsibilities. More specifically, it is proven that when some of the Subcommissions have been dormant and inoperational without activities for decades, the GRAs were operational supporting national and regional observations. Funding for ocean observations come from various sources beyond the IOC membership and thus, the GRAs can not and should not be integrated within the Subcommissions.	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
11	8 changes	4. As a principle, there can not be «one size fits all» administrative and bureaucratic rule and approach. Flexibility is required to allow each GRA to build on own successful historical experience based on diversities of the regions	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
11	8 changes	5. Ocean observations are a key priority of the IOC, which is the statutory reason for the establishment of GOOS project office. Thus, GOOS project office should continue supporting, and even more an enhanced level of support to national and regional observations efforts. If not, what would be the role of GOOS project office if it can not provide support to the national and regional observations network	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
11	8 changes	6. Nations and partners are not accountable vis-à-vis of the IOC Secretariat.	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
11	8 changes	7. It is the Secretariat which is accountable vis-à-vis of Member States, partners and governing bodies.	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5

11	8 changes	This list of 8 recommendations is already a long list, but note that none of them addresses the USE of these observations. This is one of the identified weaknesses of the current situation - no one in the GOOS world has the same vision of who the users are. How could we justify long-term and sustained investments if this is not managed ? ETOOFS can play a role here, it requires some discussion to organize things, but if this is not identified as a priority for GOOS, there is little chance that anything will happen. In the same vein, the GRAs is a strategic asset to connect with national applications : if a repositioning is planned, it must be discussed with this "user/impact" objective in mind. On the contrary, the proposed change can jeopardise this objective by undermining GOOS's own ability to understand the external environment. The governance of GRA might be aligned and modified, but not unlinked from the system without a clear strategy here. This is losing capacity for action and 'internal' capacity development & guidance. Additionally, the design of how this will work is unnecessarily complex (slide 19) and difficult to understand.	Pierre Bahurel and Enrique Alvarez Fanjul	ETOOFS
11	8 changes	A key challenge that GOOS faces that was identified during the interviews with stakeholders (slide 41) is the poor brand visibility and insufficient communication and outreach outside of the research community, ie among decision-makers, the general public, and non scientific community. This key question is not really relected in the changes proposed in the table of slide 11.	Luís Menezes Pinheiro	Member States, Group 1 - Portugal
11	8 changes	same issue with above about dropping UNEP, we will continue to be invisible to the biological community. I would suggest rather than dropping strengthening this relationship.	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
11	8 changes	streamline reporting to SC: I thought we already do this, don't we? but now NFP will be reporting, what will be the workload for an SC that will oversee the NFPs?	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
11	8 changes	I am confused about the GRAs and NFP. It is not clear to me how you strengthen regional coordination by dropping the GRAs to join the sub-commissions to free up some secretariat time while emphasizing on NFP to build collaboration between them and get them to report to GOOS ... isn't the collaboration between nations supposed to be through the GRAs (e.g. eurogoos). In my mind perhaps the GRAs should be re-drawn to be true regional alliance such as EuroGOOS, MONGOOS, PIGOOS, instead of national systems like IMOS, IOOS, others) but I don't think dropping them to instead coordinate NFP will be streamlining and freeing up time for the secretariat - the opposite may be true ... unless I am completely confused?	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
11	8 changes	Point 6. What is "an elevated structure"?	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
11	8 changes	Role of Member States (through NFP) is rightly emphasized. Make it clear that GOOS as a system must be co-designed by M/S and that M/S should be part of the governance.	P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France
11	8 changes	It is not clear what the consequence will be in the difference between integrating GRAs within IOC Sub-Commissions or as external contributors. This should be clarified. It does not make sense to have GRAs at two different levels within GOOS. It must be considered that IOC Subcommissions were created with a clear capacity development objective, whereas the main role of GRAs is regional coordination. In fact, the proposal of item 7 is to improve coherence and having GRAs integrated in SubCs or as external contributors does not seem to be the case. Again, we would like to highlight the importance of coordination of OOs at regional level to respond to MS's needs at this level of spatial scale (e.g. regional conventions or RFMOs).	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
11	8 changes	Repositioning the GRAs within the Sub-Commissions: This may help strengthen some regionally focused activities within individual GRAs; however, this will likely limit sharing of best practices/sharing of experiences and tools from region to region (ie across sub-commissions). I suspect this action will eliminate the GRAs with little/no noticable take up by Sub Commissions.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
11	8 changes	Urge caution about repositioning GRAs within the Sub-Commissions or as external contributors. This may not be optimal and should not proceed without significant discussion about what GOOS leadership and GOOS components need from the GRAs. There are likely opportunities to strengthen GRA contributions, and while there may be overlaps with Sub-Commissions (this should be analyzed/documentated), with some focus those might be better leveraged to ensure a GRA structure and network that is supporting GOOS observing and data flow requirements.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
11	8 changes	Strengthen leadership continuity, institutional memory, and expertise within the SC - how would active engagement by the SC be ensured throughout its tenure?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
11	8 changes	STRUCTURE & ROLES: : 1 and 4 seem linked to me - why not combine? 4. All components, except NFP, already report to the SC. 7. GRAs (see email - I do not see this working looks more of a mess than before and will lead to questions for the secretariat that we still do not know the answer to - what is the main purpose role of GRAs). 8. For NFP to report you will need a heap more funds for OceanOPS/BioEco Panel, so in 1 - 8 you need to represent some dependences later.	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
12	Mandates	"the GOOS management team transformed into secretariat" what does that mean? Is this more a title change or what are the expectations?	TBD	Secretariat

12	Mandates	GOOS endorsed projects - what exactly is meant by this here? The current projects are endorsed projects. They are not led by GOOS nor does GOOS have much handling in them. What is the purpose and benefit to GOOS of having these? I understand that having projects that propel things forward is a good thing and at the same time GOOS does not have the capacity to resource these efforts OR support them with secretariat support. I would suggest this becomes a potential solution for the future.	TBD	Secretariat
12	Mandates	This makes it seem as though GOOS is run entirely through voluntary contributions and donations. Is there no move to suggest that IOC-UNESCO regular program budget should be used to support GOOS coordination structures? If GOOS is a flagship of the IOC, shouldn't there be a sustained minimum funding for its key structures? Why is the BioEco panel separated from the Expert panels?	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
12	Mandates	GRA will continue exist as external contributors -Can not agree with this	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
12	Mandates	In strongly recommend to create an expert panel (in addition to existing 3) for operations/translation of EOVS to products/service	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
12	Mandates	Strongly recommend to merge OCG and OceanOPS-highly duplicating/overlapping in nature	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
12	Mandates	Clear distinction is required between donors, sponsors and partners in terms of finance, in-kind and technological support	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
12	Mandates	1. no one size fit all. Furthermore, the Subcommissions are too weak to takeover additional responsibilities	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
12	Mandates	2. With regard to the integration of GRA into the sub commission: It will be confusing and inoperational by experience. If there are stand alone, they can not be integrated in the Subcommissions	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
12	Mandates	3. GOOS Steering Committee Regional Experts will act as connectors for GOOS (SC-14 action) by holding a dual role as members of their respective IOC sub	Affian Kouadio	Member States,
12	Mandates	The compositions of the GRAs are multifaceted and diverse, therefore complex, and the task of the focal points is already very challenging without adding new	Affian Kouadio	Member States,
12	Mandates	4. Repositioning GRAs with IOC Sub-Commissions will minimize duplication and strengthen regional oversight and accountability: There is at present no	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
12	Mandates	There is a fair effort to simplify to 5 thematic nodes (Panels, OCG, OceanOps, NFPs, ETOOFS) with a specific role but this is not yet straightforward logically and the slide 15 adds more complexity and slide 23 confirms this impression with too many roles per body. OceanOBS could have a monitoring role and nothing else, and OCG could have a coordination role of all networks and no one else, etc At this stage, there is more effort to explain how it works (who reports to whom, who chairs what, who is hosting what, ...) than to explain what is actually the mission (who delivers what) ; we must correct this. Practically, the role of ETOOFS must be wider, not only looking into the observations (perspective of the network manager), but also on how these are transferred to the forecasting community (perspective of the Ocean forecasting service manager), and how the ocean forecasting is a tool to advocate for more Ocean observations. In a techno push approach, ETOOFS explains to users how to use observations, in a demand-driven approach ETOOFS can explain to GOOS what is needed and why. GOOS must consider the 2nd.	Pierre Bahurel and Enrique Alvarez Fanjul	ETOOFS
12	Mandates	The supplier and user categories were set before this work, so we have added a category that is not distinct from the other 2 (as states supply and use) - so what distinct value to MS do we deliver that is different from these other two categories? I think it is knowledge that there is a SYSTEM (users do not necessarily care unless they are aggregated users like WMO) but states do - this is what I think you need to articulate here - strengthens national resilience and security through enabling an integrated ocean observing system that delivers the data required by nations to safely navigate the future...	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
12	Mandates	Ok, but continues to be focus on physics and BGC ... I know OBIS is not part of GOOS but it is the system that exists for biology. Are the biological networks	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
12	Mandates	Clarify how GOOS will work with networks not part of OCG in particular for regional and coastal observations ?	P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France
12	Mandates	How GOOS governance will develop and maintain an implementation plan for the ocean observing system ?	P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France
12	Mandates	Clarify the links of GOOS panels and OCG with NFPs. NFP should endorse OCG and GOOS panels recommendations.	P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France
12	Mandates	There seems to be a certain degree of overlap between ExpPanels, OCG and Ocean OPS.	Karaer Gonzalez	Member States, Group 1 - France
12	Mandates	Do Donors/Partners/Endorsed Projects have a formal relationship with GOOS? If so, which organizational component?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
12	Mandates	OceanOps should not be recognized at the same level of Expert Panels, etc. The level of detail/level of responsibility of OceanOPS is better suited to be closely	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
12	Mandates	Despite the importance of data services (ie data management), there is no obvious organizational element where data services are addressed. Data	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
12	Mandates	Why are BioEco Observing Communities called out, but others are not specifically noted here (eg BGC obs communities, marine debris communities, Tsunami, etc) There is a process/mechanism to identify GOOS Ocean Obs Networks (which report to the OCG) so they should be included in the bottom row. Other public/private observing communities/contributors could be the second box in the bottom row	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US

