

**JOINT WMO-IOC TECHNICAL COMMISSION
FOR OCEANOGRAPHY AND MARINE
METEOROLOGY (JCOMM)**

JCOMM-III/BM. 14.1(2)

WMO Secretary-General
and UNESCO/IOC
Executive Secretary

Submitted by:

Date: 7.X.2009

Original Language: English only

THIRD SESSION

Marrakech, Morocco,
4 to 11 November 2009

Agenda Item: 14.1

JCOMM PROGRAMME AND PLANNING

WMO AND UNESCO/IOC STRATEGIC PLANNING AND THE JCOMM STRATEGY; MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF JCOMM ACTIVITIES

BACKGROUND MATERIAL

SUMMARY

Reference: JCOMM-III/Doc. 14.1(2)

CONTENT OF DOCUMENT:

Appendices:

- A. Background information on the JCOMM Review
- B. Extract of the Consultant Study on the Planning and Implementation for GOOS

BACKGROUND MATERIAL

1. The JCOMM Strategy, endorsed by JCOMM-II (Halifax, September 2005), included, *inter alia*, a requirement for a periodic review of the Commission:

“6.4 External Review

[...]. The parent bodies must ensure that JCOMM is periodically reviewed by an external group of experts every 8 years and the findings reported to every alternate Session, to ensure that JCOMM is best aligned to the requirements identified by its parent bodies and its clients.”

2. The conduct of this review during the current intersessional period was specifically requested by JCOMM-II. The Management Committee, at its fifth session (Geneva, October 2006), gave implicit endorsement for the preparation and conduct of the review, to be presented at JCOMM-III.

3. The sixth session of the Management Committee (Paris, December 2007) agreed that the review, in conjunction with the Implementation Plan (IP), had to fulfil a number of purposes, including:

- (i) Assess how well JCOMM is addressing high level strategic objectives and expected results as expressed in the various planning documents of both WMO and UNESCO/IOC since the establishment of the Commission;
- (ii) Assess how well JCOMM has fulfilled, over the past 8-10 years, the expectations of WMO and UNESCO/IOC for the Commission when it was established;
- (iii) Analyse to what degree JCOMM delivers benefits to Members/Member States, and is cost-effective in its operations;
- (iv) Based on the findings under (i) to (iii) above, provide recommendations on how JCOMM can improve benefits to its Members/Member States, as well as its cost-effectiveness, including modifications to its working structure, if appropriate.

4. In order to properly address these objectives, the Management Committee agreed that the review should be "external" (i.e. not directly by JCOMM officers, members, Secretariat, etc.), but conducted by experts with some knowledge and experience of the history (and pre-history) of JCOMM, and of its present workings. It was the view of some Committee members that the review team should include, or be comprised of, experts who could assess technical progress made by JCOMM.

5. With these considerations in mind, the Management Committee agreed on draft terms of reference for the review, together with a timeline for its conduct and reporting to JCOMM-III, as well as suggestions for composition of the review team. The Committee further provided some additional guidelines for the conduct of the review, in the form of a series of questions related to the operation of JCOMM, including its external relations with both users and other relevant bodies and organizations.

6. The seventh session of the Management Committee (Melbourne, December 2008) was informed that both WMO and UNESCO/IOC Executive Councils supported the proposed review of JCOMM, considering it timely at this stage in the Joint Commission's lifetime. They had noted that: (i) the review process should reside in, and be carried out by, the Governing Bodies of the two co-sponsoring organizations of JCOMM, and not by JCOMM itself; (ii) the review should reflect the views of UNESCO/IOC Member States and WMO Members; and (iii) that carrying out such a

