

**Report to the  
Council of the American Meteorological Society:**

**The American Meteorological Society’s Response to  
Recommendation 3 of *Fair Weather***

---

Contents:

Executive Summary

Report to the AMS Council

The AMS’s Response to Recommendation 3 of “Fair Weather” (NRC, 2003)

Attachments

1. Ad Hoc Committee membership roster
  2. Brief report of the ad hoc Committee’s deliberations
  3. Report on the prototype webcast
  4. Report on the community summit
  5. Annual Partnership Topic
  6. Edited version of paper on short-term topics
  7. Business Plan and Budget
  8. Proposed timeline
-

## Executive Summary

### MOTIVATION:

The nation's weather and climate enterprise is conducted by many parties who *provide* information to an even greater number of *users* of this information. For convenience in exposition, the providers are typically grouped into three sectors – government, private sector, and the academic community – although the enterprise as a whole includes non-governmental organizations, international organizations, private citizens, and others. Each of the three provider “sectors” is quite diverse: Government includes federal agencies (both civilian and military), as well as agencies at the state and local level. The private sector includes weather companies, practitioners working for private companies or as consultants, broadcasters, risk managers, and others. The academic sector includes both private and public educational institutions and specially chartered research organizations of various types. The community is also diverse on the user side, including a broad range of weather sensitive economic sectors (energy, agriculture, and transportation, to name three) as well as private citizens.

In 2003, the National Research Council in its report, *Fair Weather – Effective Partnerships in Weather and Climate Services* recommended that “*The National Weather Service and relevant academic, state, and private organizations should seek a neutral host, such as the American Meteorological Society, to provide a periodic dedicated venue for the weather enterprise as a whole to discuss issues related to the public-private partnership.*” In response to this recommendation, the American Meteorological Society formed the 22-member ad hoc Committee on the Weather and Climate Enterprise. The Committee was charged with preparing a plan that embraces the breadth and diversity of the communities of providers and users of weather and climate information, and how AMS can serve as a venue for facilitating discussion related to partnerships amongst the provider and user sectors. This report outlines the committee's recommendations for an **AMS Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise**, its membership and Board structure, preliminary terms of reference, a synopsis of points considered in the framing of the recommendations, input from community summits and a web cast, a staffing budget, and a timeline.

### RECOMMENDATION:

The AMS should establish a **Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise**. The Commission should be charged with developing and implementing programs that address the needs and concerns of all sectors of the weather and climate enterprise; promote a sense of community among government entities, private sector organizations, and universities; foster synergistic linkages between and among the sectors; entrain and educate user communities on the value of weather and climate information; and provide appropriate venues and opportunities for communications that foster frank, open, and balanced discussions of points of contention and concern. In addition, the Committee

## DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004

recommends that the Council adopt preliminary terms of reference for the Commission that ensures the continued neutrality of the Society.

1. The Commission provides venues for enterprise participants to meet and discuss issues of importance to the enterprise.
2. The Commission and its activities facilitate dialogue between enterprise participants.
3. Commission activities operate within the overall mission of the American Meteorological Society as a scientific and professional society.

The Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise will consist of a Commissioner, a Commission Executive Committee, and a Commission Steering Committee. The Commission Executive Committee will be the primary vehicle for coordinating activities of the Commission. The Commission Steering Committee, a unique feature of this Commission, will be composed of members selected from across the provider and user communities. It will provide a forum for identification and discussion of issues of interest or concern to the weather and climate enterprise as a whole, and assist the Commission Executive Committee in setting the agenda for the Commission and its Boards.

It is recommended that the Commission have three Boards, two new and one transferred, phased in over a two-year period. The two new Boards will be the Board on Enterprise Planning (BEP) and the Board on Enterprise Communications (BEC). The purpose of the BEP is to review issues identified by the Steering Committee that are of a long-term strategic nature with importance to the enterprise as a whole. The BEC will provide appropriate venues to bring together the provider and user communities to learn about, discuss, and provide input concerning issues of a short-term nature identified by the Steering Committee. Venues may take a wide variety of formats, including workshops, special symposia, and conference sessions, depending on the nature and time-sensitivity of the topic to be discussed. It is proposed that the current AMS Committee on Economic Development be renamed the Board on Enterprise Economics and Development (BEED). The purpose of BEED is to grow the economic base of the weather and climate enterprise by reaching out to the broad user community. Sample activities of this board could include sponsoring corporate fora; promoting support and services to weather sensitive industries; advertising at trade shows, on the internet, and in the print and other media; sponsoring trade shows; fostering favorable policies and procedures; etc. Each year these Boards will select a manageable number of activities to sponsor while continuously planning for events beyond one year.

The ad hoc Committee recommends that the **AMS Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise** be spun up over the 24 months following the AMS Annual Meeting in January 2005, with the goal of having the Commission fully established by the AMS Annual Meeting in January 2007.

**Report to the  
Council of the American Meteorological Society:**

**The American Meteorological Society’s Response to Recommendation 3  
of *Fair Weather***

**Introduction.** This report provides recommendations to the American Meteorological Society in response to Recommendation 3 of the recent National Research Council report, *Fair Weather – Effective Partnerships in Weather and Climate Services* (NRC, 2003). Recommendation 3 reads:

*The NWS and relevant academic, state, and private organizations should seek a neutral host, such as the American Meteorological Society, to provide a periodic dedicated venue for the weather enterprise as a whole to discuss issues related to the public-private partnership.*

***In brief, the ad hoc Committee recommends that the AMS respond to Recommendation 3 by establishing a Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise within the Society organizational structure.*** This report outlines an organizational structure for the recommended commission, describes its membership and purpose, and proposes an approach for starting the Commission in early 2005, with the goal of being fully established by January 2007.

A preliminary report was presented to the AMS Council at the January 2004 meeting. A revised second draft report was presented to the AMS Executive Committee in April 2004. This report was prepared by the ad hoc Committee on the Weather and Climate Enterprise (committee members are listed in Attachment 1). A synopsis of points considered by the Committee in framing its recommendations is contained in Attachment 2.

In light of discussion at the time the preliminary report was presented to the AMS Council, the Executive Committee authorized the ad hoc Committee to conduct two experiments: a web cast (report in Attachment 3) and a “community summit” (report in Attachment 4). These two experiments illustrate the types of activities that the Commission proposed below would carry out. The web cast is an example of an activity that would be conducted by the Board on Enterprise Communication. The community summit represents a meeting similar to what is proposed for the Commission Steering Committee.

## Recommendation

### **The AMS should establish a Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise.**

The Commission should be charged with developing and implementing programs that address the needs and concerns of all sectors of the weather and climate enterprise; promote a sense of community among government entities, private sector organizations, and the universities; foster synergistic linkages between and among the sectors; entrain and educate user communities on the value of weather and climate information; and provide appropriate venues and opportunities for communications that foster frank, open, and balanced discussions of points of contention and concern.

**The AMS should adopt preliminary terms of reference for the Commission that ensures the continued neutrality of the Society.** An AMS commission must operate within certain limits imposed by law and by legal and procedural limitations imposed on the various participants. Further, in keeping with the spirit of neutrality proposed by Recommendation 3, the terms of reference for the Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise must recognize the following: *Private sector participants* have shareholders, investors, and governing boards which must provide direction to their activities, and all participants must be mindful of restrictions traceable to antitrust statutes; *Academic institutions*, whether public or private, operate under various charters and typically have governing boards (e.g. a Board of Regents) which provide overall direction; *Federal agencies* have specific oversight provided by Congress and the Executive branch and operate under various legal restrictions on their activities (e.g. the Federal Advisory Committee Act) -- state and local governments have similar, though varied, limits on their participation.

