NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Date 12/13/2013

Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Simon Szykman
FOR CLEARANCE OFFICER: Jennifer Jessup

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken action on your request received 10/31/2013

ACTION REQUESTED: Revision of a currently approved collection
TYPE OF REVIEW REQUESTED: Regular
ICR REFERENCE NUMBER: 201310-0648-008
AGENCY ICR TRACKING NUMBER:
TITLE: NOAA Constituent Engagement Survey
LIST OF INFORMATION COLLECTIONS: See next page

OMB ACTION: Approved without change
OMB CONTROL NUMBER: 0648-0615
The agency is required to display the OMB Control Number and inform respondents of its legal significance in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.5(b).

EXPIRATION DATE: 12/31/2016 DISCONTINUE DATE:

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS
Previous	650	217	0
New	325	81	0
Difference			
Change due to New Statute	0	0	0
Change due to Agency Discretion	-325	-109	0
Change due to Agency Adjustment	0	-27	0
Change due to PRA Violation	0	0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE:

OMB Authorizing Official: Dominic J. Mancini
Acting Deputy Administrator,
Office Of Information And Regulatory Affairs

List of ICs			
IC Title	Form No.	Form Name	CFR Citation
NOAA Sea Grant Constituent Engagement Survey	NA	NOAA Sea Grant Constituent Engagement Survey	

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

Please read the instructions before completing this form. For additional forms or assistance in completing this form, contact your agency's Paperwork Clearance Officer. Send two copies of this form, the collection instrument to be reviewed, the supporting statement, and any additional documentation to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503.

1. Agency/Subagency originating request
DOC/NOAA/OAR

2. OMB control number b. [✓] None
a. 0648 - 0615

3. Type of information collection (*check one*)
a. [ ] New Collection
b. [✓] Revision of a currently approved collection
c. [✔] Extension of a currently approved collection
d. [ ] Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
e. [ ] Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired
f. [ ] Existing collection in use without an OMB control number
For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions

4. Type of review requested (*check one*)
a. [✔] Regular submission
b. [ ] Emergency - Approval requested by ____/____/____
c. [ ] Delegated

5. Small entities
Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? [ ] Yes [✔] No

6. Requested expiration date
a. [✓] Three years from approval date b. [ ] Other Specify:____/____

7. Title NOAA Constituent Engagement Survey

8. Agency form number(s) (*if applicable*)

9. Keywords constituent engagement, accessibility, responsiveness, respect for partners

10. Abstract

This request is for revision and extension of a current information collection. NOAA supplies the nation with information, products and services that are essential public goods used in public and private sectors, science institutions and households around the world. Because NOAA's information, products and services are important to both the nation as a whole and to the daily lives of U.S. citizens, NOAA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) has identified a need for more effective two-way communication between its programs and the customers and clients it serves. This survey instrument will be used by the National Sea Grant College Program to obtain information used to assess NOAA's accessibility, responsiveness and respect for partners. These parameters are three of the seven parameters included in the Kellogg Engagement Test, which the SAB recommended NOAA use for assessing engagement with constituents. One objective of the survey is to collect responses to provide NOAA Sea Grant with information and feedback from its constituents that will lead to greater emphasis placed on the needs of NOAA Sea Grant partners, techniques to improve NOAA's products and services, and

11. Affected public (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"*)
a. x Individuals or households d. ___ Farms
b. x Business or other for-profit e. x Federal Government
c. x Not-for-profit institutions f. x State, Local or Tribal Government

12. Obligation to respond (*check one*)
a. [✔] Voluntary
b. [ ] Required to obtain or retain benefits
c. [ ] Mandatory

13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden
a. Number of respondents 325
b. Total annual responses 325
1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically 99 %
c. Total annual hours requested 81
d. Current OMB inventory 217
e. Difference -136
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change -109
2. Adjustment -27

