**Minutes of ESIP Call April 27, 2010**

**Participants**

Diane Gould (EPA), Gary Lines (EC), Hilary Neckles (USGS), and Kathryn Parlee (EC)

***0.5 hour has been added as in-kind for all participants.***

**1. Personnel changes**

Following greetings Gary Lines announced that after 35 years with Environment Canada he will be retiring in October. His last day will likely be around October 22. He's hoping that his replacement comes on board prior to that to help with continuity. He does not believe that participation in the Council and ESIP efforts will stop with his retirement.

**2. June Meeting and Agenda Timing**

The group on the call then discussed the 3rd Annual ESIP Steering Committee in Portland, Maine. Christine has reserved a room at the Gulf of Maine Research Institute (http://www.gmri.org/) for June 10. Recent discussions have slated the morning as a time for the ESIP Steering Committee to invite other Council Committee chairs to discuss possible interactions between the committees. The afternoon is then set aside for discussing ESIP items. Gary Lines stated that due to commitments he will not be able to participate in the afternoon. Christine mentioned that invited participants from other Council committees might not want to have an empty morning prior to the ESIP meeting, therefore she feels the morning agenda should remain the same. The group agreed with this approach.

**2. Framework for Fact Sheet Review**

The Steering Committee then discussed the framework for fact sheet review Christine had prepared. Hilary Neckles mentioned that the critical point for her in past work has been the review from users. Each time she has the end users review a fact sheet the materials have changed quite a lot. She also suggested that discussions with the Council Communication Team (Theresa Torrent-Ellis and Marilyn Webster) should come sooner in the process. She stated that it often becomes the case that scientists end up with "executive summaries" and if guidance could be provided earlier the process might result in a very different product. In general, the Steering Committee members on the call thought that the columns ("Data Providers", "Council Communication Team", "Users", and "Science/Steering Committee") should be arranged in order of preferred timing. The group thought an improved order would be "Steering Committee", "Council Communication Team", "Data Providers", and "Users". Christine agreed to make these changes. ***(Action to be taken: Christine will change the framework for review document).***

Christine also wondered about the questions to be asked of the various types of reviewers. The group did not think that it would be necessary to go over the questions via e-mail and thought that the following would succinctly achieve the answers needed by the subcommittees:

1. Data Providers: Is the data accurate?
2. Science/Steering Committee: Provide information on missing data and review technical details.
3. Users:

a. How relevant and useful is the information presented with respect to your current job?

b. How clear and understandable is the information as it is presented?

**3. Spotlight Proposal**

Christine then mentioned that David Keeley had asked that the Steering Committee discuss the proposal "core" that Christine had drafted and attached to the agenda. Unfortunately David was delayed on a trip South and couldn't participate. The group discussed some particulars of the proposal but thought it would be better to have a larger group participate. David had asked that the next Steering Committee call be moved earlier in May so that he would be able to participate and start getting the ball rolling with the proposal. The group agreed that the call could possibly be moved to May 10, May 11, or May 18.