12	Mandates	Each of the Expert Panels has a different scope leading to confusion across the wider GOOS community. How will this be addressed in the reform? Does	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
12	Mandates	Endorsed Projects: We'd like to see a closer connection between these projects and GOOS in terms of identifying expectations and deliverables.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
12	Mandates	"Expert Panels (x3)" should have a role not only in setting requirements but in evaluating the system and making recommendations on its evolution	Albert Fisher	WMO
12	Mandates	"ETOOPS" the role is articulated only in the context of observations, but what about a focus on organizing prediction products, engaging users, setting standards and interoperability of forecast outputs?	Albert Fisher	WMO
12	Mandates	"Endorsed Projects" should have an innovation role, not mentioned	Albert Fisher	WMO
12	Mandates	across the bottom - are these communities and networks designing observing "systems"? or "networks" that contribute to GOOS? Hopefully we have one system not a system of systems.	Albert Fisher	WMO
12	Mandates	How are capacity development and best practice sharing supported by the components of GOOS?	Albert Fisher	WMO
12,18	Mandates, Secretariat	Clarification of OceanOPS dual identity OceanOPS is described both as an independent component and as part of the Secretariat. This situation need clarification about what OceanOPS does as a GOOS independent component and what it does under the Secretariat.	Luís Menezes Pinheiro	Member States, Group 1 - Portugal
12, 19	Mandates, GRAs	The removal of GRAs as components is a major structural change, but the document lacks: 1- A clearer definition of key advantages and potential risks (e.g., potential loss of regional identity, in some cases); 2- Steps for GRA restructuring. For clarification will be very helpful the inclusion of a transition roadmap with timelines, responsibilities, funding implications, and success indicators.	Luís Menezes Pinheiro	Member States, Group 1 - Portugal
13	Sponsors	Governing mechanism of GOOS by IOC and WMO is unclear.Can JCB play a role here ?	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
13	Sponsors	Why the operational institutes can be a partner ???	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
13	Sponsors	same comment about UNEP. WMO will focus on climate who will help with strategic decisions in ecosystems? Relationship with UNEP should be strengthen not dropped.	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
13	Sponsors	"staffing support" from WMO includes OceanOPS and OOPC	TBD	Secretariat
13	Sponsors	Donors : need to separate the role of M/S (that fund most of the observation) from the role of external donors.	P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France
13	Sponsors	I like the clarity this slide tries to provide. The definition around Partners needs improvement, focusing on the primary roles (colaborates/promotes). The Partners example lists only governance/inter-governmental partners, vice partners who contribute ocean data. For example: would the private sector be considered partners if they are selling/providing data freely to the system?; where do the ocean observing satellite communities fit here?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
13	Sponsors	How will WMO be involved in strategic decisions of GOOS? What is the pathway to get that involvement?	Albert Fisher	WMO
13	Sponsors	WMO will probably want more visibility and symmetry with IOC/UNESCO, in line with its interest and investment in GOOS, while recognizing the lead organization	Albert Fisher	WMO
13	Sponsors	Will the JCB still be useful if GOOS becomes a strong joint programme?	Albert Fisher	WMO
13	Sponsors	The staffing support from WMO to GOOS is through OceanOPS but also secretariat support to OCG and individual marine meteorological networks (SOT and DBCP)	Albert Fisher	WMO
13	Sponsors	Here I am missing some articulation or clarity on how the GOOS components address global vs. regional/national issues in a differentiated way	Albert Fisher	WMO
13	Sponsors	The global networks of GOOS have a limited number of players who have the capacity to work in areas beyond national jurisdiction and with a basin-spanning or global view. There is an analogy to the world of space observations for weather and climate, where an independent Coordination Group for Meteorological Satellites is organized to serve WMO requirements, but runs their own processes to coordinate and identify risks of failing to meet requirements. Is this a model worth examining for GOOS to engage?	Albert Fisher	WMO

14	Donor Coordination Group	Member States are included in the donor coordination group - does this mean that you expect them to contribute funds to GOOS coordination structures (panels, etc) or are you considering that national infrastructure is a contribution to the global system? For the "investment menu" developed by the SC, that needs to be developed closely with Member States whose combined infrastructure is the global system and driven by national and regional priorities. For too long, GOOS has been providing a "menu" developed by the research community that is often out of phase with national priorities. Also, quarterly updates on implementation progress is a bit ambitious, not only in terms of resources but also because progress will simply not move that quickly.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
14	Donor Coordination Group	Re footnote on working with groups including G7, there is a real conundrum to be solved. Ideally what you want is a group that pulls together the Member States who contribute the most to the system. G7 is 80%, G20 is up to 90% or more, but also includes some countries that make only small contributions. Trying to establish rules about who can be in the club will be complicated, and you cannot (history shows) do this with all MSs sitting around the table. As this will be a joint IOC-WMO led group, perhaps it should be set up under the JCB? That doesn't make it any easier but at least GOOS would not take the blame for who is in and who is out.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
14	Donor Coordination Group	In DCG, there can be co chairs one from member states and other from non -governmental	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
14	Donor Coordination Group	We propose a gradual approach for the role of Donors. It will not make sense to create this structure if donors will never be a relevant factor, something that we believe might be the case. If, after some exploration, this is a real opportunity, this might be a good idea.	Pierre Bahurel and Enrique Alvarez Fanjul	ETOOFS
14	Donor Coordination Group	This is a detail, but does it make sense to report quarterly? Will funding impact be perceived with that frequency?	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
14	Donor Coordination Group	Donors: for GOOS secretariat or for the system ? If this is for the system this should be through Member States unless you propose a central funding for ocean observations (?)	P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France
14	Donor Coordination Group	What does it mean to be a governance forum without being a decision-making body. If the DCG has the capacity to prioritise the investment menu or link donor and GOOS priorities, then, it is a decision-making body. Please clarify.	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
14	Donor Coordination Group	Currently, OOS are sustained by public MS funds (which is an in kind contribution), including the budget of GOOS secretariate. If the private sector and philanthropy are going to influence prioritization, this must be adequately balanced.	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
14	Donor Coordination Group	NOTE. It is not clear what is meant. It is not clear which body could be complementary GOOS MS WG vs. existing high level-forums? GOOS MS WG vs DCG? Further, it must be noted that those high-level fora are composed of a restricted number of MS which may not represent the general MS interest.	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
14	Donor Coordination Group	clarity on the mandate of the DCG, given it appears to address extrabudgetary funding only. MS contributions to the actual undertaking of observations should not be subject to the DCG	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
14	Donor Coordination Group	The Donor Coordinating Group seems to have a cadence of every two years for meeting. How was this cadence determined, and is this optimal for the functions of the group?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
14	Donor Coordination Group	The Donor Coordination Group concept is promising, but operational details are missing. It is necessary to better define, for example: 1- Expected outputs (e.g., annual investment packages); 2- Secretariat support mechanisms; 3- How to engage the private sector and how to ensure this engagement is ethical and aligned with UN rules.	Luís Menezes Pinheiro	Member States, Group 1 - Portugal
14	Donor Coordination Group	WMO has recently launched an initiative called the "Global weather and climate intelligence commons" with similar objectives to the Donor Coordinating Group of attracting interest and investment from non-traditional donors to the central coordination activity and infrastructure creating a backbone for value creation in businesses. It would be worth articulating a relationship here.	Albert Fisher	WMO