14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (*in thousands of dollars*)
a. Total annualized capital/startup costs 0
b. Total annual costs (O&M) 0
c. Total annualized cost requested 0
d. Current OMB inventory 0
e. Difference 0
f. Explanation of difference
1. Program change
2. Adjustment

15. Purpose of information collection (*Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"*)
a. x Application for benefits e. P Program planning or management
b. x Program evaluation f. ___ Research
c. ___ General purpose statistics g. ___ Regulatory or compliance
d. ___ Audit

16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (*check all that apply*)
a. [ ] Recordkeeping b. [ ] Third party disclosure
c. [ ] Reporting
1. [ ] On occasion 2. [ ] Weekly 3. [ ] Monthly
4. [ ] Quarterly 5. [ ] Semi-annually 6. [✔] Annually
7. [ ] Biennially 8. [ ] Other (describe) ____

17. Statistical methods
Does this information collection employ statistical methods
[✔] Yes [ ] No

18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission)
Name: Dr. LaDon Swann
Phone: (228) 818-8843

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

On behalf of this Federal Agency, I certify that the collection of information encompassed by this request complies with 5 CFR 1320.9

NOTE: The text of 5 CFR 1320.9, and the related provisions of 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3), appear at the end of the instructions. *The certification is to be made with reference to those regulatory provisions as set forth in the instructions.*

The following is a summary of the topics, regarding the proposed collection of information, that the certification covers:

(a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;

(b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;

(c) It reduces burden on small entities;

(d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;

(e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;

(f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;

(g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):

- (i) Why the information is being collected;
- (ii) Use of information;
- (iii) Burden estimate;
- (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
- (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
- (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;

(h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);

(i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and

(j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

If you are unable to certify compliance with any of the provisions, identify the item below and explain the reason in Item 18 of the Supporting Statement.

Signature of Senior Official or designee	Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)	
Signature signed by Jeremy Warren, Acting OAR ACIO	Date 10/31/2013
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 Digitally signed by BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=OTHER, cn=BRABSON.SARAH.1365710488 Date: 2013.12.31 11:11:10 -05'00'	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
NOAA Constituent Engagement Survey
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0615

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary.

This supporting statement is for a request to revise and extend an existing NOAA engagement survey. The revision is a request by the NOAA National Sea Grant College Program , created by the Sea Grant Act, to extend the existing engagement survey (OMB Control No.0648-0615) for its use, focusing on Sea Grant engagement. The current engagement survey was developed because NOAA services, products and sciences are important to both the nation as a whole, and to the daily lives of US citizens. NOAA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) identified a need for more effective two-way communication between its programs and the customers and clients it serves. NOAA's National Sea Grant College Program invests in sustaining a two-way communication channel between its sponsored research and its customers through a robust constituent engagement program. The goal of Sea Grant's engagement program is to solve problems through university-based research, extension, outreach and education programs. Sea Grant regularly analyzes the way it engages with its constituents and the results of the engagement survey will provide information to form recommendations on ways to continually improve its two-way communication with customers. To achieve this goal, extension, outreach and education staff will use the previously approved engagement survey to assess Sea Grant's success in engaging with a cross section of its constituents. The survey instrument assesses NOAA Sea Grant's accessibility, responsiveness and respect for partners. The three engagement characteristics were identified by NOAA's SAB as three of seven engagement characteristics defined in the Kellogg Engagement Test[1] (an activity of the Kellogg Commission).

2. Explain how, by whom, how frequently, and for what purpose the information will be used. If the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support information that will be disseminated to the public, then explain how the collection complies with all applicable Information Quality Guidelines.

The information will be collected by Sea Grant programs to assess how well NOAA Sea Grant is meeting the needs of customers in terms of accessibility, responsiveness and respect for its partners. The survey instrument will be a tool available to Sea Grant for measuring how effectively Sea Grant engages its constituents. The survey instrument is flexible in design and could be used by other NOAA programs submitting similar requests to OMB. Results of the administered survey will provide NOAA Sea Grant with valuable information and feedback from its constituents that can lead to:

[1] The commission was charged not only with defining and bringing to public attention the kinds of changes occurring at public universities today, but with analyzing necessary reforms and suggesting ways to accomplish them and monitor the results. A series of reports document the commission's findings (http://www.aplu.org/page.aspx?pid=305).