Accordingly, the ad hoc Committee recommends that the Commission adopt the following preliminary terms of reference:

### **Proposed Preliminary Terms of Reference for the AMS Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise**

The Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise (the Commission) is established by the AMS Council to promote a healthy weather and climate enterprise (the enterprise). Like all AMS Commissions, the Commission advises the Council, provides recommendations for Society actions, and reports on the status of Commission activities. Also, like all AMS Commissions, the Commission conducts all of its activities and functions in such a way as to comply with the letter and spirit of all applicable public laws as well as with the AMS Constitution and Bylaws. In particular:

- 1. The Commission provides venues for enterprise participants to meet and discuss issues of importance to the enterprise. All findings and reports resulting from Commission activities are directed to the AMS Council.** Many meetings sponsored by the Commission result in reports that may collect views, identify consensus, clarify issues, summarize activities, identify next action steps, etc. These reports are directed to the Council rather than to enterprise participants. The Commission does not operate as a federal advisory committee, nor does it attempt to speak for the Society. All Commission reports must be worded carefully and must include disclaimers stating that the reports do *not* represent official positions or policies of the Society.

## DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004

2. **The Commission and its activities facilitate dialogue between enterprise participants.** The AMS has a long-standing tradition of sponsoring events at which enterprise participants discuss outstanding issues and their resolution. The commission does not serve as a mediator or as an adjudicator of disputes among enterprise participants. Numerous outside mechanisms exist for resolving disputes among parties. The Commission does not seek and will not accept such a role.
3. **Commission activities operate within the overall mission of the Society as a scientific and professional society.** The Society exists to advance the science and profession of meteorology as a whole and to improve service to the public, as stated in the AMS Constitution: “The objectives of this Society are the development and dissemination of knowledge of the atmospheric and related oceanic and hydrologic sciences and the advancement of their professional applications.” The Commission does not act as an industrial or trade association and does not lobby or advocate for the Society's positions or for the positions of any participant in the enterprise.

**The Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise** will consist of a Commissioner (appointed to a three-year term, on a rotating basis from the private sector, the public sector, and the academic sector), a Commission Executive Committee, a Commission Steering Committee, and such boards as the Council authorizes. It is recommended that the Commission initially have three boards, two new and one created from an existing committee.

The Commission will focus on organizations and the interconnections amongst the organizations that comprise the weather and climate enterprise. Accordingly, it is essential that the members of the Commission and its Boards represent the full diversity of the provider and user sectors.

**a) Commission Executive Committee** – this committee will consist of the Commissioner (as chair) and the chairs of the boards comprising the Commission. It will meet quarterly by teleconference and be the primary vehicle for coordinating activities of the Commission.

**b) Commission Steering Committee** – this committee will consist of 20 leaders drawn from the community as a whole, plus five ex officio (non-voting) members. Members will be appointed to three-year terms, with the terms staggered so that approximately one-third change each year. Balance in membership among all sectors in the provider community (government, private, and academic) and breadth of representation from the user community is essential for the Commission Steering Committee. Candidates for membership on the Steering Committee will be nominated by the AMS Executive Committee in consultation with the Commission Executive Committee, and then appointed by the AMS Council. Steering Committee members are expected to be active and participate in committee meetings. At the discretion of the Commissioner, an appointed member who fails to participate may be replaced. In such a case, the Commissioner will recommend to Council a replacement appointment for the remainder of the term.

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

The purpose of the Steering Committee is to provide a forum for identification and discussion of issues of interest or concern to the weather and climate enterprise as a whole. The Steering Committee will meet at least twice yearly, normally the Saturday before the AMS Annual Meeting and approximately six months later. These meetings will be open to all who desire to attend and will be designated as “community summits”. The Steering Committee will normally refer items requiring further action to one of the boards of the Commission. Some individuals on the Steering Committee may also serve on the boards of the Commission.

Designated Commission Steering Committee members (based on position) will include

***Four members by AMS position:***

- Commissioner for the Weather and Climate Enterprise (chairs the Steering Committee)
- Chair of the Board on Enterprise Planning
- Chair of the Board on Enterprise Communication
- Chair of the Board on Enterprise Economics and Development

***Seven senior members from the provider community (not otherwise integral to the AMS organizational structure):***

These individuals should be prominent national leaders in their sector.

***Five senior members from user organizations or functional areas in the meteorological user community (not otherwise integral to the AMS organizational structure):***

These individuals should be prominent national leaders in their sector.

***Four members-at-large, selected to maintain balance and diversity (not otherwise integral to the AMS organizational structure):***

Up to four Members-At-Large may be appointed to ensure diversity and balance.

***Five Ex Officio (non-voting):***

- Current President of the AMS
- Executive Director of the AMS
- Commissioner for Professional Affairs
- Commissioner for Scientific and Technical Activities
- Commissioner for Education and Human Resources

**c) Board on Enterprise Planning** – this board will consist of 13 members-at-large, a chair and three working groups. Normally, each working group will have one member from the private sector, a second from the academic sector, a third

## DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004

from the public sector, and, if possible, a fourth from the user community. The Board Chair will be appointed by the Commissioner.

The purpose of the Planning Board is to review issues identified by the Steering Committee that are of a long-term strategic nature with importance to the enterprise as a whole<sup>1</sup>. The ad hoc committee recommends a structured, deliberative process focusing on a topic selected annually, with a working group responsible for the review of a specific issue. The outcome will be an annual report to the Steering Committee, which will review it and disseminate it via the Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society (BAMS) and presentations given at the Annual Meeting and Users Forum. On occasion, the Steering Committee may ask the working group to prepare a draft policy statement for consideration by the AMS Council. See Attachment 2 for additional details.

**d) Board on Enterprise Communication** – this board will consist of ten members-at-large. Three members will be appointed each year for a three-year term, with the goal of maintaining a balance of members from each of the three provider sectors. The Board chair will be appointed by the Commissioner.

This board has an *internal* focus. Its purpose is to provide appropriate venues to bring together the provider and user communities to learn about, discuss, and provide input concerning issues of short-term nature identified by the Steering Committee. These issues will normally be of immediate interest to the weather and climate enterprise. Venues may take a wide variety of formats, including workshops, special symposia, and conference sessions, depending on the nature and time-sensitivity of the topic to be discussed. A report will be prepared for each meeting and submitted to the Steering Committee, which will review it and disseminate it through BAMS and other means. The time from identification of an issue to the dissemination of a report should normally be less than six months.

**e) Board on Enterprise Economics and Development** – this board will consist of thirteen members-at-large including the chair, four appointed each year. Members-at-large will serve three-year terms. The Board Chair will be chosen by the Commissioner from the members-at-large, preferably from those who have already served at least one year on the board. During the year the chair rotates off the board, five members will be appointed.

The Committee on Economic Development currently operates under the Executive Committee. It is recommended that this committee be transferred to the

---

<sup>1</sup> The studies prepared by Planning and Development Board will be coordinated with the AMS Planning Commission. It is envisioned that these studies will be based on input obtained from the community as well as experts in the field. The Board will be encouraged to hold town hall meetings and obtain the sense of the various sectors on the topic being considered. In this fashion, the operation of the Board will be different from the study methods used by the National Research Council's Board on Atmospheric Sciences and Climate.

## DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004

Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise and renamed the Board on Enterprise Economics and Development.

The purpose of the Board on Enterprise Economics and Development is to grow the economic base of the weather and climate enterprise by reaching out to the meteorological community as a whole, identifying user needs, and helping providers meet those needs. Sample activities of this board include, but are not limited to, sponsoring corporate fora (usually at the Annual Meeting); promoting support and services to weather sensitive industries; advertising at trade shows, on the internet, and in the print and other media; sponsoring trade shows; fostering favorable policies and procedures; etc. Each year the board will select a manageable number of activities to sponsor while continuously planning for events beyond one year.

