

# TWG Report

## '06 Budget

- Key concepts - original budget process
  - A draft two-year budget would be provided to AMWG at winter meeting
  - Key planning/management docs would serve as foundation (and minimize need to discuss workplan)
    - CMP
    - Research Plan
    - LTEP
    - Strategic Science Plan
    - 2004 budget closeout
  - Draft budget to TWG by mid December

Fall high flow test interrupts completion of planning docs and '06/'07 budget

BAHG meets 12/7-8 makes recommendation to TWG:

- Next budget cycle would be a one year budget ('06)
- Use '05 as a foundation to simplify process
- Proposes revised '06 schedule and process
  - 12/10/04 – 1/24/05 GCMRC/BOR develop draft '06 budget (and '04 close out)
  - 1/24/2005 - '06 draft provided (TWG and bahg)
  - 2/1/2005 - bahg meets/recommends '06 budget
  - 2/2-3/2005 - TWG meets/reviews bahg rec
  - 2/16/2005 - Revised draft sent to AMWG
  - Conceptual level review (does it address AMWG priorities)

Mid Dec. - Secretary's Designee approves revised schedule

## Actual 2006 draft budget completion schedule:

- 1/26 – Budget provided TWG/Budget AHG (BAHG)
- 1/28 – BAHG meets/answers key questions
- 2/2-3 – TWG meets reviews BAHG evaluation - provides comments
- 2/4-17 – GCMRC makes changes and submits budget to AMWG
- 2/25 – TWG reviews answers to key questions

# 2006 Budget Conceptual Issues

1a Does the budget and workplan contain adequate information for the AMWG to determine whether the priorities identified at their August 2004 workshop were adequately considered in developing these products?

No – TWG requests the following:

- A table of MOs and projects to identify MOs addressed/not addressed
- A pie chart illustrating AMWG priorities
- Add a workplan section that specifically addresses AMWG priorities

1b Are the AMWG priorities identified in sufficient detail for the TWG to make these comparisons?

- Some uncertainty over what is contained in the AMWG priorities
- Provide a better connection between AMWG priorities and AMP MO/Ins

2. The budget is weighted heavily toward monitoring and contains very little funding for experiments. Are the reasons for this weighting adequately portrayed?

- Not clear why budget was weighted 95% towards monitoring
- GCMRC should explain rationale for distribution in workplan

3. Deliberations over allocation of the budget resulted in continuation of some projects, rejection of some projects, amalgamation of some projects, and development of some new projects. Are the thought processes that led to these decisions apparent? Are the pros and cons of projects compared adequately for you to be able to understand why some projects are proposed to be continued and some not?

- No
- GCMRC should provide the rationale for these decisions in the workplan, including the pros and cons

4. There are changes in budget figures as portrayed in the FY 06 budget sheet from those in FY 04 and FY 05 budgets passed by AMWG, including an identification of deficits in the previous years. Is it clear to you why these changes have occurred and what the implications of these changes are to the GCDAMP?

- GCMRC clarified this to some degree at the 2/2-3 TWG meeting (discussion with Denny Fenn). That discussion should be summarized in the workplan (pages 128-129).

5a. Does the FY 06 budget and workplan contain sufficient funding emphasis for synthesis of existing information and development of an ecosystem perspective?

- GCMRC could identify its reorganization to improve integration
- Tie its proposed projects to MOs
- Provide a section that ties together the multiple plans and reports either developed or in development, e.g. SCORE, Core Monitoring Plan, Long-term Experimental Plan, HBC Comprehensive Plan, etc.

5b. Do they adequately portray the connection between proposed FY 06 expenditures and the measurement of success or failure in meeting program management objectives and fulfilling information needs?

- No, however, these measures/targets are mostly not quantified in MOs
- TWG and GCMRC should recommend to AMWG a process to finally identify and quantify resource targets and metrics

6. The '06 AMP budget contains no funding for an experimental action

- Need guidance from AMWG

7. Upcoming budget cycle ('07/'08) uncertain

- Need to complete planning docs by July/August 2005
- Completion schedule brought to AMWG at its July meeting

Where do we go from here?

Proposed schedule for final '06 AMP budget

3/4 -17	GCMRC makes changes identified by TWG, BAHG, AMWG
3/18	GCMRC distributes revised work plan/budget to BAHG/ TWG
3/19 – 4/7	BAHG reviews the revised budget and work plan and consolidates comments
4//8	BAHG distributes consolidated comments to GCMRC/SA
4/11-14	SA reviews budget, work plan and BAHG comments and produces consolidated SA comments
4/15	SA distributes their consolidated comments to BAHG, TWG, GCMRC (and AMWG?)
4/11-21	GCMRC revises workplan/budget
4/22	GCMRC distributes revised work plan/budget and responses to comments to BAHG, TWG and SA
5/18 - 19	TWG discusses work plan/budget and makes recommendation for AMWG mailout (summer AMWG meeting)