

Name or GOOS Component:

Member States representatives Group 4

Report submitted by:

Michiyo Yamamoto-Kawai

Date submitted:03/20/2026

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?

*The role of science seems to be underemphasized. It is important to explicitly highlight "science" in the mission statement. This is essential to maintain a strong link between scientific research and real-world impact. Without clear reference to science, there is concern that GOOS could become overly focused on societal applications at the expense of its scientific foundation.

*Although metrics such as the "number of co-developed initiatives or products" are important, there is concern that they may unintentionally encourage Member States to focus primarily on domestic or economically driven activities. This could result in further fragmentation of the observing system rather than reinforcing global integration. Therefore, a stronger emphasis on a global perspective is considered necessary.

*While making Member States more visible and recognizing data users is a positive step,

there is a need for clearer and more concrete strategies to increase the number of users and funders, which is expected to be a key challenge.

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

Basically agreed but there are some suggestions:

***Contribution to International Efforts:**

Co-design and product-oriented activities should be evaluated based on how they connect to and benefit the international community (e.g., sharing outcomes as global best practices, open data integration, and technology transfer).

***Valuing broad, connected, Open-Ocean Science:**

The ocean is fundamentally interconnected. Localized products rely on a deep understanding of the broader ocean. Therefore, scientific activities in the open ocean that support the foundational understanding of this interconnected system must be highly recognized and properly evaluated. It is also necessary to acknowledge activities that extend beyond a country's own waters.

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

*The standard approach would be to increase the budgets of individual data providers and expand the number of participating institutions, but no specific methods for achieving this were proposed.

*Open-ocean observations and international data/technology sharing are fundamentally "global investments" rather than activities that directly drive short-term domestic economic growth. As a result, data providers often face challenges in securing domestic funding for these activities. To make the new accountability mechanism effective, it was proposed that GOOS establish a formal system to officially evaluate and publicly announce each Member State's (and NFP's) contributions to these global investments (e.g., via a public dashboard or

report card). This official recognition would provide NFPs with a credible advocacy tool to convince domestic policymakers and financial authorities of the need for explicit and sustained budget allocations for open-ocean science.

Proposed structural changes nr. 1-5

(slides 11 - 19)

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

How should the actual roles of NFPs be defined?

Furthermore, there appears to be significant variation in how different countries handle this issue, and consideration should be given to how these differences should be addressed.

In addition, it seems necessary to thoroughly discuss approaches to strengthen the activities of NFPs..

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: Infrastructure Coordination Group (ICG)

(slide 20)

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

How should the relationship between the ICG and the national observing network be

regarded?

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?

*Strengthening NFPs may take time and requires serious engagement, including coordination with relevant ministries.

*Care is needed not to overemphasize NFPs in this section. Emphasizing GOOS evaluation or recommendations could overlook the circumstances of other countries.

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: GOOS Regional Alliances

(slides 22-23)

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

There appears to be potential for overlap and/or gaps between global and regional coordination, which warrants consideration.

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?

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?

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)

Any additional considerations for the GOOS SC on GOOS reform?

- The proposed reform represents a significant restructuring, clarifying the GOOS components, their roles, relationships, and reporting lines are expected to improve transparency and understanding of the program, both internally and externally.
- From the perspective of strengthening GOOS-related activities domestically, clarifying the role and positioning of NFPs within the GOOS structure is expected to provide supportive leverage.
- The reform will likely require substantial effort. Effective domestic coordination—including with relevant ministries—will be necessary before making any formal statements or decisions.
- Information sharing between the GOOS SC and individual observing networks, regional alliances, and countries does not seem very effective. GOOS mainly shares updates via LinkedIn, which some countries and individuals cannot access; relying only on the website can be a barrier. Mailing lists or webinars could help improve Information sharing.
- The website does not clearly show which countries are in each Region or who the National Focal Points (NFPs) are. This lack of basic information sharing may be hindering smooth communication.