- Techniques to improve NOAA Sea Grant's products, services, and information.
- Improved accessibility and responsiveness throughout NOAA.
- Greater emphasis on engagement with NOAA partners.
- Improved reputation among the public

The survey focuses on three of the seven characteristics of engagement as defined by the Kellogg's foundation work on university engagement. The three defining categories are accessibility, responsiveness and respect for partners. Volunteer participants who complete the survey are asked to respond to 24 questions divided unevenly among the three categories (Sections 2, 3 and 4) and 9 additional demographic questions. In the current survey, "Sea Grant" is appended after each reference to NOAA.

Accessibility

Based on the NOAA products, services and information you have identified, please rate NOAA's accessibility for each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
It was easy for me to locate NOAA products, services and information.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I was able to obtain the NOAA products, services and information I needed.	○	○	○	○	○	○
It was easy to find a NOAA employee to handle my request.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The NOAA product or information was easy to use.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA made it easy for me to learn what products, services and information were available.	○	○	○	○	○	○

What difficulties, if any, did you have accessing NOAA products, services and information, and how can NOAA improve accessibility?

Figure 1. A screen capture of the 6 accessibility survey questions.

Responsiveness

Based on your experiences with NOAA products, services and information you previously identified, please rate NOAA's responsiveness for each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
I was satisfied with the timeliness of NOAA's response to my request(s).	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA tried to meet my needs.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA's products, services and information met my needs.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA understood local and regional issues that are important to me.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA provided opportunities to give my input and feedback.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA was receptive to my input.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA let me know how they used my input.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA was adaptive in addressing emerging issues.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am confident in NOAA's ability to respond to my needs in a time of crisis.	○	○	○	○	○	○

What more can you say about the responsiveness of NOAA products, services and information, and how NOAA can improve its responsiveness?

Figure 2. A screen capture of the 10 responsiveness survey questions. The revised questions append Sea Grant after each reference to NOAA in the survey.

Respect for Partners

Based on your experiences with NOAA products, services and information you previously identified, please rate NOAA's respect for partners for each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
I was satisfied with the professionalism and courtesy of the NOAA staff who assisted me.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA understood my individual and/or organization's capabilities.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA respected my knowledge, skills and abilities.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA provided opportunities for collaboration.	○	○	○	○	○	○
I was satisfied with the level of collaboration with NOAA.	○	○	○	○	○	○
My input was reflected in NOAA's actions.	○	○	○	○	○	○
NOAA encouraged ongoing dialogue with me.	○	○	○	○	○	○

How can NOAA enhance and better leverage its partnership with you and/or your organization?

Figure 3. A screen capture of the 8 respect for partners survey questions. The revised questions append Sea Grant after each reference to NOAA in the survey.

NOAA's National Sea Grant College Program will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy and electronic information. See response to Question10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collected is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Individual responses will not be disseminated; summary results may be used in scientific, management, technical or general informational publications. Should NOAA Sea Grant College Program decide to disseminate the information, it will be subject to the quality control measures and pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology.

Primarily, respondents will be asked to complete the survey online through the web-based survey tool "Survey Monkey" (www.surveymonkey.com). Alternatively, a print version of the survey will be made available upon request, which can be returned by mail or facsimile.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

Through research, consultation with NOAA line offices and personal/professional experiences, it appears that there are no other efforts that duplicate the proposed questions. Guiding OMB approved survey documents were obtained and used as a reference in creating the survey instrument:

- Office of Management and Budget (OMB Control No.0648-0342) approved Quantitative Questions were used as a guideline for a table of specifications.
- A 2009 Office of Education survey regarding the Teacher at Sea Program was used as a guideline for questions pertaining to regions. This collection targeted the measurement of professional development programs, and is not a duplicate of the proposed collection.
- We are aware of a collection entitled the NOAA Awareness Study, OMB Control No. 0648-0574, conducted from 2008-11. The proposed collection herein differs in that he NOAA Awareness Study is focused on collecting information to assess the general public's understanding and awareness of NOAA and its programs. The proposed NOAA Engagement survey is designed to specifically measure NOAA accessibility, responsiveness and respect for partners in terms of two-way communications with customers.

