December 12, 2022 Translation Working Group Call

Attendees: Kira Sullivan Wiley, Alison Gerken, Cliff Duke, Michael Gerst, Dana Simon, Jody Peters, Chris Brown
Regrets: Jaime Ashander

Agenda

1. Announcements:
    a. Congratulations to Chris Brown on his retirement from NOAA!
    b. Poll for scheduling Jan-May monthly calls.
    c. RCN June 21-23, 2023 Unconference at NEON HQ Save the Date
        i. Bringing People Together to Do Forecasting: Training, Technology, Theory, and Translation
        ii. The goal of the Unconference is for participants to work together to produce a product such as getting a forecast up and running, developing teaching materials, finalizing tutorials, refining or creating tools, analyzing forecasts for a manuscript, and/or developing visualizations. The event will also include a poster session for attendees to present their research.
        iii. Space is limited to 50 people. Short application will be available Jan 1 and due Feb 1. Applicants will be notified Feb 15.
        iv. Travel funds will be available for >30, <50

2. Update and synthesis from the interviews and plans for pulling together the information and making plans for what to do
    a. Update on additional 5 people for interviews focus on academia and diversity across type of discipline, type of institution, etc
        i. Decided we have enough input from the people we interviewed at this point, so will continue to keep those 5 people in mind for future activities.
    b. Goal was identifying the big translation barriers and once identified then find the low hanging fruit that the group can address
    c. Synthesis
        i. Michael tried to organize what was shared into topics that could be a self-contained workshop or a manual or guidance document
        ii. Of the topics all were mentioned multiple times, except for point #7
            1. Point 1: It was difficult for themselves or their groups to have ecoforecasts as seen as useful or valid in the public sector. Provide some sort of greasing of the wheels. If stakeholders have idea of what they need or if a group approaches someone, ecoforecasting isn't a foreign concept
                a. Wonder if the External Advisory Board Melissa is building could provide input on this. A lot of people have raised the

profile of ecoforecasting in the academic community, but not sure about outside of academia

2. Point 2: Matchmaking to a social scientist. Then once matched, how to set up a multi-disciplinary project that is interesting for everyone. Set it up so people aren't tacked on at the end, but involved from the beginning. This meshes with what the DEI Working Group has been talking about in regards to barriers to including underrepresented people at the beginning of a project. NOAA has a new justice focus which may help with this.
    a. Could imagine a workshop on how to have multidisciplinary dialogues, plan ahead project planning
    b. Funding and timeline - feeling like you are involved in a meaningful idea. Drawing out key issues that came up in the co-production presentations held earliers
    c. Pitch meeting - bringing people together with not fully developed ideas. If they have a kernel of an idea, bring them together with social scientists, community members in the same room. How to get people together and have it go places, but need to have funding to get people actually working on projects that are funded. Have lower costs to participation.
        i. This will help relationships that come out of that can be more organic. Similar to what happens when meeting up with people at conferences. This happens in academia alot, but for people who are early career or in sectors outside of academia, it doesn't seem to happen as much.
        ii. How to put in a framework/structure to increase people's network. Think this will be a challenge, but will be worth doing it.
        iii. Have open mic for ecological forecasting on a particular topic
        iv. Branding - Kira got involved because she already knew people, thought she could find a place even if she didn't do ecoforeating. So think about how to advertise to reach out past ecoforecasting. To bring in new people who don't see themselves as ecoforecasters, but have the skills, expertise, connections for the other aspects needed for ecoforecasting
3. Point 3: Is co-production always the right answer?
    a. When you think you have a socially important problems, but the stakeholders you think should be interested, but they aren't