review would require extrabudgetary support. The Committee was also informed that UNESCO/IOC had mobilized some extrabudgetary funds from US NOAA to provide support to the former NOAA Administrator Dr D. James Baker to undertake a broad review of UNESCO/IOC-WMO interactions, including JCOMM, and that a joint circular letter would be issued to Members/Member States informing them about the review process and seeking additional funds. The Committee noted that the WMO and UNESCO/IOC Secretariats had agreed on the Terms of Reference for Dr Baker's consultancy contract. However, these ToR were broader than those required for a full review of JCOMM, as requested by both MAN-VI, and the WMO and UNESCO/IOC Executive Councils. The Management Committee had therefore strongly recommended that, should Members/Member States provide additional funds in response to the circular letter, that these should be used to undertake this full review. In the event, no such additional funding was provided, so that the only review available to JCOMM-III would be that to be done by Dr Baker.

7. The review was undertaken by Dr Baker in the first half of 2009, and the final report delivered to the UNESCO/IOC and WMO Secretariats in early June 2009. This report, *Planning and Implementation for GOOS – A Consultant Study for WMO and UNESCO/IOC*, is available at <http://www.jcomm.info/GOOS>. The existence of the review report was made known to the sixty-first session of the WMO Executive Council (Geneva, June 2009) and the 25th session of the UNESCO/IOC Assembly (Paris, June 2009), and placed on the WMO and UNESCO/IOC Websites, with Members/Member States invited to provide comments as appropriate.

8. The recommendations of the study are presented in summary form in Appendix B to this information document. Many of them make specific reference to JCOMM, and most of the remainder are of at least indirect relevance. The Commission is invited to provide advice on the outcomes of the review and recommendations as they relate to JCOMM, and in particular to advise and instruct the Management Committee on any follow-up.

EXTRACT OF THE CONSULTANT STUDY ON THE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION FOR GOOS

28 May 2009

Recommendations:

Recommendation 2.1: UNESCO/IOC and its partners should complete the development of and implement a business plan for the operations and delivery of services of GOOS as a whole (coastal and global).

Recommendation 2.2.1: The business plan for GOOS implementation should have an emphasis on the “user pull,” drawing examples from successful country and regional implementation such as the US IOOS, European Commission's GMES Marine Services, and Australia's IMOS.

Recommendation 2.2.2: The business plan should clearly identify products and services to be delivered, drawing heavily on the experience and capability of existing UNESCO/IOC services such as GLOSS in JCOMM's Observations Programme Area and JCOMM's Services Programme Area. An important input for building products and services will come from development and support of GODAE OceanView.

Recommendation 2.2.4: The Business Plan should show how UNESCO/IOC and WMO JCOMM plan to broaden their activities in capacity building, and to partner with marine groups deeply involved in capacity building.

Recommendation 2.2.5: UNESCO/IOC and WMO should continue to ensure the free and open exchange of ocean and related data through IODE of UNESCO/IOC and national centres. This is a particularly high priority for coastal GOOS. The strong efforts of GEO to ensure a free and open data policy for satellite information can help UNESCO/IOC and WMO in providing data for GOOS.

Recommendation 2.2.6: The Business Plan should include a clear explanation of the roles and responsibilities of the intergovernmental groups with direct responsibility for both management and outreach: I-GOOS (or a new group as recommended), JCOMM, and GSSC.

Recommendation 2.2.7: The Business Plan should incorporate the ways in which GOOS will contribute to providing the data needed for the issues raised by the Secretary-General in his March 2009 Law of the Sea report to the UN.

Recommendation 2.2.8: The Business Plan should include identification of the roles of SCOR, POGO, the marine component of GEO/GEOSS and other related groups to ensure their full engagement in GOOS implementation.

Recommendation 2.3: Completion of the Business Plan should be the direct responsibility of the GOOS Project Office, working in conjunction with JCOMM and the GRAs. Other sponsoring bodies ICSU and UNEP should be invited to participate. Input should be solicited from POGO, GEO, the private sector, other ocean-related parts of the UN family, regional organizations and appropriate Member States, of both developed and developing countries.