5. If the collection of information involves small businesses or other small entities, describe the methods used to minimize burden.

The survey instrument will create minimal burden on small business owners because the survey is brief, taking 15minutes to complete. There are also no required questions to answer before going to the next question. The brevity of the survey is purposeful since NOAA Sea Grant College Programs seeks to repeat the survey over time to assess change.

6. Describe the consequences to the Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently.

If the collection were not conducted, NOAA's two-way communications with its constituents would remain unchanged or improve incrementally because of the lack of quantifiable input from constituents for the three constructs of this survey. Collection of constituent input as frequently as annually will allow NOAA to monitor improvements in constituent engagement through time.

7. Explain any special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

N/A.

8. Provide information on the PRA Federal Register Notice that solicited public comments on the information collection prior to this submission. Summarize the public comments received in response to that notice and describe the actions taken by the agency in response to those comments. Describe the efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

A Federal Register Notice published on August 12, 2013 (78 FR 48859) solicited public comments. None were received.

Since this survey was not implemented during the first three-year period – due to staff being unexpectedly occupied addressing Deepwater Horizon issues – we were not able to collect feedback from respondents, but we recently received feedback from three Sea Grant constituents (university scientist, representative of the tourism industry and county employee). Each person said the estimated response time was accurate and that they were pleased that Sea Grant plans to use the survey to improve how it engages with its customers.

9. Explain any decisions to provide payments or gifts to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

N/A.

10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy.

There will be no assurance of confidentiality; Summaries of responses will be used in as part of professional development programs for Sea Grant staff and on Sea Grant web sites.

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private.

N/A.

12. Provide an estimate in hours of the burden of the collection of information.

An estimated 325 respondents will spend 15 minutes answering the survey annually: 325 x 15 minutes/60 minutes, which is a total of 81.25 (81) burden hours/year to obtain the information from NOAA Sea Grant constituents.

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to the respondents or record-keepers resulting from the collection (excluding the value of the burden hours in Question 12 above).

There will be no reporting/recordkeeping costs to respondents. For those respondents replying by mail, postage-paid envelopes will be supplied.

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government.

The estimated annualized cost to the federal government to administer the survey and summarize the requests is $3,250 or $10 per completed survey.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments.

Program change: The responses and hourly burden have been changed to reflect current plans. This removes 325 respondents and responses, and 109 hours.

Adjustment: The response time has been changed from 20 minutes to 15 minutes, to be more accurate. This removes 27 hours.

16. For collections whose results will be published, outline the plans for tabulation and publication.

N/A. Individual results will not be published. Summary statistics will be made available to the Sea Grant network and NOAA to monitor changes in Sea Grant engagement.

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons why display would be inappropriate.

N/A.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

N/A.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
NOAA Engagement Survey Instrument
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0615

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g. establishments, State and local governmental units, households, or persons) in the universe and the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form. The tabulation must also include expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection has been conducted before, provide the actual response rate achieved.

Potential respondents are constituent groups located within any of the coastal and Great Lakes states with Sea Grant Programs. There are 32 Sea Grant Programs. The survey will be implemented by NOAA Sea Grant Programs. The desired response rate is 25% based on a 5-40% range for customer surveys. The estimated sample size for the 7 constituent groups to be sampled is provided in Table 1. Each group represents a cross section of the groups with which Sea Grant works. The higher the estimated sample, the more variability we expect within each group.

