

Dear Patricia

Thanks for circulating your report for comment. The team has covered a lot of ground in a very short time and appears to have captured the main issues between different system entities. The pros and cons of the five options are described well in the draft, including the need for greater representation of Centers in the Consortium governance and decision making processes. We do not wish to express any preference at this stage but look forward to the final version of the report. In further elaborating the report we would suggest:

- Clarify how options 5a and 5b would overcome some of the difficulties experienced in the arrangement in place prior to the reforms.
- Provide a summary of all options against the 7 characteristics stated on page 16 and how each option addresses the key issues highlighted in the MTR, including the issue of CO's dual role as a facilitator and regulator. Such a summary would build on the text already given under the individual sections of the report entitled "problems it would address and benefits it would produce" and provide a structured summary in one place.
- Clarify how the strengthened role of ISPC would work more effectively than the previous arrangement of the Science Council and Technical Advisory Committee, particularly in relation to priority setting with capacity across all three of the System level Outcomes of the SRF
- Clarify how this role of ISPC interplays with the science advice from the independent Steering Committees for the CRPs that have extensive experience in each of these areas.
- Make recommendations on how any of the more far reaching reform options would handle the transition to avoid disruption to the ongoing research through conflicting messaging or periods of uncertainty and hiatus.

Best regards
Jeremy and Don (IWMI)