

Advisory and Oversight Group Science Steering Committee

Jack A. Kaye
Akimasa Sumi

Key Points

- AOG is impressed by what CEOP has done, especially with 3 types of data, but don't declare victory prematurely
 - Data delivery times for in situ data
 - Satellite data providers actually providing to CEOP
- Looking for quantitative metrics for phase I/II
 - Need to be sure this gets done soon
 - NRC report may provide useful approach
- Confusion exists about unique nature of CEOP
 - Science-driven vs. Science-enabling
 - Scientists being involved in data activities is important
 - CEOP should not be about “establishing an integrated observing system”

Key Points, cont.

- Expansion of scientific scope seems reasonable and constitutes a natural evolution.
 - May require additional data types
 - Rest of WCRP needs to understand/be comfortable
- Role of CEOP within WCRP is unclear - is now the time to remove from under GEWEX and make a cross-cutting activity of WCRP?
- Can we articulate the meaning of the name better - to remove confusion?
 - What do we mean by “period” and “enhanced”?
 - Will CEOP ever end? Will commitment of data providers continue as CEOP continues?

Key Points, cont.

- What is relevance of CEOP to GEO? It may be a positive yet incomplete example.
- Should CEOP be better connected to GCOS? How can we build on CEOP views of comprehensive observations?
- Should AOG continue? How useful/unique is advice given that from others (GEWEX SSG, WCRP JSC, WOAP, ...)?