The survey approval came within months of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. As a result the necessary changes in job duties associated with responding to the spill, the survey was not administered; therefore we have no prior response rate.

Table 1. Seven Constituent Groups to be sampled: Estimated sample size and number of completed responses based on an estimated 25% response rate. The larger estimated samples indicate strata with larger populations.

Constituent Group	Estimated Sample	Estimated Number of Completed Surveys
Non-profit organizations	50	13
Other Federal Agencies	100	25
NOAA Partners	150	37
State and local governments	200	50
K-12 Education Professionals	200	50
Higher Education Professionals	200	50
Business and Industry	400	100
Total	1,300	325
Expected response rate	25%	

2. Describe the procedures for the collection, including: the statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection; the estimation procedure; the degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification; any unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures; and any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.

Since the sample population is divided into seven subgroups (see Question 1 above) that are more homogeneous as individual groups than as a whole population, we will use the seven strata identified in Part B, Question 1. Simple random sampling will then be used to obtain the expected sample size within each stratum. By using a stratified random sampling scheme we will be able to develop a weighted mean for strata with larger populations with which Sea Grant engages the most.

Email addresses will be collected over a period of 90 days. The email list will be drawn from databases maintained by individual Sea Grant programs and consists of constituents who previously used Sea Grant products or services. The survey instrument will be emailed to members in the subgroups identified in Question 1 above using a stratified sampling technique. As noted in the table above, more samples will be taken in subgroups that have more potential respondents (larger population).

3. Describe the methods used to maximize response rates and to deal with non-response. The accuracy and reliability of the information collected must be shown to be adequate for the intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided if they will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

We will send an email a few days prior to distributing the survey and inform the participant that they will receive the engagement survey shortly. The participant will receive the survey two to three days later. Three weeks later we will follow-up with an email thanking those who have completed the survey and ask non-respondents a final time to take the survey.

We will compare the types of constituent and demographic information of respondents and nonrespondents. If we observe a potential non-response bias, we will weight the responses accordingly.
The survey questions were developed using primarily a five-point Likert scale instead of open ended questions to maximize the response rate.

A workshop which included a panel of experts in social sciences was held with multiple follow-up conference calls to generate survey questions tailored to determine how well NOAA engages with constituents. This panel of experts addressed threats to content validity by developing a list of questions that when answered match outcomes and conditions identified in a table of specifications. The survey instrument was piloted with 9 non-NOAA constituents to determine question reliability and ease of use. A 0.8 Cronbach alpha for question reliability will be considered acceptable.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Tests are encouraged as effective means to refine collections, but if ten or more test respondents are involved OMB must give prior approval.

The survey was piloted by 9 non-federal employees serving on a NOAA Gulf of Mexico Regional Collaboration Team Engagement Working Group to check for functionality of survey instrument, ease of use and internal reliability. Based on feedback from the pilot respondents, minor revisions were made to the survey.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on the statistical aspects of the design, and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

Statistical methods and data analysis: LaDon Swann, Ph.D. (251) 64-5877 or ladon.swann@noaa.gov.

Survey administration; Sami Grimes , (301) 734-1073 or sami.grimes@noaa.gov.

Email announcing forthcoming Sea Grant engagement survey.

Dear Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Constituent:

The Sea Grant mission is to understand and predict changes in the Earth's environment and conserve and manage coastal and marine resources to meet our nation's economic, social and environmental needs. On (the date three days following this email) the Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium will release an online survey that will require no more than 15 minutes of your time. The survey is an ongoing evaluation program with a goal of improving the quality of Sea Grant's engagement with the public. Individual survey responses will be compiled in a summary of aggregated results and will be used to help Sea Grant improve its engagement with you and others who use Sea Grant products and services.

As always, we will keep your responses anonymous. We look forward to your participation. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,
LaDon Swann, Director
Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium
swanndl@auburn.edu
251-648-5877

Email releasing the Sea Grant engagement survey.

