Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee
Staff Meeting
15:00 – 17:00
11 October 2011

Location:
Herbert C Hoover Building
14th and Constitution
Room 6205

Meeting Notes

PARTICIPANTS

Simon Stephenson (NSF)
Brendan Kelly (NSF)
John Farrell (USARC)
Shella Biallas (DOI)
Nikoosh Carlo (NSF)
Adrianna Muir (DOS)
Igor Krupnik (SI)
Alison LaBonte (OSTP)
Mike Kuperberg (DOE)
Lindsey Williams (NOAA)
Martin Jeffries (ONR)
Kathy Crane (NOAA)
Sara Bowden (IARPC Staff)

By Phone:
John Calder (NOAA)
Ashley Chappell (NOAA)
Alan Parkinson (CDC)
Louis Tupas (DOT)
Jon Berkson (USCG)
Chuck Byzik (DOD)
Peter Thomas (MMC)
Tom Wagner (NASA)

1. Introductions – Kelly (5 min)

2. Approaching a budget cross-cut for Arctic research – La Bonte and Kelly (10 min)

Alison and Brendan met last week with Joel Parriott (OMB) to discuss several items, one of which was the possibility of IARPC beginning a budget cross-cut for Arctic research. Joel indicated that he would be willing to come to a meeting of the IARPC to discuss the cross-cut concept for 2014 or beyond. He pointed out that cross-cuts are very labor intensive, but if a clear benefit for one can be articulated, than it would be worth doing it. Showing the benefit is crucial.

It was agreed that John Farrell will prepare for the next staff meeting an overview of how a new cross-cut would be beneficial and why work on one should be undertaken. Ashley offered that NOAA has some examples of past Arctic cross-cuts that have been completed within NOAA. She will share those with John prior to the meeting. John will assemble the background material and distribute it prior to the next staff meeting.

There was some discussion on the need for budget staff to be present for the discussion, but in the end, it was decided that just the substantive staff need be present at the next meeting. If there is clear buy-in for a budget cross-cut, then we will include the budget staff.

3. Integration issues for IARPC 5-year Plan - all (70 min)

Brendan summarized where things stand on drafting of the 5-year plan. All science sections are in. Some require additional work and all need some revision.

Tom Wagner requested verification on whom the document is being written for and why. In the subsequent discussion, Simon Stephenson explained his view that the document, required by law, is being written so that U.S. agencies can better coordinate their activities. It is written first and foremost, to identify a small number of themes where the federal government would benefit from doing things together. There are many activities which will and should be undertaken by only one agency, but there are a small number of things that can be done better if they are done in collaboration with multiple agencies. Each agency's goals will be enhanced by this interagency coordination. If IARPC can identify several areas that would benefit from enhanced collaboration among funding agencies, then the process will have been successful. A secondary benefit is that Agencies can illustrate for OMB how they have enhanced their programs through interagency coordination.

Tom suggested that stating this objective up front in the introduction is extremely important. Brendan, will review the introduction and make sure that the intent of the 5-year plan is clearly articulated.

Section 4.1
Brendan explained that Section 4.1 provides too much detail on CDC activities without looking to where these or other activities could be enhanced by interagency collaboration.

Alan Parkinson from CDC explained the genesis of this section. The CDC used the Arctic Council Health document issued in April as a starting point. The Director of CDC was drawn into the process too and that contributed to a survey of all activities related to the Arctic. He noted that a big player missing from the document is NIH. Alan noted that he understood better the intent of the document and would go back and look for activities that are in need of better coordination not only within HHS (with NIH) but also with other agencies such as Fish and Wildlife and EPA. One such project is an EPA/CDC project on contaminants.

Section 4.2
Section 4.2 has the most cross links to other activities mentioned in other sections, such as the DBO in section 4.3.

Several discussions took place about various linkages and whether or not there should be a list of agency activities included in this section.

First, it was agreed that DBO (biology) will stay in chapter 4.2 but with a clear link to section 4.3.1

Second, Igor Krupnik (SI) noted that there needs to be enhanced mention of the human component of AON. He will work with Nikoosh to add more text on human and social observations.