Recommendation 3.1: UNESCO/IOC and WMO must continue and enhance their support of sustained ocean observations. UNESCO/IOC needs to work with UNESCO to make the case for GOOS, make its membership more aware and responsive to GOOS needs, and to enhance capacity building.

Recommendation 3.2: At this point and with the current structure, I-GOOS is a failed experiment. I-GOOS should be dissolved and replaced with a body that could truly help make UNESCO/IOC Member States aware of its role in implementing both coastal and global GOOS. The new body

should seek Member State representatives who represent relevant national agencies or otherwise play a significant role in coastal or global observations and to the extent possible, can make binding funding commitments. The new body needs to be responsible for GOOS (both open ocean and coastal components) and its implementation in these domains and able to take up advice from OOPC, PICO etc.

Recommendation 3.3: JCOMM is playing a key role in the implementation of GOOS and the proposed restructuring needs support by both UNESCO/IOC and WMO. JCOMM could take on the responsibility for coordinating the Global Coastal Network (GCN). JCOMM should examine its roles and responsibilities for GOOS particularly with an eye towards identifying its role in implementing coastal GOOS, and help make both UNESCO/IOC Member States and WMO Members aware of its role in implementing GOOS overall.

Recommendation 3.4: In recent years, GSSC has lacked direction and focus. Members are not clear about their roles and responsibilities, whereas the GSSC Panels are active and effective. GSSC should be dissolved in its current form and reformed based on the Panels. One possible arrangement would be a joint body made up of the two panels with a governing tripartite executive committee: the current Chair representing outreach, the Chair of PICO, and the Chair of OOPC. To save funds, a single 3-4 day joint annual meeting that includes PICO and OOPC should be convened, and the Executive Committee could meet during the joint meeting.

Recommendation 3.5: UNESCO/IOC through the GPO should lead the effort to strengthen and clarify the relations between UNESCO/IOC, I-GOOS, JCOMM, POGO and the marine component of GEO/GEOSS, as well as UNCLOS, IMO, the Small Island States, and other organizations so that coastal ocean GOOS and open ocean GOOS are made more visible to the public and decision-makers.

Recommendation 4.1: UNESCO/IOC and WMO JCOMM management of GOOS should be streamlined, starting with a careful consideration of what meetings and reports are really required, and a review of recommendations that have been made in the past and whether these are being followed up. UNESCO/IOC and WMO JCOMM need to do a regular review of their priorities as new ideas and techniques arise, and should consider reallocating internal resources to meet planning and coordination needs.

Recommendation 4.2: Following the successful move of IODE of UNESCO/IOC and the establishment of the regional GOOS offices, UNESCO/IOC should carefully explore moving other central functions from Paris to countries willing to commit resources and help to leverage funds.

Recommendation 4.3: UNESCO/IOC and WMO JCOMM should make every effort to find additional support for planning and coordination in order to ensure day-to-day attention to these critical issues.

Recommendation 4.4.1: UNESCO/IOC GPO and WMO JCOMM should be active and entrepreneurial in seeking outside funding from the private sector, foundations, and regional governmental groups and consider other ways of doing business, such as contracting with outside organizations, if this reduces costs.

Recommendation 4.4.2: UNESCO/IOC should task I-GOOS to develop a process for helping developing countries develop sustainable coastal plans for possible funding from the developed world.

Recommendation 4.4.3: UNESCO/IOC and WMO JCOMM should use the business plan to help increase support from Member States for the operations of GOOS and delivery of services.

Recommendation 5: The UNESCO/IOC Secretariat should consider convening a series of strategic coordination meetings that would involve existing bodies and new institutions to help GOOS meet

the many issues that have been discussed above. Such institutions and bodies include I-GOOS (or the new body recommended), JCOMM, other parts of the UN family, GEO, POGO, SCOR, IMO, IHO, and the private sector. These meetings could form the basis for consideration of a larger regular “Oceans Davos” conference to bring together all the constituencies of the ocean community.
