

Name or GOOS Component:

Steering Committee

Report submitted by:

Patrick Heimbach

Date submitted:03/17/2026

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?

Slide 8 & 9

--

It is odd that "science and society" are nowhere mentioned on slide 8 as a key developer and user of GLOBAL ocean observations. Arguably, without science as a key focus, observational network design and deployment will be piecemeal and catering to narrow interests. It faces the considerable risk that key observations to constrain key global-scale oceanographic metrics will not be taken.

Related, I am quite concerned (slide 9) to dropping "the operational and scientific oceanography community as the primary stakeholder".

My perspective is driven by the piece (and its implication for ocean observing) - which probably nobody at Accenture has considered - by:

Wunsch, C., Schmitt, R. W. & Baker, D. J. (2013). Climate change as an intergenerational problem. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(12), 4435–4436.

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1302536110>

Slide 25 & 26

--

"Embed OKRs into existing performance dashboards/ reporting tools". I am not aware that performance metrics for GOOS even exist? Wouldn't a basic task be to establish such metrics? (They don't have to be set in stone, but defining something would seem warranted).

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

Establish a baseline of GOOS performance metrics.

ETOofs could play a role here, although other metrics unrelated to operational ocean forecasting are critical as well. For example, separately from the ETOofs mandate, involvement of relevant climate entities, such as GSOP, WCRP (eg Obs4MIP) would seem important.

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

Proposed structural changes nr. 1-5

(slides 11 - 19)

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

Slide 12

--

"Components" seems to be a key word, but nowhere defined what GOOS "components" are or should be (even as an SC member I find the current GOOS organization highly confusing).

Slide 12

--

Role of the ICG: how does this interfere with the role of the Ocean Data and Information System (ODIS), which seems to be working rather productively? A related question is, how does ODIS related to the International Oceanographic Data and InformationExchange (IODE) and to GOOS? I find the relationship between GOOS, IODE, and ODIS utterly confusing, but a critical element of any successful, efficient GOOS structure.

Slide 13

--

That WCRP, GSOP, and CEOS (Committee on Earth Observation Satellites) aren't mentioned explicitly in one of the boxes is a major omission of this report (and of the current GOOS organization?).

Also, what is the difference between "Endorsed Projects", "GOOS Networks", and "Other Communities"?

Also, if the ICG plays such an important role ("Ocean observing data providers will be coordinated through a single integrated component, the Infrastructure Coordination Group (ICG)"), how does it connect with the expert panels who seem to be the actual experts (e.g., defining and extending EOVs)?

Slide 14:

--

- It says: "Oversee, monitor, guide, and evaluate GOOS system performance". What tools and support does the SC actually possess to deliver on what seems to be major responsibilities?
- Nowhere on slide 14 do I see mention of IODE or ODIS, but which should be - in some form - a key element of GOOS? It is probably somehow subsumed under ICG, but obscure.
- I'd be curious to know under ETOOFS, why "Assess forecasting system performance" is out of scope? It seems one of the extremely few actual quantitatively verifiable ways to assess GOOS performance. So it should be removed?
- I do not see the Donor Coordination Group mentioned here (but seems like an important addition, see slide 17).

Slide 15

--

- "Facilitate planning, coordination, and communication across GOOS components to ensure system-level integration": is a secretariat able to fulfill this role? Shouldn't there be fora for the different "components" and their relevant experts to enter into a closer dialogue directly, not just via the Secretariat?
- "Standard steward": what role for ODIS?
- I had (naively?) considered one of GOOS' (important) roles to improve pathways to private-sector funding of the GOOS system (hardware and software). I have a hard time finding this on slide 15 (where I'd expect it to be spelled out). The statement "Activate government and private sector engagement for project design" seems lukewarm.

Slide 19

--

- Not sure why the expert panels will be "potentially outsourced"? Aren't they the ones who do the heavy lifting for GOOS?

- Four new positions are envisioned. What are their roles?
- Having IODE sitting outside of the the GOOS organigram (and not connected to ICG in particular) really bothers me.
- Establishing a connection somewhere here to the GCOP would seem important (at a minimum under "Other communities").

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

Some of the answers are embedded with my comments above for each slide.

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?

Slide 20

--

- See my earlier comments, it's really worrisome that IODE and ODIS do not feature prominently(!) here.
- Explicit mention (and making connections) to GSOP and CEOS would seem important.

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

See above for suggestions (eg, regarding IODE, ODIS, GSOP, CEOS)

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?

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?

Slide 23

--

GRAs: Regional Alliances are often highly effective as they comprise key subject-matter experts, understand the region (and its specific issues) very well, and are driven by problem-solving. GOOS should take advantage of these GRAs, it should let them be productive, not "swallow" them, and establish a formal process for engagement (eg similar to GOOS Networks).

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 28 & 29

--

- Item #4 ("Governance meetings will break silos between different components through enhanced collaboration to ensure coordinated ocean observing efforts") seems key.
- Thoughts need to go into more direct involvement of GOOS Networks and GRAs.
- Same as above, IODE and ETOOFS participation seems important, as does GSOP/WCRP.

Slide 30-33

--

It seems to me that various important GOOS "components" rarely, if never get to meet? For example, wouldn't it make sense for periodic - eg annual - meeting that includes the GOOS Secretariat, SC, representatives from the expert panels, representatives from the ICG and IODE, and representatives of ETOOFS, to enable more in-depth information exchange & discussion?

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?