A discussion about whether or not this report is the appropriate place to list all agency activities (especially as has been done by NASA for this chapter) ensued. Overall, the staff group felt that this document should only reflect the 5-year planning process and not look at what is already being done. That might be included in an appendix or might be a topic for another report by IARPC. Tom felt that without mentioning ongoing activities (like remote sensing missions), the five year plan would be ignoring major tools at its disposal.

Simon suggested that he and Nikoosh will work to better map the ongoing observing activities with those that are mentioned as priorities for the next five years. In this way, we will note the benefit of ongoing observing systems which can be used to enhance collaboration on planned activities.

Section 4.3
Brendan suggested that it would help in the introduction to add in some references for the assertions. John Calder will do so. Brendan also indicated that the time frame for DBO seems short. Say that this has to be a multidecadal effort, but for this document we are going to lay out the plans just for the first five year. (John)

The DBO section needs to be connected with the AON section.

Igor indicated that Smithsonian wants to provide some input to section 4.3.4. Igor will submit language to John.

Tom suggested that some language to indicate what are the specific intended outcomes of DBO would be useful. John will enhance the outcome section and indicate which agency is driving the various components.

Section 4.4
Brendan suggested that Section 4.4 needs to link to 4.6. Shella will work on that with Ashley.

Bill Fitzhugh (SI) will provide some input on their boreal forest initiative.

Shella indicated that she will add some more specifics on the milestone and will strengthen references.

It was agreed that for all science sections, authors need to put collaborating agencies right after the title and not in each section. It was also agreed that all sections will use the same editing format for footnotes and references which will be provided by Brendan.

Section 4.5
Brendan noted that the authors need to insert collaborating agencies right under the title.

He also noted that currently the introduction is a long mix of detail. It would help to have a succinct statement about what needs to be done on an interagency basis.

Finally, this section needs some reformatting to match the formatting of the other chapters and Tom W. agreed to work on this with the authors.

4.6
Igor Krupnik noted that this section is now being led by SI. Adrianna noted that she still needs to provide comments. Brendan noted that the lead authors still need to be identified.

4.7
Brendan apologized for not having NSF comments in on this chapter. They will be forthcoming soon. He did ask Mike to try and condense this section a bit to bring it into the 6-8 page limit.

4. Strategy for infrastructure section of research plan – Kelly and La Bonte (5 min)

Brendan summarized the talk that he and Alison had with Joel about the infrastructure section of the report. Prior to the meeting, the staff group had been under the assumption that there could be no indications in the plan about new infrastructure needs. Brendan said that Joel indicated that it is acceptable to talk about some needs in order to accomplish the mission but that buzzwords like “gap” should be avoided. It will be important to iterate the infrastructure section with Joel as it is developed to make sure that it accurately reflects the needs of agencies to accomplish their mission without jeopardizing the OMB guidelines.

Brendan noted that there will be a discussion about infrastructure at the principals meeting, so please make sure that principals are briefed about the no new spending issue. The infrastructure section will be drafted later based on the discussions at the principals meeting.

Alison suggested that we should have a brief outline of the infrastructure section of the report ready with the OMB caveat stated up front.

It was noted that OMB did a big interagency review of Arctic Infrastructure in 2008. John Farrell will provide this.

5. Update on interagency research in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas – Biallas (10)

Brendan initiated this discussion by indicating that this is an excellent example of an activity which is enhanced by interagency collaboration. Right now, NSF is working with NPRB, DOI, and Industry to develop a gap analysis which can be extended to other agencies.

Shella added that DOI is responding on calls for better information for industry. DOI wishes to include other agencies in the effort. An outline of the research plan was circulated at the last staff meeting. We want to bring this effort into line with other efforts such as those going on within NOAA and other areas of DOI (for example the Permitting Task force). Alan Thorhill (DOI) will present this to IARPC principals on November 7.

Kathy Crane from NOAA indicated NOAAs interest in being involved in this effort as did Martin Jeffries from ONR. At a minimum we should all know what our RFPs look like, but even better, a summary of the awards made would be useful.

Brendan noted that what we are trying to accomplish in this effort is to turn around the phenomena of not talking enough when we put research plans together.

Brendan noted that industry has a significant interest in this and is funding the gap analysis. They want to know what is known and what is not known.

John C. summarized a NOAA MOA with Industry on data sharing. It is primarily for the purpose of data sharing. The MOA is fairly broad with details being left to annexes which are still under consideration. The first annex relates to making available to NOAA real time atmospheric and oceanographic data. The second annex relates to data access, data archiving, and sharing. It will make available industry supported environmental data.