Further, to minimize overlap with the duties and responsibilities of the Commission on Professional Affairs, the focus on private sector as a *community of organizations* currently in the terms of reference for the Boards in the Commission on Professional Affairs should be transferred to the Board on Enterprise Economics and Development. The Board on Enterprise Economics and Development thus will have a strong *external* and *organizational* focus. To this end, it is recommended that the terms of reference of the Boards comprising the Commission on Professional Affairs be reviewed. Where necessary and with continuous Council oversight, these terms of reference should be adjusted to more strongly focus on the professional development of the individual meteorologist. These Boards may also be renamed to reflect this sharpened focus. For example, the Board on Private Sector Meteorology would become the Board on Private Sector Meteorologists.

**As part of the overall AMS web site, the Commission will establish a prominent web presence** that will be used to disseminate the minutes and reports of the various commission activities. In recognition that many of the potentially interested parties, especially in the private sector, will be unable to attend meetings in person, the CCA will use technology such as web casts and streaming video to allow the maximum number of people to participate in meetings and discussions.

### **Business Plan and Budget**

A business plan and budget for the Commission is in Attachment 7.

### **Getting Started**

The ad hoc Committee recommends that this new Commission be spun up incrementally over the 24 months following the AMS Annual Meeting in January 2005, with the goal of having the Commission fully established by the AMS Annual Meeting in January 2007. A time line is in Attachment 8.

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

An initial roster of individuals for key positions on the Commission could be submitted for Council approval by its January 2005 meeting. The Commission could hold its first meetings during the following AMS Annual Meeting. An organizational meeting of the Commission Steering Committee would be held in summer 2005, with its first formal meeting as the Steering Committee in January 2006. During 2005-2006, the new Commissioner would coordinate with the other Commissioners on final terms of reference for the Commission and its boards.

Such a spin-up would allow close Council oversight of the process, with interim reports every six months or so. The development of final terms for reference for the Commission and each of the boards will provide the Council an opportunity to fine tune the direction being taken by the Commission.

### **Ad hoc Committee**

Assuming Council approval of the recommendations made above, the ad hoc Committee proposes to hold a town hall meeting at the AMS Annual Meeting in San Diego to introduce the new Commission. The ad hoc Committee would then be disestablished.

The current ad hoc Committee volunteers to serve as the nucleus around which to form the recommended Commission.

### **Attachments**

1. Ad Hoc Committee membership
2. Brief report of the ad hoc Committee's deliberations
3. Report on the prototype webcast
4. Report on the community summit
5. Annual Partnership Topic
6. Edited version of paper on short term topics
7. Business Plan and Budget
8. Proposed timeline

## DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004

Attachment 1

### Ad Hoc Committee for AMS Response to the NRC Report *Fair Weather*

**Chair:** Prof. John T. Snow, Sarkeys Energy Center, The Univ. of Oklahoma, Suite 710, 100 East Boyd St., Norman, OK 73019-0628 | (405) 325-3101 [FAX# (405) 325-3148] E: [jsnow@ou.edu](mailto:jsnow@ou.edu)

Dr. Susan K. Avery, CIRES, Univ. of Colorado, Campus Box 216, Boulder, CO 80309-3000 (303) 492-8773 [FAX# (303) 492-1149] E: [susan.avery@colorado.edu](mailto:susan.avery@colorado.edu)

Mr. Jay Baker, 2308 Carrick Court, Tallahassee, FL 32309 . 850-668- 045 [FAX#] E: [jbaker@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:jbaker@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)

Raymond Ban, Professional Affairs Commissioner, The Weather Channel, 300 Interstate North Parkway, Atlanta, GA 30339 (770) 226-2161 [FAX# (770) 226-2951] E: [rban@weather.com](mailto:rban@weather.com)

Dr. Ana Paula Barros, Harvard Univ. Pierce Hall 118, 29 Oxford St., Cambridge, MA 02138 (617) 495-2858 [FAX# (617) 496-1457] E: [barros@deas.harvard.edu](mailto:barros@deas.harvard.edu)

Mr. George L. Frederick, Vaisala Meteorological Systems, Inc., P. O. Box 3659, Boulder, CO 80307-3659 (303) 402-4728 [FAX# (303) 499-7659] E: [george.frederick@vaisala.com](mailto:george.frederick@vaisala.com)

Dr. Elbert W. (Joe) Friday, President, American Meteorological Society, 1120 G St., NW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005 (202) 682-9006

Dr. Edward R. Johnson, Strategic Planning and Policy Office, National Weather Service, 1325 East West Hwy., Silver Spring, MD 20910-3283 . (301) 713-3095 [FAX # (301) 713-1239] E: [Edward.Johnson@noaa.gov](mailto:Edward.Johnson@noaa.gov)

Mr. Carl R. Knable, 2050 Hallmark Court, Wheaton, IL 60187-3137. (630) 682-3836 [FAX#] E: [crkdak@sprynet.com](mailto:crkdak@sprynet.com)

Mr. Kevin Lavin, NWA - Executive Director, National Weather Association, 1697 Capri Way, Charlottesville, VA 22911-3534 . (434) 296-9966 [FAX#] E: [natweasoc@aol.com](mailto:natweasoc@aol.com)

## DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004

Prof. Clifford F. Mass, Dept. of Atmospheric Sciences, Univ. of Washington, Box 351640 - 612 Atmospheric Sciences/Geophysics Bldg, Seattle, WA 98195 (206) 685-0910 [FAX # (206) 543-0308] E: [cliff@atmos.washington.edu](mailto:cliff@atmos.washington.edu)

Dr. Ronald D. McPherson, Executive Director, American Meteorological Society, 45 Beacon St., Boston, MA 02108 (617) 227-2426 ext. 201

Mr. Matthew J. Parker, Atmospheric Technologies Group, Westinghouse Savannah River Co., Bldg. 735-7A, Aiken, SC 29808 (803) 725-2805 [FAX# (803) 725-4233] E: [matt.parker@srs.gov](mailto:matt.parker@srs.gov)

Ms. Maria Pirone, Atmospheric & Environmental Research, Inc., 131 Hartwell Ave., Lexington, MA 02421-3136 (781) 761-2288 - [FAX# (781) 761-2299] E: [mpirone@aer.com](mailto:mpirone@aer.com)

Mr. Doyle E. Pittman, Tennessee Valley Authority, 1101 Market St., BR 3F, Chattanooga, TN 37402-2801. (423) 751-8097 [FAX# (423) 751-7350] E: [depittma@tva.gov](mailto:depittma@tva.gov)

Mr. Robert J. Plante, 7430 Mellow Ridge, Fair Oaks Ranch, TX 78015 (830) 755-4725 [FAX# (830) 755-4765] E: [rjplante1@aol.com](mailto:rjplante1@aol.com)

Mr. John Polasek, Entergy-Koch Trading, LP, Vice President, 20 Greenway Plaza, Suite 700, Houston, TX 77046 (volunteer for Weather Risk Management Association). (713) 544-5592 [FAX# (713) 544-9144 ] E:

Prof. Emeritus Thomas D. Potter, Meteorology Dept., Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112 . (801) 585-1414 [FAX # (801) 581-4362] E: [tdpotter@met.utah.edu](mailto:tdpotter@met.utah.edu)

Mr. Steven A. Root, President & CEO, WeatherBank, Inc., 1015 Waterwood Parkway, Suite J, Edmond, OK 73034. (405) 359-0773 [FAX#] E: [sroot@weatherbank.com](mailto:sroot@weatherbank.com)