11, 13, 14, 27 inter alia	Donor Coordination Group, 8 changes, sponsors, governance (steering)	<p>Recommendation 3: Donor Coordination Group:</p> <p>While recognising that GOOS lacks sustained long-term funding and that there is an urgent need to diversify donors and contributors, the following questions arise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whom exactly do we mean by 'donors/contributors'? The definition on page 13 is not very specific. Are they someone who provides extra-budgetary resources to the GOOS Secretariat? Or operators of ocean observation infrastructure who provide data and information? It seems more promising to communicate specifically with specific groups on specific problems than to have an unspecific 'donor coordination group'. - Is the 'donor coordination group' identical to the 'GOOS Working Group on Ocean Observing Risk' that was launched at UNOC? If so, it might be beneficial to establish this group and evaluate its effectiveness before forming a new one. - Is there really a significant contribution from philanthropy or the private sector? It seems that the biggest contribution in the form of 'operating ocean observation' comes by far from Member States, either through 'operational monitoring activities' performed by public authorities or the scientific community (also funded by public money). The answer to this question may be similar to the question of who the donors/contributors are. 	Matthias Wunsch, Manfred Zeiler	Member States, Group 1 - Germany
15	Reporting structure	Recommended changes: The GOOS SC will be reporting to the IOC Governing Bodies (Assembly, EC) and to the WMO governing Bodies (INFCOM and Congress).. It would be good to change the paradigm here and state that GOOS reports to both its sponsors governing bodies - providing equal weight	Joanna Post	Secretariat
15	Reporting structure	GRAs are not included in the organization scheme. Is that correct?	Alvaro Scardilli	GRA Vice Chair
15	Reporting structure	I find this confusing. You include Member States as donors (still not clear if that is for something other than infrastructure) and Member States are included in National Observing Networks. The label "external contributor" is also a bit odd ... there is NO global observing system without infrastructure, all provided (or 99%) by Member States. Why do they not have a direct line to the GOOS SC but instead have to work their way through various panels? I realize that the OCG pulls together the national contributions via different networks (Argo, etc.) but this is not a substitute for advice on investment priorities that will come directly from Member States. I'm not sure what to suggest on your diagram .. should this level of MS engagement come directly from the combined IOC-WMO branch to the GOOS SC ? I realise the SC will include some MS representatives but not likely major donors on a permanent basis. Or simply replace "donors" by Member States and donors ?	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
15	Reporting structure	It is unclear that who represent from IOC and WMO as Governing body of GOOS SC...Is it JCB of IOC and WMO ?	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
15	Reporting structure	GRA's are not represented in the reporting structure. Do the GRAs report to anyone?	Captain Carlos Zúñiga & Lt Cmdr Matías Sifón	Member States, Group 3 IOC Vice Chair
15	Reporting structure	How OceanOPS links with IODE role is not clear. Seems to me that there are overlaps to be solved; Idem for OCG and its coordination role with satellite and in situ obs. This must be clarified, to be stronger	Pierre Bahurel and Enrique Alvarez Fanjul	ETOOFS
15	Reporting structure	The document talks about NFP and "National Observing Networks". These, in the real world, are not the main component of the system. Ocean Observing is much more fragmented. In many countries, the NFPs are not really representatives of the existing networks. We should follow a more institution-oriented approach for the coordination of networks. EMODNET and the in-situ TAC are remarkable examples of the potential of this approach, which is missing in the document. This approach is leaving outside probably more than 50% of the observing system. A different, more inclusive, and institution-based approach is needed.	Pierre Bahurel and Enrique Alvarez Fanjul	ETOOFS
15	Reporting structure	Good for OceanOPS, OCG to understand the implications of an expansion to oversee biology or discuss what the best way forward will be, with OBIS having a place in these discussions as our main data system for biology, also recognised globally by the biological communities who already provide data to this.	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
15	Reporting structure	I don't understand the "coordination" lines... the Panels do not coordinate the networks... maybe SOCONET is an exception... also what does it mean that GOOS Secretariat coordinates the donors and PARTners and Endorsed Projects?	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
15	Reporting structure	Reporting Structure The regional level does not appear in the reporting lines (see below. Comment on GRAs). The term "external contributors" might be worth rethinking, as it might create a we vs. them attitude.	Matthias Wunsch, Manfred Zeiler	Member States, Group 1 - Germany
15	Reporting structure	Where do GRAs under IOC subcomm. fit in this structure? Also GRAs are not data providers, which is the role given to External Contributors. They are coordinating bodies mainly.	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain

15	Reporting structure	In the "Operational & scientific coordination" level, except OceanOPS, all others are member-driven groups, while OceanOPS is a facilitator primarily for OCG (Networks) and some others. OCG should approve the OceanOPS workplan, and therefore, OceanOPS should be placed under OCG with a connection to the GOOS SC.	Champika Gallage	WMO
15	Reporting structure	Should GOOS have some explicit link to the satellite community through CGMS and CEOS?	Albert Fisher	WMO
15	Reporting structure	How will the GOOS Steering Committee engage WMO as a co-sponsor?	Albert Fisher	WMO
15, 26, 30	Reporting structure, governance	Role of the IOC-WMO Joint Collaborative Board Currently, the specific role of the JCB in coordinating the future co-sponsors, the IOC and the WMO, is unclear. However, given its status as an inter-agency mechanism between the IOC and WMO secretariats, the JCB should play a specific role in the future.	Matthias Wunsch, Manfred Zeiler	Member States, Group 1 - Germany
15, 28, 29, 38	Reporting structure, governance	Data Delivery 'Data Delivery' or 'Guide standards, best practice and network specifications for data delivery' is mentioned as task. It might be beneficial to clarify how the interlinkages with IODE under the new IOC Data Architecture might look like or at least reference the future Data Architecture.	Matthias Wunsch, Manfred Zeiler	Member States, Group 1 - Germany
16	Steering Committee	It's good to have the regional experts integrated into the SC, but it's not clear that you will actually get representatives that know anything about ocean observing. The criteria for those positions will be important (e.g., directly engaged in planning and implementing ocean observations in your country). I find the membership rotation very confusing - Co-chairs are only elected for non-renewable 2 year terms but members can be elected for 4 years with the possibility of renewal, so 8 years? I think it may be difficult to get good candidates who are willing to make a commitment for 4 years, especially since the work is done on a voluntary basis and people don't know what their work loads will look like 4 years down the road. Consider 3 years ?	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
16	Steering Committee	Selection of non-regional experts: The areas in which the nominations will be sought and selected, should cover the priority areas identified by the steering	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
16	Steering Committee	I really do not understand what role the GRAs have in this new structure. It seems to me there isn't any. Also, the SC does not include the sponsors, should	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
16	Steering Committee	What does it mean that "ex-officio" are no longer part of the SC? That they cannot vote? That they cannot participate? Aren't the sponsors represented in the SC?	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
16	Steering Committee	GOOS Steering Committee, rotation of co-chair Further explanation of the proposed rotation mechanism for the co-chairs may be required. This is particularly the case for the "regional experts". Does 'Year 1' refer to 'Years 1 and 2'? While recognising the need for rotation and stronger regional representation, Exemptions may be needed if a regional expert is unable to fulfil the role. The new role and its expectations must be communicated properly to enable member states to select suitable candidates.	Matthias Wunsch, Manfred Zeiler	Member States, Group 1 - Germany
16	Steering Committee	Again, where do GRAs not included in IOC CubCs fit in "with Regional Experts coordinating with GRAs integrated into IOC Sub-Commissions	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
16	Steering Committee	terms of office should not be fixed as suggested at this time	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
16	Steering Committee	In this document, WMO is proposed as a co-sponsor alongside IOC. I expect the GOOS SC membership should consist of members from the WMO community, proposed by WMO. None of the Secretariat employees (e.g., OceanOPS) should be regular GOOS SC members, but can be ex officio.	Champika Gallage	WMO
16	Steering Committee	Is there no questioning of the utility of the regionally-appointed experts on the GOOS Steering Committee? Has this worked, is this political process helpful?	Albert Fisher	WMO
16	Steering Committee	How will WMO have influence on the Steering Committee? Would it lose its ex officio seat? Will it have a say in the nomination or selection of Steering Committee members?	Albert Fisher	WMO
16	Steering Committee	How will the working components of GOOS be connected to the Steering Committee if they are no longer members?	Albert Fisher	WMO
16	Steering Committee	On the one hand you speak about the SC needing continuity but the chair will rotate every two years? This is contradictory	Albert Fisher	WMO
16	Steering Committee	Will WMO not be consulted on SC composition?	Albert Fisher	WMO
17	Secretariat	New activity #2 under priority 1 - Advise on ocean observing strategies and solutions in response to policy-based queries and respond to Member States requests - may be moved to priority 2.	Jing Li	Secretariat

17	Secretariat	Empowering the secretariat will require RP funds for staff positions - difficult to talk about expanding when GOOS has difficulty with funding the staff it needs now. On this slide but also slide 52; innovation catalyst includes system and network design, but this should be a central and standard part of the observing system coordination, including participating in rolling reviews of requirements processes as part of strategic planning (under ocean obs system coordination). Observing system / simulation design experiments will be required and ETOOFs is the panel that needs to provide guidelines / catalyze the work for those (e.g., this is not an area where capacity is missing - it just has never / rarely been applied by GOOS). Also, this makes it sound as if only the private sector is engaged in innovation. There are many national programmes focused on tech innovation for ocean observing. Suggest changing this to include government funders as well. For your OKRs, I suggest to be careful about the wording as you may have tasked the secretariat and GOOS components with results over which they have little control (will comment on slide 23).	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
17	Secretariat	I would love to know what is "the" accreditation system! I don't recognize myself in a good part of this slide, I think the exploratory roles mean very little right now, and I am not sure who is demanding that? I am sure there are many consultancies claiming they do those two exploratory things, I think GOOS needs to find a distinct niche	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
17	Secretariat	"Standards steward" oversees governance of the standards or more broadly? not clear	Albert Fisher	WMO
17	Secretariat	"accreditation system" - WMO experience has been that accreditation systems are very costly in terms of resources required, GOOS will need to be cautious with more than self-accreditation against standards or best practice	Albert Fisher	WMO
17, 22, 23	Secretariat	In the expand on user engagement strategy the interaction with users and stakeholder lacks operationalization. For example: How GOOS will use co-design? How GOOS will prioritize users (industry, policymakers, small island states)? How GOOS will deliver the "actionable insights" highlighted in the mission?	Luis Menezes Pinheiro	Member States, Group 1 - Portugal
18	Secretariat	Not clear exactly what the science policy engagement officer is meant to do (what is "science" or "policy" about coordinating funding support for infrastructure?) - it's hard to tell how that might be different from a Resources manager. It's also not clear that the Resource management officer would be a full time post... depends on having donors to coordinate. In general, this is very ambitious given the current status of staffing for GOOS. How realistic is this?	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
18	Secretariat	If OceanOPS is a stand alone component, why can't OBIS be represented here in the same way? It is not funded by WMO but funded by IOC the second sponsor and it is critical for the biological side. Suggest OBIS be added and considered as part of the secretariat like OceanOPS. The picture here isn't complete for the biological side so in my mind this structure/governance is not a complete picture. BioEco Panel science officer position has footnote 9 missing, should it be 8?	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
18	Secretariat	New Resource Management Officer: Not just a full time person here is needed, but someone with a background on economics and fundraising. This should not be a scientist.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
18	Secretariat	New Science Policy Engagement Officer: Concern about the title and scope; GOOS is apolitical; what would this person do? GOOS cannot be policy prescriptive, so should clearly define the goal of this position.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
18	Secretariat	Communications Officer: Is this a full-time position, and is full time needed?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
18	Secretariat	The admin team will include an Admin Assistant, in addition to Admin Assistant Consultant; are two admins needed?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
18	Secretariat	BGC Panel Scientific Officer: IOCCP has worked in this capacity, saving funds and coordinating with GOOS. Why move away from this model? What would be the role of IOCCP, and would this result in duplicative roles?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
18	Secretariat	[empower goos secretariat] More a comment for GOOS - but it may be beneficial to create an onboarding document w/ a clear outline of responsibilities, documents etc and expectations for the secretariat. Some GOOS core employees are obviously very well versed in GOOS and are able to naturally step into places - it may be beneficial to empower the rest to do the same and create efficient ways to update the secretariat and built their toolkit to effectively lead on their own	TBD	Secretariat
18	Secretariat	I would recommend that the present working arrangement of cooperation between WMO and IOC/UNESCO on the GOOS secretariat be codified, as it relies on personal engagement and contact that might not survive personnel changes.	Albert Fisher	WMO
18	Secretariat	The diagramme needs to show the WMO line management of WMO secretariat colleagues and connection to WIGOS and GCOS	Albert Fisher	WMO
18	Secretariat	The diagramme is missing the WMO support to OCG (P4 part-time)	Albert Fisher	WMO