b. From NOAA perspective, initially started out with having the scientists come up with an answer, but over the past couple of years there has been much more of a users needs portion that is required. NOAA has been having the scientists and in some cases, NOAA employees working with users. If there are needs that users come up with, then that is what is pursued
c. Developing a decision tree or flowchart for how to take the exit ramp off the co-production highway so you don't contribute to stakeholder fatigue
d. Worthwhile asking if it is necessary all the time. Because we are all leaning towards co-production is something useful.
e. Cliff participated on a report about how to do co-production from when the Climate Science - it addressed how to do co-prodution, but didn't get to the question, is it always necessary to do co-production. The report might be a useful tee up for thinking about when and when not to do co-production.
f. Key consideration - when is my science or science to include co-production and when is it right when it is needed to address the costs of participating for users. Evaluate cost-benefit for what you are asking people to participate.
g. Stakeholders have different reasons for participating
h. For example, if NOAA is setting up and determining the stakeholders, then they should be able to share those relationships (not sure if the relationships are written down). If funded by tax payers, then the organization should advertise those relationship to the community so people aren't starting from scratch. If lists are available from organizations that are required to have thse types of interactions then it would provide
i. Co-production answer is something that could be considered for a grant - multi-case study proposal to tease out factors

iii. Point 4: how to set up and foster stakeholder relationships?
    1. Database of existing relationships discussed in the previous point could be useful here.

iv. Point 5: Understanding stakeholder decision making processes
    1. It was a forecasting project, but what the stakeholder really wanted was the monitoring

v. Point 6: Setting up project pipelines for continued operationalization
    1. Could put it under the broader headline of looking at the business side of ecological forecasting

2. Having model owners and funding and structure to continue to provide input/forecasts to stakeholders
3. Knowing who will take over the operationalizing. Owner pays for it. May be different than the advocate for it.
4. If people start using the forecast for their own means and then it goes away after the grant is done, then they get frustrated and have to look for the information elsewhere.

vi. Point 7: Making sure models and systems are documented and reusable
1. Scientists are not software engineer. What they produce is useful for the small research group, but may not be documented and useful for the broader community, so people are reinventing the wheel.
2. Should be a peer reviewed system in place to put out the forecast - in peer reviewed journals. Make sure the scientific validity behind the forecast is evaluated

d. What is missing from the list, do we need to do more interviews?
i. It is a comprehensive list that brings up things we hadn't thought of as the group
ii. One of the original reasons to do this was to inform our workplan.
iii. Next steps - evaluate interest in making progress on the points
iv. Point 7 - this fits with what the forecasting standards that the Standards working group has been working on. It also fits with the NSF workshop proposal the CI/Methods working group has been talking about.
v. Put together a data base where different types of information is available that everyone uses with forecasts is available (e.g., weather forecasts)

e. Next steps -
i. Can individually rank these to find what is of most interest to the group?
ii. Distribute this list to a bigger group to get feedback on what is needed
iii. Could send out a survey similar to what has been done
iv. Is this a Translation working group task or do we broaden it out?
1. Start within Translation
2. But be open to sending it more broadly.
v. Could use display criteria for the survey - allow people who are interested in a topic be part of discussing it, but not feel like they are the expert.
vi. Survey - shoot for mid-January

3. Notes Jody is keeping in for reference about the interviews from previous calls.
a. Targeted survey to gauge the translational needs of the EFI community - get a better handle on what the modelers/physical scientists needs are in terms of translational needs
i. Interview questions
ii. What will we do with the output?
1. Synthesize what we have heard that might lead to focus groups

2. Get to the bigger picture of what are the gap or needs across EFI
3. After synthesis - could do a webinar or Q&A. This is what we have heard. Bring in speakers on specific topics and use that as an opportunity to see what specific guidance for the community.
4. Have version 1.0, 2.0 - build on based on different interactions with broader EFI community

iii. Next steps from Sept call -

1. Do interviews in 10 person buckets
2. Focus on career stage dimension
3. Jody can help with Intro email
4. Mike will set up an interview with Chris to get started

4. Resources from previous calls
   a. Terms of Reference & Work Plan
   b. Cliff about National Academies workshops
      i. https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/workshops-to-support-epas-development-of-human-health-assessments-i-artificial-intelligence-and-open-data-practices-in-chemical-hazard-assessment-ii-triangulation-of-evidence-in-environmental-epidemiology
      ii. https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/workshops-to-support-development-of-epas-iris-toxicological-reviews
      iii. https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/workshop-on-federal-government-human-health-pfas-research