Ms. Shelley Row, Director, Office of Transportation Operations, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Federal Highway Administration, HOTO-1, Room 3401, 400 7<sup>th</sup> Street SW, Washington, DC 20590 . (202) 289-0222x134 [FAX# (202) 289-7722] E: [srow@ite.org](mailto:srow@ite.org)

**DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

Mr. Robert T. Ryan, WRC-TV, NBC Television, 4001 Nebraska Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20016 (202) 885-5081 [FAX# (202) 885-4512] E: bob.ryan@nbc.com

Mr. John Toohey-Morales, CCM, President, ClimaData Corporation. Chief Meteorologist, NBC Telemundo. E: morales@climadata.com

Attachment 2

**Brief Report of the ad hoc Committee’s Deliberations**

The report, *Fair Weather – Effective Partnerships in Weather and Climate Services* (NRC, 2003), was commissioned by the National Weather Service for the purpose of obtaining advice and recommendations regarding the evolving roles of the public, private, and academic sectors in providing weather and climate services and products to users. *Fair Weather* contains a number of recommendations for reducing friction and enhancing partnerships among these sectors. The American Meteorological Society is specifically mentioned in Recommendation 3:

*The NWS and relevant academic, state, and private organizations should seek a neutral host, such as the American Meteorological Society, to provide a periodic dedicated venue for the weather enterprise as a whole to discuss issues related to the public-private partnership.*

The charge to the ad hoc Committee from the Executive Committee is to “*study the possible responses to Recommendation 3, seeking input from all of the various constituencies that make up the Society.*”

In its deliberations, the Committee came to realize that the Society must look beyond simply responding to Recommendation 3 of **Fair Weather**. The weather and climate enterprise is evolving rapidly and the Society must change as well to remain relevant and supportive of the discipline. Hence the recommendation made here goes well beyond the provision of new venues for discussion.

**Partnership versus Community.** *Fair Weather* makes numerous references to a “partnership” existing between the private, government, and academic sectors, the almost classical tripartite division of American meteorology. In this view, “private” has often been associated narrowly with commercial forecasting firms, while “government” has often been taken to mean the National Weather Service. In practice, the situation is much more complex than suggested by these narrow terms and a three-sector model. The private sector includes the media, equipment manufacturers, weather risk management companies, and others. “Government” includes more federal agencies than the National Weather Service and extends to state, local, and regional agencies as well. And the academic sector likewise is diverse, and growing more so.

The ad hoc committee believes it is important to recognize that today there exists in the U.S. a vibrant *weather and climate enterprise*. One part of this enterprise is the three sectors, which might be considered the *provider community*. However, this core is surrounded by and dependent upon a *user community*. In a simplistic sense, the provider community produces and delivers the weather and climate products and services employed by the user community to reduce risk to life and property and to enhance economic competitiveness.

## DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004

While partnerships do exist between the National Weather Service and a subset of private sector meteorological companies, this is only one of the many interconnections that exist. Accordingly, the ad hoc committee recommends that the Society use the word partnership sparingly and focus its efforts on enhancing the weather and climate enterprise understood in broad and inclusive terms. Such terms convey an image that is more encompassing and less weighted with business overtones than the word “partnership”.

**Neutrality – a Serious Issue for the AMS.** In the course of numerous teleconferences since its inception and from communications received from members of the provider community, it is clear that some members of that community do not perceive the Society as providing venues for frank, open, balanced discussion. There is the perception – strongly held by some -- that there are "working" relationships between the AMS and the NWS, and between the AMS and the academic sector, both to the detriment of the private sector.

To be effective and widely accepted, the actions the Society takes in response to Recommendation 3 must be seen as distinct and independent from the NWS response to other recommendations in *Fair Weather* and as providing tangible benefit to all members of the enterprise. While actions and initiatives undertaken by the Society in response to Recommendation 3 may have relevance and benefit to the NWS in responding to the other recommendations within the report, it is important that the Society's response not be interpreted as any endorsement of the NWS responses. The AMS can not be seen as directly advising or supporting the NWS as it deals with the concerns of the private sector.

It is important that the Society not place itself in the role of mediator, adjudicator, or negotiator for only one portion of the weather and climate enterprise with respect to another. The Society should not seek to become an industrial or trade association. Rather, the Society should remain a scientific and professional organization that works to strengthen both the provider and user communities and provides leadership to advance the entire weather and climate enterprise. Given the continuing evolution of the enterprise in recent years, such efforts have been an essential, fundamental mission of the Society. The main tools that the Society has for such purposes are related to initiating and fostering communication among parties. The Society should use its abilities to convene meetings to bring together individuals from all aspects of the weather and climate enterprise, and to disseminate material which enlightens and educates. In such endeavors, the Society's efforts must be perceived as open, balanced, and representative of all the various players/sectors in the weather enterprise. It is vital that the Society take a proactive, positive stance on issues or activities that help the weather and climate enterprise. To assure neutrality by the AMS, the ad hoc committee recommends certain explicit limitations in AMS activities.

Attachment 3

**Report on the Prototype Webcast**

As an experiment to demonstrate the feasibility of using technology to reach a broad audience that would not normally come to a short (half-day) meeting, the ad hoc Committee hosted the

**National Webcast Panel Discussion and Public Forum  
On the  
National Weather Service’s Proposed Policy on Partnerships in the Provision of  
Weather, Water, Climate and Related Environmental Information**

**14 April 2004**

On Wednesday, 14 April 2004, the AMS Ad hoc Committee on the Weather and Climate Enterprise hosted the Society’s first national web cast. The specific goals for the web cast were to 1) provide a public forum for comment on the proposed National Weather Service policy on partnerships in the provision of weather, water, climate and related environmental information; 2) educate participants on the details of the proposed NWS policy; and 3) encourage comments on the proposed policy. The committee also had an important parallel goal: demonstrate the viability of using technology such as web casting to reach a wide national audience in lieu of a traditional conference or workshop.

This event presented a three-hour panel discussion and public forum on the National Weather Service’s Proposed Policy on Partnerships in the Provision of Weather, Water, Climate and Related Environmental Information, a topic of great interest to many in the Society. The event was interactive. Several weeks before the webcast, the AMS established a website and invited interested individuals to register and submit questions to be considered by the panelists. During the web casts, arrangements had been made for viewers to submit questions to the panelists in near-real-time via e-mail.

The web cast format was selected in an effort to involve as many private sector meteorologists as possible. Since many private sector firms are small, it is often a challenge and a significant financial expense for individuals working in such firms to take off two or three days to make a trip to places such as Washington, D.C.,

The panelists, all members of the AMS Ad Hoc Committee on the Weather and Climate Enterprise, included:

- Dr. Elbert (Joe) Friday, AMS Past President
- Dr. John Snow, University of Oklahoma and ad hoc Committee chair
- Dr. Edward Johnson, Strategic Planning and Policy Office, National Weather Service

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

Mr. Steven Root, President & CEO, WeatherBank; Chair, Commercial Weather Services Association

Mr. Matthew Parker, Westinghouse Savannah River Company; President National Council of Industrial Meteorologists

Mr. John Toohey-Morales, NBC Telemundo; AMS Commissioner on Professional Affairs

Participants were asked, but not required, to register via the web site prior to the web cast. 152 registrations were received (not counting AMS staff). The breakout on the sector association of those registered, as indicated by the suffixes on their e-mail addresses is as follows

.com = 73  
.gov = 49  
.edu = 8  
.state.x.us = 4  
.net = 13  
.mil = 1  
.tv = 1  
.fr = 2  
.ca = 2

Registrants were asked to provide questions and comments regarding the topic of the web cast. These were provided to the presenters in advance of the web cast and were used to initiate the discussion at the start of the web cast.

During the event, the monitoring equipment of the contractor providing the web cast facilities indicated that the maximum number of hits was 532 hits, with a steady number of 260 (= number of individuals who watched the whole production). Numerous questions and comments were received through the course of the web cast, far too many for the panelists to address in real time.