Brendan suggested that before our next meeting several items should be collected.

- Study plans from BOEMRE.
- ONR's Chukchi Seas research plans in the marginal ice zone
- NOAA's research plans for the Chukchi and Beaufort

6. Update on Ecosystem-Based Management Expert Group – Biallas (5 min)

Not covered

7. Date and Agenda for principals meeting – Kelly (10 min)

The Principals' meeting will take place from 9:00-noon on November 7. Invitations have been sent. Sara will contact you if your agency has not yet responded.

Brendan reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

In order to have briefing books to agencies by October 24, which is the goal, the following timeline was developed:

- Comments to lead authors by Friday 14 October
- Background and introduction will be drafted and sent to the staff group by early next week.
- Lead Authors send their final drafts by COB on the 19 October.
- Briefing books sent to Principals and staff electronically.

8. Summary, assignments, and next meeting – Kelly (5 min)

Action Items from this meeting:

John Farrell will prepare an overview of past work on cross-cuts, how they can be beneficial, and why one should be undertaken for the next staff meeting. Ashley offered that NOAA has some examples of past Arctic cross-cuts that have been completed within NOAA. She will share those with John prior to the meeting. John will assemble the background material and distribute it prior to the next staff meeting.

Brendan, will review the introduction and make sure that the intent of the 5-year plan is clearly articulated.

Action Items related to science sections of the 5-year plan:

1. 4.1: Revise section 4.1 to include only those activities which would benefit from interagency collaboration, both within HHS and with other agencies such as Fish and Wildlife and EPA. (Alan and Marya)

2. 4.2: DBO (biology) will stay in chapter 4.2 but with a clear link to section 4.3.1. (John and Nikoosh)
   4.2: Enhance the human component in section 4.2 (Igor and Nikoosh)
   4.2: Better map the ongoing observing activities with those that are mentioned as priorities for the next five years. In this way, note the benefit of ongoing observing systems which can be used to enhance collaboration on planned activities. (Nikoosh and Simon)

3. 4.3: Include references in the introduction (John C.)
   4.3: Spell out that the time frame for DBO is multidecadal but that this report deals only with the first 5 years. (John C)
   4.3: Link the DBO section to the AON section in 4.2. (John C and Nikoosh)
   4.3: Include revision from Smithsonian in section 4.3.4 (Igor and John C)J
   4.3: Enhance the outcome section of DBO and indicate which agency is driving the various components. (John)

4. 4.4: Section 4.4 needs to link to 4.6. (Shella and Ashley)
   4.4: Include input from SI on their boreal forest initiative. (Shella and Bill F.)
   4.3: Add some more specifics on the milestone and strengthen references. (Shella)

5. 4.5: Insert collaborating agencies right under the title. (Tom)
   4.5: Shorten the introduction and include a succinct statement about what needs to be done on an interagency basis. (Tom)
   4.5: Reformat the section so that it matches the other sections. (Tom)

6. 4.6: DOS comments need to be incorporated (Adrianna and Igor)
   4.6: Lead authors need to be identified along with collaborating agencies. (Brendan and Igor)

7. 4.7: NSF comments need to be sent and incorporated. (Brendan and Mike)
   4.7: The text needs to be condensed down to the 6-8 page limit set by the staff group. (Mike)

Drafting comments that apply to all science sections:

- Authors need to put collaborating agencies right after the title and not in each section.
- All sections will use the same editing format for footnotes and references which will be provided by Brendan.

Infrastructure:

- Draft a brief outline of the infrastructure section with the OMB flat line caveat clearly stated at the beginning (Alison and Brendan)
- John Farrell will provide the staff group with a copy of the 2008 OMB review of Arctic infrastructure. (John F)

For comments and drafting deadlines, see the timeline above.

In order to enhance our discussion of interagency collaboration on the Chukchi and Beaufort, Brendan suggested that before our next meeting several items should be collected.

- Study plans from BOEMRE.
- ONR's Chukchi Seas research plans in the marginal ice zone
- NOAA's research plans for the Chukchi and Beaufort

Please send these items to Sara and Brendan who will put them in a packet for the next staff meeting.

The next staff meeting will take place on November 14 from 3:00-5:00. The location is to be decided.