18	Secretariat	This is more complex than what is depicted but necessary to reflect the actual complexity of a two-organization secretariat	Albert Fisher	WMO
17, 18, 50	Secretariat	would need to see a business case to establish a secretariat that appears to be expanding considerably and arguably isolating itself from other IOC responsibilities	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
19	GRAs	<p>2. GRAs: it is clear now that this is perhaps the most dysfunctional part of GOOS and needs change, moreover the GRAs are close to the last chance saloon - i.e. if this change does not work maybe we need to start again with fit for purpose organisations. Notwithstanding, I do not see the current suggestion made for them (GRAs under sub commissions, in a leaderless unconnected group or as NFP) working in reality, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Distribution: The sub commissions are not global, and some of the suggestions (most of OCETLAN and GRASP are not in caribbean or LA), and also it will leave large continent sized gaps of no GRA collaboration (N America, Australia) •Not resolving role: They still will not know what to do and the sub commissions neither, both will just ask GOOS what to do - so not resolving the core issue 	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
19	GRAs	<p>GRA suggestion: suggest we focus on what we want them to do, 1) support/enable practical cross border collaboration, 2) finding regional agreement on priorities and discussion of regional design that responds to 'recognised global requirements', developing a common regional view of a design and collaboration towards achieving this, 3) regional capacity balancing, 4) working/discussing action with other GRAs as asked by GOOS, 4) whatever else they deem important (but specified what). I suggest that we ask the GRAs to commit to this clear remit, place in their TORs, and report against it, plus set up cross GRA meetings to look at supra-regional and/or basin design - e.g. specific session on pan tropical design, specific session on Atlantic basin collaboration and design, etc. Why is this better?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Distribution: we cover the globe (SOOS can join if they want) •Role: this is a clearly articulated and unique role, different from NFPs on the one hand and GOOS on the other •Consistency: GOOS only need a specific aspect of what they might do - homogeneous for GOOS/heterogeneous for other things •Working together: work on these supra regional issues through extra meetings/GRA topic fora - that addresses items the community need (pan tropical is already a request, Aaoira exists, etc.) •GOOS assesses results after 2 years and decides if its worth the time 	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
19	GRAs	<p>The proposal for repositioning GRAs with IOC Sub-Commissions is not applicable in all cases. For example, OCEATLAN and GRASP are not in the Caribbean, so it don't belong to IOCARIBE. In my opinion this will add complexity to the interaction of GRAs with GOOS SC. It's going to be hard, and maybe not possible, that some GRAs accept this. About the Recommended changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) GRAs will no longer operate as a standalone component within GOOS and will not receive direct support from the GOOS Secretariat; however, their core functions will remain unchanged. This is partial, not for all GRAs. There is a GRA Council and a Forum for not having GRAs as standalone components. 2) GRAs will be encouraged to reorganize around ocean basins for better alignment and efficiency. Maybe a good idea in some cases, but GRAs are already working since a while, and this could be not accepted. 3) The remaining GRAs will be recognized as external contributors to ocean observation. So far, all GRAs are in the same level, this new organization will mark differences that, in my opinion, are not beneficial. 	Alvaro Scardilli	GRA Vice Chair

19	GRAs	<p>The existence of GRAs should have value to GOOS, probably for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Countries in the region could work together to address a common issues faced by the region, with the ocean observation priorities identified for the region. - GRAs provide opportunities for countries to collaborate on deployment of observing equipment, on joint cruises and on data sharing among participating countries. - National contribution to GOOS could not only be measured by their contribution to GOOS networks. There are great portion of national ocean observing activities are not connected to GOOS networks, and thus cannot be captured by OceanOPS. Meanwhile, most of the GRAs already have their own data portal for sharing data (publicly available but may not be integrated to global repositories). - GRAs could also play an important role in strengthening national observing capabilities through knowledge exchange, technical training, and resource mobilization. <p>Proposed activities to evolve the roles of GRAs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen the governance and accountability of GRAs <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reaffirm GRA recognition through updated ToR align with GOOS 2030 Strategy and FOO; b. Enhance the GRA reporting to GOOS on their observing activities, EOY measurements, and data flow to GOOS; c. Enhance the GRA connection to GOOS NFPs to facilitate the regional cooperation through existing framework. d. Evolve GOOS SC regional experts' roles and engagement with GRAs 2. Strengthen the integration with GOOS networks <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Promote regional pilot projects (which most GRAs are operating with) to connect national observing assets directly with GOOS networks; b. Integrate the regional data portal into IODE structure. 3. Promote regional collaboration and joint operations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Encourage GRAs to coordinate regional observing initiatives, including joint cruises (including access to EEZs), deployment campaigns, and shared maintenance efforts. b. Support cross-border collaboration in instrument calibration, data validation and quality control, and technology transfer. 4. Build regional capacity <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Support the capacity building within and among GRAs through identifying the needs as well as the unique expertise and best practices that can be shared 	Jing Li	Secretariat
19	GRAs	<p>How will the external contributors interact with GOOS? You may be creating a situation where basin coordination alliances like these will self-organize, associate themselves with other international sponsors (SCAR, the Arctic Council and SAON, UNEP regional seas conventions, etc.) and demonstrate that they do not need GOOS and its heavy reporting overhead, etc. This has been the case for SOOS for many years. And when people ask GOOS "what are you measuring in the Arctic?" you will have to say "go see our external partners" ? It might be better for GOOS to create a forum or 'home' for these basin groups (maybe in OCG?) so that it doesn't get away from you entirely. Those need to be formalized a bit more than you show here. Also... why is Canada and CI GOOS not linked to anything? How will they interact with GOOS if they aren't represented in a sub commission? Frankly, I think this is a topic that needs an open discussion with Member States about what they need from GOOS secretariat in order to coordinate their investments with their neighbors - the proposed solution is a bit chaotic and full of gaps.</p>	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
19	GRAs	<p>This appears as though GRAs are effectively being disbanded. Is this the intent? The slides says the GRAs won't act as a component of GOOS, but are expected to maintain their functions. It isn't clear how that will work in reality. If the GRAs are disconnected from the Secretariat and SC how will they know what GOOS plans or priorities are? Is it anticipated that the NFPs take over a coordination role to help fill this gap? This change in GRA placement and role isn't clear to me based on the information provided.</p> <p>The US, Canada and Australia have been pulled out as national coordination committees. This creates a few questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does this intersect with/relate to NFPs? Is there overlap or duplication of effort here? 2. The GOOS SC interacts with the sub-commission GRAs but not with the others? So how do others stay connected to the SC, or are they not intended to? How will they be informed and/or included in SC plans, noting they are operators of national observing systems? 3. How will communication/connection between NFPs and "GRAs" be facilitated? <p>In short, this feels like some of the current GRAs are a bit disconnected in the new structure.</p>	Michelle Heupel	IMOS
19	GRAs	<p>members of the SC will connect to GRAs through subcommission, those GRAs that are not included in the sub-commissions and are consider external contributors how will GOOS engage and coordinate with them? Are we throwing the baby with the bathwater here?</p>	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
19	GRAs	<p>GRAs. What about basin scale / regional coordination of the observing system design and development ?</p>	P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France

