**Board Response to CoCom Questions 6/16/2014**

**CoCom: Issues requiring discussion by CoCom and/or the BoD:** CoCom has compiled the following program-specific requests for Board discussion at the upcoming meeting.

1. IS,GSN,PASC,POLAR: Using GSN and PASSCAL managers to cover Polar responsibilities remains an issue, exacerbated by resignation of PASSCAL PM. CoCom recommends that IRIS redouble its efforts to fill this position as a very high priority. **IRIS management working with the BoD has restructured staffing within the IS directorate. Within IS, there will be a Portable Instrument Manager who is responsible for both PASSCAL (including FA) and Polar activities.  A more junior level staff person will work with and support the Portable Instrument Manager.  The GSN Program Manager will be a full time position. Kent Anderson has accepted the position of Portable Instrument Manager. We have initiated a search for a new GSN Manager and the junior level assistant for the Portable Instrument Manager.  We expect this recruitment process to take up to 3 months.  In the interim, Kent will continue in his present role as GSN Manager and PLR coordinator while Bob Woodward will continue to temporarily assume the duties of the PASSCAL Manager.**
2. PASC: encourages quick action to replace the PASSCAL Program Manager. **see #1 above**
3. DS: wishes to remind the Board that funding constraints are having deleterious effects on core operations including abandoning support for key software (rdseed, evalresp and jWeed), inhibiting the ability to sustain the hardware infrastructure and restricting the ability to take on needed projects (e.g. re-indexing the archive to improve web services access). **The Board recognizes support problems stemming from funding constraints. It is important going forward for the Board to understand the impacts of level funding on core IRIS activities. The broader issue is that IRIS is likely to see level funding for the duration of SAGE, well below the original budget in the SAGE proposal. Significant rescoping will be required from all programs, likely reducing the number of things that IRIS does while prioritizing tasks to identify those that are truly highest priority. For rescoping to be successful, it will involve assessment of workload, costs, and impacts of all elements within each program. The Board welcomes feedback from Committees to help identify those highest priority tasks, and encourages programs to prioritize maintaining and enhancing data quality and open access to the facilities. The Board asks all Committees to develop a process and make recommendations for scope management for their respective programs, for review by the Fall 2014 Board Meeting.**
4. DS: is concerned about open-ended expectations for undersupported new data ingestions, including CEUSN, potential industry data (e.g., Sweetwater), Regional Network Data, Infrasound, Hydroacoustic, and derived products such as velocity models. **The BoD requests that a new policy be established for developing Impact Statements for new data sources or program commitments. The motivation is a concern that new commitments or initiatives may have budgetary and human resource impacts; particularly, that new data sources and derived data products create a strain on DS resources. However, impacts of new initiatives could extend across all of IRIS. Initially, IS and DS should work together on impact statements for the new data streams related to CEUSN data, potential industry data (such as from Sweetwater), regional network data, and infrasound and hydroacoustic data. In addition, the DMS should prepare an impact statement for the generation and archival of new data products such as synthetic seismograms and velocity models.**
5. EPO: What role does the CoCom/Board think EPO should play in assisting other IRIS programs? **The Board encourages coordination between the various service directorates. The recent joint hire of a Project Associate between IS and EPO is an example of such coordination.**
6. EPO: How should EPO coordinate any approaches for industry funding with the Board? **The Board requests that the EPO SC develop a short summary (< 1 page) of the ways in which the program manager and/or SC members plan to approach potential industry funders.  The Board will review the summary and respond.**
7. EPO: seeks Board approval for choice for open position on EPO Standing Committee **Approved in the Consent Agenda**
8. EPO Board Awareness Items: an RFP is to be released for faculty to apply for funds to create undergraduate resources; EPO intends to engage a consultant to assist in creating an EPO facility assessment plan as required in SAGE Year 1. **Noted.**
9. GSN: nothing left to cut but personnel; UCSD is underfunded for field operations and losing personnel with impact on data quality. **The Board acknowledges the severe stress that level budgets have placed on GSN operations, and the importance of UCSD field operations to the program success. IRIS should emphasize data quality goals such as these in scope management processes. The broader context of level budget impacts is addressed in Item 3.**
10. PASC: Report to CoCom includes summary of New Technology Report recommendations requested by Board. Sustainability Report will be presented separately. **Noted.**
11. PASC: has communicated with NSF on pool-related issues related to FA/PASC merger and RAMP reimbursement (see Report). **IRIS management will follow-up with Greg Anderson to resolve these issues and report back to PASSCAL.**
12. PASC: has formed an Instrumentation Subcommittee to formulate specifications for decommissioning difficult-to-repair instruments. **Noted.**
13. PASC: concern that instrument commitments are made up to 5 years ahead of experiment demobilization, which can lead to a mismatch between level of commitment to PI’s and resources, which have declined. Examples include FA experiments funded prior to SAGE but deploying now, and experiments soon to be funded that extend past 2018. How can this be managed? **IRIS management will follow-up with Greg Anderson to discuss these issues and report back to PASSCAL.**
14. **PASC**:  The level of data support by the PIC under SAGE has not yet been resolved.  At full SAGE budget, it was proposed to extend FA-level support to all projects, but that funding level was not reached.  A particular issue are the 13 experiments that were funded pre-SAGE as EarthScope FA experiments, for which resources for FA-level data support may be lacking. **The Board acknowledges uncertainty in the level of data support arising from cuts to the original SAGE budget, and the cost of maintaining such support. The broader issue of rescoping under level funding is covered in Item 3. Data availability and access are high priorities. Any reduction in data support could degrade the final data product and have adverse impact on many users beyond the PI’s of experiments, and such broader long-term use of PASSCAL data forms an important component to the justification for the facility. The specific issue of the 13 transitional experiments are covered under Items 11 and 13, through interactions with NSF regarding use of the Instrument Pool.**
15. Polar: requests help and ideas to secure base funding for Artic activities similar to what has been provided by the Antarctic. **The Board understands that this is a problem and supports the goal of formalizing base funding for Arctic activities. This is a management issue. The Board encourages the SMT to work with the Portable Instrument Program Managers to continue conversations with NSF about this.**
16. TA: seeks guidance in managing overlapping awards and funding of SAGE in increments as these greatly add to administrative load and subawardee budget confusion. CEUSN-USArray-SAGE overlap has been particularly difficult to manage. **This is a management issue. The Board encourages the TA Program Manager to work with the SMT to deal with these complexities.**
17. CoCom: Some programs expressed concern that committees are not being populated by a broad enough spectrum of the community. Should there be an open call for candidates? **The Board agrees. We will initiate a process starting this fall to incorporate an open call for candidates for various IRIS committees.**
18. CoCom: Scope management, priorities and new activities. How do we manage work load and retain quality and balance the desire to undertake new activities? In addition to the text from Geoff (which is excellent), we could add: **The broader issue of rescoping to operate under level budgets is addressed in Item 3. To undertake new activities in a constrained funding environment requires identifying efficiencies, letting existing activities go, and/or identifying new resources. The Board recognizes that current operations are efficient so that for the most part, taking on new activities means letting something go or finding new resources. New activities need to be prioritized, the potential benefits of new activities need to be weighed against current ones, and we need to look to diversify our funding base. In reaffirming the essential role of SC in IRIS governance we encourage the SC to build into their committee deliberations a regular process to review/set priorities, align resources with these priorities, and to assess performance and effectiveness. The Board also welcomes committee input on new opportunities to broaden our funding base.**