

Name or GOOS Component:

IOCCP GOOS Biogeochemistry Panel

Report submitted by:

Adrienne, Maciej and Veronique (IOCCP-GOOS BGC)

Date submitted:

March 19, 2026

Considerations for the GOOS Reform proposal

Draft proposal: <https://oceanexpert.org/document/37899>

Mission, scope and accountability mechanism

(slides 7 - 10 and 24 - 26)

What are your concerns regarding the reform proposal on mission, scope and accountability mechanism?

Mission and scope: I think the wording *responsive* and *receptive* does not bring the right messaging. GOOS in so doing appears slightly acting on a ‘passive’ mode. GOOS should not be receptive but rather pro-active in initiating co-design and co-development with Member states, stakeholders, providers and users of ocean observation data, etc..

Accountability: Looks good to me to report on key results progress towards goals achievement.

If you don't agree with the proposal - what is the alternative? Why?

How do we make it work? What does the implementation look like? (including with respect to your component)

For augmenting public funding from diverse Member States, supplemented by growing financial and in-kind contributions from non-traditional actors, it is becoming mandatory to perform an economic valuation of ocean observing networks in terms of a cost/benefit analysis which will probably increase GOOS efficiency in raising funds within the private sector.

Never forget that many of us are doing that work on free time, so I suggest that embedding OKRs into existing performance dashboards/ reporting tools does not become a technocratic constraint. It should rather be used as a help towards monitoring progress and adjusting the targets if needed.

Proposed structural changes nr. 1-5
(slides 11 - 19)

What are your concerns regarding the reform proposal on the first five structural changes?

Slide 14: Why developing data-flow standards and data quality control protocols has been moved to ICG? To which of the 4 ICG bodies specifically ?

Slide 14: While requirements around optimal observing design (OSSE set-up, uncertainty requirements, etc) are in the realm of the expert panels, linking open ocean network design to coastal networks and their associated stakeholders and end users is an expertise that lies within the GRAs.

Slide 15: Huge ensemble of responsibilities on GOOS secretariat..it needs to be properly staffed to reach goals.

Slides 16-17: Donor coordination group should work hand in hand with a task group from GOOS teaming up with environmental economists to ensure a proper economic valuation of ocean observing networks.

If you don't agree with the proposal - what is the alternative? Why?

How do we make it work? What does the implementation look like? (including with respect to your component)

Slide 19: Is the funding for GOOS Secretariat additional staff being secured? What is the more likely plan and timeline to achieve this deployment of human resources? What are the priorities if partially funded?

Proposed structural change: Infrastructure Coordination Group (ICG)
(slide 20)

What are your concerns regarding the reform proposal on the ICG?

Slide 20: ICG has now 4 components, mission assignment of each one needs to be crystal clear if we are to enhance the overall efficiency..otherwise expert panels might loose sight on with whom to interact specifically.

If you don't agree with the proposal - what is the alternative? Why?

How do we make it work? What does the implementation look like? (including with respect to your component)

Proposed structural change: NFP role and interaction model (slide 21)

What are your concerns regarding the reform proposal on NFP role and interaction?

Slide 21: It is surprising to see no link/interaction mentioned between NFPs and GRAs; why NFPs in a given region not interact with the corresponding GRA? Natural interlocutor?

If you don't agree with the proposal - what is the alternative? Why?

How do we make it work? What does the implementation look like? (including with respect to your component)

Pretty complex organization... may end up swiftly into an admin nightmare? I would rather facilitate dialogue between GRAs and NFPs . Is it a parallel structure to GRAs emerging?

Proposed structural change: GOOS Regional Alliances (slides 22-23)

How do you see the future role of GRAs in GOOS?

Slide 22: GRAs should play the role of animation/coordination of NFPs within their region with an harmonization of their missions (since now GRAs structure and function vary quite significantly)

Considerations for GOOS reform - SC15 Background paper

Putting them outside of GOOS does not seem an ideal solution, they should be the natural speakers to NFPs and then themselves being the natural speakers to GOOS secretariat and Steering Committee. Only on slide 23 it is mentioned : Joint meeting between GRAs and NFPs for regional coordination..This should be put upfront.
Optimal design for coastal networks co-designed with stakeholders and end users.

How do we make it work? What does the implementation look like? (including with respect to your component)

Governance

(slides 27 - 33)

What are your concerns regarding the proposed governance?

Slide 29: Brilliant to have a joint expert panel meeting

Slide 31: Good to start a GOOS Conference every 5 years.

If you don't agree with the proposal - what is the alternative? Why?

How do we make it work? What does the implementation look like? (including with respect to your component)

Draft Implementation Plan

(slides 34 - 36)

What are your concerns regarding the proposed implementation plan?

Slide 35: yes flexibility and agility are the key words here.

If you don't agree with the proposal - what is the alternative? Why?

Considerations for GOOS reform - SC15 Background paper

How do we make it work? What does the implementation look like? (including with respect to your component)

Any additional considerations for the GOOS SC on GOOS reform?