### **Post Web Cast Activities**

Following the web cast, a copy of all the questions and comments that were received were forwarded to the National Weather Service for consideration in refining its draft policy statement.

An e-mail survey form was sent to all registrants. Fifty-nine individuals (with backgrounds distributed about the same as the registrants) responded to the survey and provided a wealth of information regarding both the topic and the web cast format. The full survey report is available on request.

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

### **Lessons Learned**

The web cast format is a viable way of reaching a significant number of individuals in all aspects of the weather and climate enterprise.

Production of the web cast is a very technical and complex matter. It was wise to use a well established contractor for this purpose. Even then, getting a panellist's slides synchronized with his presentation on camera and receiving e-mails for viewers were challenges. It will take several such events to work out all the bugs.

Three consecutive hours is too long. Two hours with a 10-minute intermission would be much better.

Presentations (PowerPoint's) need to be submitted in advance and posted to the web site; this might produce more formal registrants.

The web site is essential to secure information on who is watching.

Real time interactivity during the event is essential to maintaining viewer interest.

An opportunity for a rehearsal in the studio would have been helpful for the panellists.

A post web cast survey is essential to learn what went right, what went wrong from the perspective of the viewers, who see something quite different than those participating in the study.

**More information can be found at <http://www.ametsoc.org/adhocnrc/index.html>.**

### **Open Issue**

This web cast was provided free of charge. It is not clear if individuals would pay a nominal fee (say \$50 or \$75) to participate in a two- or three-hour event.

Attachment 4

**Report on the Community Summit**

To demonstrate the feasibility of the Commission Steering Committee, the ad hoc Committee hosted a “1<sup>st</sup> Community Summit” of key leaders from all across the weather and climate enterprise. The format of the meeting – fly into a central location, meet the afternoon and the following morning, then depart the following afternoon – was selected to minimize the time and costs required of attendees (and to minimize the impact on the AMS budget). This meeting served as a prototype both for meetings of the proposed Steering Committee and for those of the workshops discussed in Attachment 6.

Dr. Gary Rasmussen prepared the following summary:

***First Community Summit Held 27-28 July in Dallas; Discusses Steps Toward Establishment Of A North American Mesonet***

Professor John Snow, Chair of the AMS ad hoc Committee on the Weather and Climate Enterprise, convened the First AMS Community Summit with the primary goal of exploring how the Society and other groups can aid in the creation of the first truly comprehensive operational, North American Mesoscale meteorological, hydrologic, and oceanic network of land, river, and coastal zone surface observing stations. The goal of this North American Mesonet is to merge data from all existing operational surface observation networks, including many which are currently maintained by diverse public and private organizations, and which serve many distinct uses and users, into a single, comprehensive, integrated, operational, and possibly distributed database. The Summit began with a panel reviewing regional and national mesonet efforts, to include MesoWest, the Oklahoma Mesonet, the Weather Bug network, and plans for modernization of the National Cooperative Observer Network. A forthcoming report on a workshop on this subject was also previewed. Participants then spent an afternoon and the following morning discussing how to overcome the technical, scientific, and institutional barriers to the creation of a comprehensive operational North American Mesonet database.

A second important goal of the Summit was to demonstrate the feasibility and utility of establishing the proposed new AMS Weather and Climate Enterprise Commission to tackle important weather and climate problems, of which the North American Mesonet is a prime example. The Community Summit was attended by approximately 40 representatives of industry, government, academia, and end user communities such as Surface Transportation, Risk Management, and Hydrology. Assisting Dr. Snow (University of Oklahoma) in conducting the Summit were AMS President Susan Avery (University of Colorado), George Frederick (Vaisala), Ray Ban (The Weather Channel), Maria Pirone (AER), and Bob Plante (private consultant). Summit accomplishments include validation of community interest and identification of several "next step" action items (e.g.,

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

develop standards for metadata, create an online registry for networks and stations, and assemble a comprehensive collection of end user requirements).

### **Lessons Learned**

- Community leaders will turn out for short (24-hour, noon-to-noon) meeting at a central location, such as Dallas-Ft. Worth Airport or Chicago-O’Hare Airport. Note that all attendees paid their own travel expenses.
- Having a set of questions well framed in advance is essential.
- Having a proactive AMS staff member on site a day in advance is highly desirable. Given the short duration of the meeting and the fast pace, there is little opportunity to make corrections or adjustments in facilities once the meeting has begun.
- Having a professional facilitator and lead the meeting discussions and a full time recorder/reporter to record the discussions and cure ideas on paper is highly desirable.
- Society needs to be prepared for taking action immediately following the meeting, e.g., forming a committee to draft a new policy statement.
- Need to get a summit web site up in advance of the meeting and use it to report meeting outcomes.

**More information can be found at**

**[http://www.ametsoc.org/adhocnrc/summit\\_dallas2004/](http://www.ametsoc.org/adhocnrc/summit_dallas2004/)**.

### **Open Issue**

- Will individuals pay a registration fee to attend such meetings?

Attachment 5

## **Annual Partnership Topic**

### **Introduction**

The ad hoc committee has concluded:

**The AMS should adopt a number of activities focused on an “Annual Partnership Topic” as an important part of the Society’s response to the Fair Weather report. The annual study of a “partnership topic” will be the primary task of the Board on Enterprise Planning.**

This paper describes the overall plan recommended to AMS by the ad hoc committee to carry out an annual partnership topic.

### **Purpose**

The AMS annual partnership topic will focus attention of affected users and providers of weather and climate information, including government, private sector, and academic participants in the weather and climate enterprise, on a specific topic. The purpose of the annual partnership topic is to give all interested parties an opportunity to express their views on the selected topic, to summarize those views in a concise report, to identify consensus views on the topic when such consensus exists, to clarify differences of opinions when consensus does not exist, and to offer recommendations to AMS itself and to the enterprise as a whole based on the understanding of views gained throughout the year.

### **Topic Selection**

The AMS annual partnership topic will be selected based on nominations received by AMS during an annual open nomination period. The selection will be founded on published selection criteria (see Appendix A) and made by the Commission Steering Committee. Any party may submit a nomination for a topic, and all nominations will be available to all for comment.

### **Nominal Calendar of Events**

Annual Partnership Topic activities will follow a nominal calendar with a total duration of a bit less than three years, with most of the work focused over about 24 months: During the first year a topic will be selected, a Topic committee or working group established particular to the selected topic, and the activities associated with the topic organized. Each Topic committee will serve as a work group within the Board on Enterprise Planning. Year two will begin with framing the topic in a presentation at the

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

AMS annual meeting and continue with appropriate information and opinion gathering activities in various fora focused on the topic throughout the year. Year three will begin with a final presentation at the AMS annual meeting by the Topic committee which summarizes its activities and findings and provides a final opportunity for community input relevant to the topic. By the end of year three a final report, prepared by the Topic committee then reviewed by the Steering Committee and approved by the AMS Council, will be published. The table below summarizes this nominal calendar.

### Year One:

- Annual AMS Meeting – Issue call for nominations for annual partnership topic
- Spring – Open comment period on nominations for annual partnership topic
- Summer – Select topic, charge Topic committee
- Remainder of year – Topic committee organizes activities for Year Two

### Year Two:

- Annual AMS Meeting – Frame topic in presentation by Topic Committee
- Throughout the year – Conduct activities appropriate to topic

### Year Three:

- Annual AMS Meeting – Conduct summary session on topic
- Summer – Topic committee presents final report for review and approval
- Fall – Publish final report

Thus at any one time there will be three Topic committees active: one in the process of being formed and getting organized, one in the process of conducting activities appropriate to their specific topic, and one in the process of writing and publishing their report.