19	GRAs	It is not clear what are the consequences of IOC-subC integrated GRAs vs those not integrated.	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
19	GRAs	articulation on the relationship between IOC GOOS and those listed as external contributors e.g. maybe add emphasis on members of those GRAs to align with IOC GOOS?	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
19	GRAs	The integration of GRAs into 4 groups may lead to better integration across GRAs. However, it's unclear how the other regional alliances will coordinate with everyone if they are grouped under external contributors.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
19	GRAs	It is stated that "GRAs will be encouraged to reorganize around ocean basins for better alignment and efficiency". At the same time, it is stated that GRA's will be integrated into the IOC Sub-Commissions, which do not correspond to Ocean Basins. A higher level of detail could be provided here for clarification, including advantages and potential risks.	Luis Menezes Pinheiro	Member States, Group 1 - Portugal
19	GRAs	The structure of GRAs is being completely modified and in some cases this could generate conflicts with the current structure, especially for those that have other governance systems, such as political consortia. Likewise, in the case of GRASP, for example, it seems to make no sense to leave it under the umbrella of IOCARIBE, since they are in different oceans and GRASP operates under the sponsorship of the CPPS. We strongly suggest that this new structure be circulated to the presidents of each GRA before being published.	Captain Carlos Zúñiga & Lt Cmdr Matías Sifón	Member States, Group 3 IOC Vice Chair
19	GRAs	Agreed, this is a good approach to the regional level	Albert Fisher	WMO
19, 47, 69	GRAs, GRA TOR	Recommendation 7: GRAs While we understand that the GRAs need better alignment and a clearer role, particularly in Europe, repositing the GRA with the sub-commission is not a viable solution due to the lack of a sub-commission. We are also unsure whether the repossession would strengthen or weaken the GRA's future role. It is crucial to follow the principle of subsidiarity, where decision should be taken at the level that is best suitable for the decision required. Or in other way to keep the balance between bottom-up and top-down approaches. Thus, the regional level plays an essential role. The draft appears to see the GRAs outside of the system. The roles of ROOSs, e.g. NOOS and IBIROOS, are not reflected in the document.	Matthias Wunsch, Manfred Zeiler	Member States, Group 1 - Germany
20	NFPs	Strategic direction and oversight needs to be a 2-way arrow. Since the observing system is entirely funded by national contributions, national governments need to be engaged in determining their global priorities and where they need global coordination assistance from GOOS. This reads as if GOOS is a top down decision making body and nations are meant to implement the decisions of the GOOS Steering Committee. While you don't want to go to a full intergovernmental model, GOOS does need to be responsive to the global coordination needs and priorities of the people who fund the system. This is not appropriately captured here.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
20	NFPs	GOOS Steering committee may be treated as Advisory body instead of governing body, as the NFPs are representatives from member states	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
20	NFPs	NFPs engagement with subcommissions need to be clarified	Balakrishnan Nair	Steering Committee
20	NFPs	Strengthening engagement model for NFPs will enable national contributions and better integrate within global coordination efforts:	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
20	NFPs	1. The major funding for national and regional ocean observations do not come from the IOC, subsequently, IOC Secretariat can not create accountability for operational self funding structures.	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
20	NFPs	2. Not applicable: GSC is only an advisory Board. Strategic directions and oversight comes from national Governments and regional entities who have a keen and deep knowledge of national and regional priorities and needs.	Affian Kouadio	Member States, Group 5
20	NFPs	As per above, I don't see the NFPs connecting to the obs systems/GRAs. How will NFPs manage reporting, etc if they aren't connected to the obs systems? The underlying question is whether the focus on NFPs will undermine regional coordination and communication.	Michelle Heupel	IMOS
20	NFPs	The arrow from the Secretariat to the NFPs should include "timely provision of information on GOOS activities." It is currently difficult for NFPs to grasp the overall GOOS activities. For example, no communication was sent to the NFPs regarding the review of this proposal. Relying solely on each NFP to check the GOOS website in a timely manner often results in missing information, making it difficult for them to provide input.	Michiyo Yamamoto Kawai	Member States, Group 4
20	NFPs	a massive task for the SC and the NFPs. Is the assumption that the member states will be providing some funding/contribution by supporting and funding the work and functions of their NFP to coordinate and connect with their national observing systems, institutions, national government departments, other focal points? Has there be any consideration that there may be nations unable to provide that support?	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel

20	NFPs			P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France
		Need a double arrow between GOOS SC and NFPs (co-design). Strategic priorities must be validated by NFPs.			
20	NFPs		KPIs for NFP reporting will be important for clarity and consistency	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
20	NFPs		GOOS SC interfacing more actively with NFPs is positive and will provide some strategic direction. Assume this is a two-way conversation (with countries sharing priorities as well)? Concern about the weight that seems to be put on NFPs - we already have a very heterogeneous group. How do you ensure you have who you need as NFP to provide the needed information and feedback loop (in country)? How are they supposed to "coordinate with IOC NFP and other relevant focal points and representatives" when many don't have the time/power/connections? And 'encouraging' can almost be translated to 'won't really happen.' What would be the point of this coordination? Unless there's a tangible ask on the table on what these NFPs should do amongst themselves, it may be difficult to get some useful outcome of those interactions. We'd need to know who all those other NFPs are too.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
20	NFPs		How does this vision for NFP engagement (which focuses on reporting) mesh with the current NFP TORs?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
20	NFPs		The JCB survey identified a lack of coordination between oceanographic and meteorological counterparts at the national level, and so an articulation of how GOOS NFPs can work with WIGOS and WIS NFPs could be beneficial	Albert Fisher	WMO
17, 22	OKRs		OKR (Objectives and Key Results) It would be more stringent (and more transparent for Member States) to incorporate the planned OKRs into the general IOC Key Performance Indicators, rather than having separate OKRs for GOOS.	Matthias Wunsch, Manfred Zeiler	Member States, Group 1 - Germany
22	OKRs		Suggest you write out what OKR means. Except for "be responsive...", you have just saddled the secretariat with OKRs over which they have almost zero control. The key results are all dependent on national programmes. All of these OKRs are fine, but would be more appropriately targeted to the full system, not the secretariat, perhaps monitored by the SC and reported to the Assembly ?	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
22	OKRs		Need to align the GOOS OKR with KPIs in the IOC Resource Framework.	Jing Li	Secretariat
22	OKRs		Problems with this based on comments for slide 21. Reporting can still be carried out by the components but with the understanding that the secretariat cannot be held responsible for lack of performance here.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
22	OKRs		% increase in GOOS funding and commitments is perhaps not the best indicator of ensuring resilience if that increase comes from one big cash injection that might dry up. It would be better to find a measure that looked at ability of portfolio of donors to flex with changing resource pressures.	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
22	OKRs		Accountability and metrics: "Apply a % yearly increase to each Key Result through 2030" - sustained (flat) maintenance is a good metric as well. There should also be metrics associated with implementation of EOVs.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
22	OKRs		ACCOUNTABILITY: GOOS Components report to secretariat mission? This is not clarity on roles, they are GOOS components and report to GOOS vision and mission. Secretariat are supported to support them... some crossing of responsibility.	Emma Heslop	Secretariat
22	OKRs		The actual work of ETOOFS is not captured in these OKRs	Albert Fisher	WMO
22	OKRs		The key results are singularly focused and may skew the work of GOOS components - they may also be hard to measure	Albert Fisher	WMO
22	OKRs		Evolution of the global ocean observing system may be in a dimension that does not increase the number of MS involved.	Albert Fisher	WMO
22	OKRs		"Ensure resilience..." this is the right OKR combination	Albert Fisher	WMO
22	OKRs		"Be responsive..." the key result may yield a generation of initiatives without really understanding if the outputs are useful	Albert Fisher	WMO
23	OKRs		The title exemplifies the confusion between the components and the Secretariat - what are we addressing? I think it is all the components including the Secretariat	Albert Fisher	WMO
23	OKRs		This graphic raises the question again of how capacity development is operationalized, development funds leveraged, competencies defined and capacities built.	Albert Fisher	WMO
23	OKRs		Also again, the global approach vs. approach to support national investment is unclear in this slide	Albert Fisher	WMO
23	OKRs		NFP could also play an important role in 'Enable ocean observing system' in addition to OCG, OceanOPS and networks.	Jing Li	Secretariat

23	OKRs	This still sounds as if GOOS will be making decisions about infrastructure implementation - I've mentioned this misconception in several spots already. We used to speak of "big GOOS" and "little goos" to make the distinction between the global system formed by national infrastructure versus the global coordination mechanism at HQ in Paris - I think those distinctions might be helpful in these discussions. In general, this slide assumes that the goos coordination forum at the IOC has some sort of authority and that nations are accountable to it. Maybe it would help if you can first point to agreements and decisions of governments (UNFCCC, WMO, IOC) where MSs have agreed to work together on establishing a GOOS, and say that the goos coordination mechanism is there to help nations implement the commitments they've made to international conventions. Then the words "accountability" and "governance" will make more sense for Member States.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
23	OKRs	This slide and elsewhere seems to lack intersection with IODE. Is IODE part of delivering this vision or does it sit to the side? IODE is to sit on the NFP advisory group (slide 26) and connect with NFPs (slide 20) but the role, connection, accountability, etc are not included/apparent.	Michelle Heupel	IMOS
23	OKRs	I am not savvy about data, but how do you demonstrate % observing systems with interoperable EOv dataflows and how will that be different to the # of contributors of data? The assumption being if you are contributing data, you have interoperable EOv dataflows ... Also, the second box "evolve globally integrated ..." the key result is # member states contributing and sharing data". This will not necessarily show progress on how many new observing communities/networks are providing data. For example, the US is already a member state providing data, but not all its networks provide data to the system (think biological). If new networks from the US start providing data, there is no way to demonstrate this progress, because the KPI is # of member states contributing data, so the # will not change. I do not think this metric works in demonstrating progress.	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
23	OKRs	I think there is a risk in all this. First of all, the Secretariat cannot do anything without the experts, and experts are volunteers... this "accountability" would be OK if the performance of the Secretariat depended mostly on themselves, but this is not the case. I also do not grasp well what it means this co-developed initiatives or products, as a means to prove that the panels are responsive... what kind of products are we talking about? will we take into account the individual work of the experts for this... I do not see it	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
23	OKRs	GOOS needs to define what qualifies as a Co-developed initiative/product.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
23	OKRs	Current key results focus on quantity but not quality or impact	Luis Menezes Pinheiro	Member States, Group 1 - Portugal
24	Governance	Following on from suggestions in slide 23, make it clear that MSs have committed to establishing a GOOS, and that this governance structure and components are there to help them work together to meet their agreed goals. Without stronger buy in from governments, these structures seem disconnected from the reality of instruments in the water. Again, you don't want a full intergovernmental panel to oversee GOOS but there must be more of a 2-way communication with MSs who are investing mostly in this "external" component of the observing networks (Argo, gliders, etc.) The leads come together in OCG but the link between OCG and those groups and the SC are not clear. Where is the opportunity for dialogue, or for MSs to say "we want to see a priority on x,y, z " (for example, addressing thematic issues like AMOC) and how can that be fed up to the SC level?	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
25	Governance principles	Same. It says that the SC will act as a bridge ... with Member States, but how? You only have a small # of regional representatives on the SC and there are no clear components for 'dialogue' here. You now have a re-activated NFP forum, but it seems that they are meeting in a vacuum (as the GRAs did). I'm afraid the NFP Advisory Group will be too limited in its composition to be of much use in terms of real investment in infrastructure, and there doesn't seem to be any other connection between the NFP forum and the SC except through the NFP Advisory Group.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
25	Governance principles	The "governance fora" concept is only explained in slide 28, here it is not very clear what it means, and is mixed with the meetings	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
25	Governance principles	4: let's also break the governance silos between GOOS and WMO through INFCOM	Albert Fisher	WMO
26	Governance - overview	I find this slide a little confusing - and could be made clearer. Are you referring specifically to the component parts and what their focus is - or you referring to the meetings that will be held under GOOS? SOemtimes you use the word "meeting" in the columns and sometimes not.	Joanna Post	Secretariat
26	Governance - overview	We discussed that secretariat team and GOOS Management Team were the same - as we bring together the IOC/WMO and other relevant members as the "GOOS secretariat"	Joanna Post	Secretariat
26	Governance - overview	In fourth column "External" - 'Observing Network' - please use 'GOOS networks' to be consistent	Joanna Post	Secretariat