See Appendix B for the roles of the Planning Board and the Steering Committee in providing oversight for annual partnership topic activities.

See Appendix C for a sample charge.

### **Costs**

Annual Partnership Topic activities will require support for both direct costs (e.g. publication costs, staff costs and infrastructure costs for AMS for things such as email and web sites) and indirect costs (primarily travel and per diem). Indirect costs might be borne by the participants on the committee, but this will provide a disincentive for participation and may preclude some from participation altogether. Although the government might be able to provide support for the partnership activities of AMS, broadly defined, direct support for a specific annual partnership topic should be avoided since government sponsorship of the involved committees may well call into question whether the committees are being utilized to provide advice to the government and

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

therefore subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Direct sponsorship of an annual partnership topic by non-government sponsors may call into question the neutrality of the process.

3 Appendices to Attachment 5:

Appendix A: Annual Partnership Topic Selection Criteria

Appendix B: Roles of the Board on Enterprise Planning and the Commission Steering Committee in Annual Partnership Topic

Appendix C: Sample Charge to Annual Partnership Topic Committee

**Appendix A to Attachment 5**

**Annual Partnership Topic Selection Criteria**

The following criteria, listed in order of importance, will be applied when selecting an annual partnership topic:

1. Timeliness: The AMS annual partnership topic process takes approximately three years to complete from the time when nominations for a topic are presented through the “topic year” itself and finally through the preparation, approval, and publication of a final report. This timeline creates an important consideration for topic selection – the results of the AMS annual partnership topic activities must be relevant to the weather and climate enterprise in relation to this timeline. Topics which require results more rapidly than this will be rejected even if all other selection criteria are met, recognizing that other forms of consideration may be appropriate for a topic which fails this test. Topics which have much longer time frames than 3-5 years will be considered, but may be given lower rank with regard to timeliness.
2. Breadth: The AMS annual partnership topic will have broad impact and interest. The breadth of the topic will be judged on two factors: (1) Sectoral breadth in the sense that the topic is of concern to many private sector, academic, and government organizations of various kinds, and (2) disciplinary breadth in the sense that the topic is of concern to scientific, technological, policy, legal, and economic interests of various kinds. Sectoral breadth is more important than disciplinary breadth. Topics which are of broad interest to many kinds of government agencies (federal, state, local), many kinds of private sector organizations (both users and providers of weather and climate information) and many kinds of academic / research institutions will be favored over topics which are of narrow concern to a specific sector, e.g. to a single federal agency. Topics which have dimensions touching multiple disciplines will be favored over topics which have a primary focus in a single discipline, e.g. a specific technology.
3. Impact: Each topic will be judged on the basis of the impact it is expected to have on the weather and climate enterprise and on society as a whole. Impacts may be evaluated in tangible terms (e.g. the fraction of the U.S. and/or global economy affected) and/or intangible terms (e.g. potential legal and institutional effects).
4. Interest: To succeed as an AMS annual partnership topic, the Society must form an active and committed committee able to conduct the activities over a span of almost three years and must secure the interest of many participants to contribute their views on the topic. The “interest” selection criterion is based on an estimate of the likelihood of success in forming such a committee and in gaining multiple contributors to the topic.

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

5. Linkage: Potential linkage to other planned activities will be given some weight in topic selection. For example, a topic which is related to a planned activity by an organization other than AMS (e.g. the World Meteorological Organization) would be favored.

Note that annual partnership topic selection will neither favor nor avoid a topic based on whether the topic is considered controversial in the sense that diverse views on the topic are expected.

**Appendix B to Attachment 5**

**Roles of the Board on Enterprise Planning and the Commission Steering Committee in the Annual Partnership Topic**

Planning Board Functions: The Planning Board will perform the following functions:

1. Organize the Partnership Topic nomination process. Each year the Planning Board will issue a call for nominations, make the nominations public, and collect comments on the nominations.
2. Evaluate nominations. Each year the Planning Board will evaluate the nominations with respect to the selection criteria and prepare a report for the Steering Committee. This report will describe the nominations received, provide a “score” of each nomination with respect to the evaluation criteria, and include a draft charge for the associated committee which identifies parties willing to serve on the committee. In carrying out this function, the Planning Board has the authority to combine multiple nominations into a single topic, or to limit the scope of a nomination for practical considerations, e.g. to focus on an especially critical component of a broader nomination based on its judgment that the original nomination is “too big” for effective consideration.
3. Fill the committee. Once the annual partnership topic is selected and a final charge is developed by the Commission Steering Committee (see below), the Planning Board must identify parties willing to serve on the committee for the selected topic.
4. Review the report. Each year the Planning Board must review the report of the committee for the topic considered the previous year; in effect, the Planning Board serves as an “editorial board” for the report. The main functions of this review are to be sure the report’s contents reflect the scope of inquiry as defined by the charge to the committee, and the report accurately reflects significant minority views, if any, essential to the scope of inquiry.
5. Following its review of the report, the report will be submitted to the Steering Committee for final approval.

Analysis: The functions listed above have several important characteristics which affect the necessary makeup and structure of the Planning Board. The annual partnership topic selection criteria give great weight to the breadth of the topic itself. To evaluate, and potentially modify, the nominated topics, the Planning Board has to have broad representation both in the sense of sectors represented (government, private, academic, and users) and in the sense of disciplines represented (science, technology, policy, etc.). The selection among the nominated topics may be controversial, i.e. participants in the weather and climate enterprise as a whole may have strongly held and differing opinions with regard to nominated topics. In short, to successfully oversee the process, the Planning Board needs to be broadly representative of the weather and climate enterprise. In a similar vein, the review and approval of a report may also be controversial and thus requires a broadly representative oversight committee.

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

The Commission Steering Committee Functions: The Steering Committee will perform the following functions as regards the annual partnership topic:

1. Select the annual partnership topic. Based on the report from the Planning Board (see item 2 above), the Steering Committee will select an annual partnership topic for consideration the following year.
2. Finalize charge to committee. The Steering Committee will finalize the draft charge for the selected topic.
3. Approve final report. After the final report is submitted by the Planning Board, the Steering Committee has final approval authority. One purpose of obtaining Steering Committee approval is to assure the final report maintains the neutrality of the Society and honors the limitations on Commission activities established to assure this neutrality.

**Appendix C to Attachment 5**

**Sample Charge to Annual Partnership Topic Committee**

---

**Data Policy and Ownership Issues in the Weather and Climate Enterprise**

**Issue:**

The Federal government is the largest generator of the raw data utilized by the weather and climate enterprise. Taxpayer-funded observing systems from satellites, surface and airborne sensors, ocean sensors, and others provide the bulk of the input required for understanding and predicting the earth-ocean-atmosphere system. In the United States, the policy regarding dissemination of Federally-generated data is one of open and unrestricted access on an equitable basis to all, without copyright or other restrictions, at a price not to exceed the incremental cost of dissemination. These principles are enshrined in the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 USC Part 35, and OMB Circular Number A-130, “Management of Federal Information Resources.”

Increasingly, however, non-Federal partners in the weather and climate enterprise are investing in specialized or complementary observing systems. These include surface sensors operated by state and local governments, often highway departments; automated weather stations owned by private enterprises and academic institutions; radars operated by commercial television stations; and specialized sensing systems such as lightning detectors fielded by private enterprise. As technology advances and costs decline, private enterprises and academic institutions are likely to become increasingly involved with remote sensing systems, particularly satellites.

These non-Federal entities handle their data in a number of ways. Commercial enterprises need to generate financial return from their investments so they tend to charge fees and assert restrictions, primarily through contracts and licenses, aimed at achieving a reasonable return. At times they share some data openly, or without cost to particular users, out of public interest concerns or for promotional purposes. Academic and research institutions have a long history of open sharing of data, at least within their community; but are increasingly experimenting with commercial-style licensing methods as incentives to commercialize the results of academic research increase. State and local governments engage in a range of practices, many ad hoc and not clearly articulated in law or regulation, ranging from open and unrestricted access to commercial licensing schemes with many variations in between.

These varying practices raise issues whenever there is a need to aggregate data from varying sources for specific purposes. For example, the National Weather Service contracts for lightning data from a commercial firm and is not permitted to further disseminate the raw data, although the data becomes integrated into openly available

## DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004

transformative products such as forecasts and model outputs. Whenever such an approach is taken, three major issues arise:

Policy: How does the government make decisions as to when it is appropriate to agree to restrictions given the level of public interest in the particular data?

Operational: How can data with restrictions be effectively managed and assimilated in a technology environment designed to handle data without restrictions?

Political: Some complain that the Federal government has an obligation to share all data, and that entering into restrictive agreements undercuts this obligation.

The National Research Council report, “Resolving Conflicts Arising from the Privatization of Environmental Data,” (National Academy Press, 2002), examined this issue primarily from the standpoint of Federal and commercial actors. It recommended that:

**The practice of public funding for data collection and synthesis should continue, thereby focusing contributions of the private sector primarily on value-added distribution and specific observing systems.** ...The decision on public versus private funding should not be an ideological one. Rather, the choice of whether to acquire data or value-added products to meet government missions and mandates by direct funding or to purchase them through private-sector initiative must be based on sound analysis of the value of the information to the public good, likely market forces, revenues and costs. The government should not expect the commercial market to supply data or value-added products on a full and open basis. Thus, commercial data or information products meant specifically to meet public-sector needs should be purchased and wholly owned by the government and placed in the public domain.

The study did not examine these issues from the perspective of academic/research or state and local government data producers. Nor did it provide specific guidelines for determining under what circumstances the public interest would suggest that the Federal government purchase unrestricted rights to privately generated data, or invest taxpayer’s money in creating government-run systems which duplicate that data.

### Committee Charge

1. Examine the weather, climate and related environmental data dissemination practices of the public sector (including federal, state, and local governments), academic and research institutions, and private sector entities. Identify factors which may cause these practices to change.
2. Examine the interface between these sectors in the provision and use of weather, climate and related environmental information. Identify the barriers to effective

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

uses of such information which may arise from the differing practices of the sectors as well as existing practices which facilitate effective use.

3. Examine what kinds of restrictions, e.g. strict prohibitions on reuse versus restrictions on reuse limited in time or in kinds of uses, are essential to motivate private investment in observing systems; and which kinds of restrictions are most problematic for the academic/research sector.
4. Articulate criteria for determining circumstances when government purchase of less restricted rights to data generated by other sectors, or investment of taxpayer's money to create government-run systems which duplicate that data, would serve the public interest.
5. Make recommendations regarding how most effectively to coordinate the data gathering and dissemination functions and practices of the sectors.

### **Committee Membership**

[to be determined]

### **Committee Activities**

Period between committee formation up to first annual meeting

- Coordinate with AMS staff regarding annual meeting agenda; identify relevant meetings/activities for committee participation within AMS or elsewhere.
- Prepare and deliver presentation to frame the topic at the annual meeting.

Period after first annual meetings up to second annual meeting

- Gather information and views relevant to the topic.
- Prepare and deliver presentation at second annual meeting summarizing work performed.

Period after second annual meeting

- Prepare report. The report will describe the degree of consensus on its conclusions, and include minority views, if any, as appropriate.
- Submit to Board on Enterprise Planning.
- Revise as necessary and publish prior to third annual meeting.

Attachment 6

**Workshops on Partnership Development<sup>1</sup>  
Facilitated by AMS  
December 2003  
M. Pirone, R. Ban, R. Ryan**

Introduction.....	31
Purpose.....	31
Structure of the Workshop.....	32
Topic Selection.....	33
Costs.....	33
Board on Enterprise Communication.....	33
Summary.....	34

**Introduction**

Charged with the task of defining the AMS involvement as a “neutral host” for discussions concerning the Public-Private-Academic Partnership in Weather and Climate Services, this paper identifies one venue for furthering discussions specifically on short term concerns. This is not meant to be the only response to Recommendation #3<sup>2</sup> of *Fair Weather* but just one of a spectrum of venues which facilitate the discussions on all time scales.

**Purpose**

One of the more obvious culture differences between the three sectors is their perception of acceptable timescales when formulating plans and responding to concerns impacting their business environments. The Private Sector has the fastest pace in this race against time, quickly assessing the near term opportunities and revamping their strategic opportunities on a yearly basis. Ten years in the Private Sector’s horizon is beyond the ability to predict with any usable accuracy or skill. Five years is almost as difficult but is diligently attempted and re-evaluated constantly to adjust for changing market forces. In the other sectors, these time scales are reasonable for planning purposes because their business cultures have built in mechanisms that protect them from making what is considered “rash” decisions and puts them on the slower, more arduous yet thorough course to completion of their goals.

This being said, the partners in the weather enterprise need to have access to fora that relate to their business cultures in order to effectively make decisions for their respective organizations. Continuing education among the sectors on topics that are far reaching and very long range is very attractive to consider and implement. However, shorter term, concentrated discussions facilitated to promote understanding and bring

---

<sup>1</sup> This white paper was prepared early in the discussions of the ad hoc Committee. It is presented here in its original form. Consequently, some of the terminology in this white paper differs slightly from that adopted by the ad hoc Committee.

<sup>2</sup> Recommendation #3 states “The NWS and relevant academic, state, and private organizations should seek a neutral host, such as the American Meteorological Society, to provide a periodic, dedicated venue for the weather enterprise as a whole to discuss issues related to the public-private partnership.”

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

about acceptable solutions among the partners should be yet another goal of the AMS role. Giving people in the community adequate opportunity to address specific topics over a period of days in a cloistered environment, similar to a business planning exercise, is pivotal in bringing closure to these discussions. By day two or three, people are more comfortable with each other and begin to peel away the layers of perception that have become transparent walls, standing in the way of productive communication. Once these perceptions are corrected or minimized, true progress can be made. Over time, the length of time necessary to get to this point should shorten and this very valuable time can be spent dealing more effectively on the partnership.

In summary, the goals of the workshop are to:

- Foster interaction between the sectors, thereby mitigating misconceptions in the future.
- Encourage more meaningful discussion between the partners, focusing on topics of mutual interest and importance.
- Finding ways to more effectively work together towards closure on open issues
- Finding appropriate mechanisms to understand the potential impact of Public Sector strategies on the other two sectors and the user community.
- Discussing topics, which were originally identified as Annual Partnership Topics, but which have a short fuse to some part of them that needs to be addressed.
- Identifying topics to consider at future workshops, etc.
- Producing written transcripts of the events of the workshop to communicate openly to the entire community.

### **Structure of the Workshop**

Optimally, having two three-day workshops per year would be of great benefit to the community since the early stages of the partnership have more topics to address and goals to accomplish. However, it is unlikely that the partners can meet for two concentrated sessions in an already too full calendar. Therefore this proposal is to plan on one workshop in the first twelve months with the possibility of shortening its length to two and one half days and having them twice or more per year thereafter. A three day workshop actually becomes one full day of meetings with two half days at either end, allowing the remaining half days for travel.

The workshop should have representatives from all sectors and include user interests in the form of trade associations. The manageable number of people for these workshops depends on how many facilitators are available, however, more than sixty-five people in one room divided into groups of 8 is about all one might want to aim for. Beyond this number the interactions may begin to be more mechanical and detract from the goal of promoting interaction.