26	Governance - overview	About the elimination of the GRAs Forum, this instance has been on place for many years, the one dedicated space where GRAs can present their achievements, challenges and regional priorities directly to the Steering Committee, the sponsors, the Expert Panels and the wider GOOS community. It has proven to be an extremely valuable mechanism for mutual learning, recognition of regional efforts, and for keeping the global system truly connected to regional realities. If the intention is to strengthen regional alliances, this seems to go on the opposite direction.	Captain Carlos Zúñiga & Lt Cmdr Matías Sifón	Member States, Group 3 IOC Vice Chair
26	Governance - overview	A GOOS conference is intriguing, but there is concern about duplication of effort; sounds a little like OceanObs, especially with a 5yr cadence. Where would funding come for participants to attend?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
26	Governance - overview	OCG Executive Committee(Board) meeting is an important component of OCG to organize and drive the OCG activities. Removing these meetings will be detrimental for the progress of OCG activities.	Champika Gallage	WMO
26	Governance - overview	The Joint WMO-IOC Collaborative Board is not the right vehicle to directly engage GOOS into WMO/INFCOM work, and if this reform goes through may also be somewhat duplicative - which neither organization can afford	Albert Fisher	WMO
26, 29, 59	Governance - overview	Expert Panels (OOPC, BGC, BioEco partly OCG) vs. GOOS observing Networks While (maybe not fully) understanding what the Experts Panels and the GOOS Networks do at the moment, their future role might require some refinement. - Currently, we have networks that coordinate according to the 'platform used to measure' and expert panels that coordinate according to the 'information necessary' for a task. - If the basic task is to set the EOVs (and Ocean ECVs), it might be sufficient to form ad hoc groups whenever an EOv needs updating, rather than having standing committees. The same may be true of the platforms/networks in the case of the 'network specification sheets'. - Also, the EOVs may require more authority and streamlining in future. For example, in regional seas conventions such as HELCOM, member states have the final decision on which indicators are used, as they finance the monitoring.	Matthias Wunsch, Manfred Zeiler	Member States, Group 1 - Germany
26, 37	Governance - overview	Mindful of UN80 it'll be important that GOOS be seen as an inclusive framework. This will mean pro-active engagement with other ocean IGOs in particular.	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
27	Governance - steering	Steering Committee Mandates: #6: Approve updates to component Terms of Reference (excluding the Steering Committee's own TOR), membership and workplan, and GOOS endorsed projects. SC annual in-person meeting participants may also need to include representatives from GOOS Components.	Jing Li	Secretariat
27	Governance - steering	Donor Coordination Group may need to meet more frequently virtually in addition to the biannual meeting?	Jing Li	Secretariat
27	Governance - steering	Eliminating the ex-officio completely has risks in a disconnection between the "desires" of the SC and the reality of the groups of volunteers doing the work in most of the components	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
27	Governance - steering	secretariat to have a role in bridging between GOOS and MS? Leaving to an individual i.e. SC co-Chair, who undertake their role voluntarily, will be a burden beyond any reasonable expectation	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
27	Governance - steering	The SC needs a vehicle into WMO. The five regional experts effectiveness can be questioned and the exclusive IOC governance as well. And how will the GOOS components inform and be informed by the SC?	Albert Fisher	WMO
28	Governance - cross-component	What is the role of WMO in the GOOS Conference?	Albert Fisher	WMO
28	Governance - cross-component	So GOOS SC members will only "touch base" with the leadership of GOOS components every five years, and occasionally with the Co-chairs... it is a huge change, given the power of the GOOS SC over them	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
28	Governance - cross-component	OceanObs conference (every 10 years) missing. Interplay between GOOS conference and OceanObs conference ?	P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France
28	Governance - cross-component	secretariat role seems very inward looking, leaving any outward facing responsibilities to others. See previous comment.	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
28	Governance - cross-component	Expert Panels: Scientific priorities should be set and not change every 4 months.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US

28	Governance - cross-component	Similar to the comment on Page 26, I reiterate the importance of OCG Executive Committee(Board) meetings.	Champika Gallage	WMO
28-29	Governance - cross-component	expert panel meetings, who are the Panel project officer? Is it the science officers or is this a new position? Should OBIS or IODE be included in the OCG/OceanOPS meetings? At what point, how and who will coordinate with previous GRAs now external groups like EuroGOOS that do not fall under the IOC sub-commissions?	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
29	Governance - component-led	Need to define the relationship between GOOS SC and NFP Advisory Body's role on NFPs.	Jing Li	Secretariat
29	Governance - component-led	Frequency of Secretariat Meeting: May be better for every two weeks as we also have GMT meetings every two weeks.	Jing Li	Secretariat
29	Governance - component-led	Mandate for Expert Panel Meetings (Line 3 Column 3): Approve Develop or update workplans, deliverables, and recommendations for the SC.	Jing Li	Secretariat
29	Governance - component-led	NFP Advisory Group Mandates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide strategic guidance advice on NFP-related matters to the SC and Secretariat • Serve as a sounding board for new initiatives, policies, and engagement models, capacity development. • Support generating best practices for national system development and coordination, alignment with global frameworks, and OO applications. • Discuss the linkage between national needs and data delivery • Work with Secretariat on NFP reporting and accountability Frequency of NFP Advisory Group meeting: Can have biannual in-person meeting, but would be ideal to meet every 6 months.	Jing Li	Secretariat
29	Governance - component-led	GOOS conference needs to intersect with the OceanObs conferences every 10 years, and may benefit from being an opportunity to respond to some of the needs highlighted by those conferences. In the last forum group (OCG / OceanOPS) how can that group talk about data delivery? OceanOPS only manages metadata. Where is the link between OCG and IODE ? Is there a GOOS data system? Who manages that?	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
29	Governance - component-led	what are the IOC electoral groups? all these look overly complicated	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
30	Governance - external	A Joint Expert Panel Meeting is great. this was a big barrier in coordination and a place where all panels come together annually is good.	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
29	Governance - component-led	Expert Panel Working Group: Is monthly reporting needed for this?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
30	Governance - external	The mandate of the WMO governing body meetings (INFCOM, EC, Congress) should be clarified in a new governance structure	Albert Fisher	WMO
30	Governance - external	The JCB as stated above is an inadequate vehicle to align GOOS work with WMO	Albert Fisher	WMO
30	Governance - external	WMO Governing Body Meeting (INFCOM and Congress) - Suggested participants must be GOOS SC co-chair or co-chair nominated representative / Frequency annual	Joanna Post	Secretariat
30	Governance - external	JCB - Co-chairs are nominated WMO and IOC representatives.	Joanna Post	Secretariat
30	Governance - external	JCB - The mandate here is not correct. Suggest 2 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in accordance with the JCB TOR, the WMO–IOC Collaborative Strategy and relevant topics as identified by the JCB • Promote integrated ocean observation across the full value chain by strengthening GOOS 	Joanna Post	Secretariat
30	Governance - external	Same comment as above - Where is the link between the obs network meetings where NFPs will play a major role and the SC? There is only a secretariat rep at the network meetings, but how does information flow from NFP actions in the water up to the SC (and back ??)	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI

30	Governance - external	external - NFP national coordination committee meetings - it is not clear to me who are the participants. Does an IODE rep be required? the person will need a full time job just to attend all these meetings. What does it mean GOOS network NFPs? all GOOS NFPs? this looks overwhelming and a bit confusing	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
30	Governance - external	Elaborate on the links between GOOS and GCOS in particular with respect to ocean observing implementation plans.	P.Y. Le Traon	Member States, Group 1 - France
33	Ocean observing enterprise today - title slide	Please include a reference... where does this mandate come from ? What are the commitments MSs have made to ocean observing? (UNFCCC, CBD, BBNJ, etc...) That would be more powerful.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
35	Trends	On "insights beyond data" GOOS doesn't do this beyond academic exercises of defining indicator criteria and methodology. Products, services, indicator tracking and reporting, etc., falls to operational services operated by Member States. How does / should GOOS partner with those operational services? WMO has its "climate services" division with a mission to "support WMO Members to develop and deliver high-quality climate services"; they do not create these themselves. There is a standing committee on services who work with National Met Services to produce what is needed. How can GOOS use this model? Use ETOOFs as a standing committee on products and services to dialogue with the NFP forum and GOOS SC ?	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
35	Trends	Missing non-ocean users of ocean information through coupled weather and climate prediction and service delivery	Albert Fisher	WMO
36		A continuing challenge is the research/operations gap - how can we get ocean observations recognized and funded as an essential infrastructure for both?	Albert Fisher	WMO
37	Stakeholders in the ocean observing enterprise	List of private sector entities v European!	Joanna Post	Secretariat
37	Stakeholders in the ocean observing enterprise	International treaties and frameworks - typo - sentence doesnt make sense • • also FAO, UNFCCC,	Joanna Post	Secretariat
38	Value chain	clarify that this slide focuses specifically on the secretariat role (maybe grey box should be "out of scope for GOOS secretariat" ?	Joanna Post	Secretariat
38	Value chain	Your expert panels are almost exclusively all from the research sector, disconnected from operational needs of Member States so it is difficult to make meaningful requirements and strategies for anyone other than the research community. In situ requirements also need to be identified as one part of a larger network that includes satellite based observations and modeling (and increasingly, DTOs and AI). How will this new GOOS structure improve links to satellite obs and modeling / AI / DTO? Similarly, on column 3 Outputs, GOOS does not and probably should not develop products and services itself (follow example of WMO mentioned above). Also, this statement is backwards "set observation guidelines for ocean forecasting". It is ocean forecasters who provide information about in situ requirements to the observing system.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
38	Value chain	This follow the Framework for Ocean Observing in some way but the ideas of what is in scope and out of scope for GOOS might usefully have a review - particularly as for GOOS those that are out of scope but influenced are identifiable partners of GOOS	Albert Fisher	WMO
40	Strengths	use ocean economy not blue economy	Joanna Post	Secretariat
44	Key challenges	Even after reviewing the recommendations, I still do not see the solution to the problem "weak national and regional integration and representation". While a strengthened NFP forum is a good first step, the 'vertical linkages' are missing or at least unclear. Also similar comment on "limited alignment with sponsors and MSs".	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
44	Key challenges	Dear Sir/Madam We kindly would like to address some points regarding the draft proposal for the revised GOOS structure. As you may recall "functional autonomy" topic is discussed and took some time in the Thirty-third Session of the IOC Assembly. That is why we just would like to remind that IOC statues should also be referred.	LTJG Furkan YAMAN	Member States, Group 1 - Türkiye
45	GOOS benchmarking	Hmmm.... Not sure that GEO should be held up as a model to follow; they are a high-level collaborative forum with no specific mandate for delivery - everything is 'best effort' and a contribution, usually an attempt by 1 nation or partner to expand markets for their services.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
46	GOOS benchmarking	GEO is not sponsored by WMO, merely hosted by it as GEO is not a legal entity in itself	Albert Fisher	WMO

47	GRA mapping	Column "Overlapping countries" - row 9 and 11 - maybe remove USA and Australia from this column. These countries cannot overlap with themselves?	Joanna Post	Secretariat
47	GRA mapping	We kindly request the use of "Türkiye" instead of "Turkey".	LTJG Furkan YAMAN	Member States, Group 1 - Türkiye
47	GRA mapping	As of Türkiye, we have reservation for the term (Cyprus) used in 13th and 14th line. The "Cyprus" mentioned herein is not the original partnership state established in 1960. Türkiye declares that the term of "Cyprus" neither amount to any form of recognition of the Greek Cypriot administration nor prejudice Türkiye's rights and obligations emanating from the treaty of guarantee and the treaty of establishment of 1960. Türkiye condemns the efforts to legitimize illegal claims of the Greek Cypriot administration by means of technical reports and technical communities, and deems them invalid. This term certainly doesn't reflect the real situation in the region. In this regard, Türkiye kindly requests the use of the term "Cyprus Island" if it is desired to specify geographically.	LTJG Furkan YAMAN	Member States, Group 1 - Türkiye
47	GRA mapping	Table line 13: EuroGOOS Ocean-Basin/Region comprises North Atlantic /Mediterranean Sea/Baltic Sea/Arctic. In the table the North Atlantic (in which IBIROOS and NOOS operate) and the Arctic basins (Arctic ROOS) are missing	Luís Menezes Pinheiro	Member States, Group 1 - Portugal
51-56	Secretariat's capabilities and activity mapping	The GOOS that is needed cannot be run with 5 professionals. WMO has roughly 300. If you only take the infrastructure commission of WMO, you're probably looking at around 50-75 staff. WMO has an easier job since each nation has a Met Service and a clear operational mission for delivery. GOOS is still stuck in a mode of being designed by research scientists for research scientists. Aligning and gearing GOOS to a more operational mission that serves MSs might help. This would be a huge step change beyond even what this review is suggesting. Slides 55 and 56 highlight these links, but there is insufficient gearing of the GOOS governance structure or panels to really engage operational users and national interests.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
52	Secretariat's capabilities	GRAs don't even appear on the slide, and some aspects don't seem to match with the information in slide 38. Int 38 slide, GRA's are along with NFP's. Should the slide 52 put them together also?	Captain Carlos Zúñiga & Lt Cmdr Matías Sifón	Member States, Group 3 IOC Vice Chair
55, 56	Value proposition details	Member states are also suppliers and users. Could this be clarified? For example, many early warning systems are on the member states part. Here it looks like there are 3 different categories, when they are not entirely separated.	Captain Carlos Zúñiga & Lt Cmdr Matías Sifón	Member States, Group 3 IOC Vice Chair
58	TOR review	Stopped reviewing at this point. The following sections are useful to streamline and clarify roles and responsibilities but don't help to address the more existential gaps in GOOS and goos.	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
61, 66	TOR review	The BGC ToR used for analysis describes the mission of the component: https://www.ioccp.org/index.php/about-us/tors . However the analysis that is provided goes to a large extent into details on how the component is operated which is described in a different document (ToRs for members of the IOCCP SSG) which is not published on our website but available on request. I believe the latter was not taking into account.	Maciej Telszewski	BGC Panel, IOCCP Project Director
61	TOR review	GOOS Secretariat composition - there isn't anyone identified as a bridge to the social sciences, needed to elevate relevance of GOOS products; would this be a consultant's job?	Allison Reed	Member States, Group 1 - US
62	TOR review	Introduce a regular review cadence forTORs (e.g., every 2 years). The suggestion for review of TOR every 2 years is too short. Maybe every 5 years could be more realistic.	Alvaro Scardilli	GRA Vice Chair
62	TOR review	Consider to incorporate non-monetary incentives in TORs, such as recognition, career development and networking opportunities. I believe this is already happening, and it is part of the great opportunity of joining GOOS.	Alvaro Scardilli	GRA Vice Chair
62	TOR review	point4: While periodic review is a good idea, reviewing it every two years seems too frequent. The ToR forms the foundation of the organization, and reviewing it every few years might be excessive.	Michiyo Yamamoto Kawai	Member States, Group 4
64	TOR review	Does not reflect the current GOOS 2030+ strategy or reform priorities. I don't think it should do it. The more general the Scope of responsibilities, the better for not being restricted. And also there is no need to revise oftenly.	Alvaro Scardilli	GRA Vice Chair
64	TOR review	Membership & composition. As a strength to preserve I suggest to mention the high quality of experts that integrate the SC.	Alvaro Scardilli	GRA Vice Chair

65	TOR review	OOPC membership and composition is not unclear. Technical competences, duration etc. are established for the experts and the co-chairs in the ToR.	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
67	TOR review	ToR analysis - BioEco - overlap with OCG non-existent as currently OCG does not include BioEco networks	Ana Lara Lopez	BioEco Panel
69	TOR review	Lack of financial stability, as the GRC is funded by the GRAs. This line is incorrect, GRAs don't fund the Council, it i GOOS or IOC.	Alvaro Scardilli	GRA Vice Chair
69	TOR review	Uneven "voice" as some countries are participating in multiple GRAs. This is not a general situation, only small cases I believe. I suggest to erase this line.	Alvaro Scardilli	GRA Vice Chair
69	TOR review	The 14 GRAs vary in maturity levels and frequently lack the capabilities to deliver on the responsibilities outlined in the TOR. We are 14 GRAs and 1 Taske Team, maybe it could be clarified.	Alvaro Scardilli	GRA Vice Chair
69	TOR review	It should be added the need of having two co-chairs instead of a chair and vice-chair.	Alvaro Scardilli	GRA Vice Chair
71	TOR review	According to the latest approved ToR, ETOOFS will only report to GOOS SC.	Jing Li	Secretariat
73	Interviewee list	if defining IOC groups then do so accurately. Group 1 has more than US and EU members (one of the interviewees is from Canada)	Alan Evans	Member States, Group 1 - UK
NA	General comment	As a general comment, the structure of GOOS should take into account the current status of global ocean governance. Although we agree that Member States are the main level of supplier and for delivering information, we miss the consideration of other ocean governance scales (i.e. global and regional), which are important to take into account for the structure and governance of GOOS. Although IGOs, and particularly those under the UN system, are taken into account, we miss other UN international processes (IPCC, IPBES or WOA) acting as drivers of demand, and to a large extent more important or as important than what we usually understand by stakeholders. Likewise, regional ocean governance organisations and structures and their appropriate interaction with GRAs, including Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) or regional conventions are critical for defining GOOS priorities. Delivering valuable information at the international and regional level is critical for the interest of Member States too. Fisheries management or conservation under these regional organisations need ocean observations beyond the specific variables implied in their regulations or assessments, and this will become more important under the current scenario of climate change. Moreover, agreements and compromises within these regional frameworks often facilitate securing long-term financial mechanisms for the sustainability of observation systems. This should be considered across several sections of the document (see further comments on this regard).	Rafael González-Quirós	Member States, Group 1 - Spain
NA	BioEco Panel	<p>3. BioEco Panel: Suggestions for this structure to resolve the dual EOVS and 'network' role and ensure it is better connected to OCG. BioEco Panel has EOVS responsibility, but this work is different to the networks building and maturing work. This already takes its inspiration from OCG and as we continue to consider the data flows, federated and interoperable, BioEco will become more closely linked. BioEco Panel started out defining the EOVS, now the communities and data flow need more work, a natural evolution, is being asked for by the community and is where the current Co-Chairs see the need to focus, and is featured in the Biodiversity Plan.</p> <p>New BioEco Panel structure suggestions: The current Co-Chairs and the Biodiversity Plan have a strong focus on this more OCG like agenda. Both Co-Chairs and support can feel overwhelmed with the work ahead, especially as they don't work full time on these tasks. There is a need to think about Panel structure in light of these realities. Suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Recognise the dual role and ensure in ToRs etc - BioEco Panel undertakes the 'traditional' Panel responsibilities of curating EOVS, with science EOVS leadership, and also has work to mature EOVS observing networks and manage (with OBIS) data flow •Create a Vice-Chair structure like OCG, e.g. Vice Chair Data, community building/maturity. Recruit area specific expertise to the panel to focus on defining action in key cross EOVS, areas, as support to Co-Chairs and Panel and leading to forming a broader Exec Team. E.g. Co-chairs, support officer, VC data, community building, etc. •EOVS Co-Leads - need to define TORs for these roles, what is expected of them, and suggest have one EOVS co-lead has a focus on the EOVS and one more on the EOVS community maturity/data/best practices etc. •(and more) but before investing more we should consider if its better to build on what we have then develop standalone (usu more efficient) •The different EOVS communities need review/mapping and different approaches may need to be made depending on structure -i.e. more partner or more GOOS centric •Close collaboration with OCG - regular BioEco-OCG discussions (quarterly?) •BioEco Portal should be assessed, and two alternatives considered, 1) extending OceanOPS (with specific support) or 2) extending OBIS (with specific support). We want the functionality but it is likely more efficient to invest in existing than a standalone solution •Suggest secretariat support for both aspects of the work <p>Note structure will need to be consistent with Biodiversity Plan in the long term OCG and BioEco Networks might merge - for now they are different</p>	Emma Heslop	Secretariat