The community of interest for workshops may be narrow or broad depending on the focus of the specific workshop. Typically workshop participants will include some number of invited experts / participants thought by the workshop organizers to be key to the workshop topic, with the rest of the participants open to all. If the number of total participants needs to be limited for logistical reasons, open positions will be filled on a first-come, first-served basis.

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

The workshop would be a mix of plenary sessions and group breakout sessions where each group had representatives from each sector as best could be accommodated. Groups would report findings back to the plenary and a summary of the groups' findings would be compiled. Open discussion would be heavily promoted during all sessions. While facilitators for each group would be optimal, the cost of doing this might be prohibitive. To reduce costs, two professional facilitators could be contracted to run the plenary and provide oversight to the working groups. The working groups could assign leaders and scribes among the eight or so members. The facilitators would float to see that the groups were progressing according to schedule.

In addition to these working sessions, experts related to the topics could be brought in to present during the first half day and perhaps another group on day two. They would provide background information on technology, government regulations, industry updates, etc. which would be of benefit to the workshop topic discussions.

### **Topic Selection**

There should be strict definition of the types of topics discussed at the workshops. Without the proper topic, the workshop would become an open-ended forum with no purpose or finding. It may very well be that there are different types of contributors to the workshop venue than the other proposed venues. However, the workshop venue could merely be an extension of the other venues to get to the heart of a concern in a shorter timeframe. The characteristics are easily classified as-

- Broad interest across the partners – although each partner may see themselves in slightly different roles.
- Early enough in the process to have discussions that shape the outcome of the topic.
- “Post-mortem” on a decision that is currently impacting the sectors from which the sectors can generate “lessons learned” (without it becoming a gripe session—used for positive future planning instead).
- Emerging trends impacting the partnership over the next 12-18 months.

The same criteria developed for the Annual Partnership Topic should be defined for workshop topics- they include timeliness, breadth, impact, interest, and linkage.

### **Costs**

Costs for the facilitator, facility and conducting the workshop should be shared among the participants as a registration fee. Travel costs are the responsibility of the participant. Costs for speakers should be born by some funding mechanism developed by AMS or handled in the registration fee.

### **Board on Enterprise Communication**

The same AMS Board, the Board on Enterprise Communication, that “triages” topics for consideration for the Annual Partnership Topic should also consider the workshop venue as well. They would consider the timeframe for discussion and the expectation of the partners for having those discussions. Some topics may begin as Annual Partnership Topic's yet parts of them might require a workshop venue to move to closure. The Board on Enterprise Communication overseeing the partnership would have a process for setting up a workshop when this happens.

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

One might even suggest that there are three planning groups within this structure that are responsible for taking a topic through to completion via the appropriate mechanisms laid out by Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise. For example, the Commission recognizes that topic A needs to be handled as an Annual Partnership Topic and so they assign this task to the Enterprise Communication Board. Then maybe the Board decides that the Annual Partnership Topic has hit a road block and needs to address some of the Annual Partnership Topic sub-topics in a workshop. They could then hand off the sub-topic to a workshop sub-committee within Board and let them plan and execute it. The same could be said about “emergency topics”.

### **Summary**

One should consider the workshop as yet another venue within the spectrum of time-sensitive venues being considered by the partners. Key to making this happen is the structure that determines the proper venue for a particular topic and the ability of that structure (and its volunteer members) to make it happen. Rather than propose something that is too cumbersome to pull off, we need to keep in mind that the volunteers involved in making this happen will have a limited amount of time. Giving them tools like the variety of venues that are being considered might help them organize and execute more efficiently. The venues also become ‘topic driven’ not ‘time driven’.

Attachment 7

**Business Plan and Budget**

**Expenses of the Commission**

The expenses associated with the Commission will be in three categories:

- Events planned and conducted by the Commission, such as the April webcast, and including “community summit” meetings of the Commission Steering Committee<sup>1</sup>;
- Semi-annual meetings of the Commission itself;
- AMS staff support.

**Events Support.** In the first category, it is requested that the AMS contribute \$30K in the first year operations (2005) and \$50K per year thereafter from the Society’s normal operating budget. This will appear in the “Community Support” portion of the annual budget and five-year financial plan. The Commission will generate additional revenue through registration fees and sponsorships sufficient to cover the cost of events beyond the AMS contribution.

**Commission Support.** AMS supports the meetings and other activities of all of its Commissions as part of the cost of conducting the business of the Society. The new Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise should be supported in the same way. These costs are quite modest for all of the AMS Commissions, because most of their meetings occur at the AMS Annual Meeting where members of the commissions are present anyway. The only costs associated with those are from food and beverage service. Between Annual Meetings, the Commissions and their subsidiary boards and committees conduct their business by e-mail and teleconferences. The accumulated costs for supporting these activities amount to a few thousands of dollars each year, and for budget purposes are regarded as part of AMS’ overhead. The additional costs for a new Commission in this area should be easily accommodated in the same way.

**Staff Support.** It is estimated that 1-1.5 FTE will be required to support the new Commission. By reallocating duties within the existing staff, AMS can provide 1 + FTE without hiring additional personnel. It is proposed that the role of Dr. Gary Rasmussen, currently Private Sector Coordinator, will expand to provide the principal staff support for the new Commission. Dr. Rasmussen is already providing staff support for the Economic Development Committee, which will become the Board on Enterprise Economics and Development of the new Commission. Additional administrative support for Dr. Rasmussen can be provided by fractions of existing staff.

---

<sup>1</sup> The April webcast had at total cost of \$15,725. The July “community summit” had at total cost of \$6,974. In addition, the Society supported \$2,109 of related travel for these two events. These numbers do not reflect internal staff costs.

## DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004

Attachment 8

### Proposed Spin-up Timeline

Oct 04	AMS Council approves in principle the establishment of the Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise.
Oct/Dec 04	Report to Council posted on AMS web site for public comment.
Jan 05	Taking public comment into account, the Council formally establishes the Commission and Board on Enterprise Planning; Committee on Economic Development transferred to the Commission and re-designated as the Board on Enterprise Economics and Development. The following are appointed: Commissioner; Chair for Board on Enterprise Planning. At the AMS Annual Meeting, ad hoc Committee holds a town hall meeting to inform membership of establishment of the new Commission; ad hoc Committee then disestablished. Commission begins operation using preliminary terms of reference. Commission on Professional Affairs begins review of terms of reference for the Commission and its Boards.
Apr 05	AMS Executive Committee reviews tentative slate for positions on Commission Steering Committee (staggered terms) and Board on Enterprise Planning (staggered terms).
Jun/Jul 05	Organizational meeting of the Commission Steering Committee.
Oct 05	Council approves proposed slates for Commission Steering Committee and Board on Enterprise Planning.
Jan 06	Council receives first progress report (including preliminary terms of reference for Board on Enterprise Planning and Board on Enterprise Economics and Development), appoints Chair for Board on Enterprise Communication. Commissioner on Professional Affairs reports on modifications to terms of reference of its Boards. First regular meeting of Commission Steering Committee = 2 <sup>nd</sup> Community Summit.
Jun/Jul 06	Second regular meeting of Commission Steering Committee = 3 <sup>rd</sup> Community Summit
Oct 06	Council approves slate for positions on Board of Enterprise Communication and for first rotation on Commission Steering Committee and Board on Enterprise Planning. Council reviews, and approves final terms of reference for the Commission on the

## **DRAFT 7.2 – Report to AMS Council – October 2004**

Weather and Climate Enterprise and its Boards, as well as the Commission on Professional Affairs and its Boards.

Jan 07

Council receives second progress report. Commission on the Weather and Climate Enterprise is fully operational. Third regular meeting of the Commission Steering Committee = 4<sup>th</sup> Community Summit