NA	Cross Cutting	<p>I'm sending my comments on the GOOS review in my own personal capacity wearing a multitude of hats (support to Pierre for ETOOFS, EU4OceanObs support for obs, G7, etc.) but without any direct role or responsibility in the GOOS landscape. I hope these comments are useful.</p> <p>Attached in the spreadsheet are my specific comments on the slides. Apologies for the sometimes stream-of-consciousness comments and typos! If I'd had more time, I would have sharpened them a bit more, but I hope the general ideas will be helpful anyway.</p> <p>In general, here are my take-aways of the exercise (in no particular order):</p> <p>GOOS needs a new narrative. It has been operating like an NGO for the past few decades where a group of scientists delivers plans to Member States and asks them to fund them, with minimal engagement of governments in the development of those plans. Everyone needs to be reminded that Member States have commitments and obligations through conventions they have signed including (inter alia) the UNFCCC, CBD, now BBNJ, and others to work together towards a global system of observations. It might be useful highlighting this message up front and in bold letters. This is not an NGO, and the GOOS secretariat is there to assist Member States to meet their commitments and obligations. Governments have asked for this system - it is not something being imposed on them by the global research community, but unfortunately the process has progressively erased them from the scene over the years. If MSs see this message up front as part of the reform, they might take notice and engage in the process more constructively. Otherwise, they are likely to say, "here comes the wish-list from the scientific community again...".</p> <p>There is confusion between big GOOS (the system) and little goos (the secretariat and internally managed components). The recommendations make it sometimes seem as if Member States have a responsibility to the secretariat rather than the other way around. In the OKRs, the consultants have given performance metrics to goos that are only appropriate for GOOS. Blaming the secretariat for failure to increase investment in obs is not helpful.</p> <p>The infrastructure of GOOS (big GOOS) a combination of the observing networks (e.g., Argo, OceanSITES, VOS/SOOP etc) that are coordinated externally to little goos. They have their own funding structure, coordination structure, steering groups, reporting, and links to agencies and ministries who fund the instruments and data delivery. These come together in a forum via the goos OCG to try to create something that is more than the sum of its parts. But the links between these networks coordinated externally and the internally coordinated components of goos that are trying to add value to these combined efforts are not clear. It might be useful to better articulate how their roles and responsibilities of externally and internally coordinated parts of the system are.</p>	Maria Hood	Mercator Ocean International; G7 FSOI
NA	Cross Cutting	<p>There is a lot of progress I strongly support these Positive Points (Strengths of the Proposal)</p> <p>The proposal itself is strong because it is built on a methodical and comprehensive foundation aimed at long-term resilience and effectiveness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Comprehensive Assessment: The proposal is grounded in a comprehensive primary and secondary assessment which included analysis of over 40 documents and engaging with 20+ stakeholders through interviews and workshops. •Buy-in and Ownership: The structural reform was developed through a co-creation process with the GOOS Director, Secretariat, Steering Committee Co-Chairs, and the IOC Executive Secretary, ensuring alignment and fostering buy-in across key contributors. •Clearer Strategic Focus: It establishes a refined mission statement ("To enable and evolve a globally integrated, responsive, and resilient ocean observing system...") and defines a clear Value Proposition for its three main stakeholder groups (Member States, Data Suppliers, and Data Users). •Stronger Accountability: It mandates that GOOS components report on four key results linked to the Secretariat's mission to drive system-wide performance and ensure accountability. These results include metrics on interoperability and funding commitments. <p>Comments Points and the suggestion response</p> <p>The proposal is essentially a response to the existing structure's weaknesses, which the document implicitly and explicitly identifies. These weaknesses fall into four main categories: operational, funding, stakeholder, and structural fragmentation.</p> <p>Area comments The comments The suggested response</p> <p>Operational & Strategic The system was reacting and responding to immediate needs as they arose, rather than strategically shaping the global ocean observing agenda.</p> <p>Shift to shaping and advising the global ocean observing agenda. Elevate the Steering Committee's function through targeted skillsets, longer terms, and stronger strategic oversight.</p> <p>Funding Structure Relying primarily on Member State contributions for funding and operating under a broad-based sponsorship structure (IOC, WMO, UNEP, and ISC) lacked financial resilience and clear focus</p> <p>Augment public funding with growing financial and in-kind contributions from non-traditional actors. Introduce a new Donor Coordination Group to strengthen resource mobilization.</p> <p>Consolidate sponsorship under IOC and WMO as key strategic sponsors, and clearly distinguish donor and partner roles.</p> <p>Stakeholder Fragmentation Viewing the scientific community as the primary stakeholder, neglecting the broader needs of Member States and data users</p> <p>Clarify mandates and roles across all GOOS components and external contributors. Streamline reporting lines with all components reporting directly to</p>	Amr Hamouda	Member States, Group 5 IOC Vice Chair

NA	Cross Cutting	<p>* GOOS focuses clearly only on observations. End of discussion about the inclusion of forecasting.</p> <p>* The role of WMO is well defined, but more details are needed on the mechanisms and situations where WMO will be consulted to really understand the role of WMO</p> <p>* GOOS do not focus on operational roles. We do not have the resources, and this is clearly left to the owners of the networks.</p>	Pierre Bahurel and Enrique Alvarez Fanjul	ETOOFS
NA	Cross Cutting	I share concerns expressed above by other members about the GRAs, it looks like a very drastic movement and it is not clear how this can be imposed on them? On the other hand, the overhead needed for the management of the NFP is enormous. Having templates to get reports is very good, but are there resources to digest and process and act upon those reports?	Belen Martin Miguez	OOPC Panel
NA	Cross Cutting	<p>The proposal provides a solid conceptual basis for reform and successfully addresses several longstanding issues around governance, coherence, and strategic direction. The proposed roles and structures reflect a more modern, mission-driven GOOS. However, we think that the following areas require further refinement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater clarity on implementation, resourcing, and transition. - Consolidation of roles and responsibilities with explicit operational procedures. - A more detailed and consultative approach to the redefinition of GRAs. - Strengthened metrics capturing qualitative impact, not only quantitative output. - A phased plan that anticipates IOC, WMO, and Member State constraints. 	Luis Menezes Pinheiro	Member States, Group 1 - Portugal
NA	Cross Cutting	Positive: the flattening of hierarchy of GOOS components reporting all to the Steering Committee	Albert Fisher	WMO
NA	Cross Cutting	Positive: the clarity that the GOOS Regional Alliances are not part of GOOS directly but a mix of constructs that need to be self-governed, either by IOC Regional Sub-Commissions, their own regional governance mechanisms, or are in fact national constructs.	Albert Fisher	WMO
NA	Cross Cutting	Positive: the expanded roles of secretariat beyond observations coordination in order to make GOOS advance in the future	Albert Fisher	WMO
NA	Cross Cutting	Negative: focus only on "ocean" users of GOOS, when WMO in general sees GOOS as a key contributor to a larger coupled Earth System observing system that serves a broader set of weather and climate users - for safety, economic benefit, and climate action well beyond the ocean economy and ocean users - and therefore deserving of their support and engagement.	Albert Fisher	WMO
NA	Cross Cutting	Negative: Lack of clarity on whether this is a proposal for the GOOS Secretariat or the GOOS "Programme" - that is the sum of the seven components including the SC, secretariat, panels, groups, and NFPs	Albert Fisher	WMO
NA	Cross Cutting	Negative: absence of clear governance connections to WMO as a co-sponsor: what is the pathway to influence WMO Members and get support and advice from WMO Members via constituent and governing bodies? What are the unique WMO selling points that can be leveraged for GOOS and the broader ocean observing community? WMO Members are in fact huge and daily users of physical ocean observations for weather prediction and short-term climate prediction - GOOS should seek to leverage their support, at least for the parts that deliver in this direction.	Albert Fisher	WMO
NA	Cross Cutting	Negative: lack of articulation on how a staff of GOOS can be managed across IOC/UNESCO and WMO as employers and line managers	Albert Fisher	WMO
NA	Cross Cutting	Negative: no timeline and pathway indicated to get WMO acceptance of the proposed reform of GOOS, which should come to the 20th World Meteorological Congress in 2027 in parallel to the 34th IOC Assembly in 2027.	Albert Fisher	WMO