Dear Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Constituent:

The Sea Grant mission is to understand and predict changes in the Earth's environment and conserve and manage coastal and marine resources to meet our nation's economic, social and environmental needs. To improve the quality of Sea Grant's engagement with its customers we invite you to complete a short online survey.

The survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. Individual survey responses will be compiled in a summary of aggregated results and will be used to help Sea Grant improve its engagement with you.
The survey link is: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/SGengagement

As always, we will keep your responses anonymous. We appreciate your participation. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,
LaDon Swann, Director
Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium
swanndl@auburn.edu
251-648-5877

3 Week Reminder Email:

Dear Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Constituent:

Three week ago I sent you a request to complete an online survey to obtain your input on how well the Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium engages with its customers. Your participation in this survey is part of an ongoing program evaluation. Your input is important and this message is a final request for you to complete the survey at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/SGengagement

Individual survey responses will be compiled in a summary of aggregated results and will be used to help Sea Grant improve its engagement with you.

As always, we will keep your responses anonymous. We appreciate your participation. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,
LaDon Swann, Director
Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium
swanndl@auburn.edu
251-648-5877

Sea Grant Constituent Engagement Survey

Introduction

The **Sea Grant** mission is to understand and predict changes in the Earth's environment and conserve and manage coastal and marine resources to meet our nation's economic, social and environmental needs. To improve the quality of Sea Grant's engagement with the public we invite you to complete this survey based on your experiences with Sea Grant during the past two years. During this time period, Sea Grant has operated under the following four mission goal areas: ecosystems, climate, weather and water, and commerce and transportation. Individual survey responses will be compiled in a summary of aggregated results and will be used to help Sea Grant improve its engagement with you. The survey should take no more than 15-20 minutes to complete.

Do you use Sea Grant products, services and information?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Sea Grant Constituent Engagement Survey

Introduction

Think about your experiences with Sea Grant over the past two years. From the following topics, please identify how frequently you have interacted with a Sea Grant representative or used Sea Grant products, services and information (select all that apply)?

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Several Times a Year	Once a Year	Never
Charting	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Climate	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Coastal Communities	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Coasts	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Education	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Fisheries	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Geo-Spatial	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Habitats	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Oceans	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Outreach	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Research	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Satellites	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Weather	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Other (please specify)

Sea Grant Constituent Engagement Survey

Accessibility

Based on the Sea Grant products, services and information you have identified, please rate Sea Grant's accessibility for each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
It was easy for me to locate Sea Grant products, services and information.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I was able to obtain the Sea Grant products, services and information I needed.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
It was easy to find a Sea Grant employee to handle my request.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
The Sea Grant product or information was easy to use.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant made it easy for me to learn what products, services and information were available.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

What difficulties, if any, did you have accessing Sea Grant products, services and information, and how can Sea Grant improve accessibility?

Sea Grant Constituent Engagement Survey

Responsiveness

Based on your experiences with Sea Grant products, services and information you previously identified, please rate Sea Grant's responsiveness for each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
I was satisfied with the timeliness of Sea Grant's response to my request(s).	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant tried to meet my needs.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant's products, services and information met my needs.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant understood local and regional issues that are important to me.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant provided opportunities to give my input and feedback.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant was receptive to my input.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant let me know how they used my input.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant was adaptive in addressing emerging issues.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I am confident in Sea Grant's ability to respond to my needs in a time of crisis.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

What more can you say about the responsiveness of Sea Grant products, services and information, and how Sea Grant can improve its responsiveness?

Sea Grant Constituent Engagement Survey

Respect for Partners

Based on your experiences with Sea Grant products, services and information you previously identified, please rate Sea Grant's respect for partners for each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
I was satisfied with the professionalism and courtesy of the Sea Grant staff who assisted me.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant understood my individual and/or organization's capabilities.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant respected my knowledge, skills and abilities.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant provided opportunities for collaboration.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I was satisfied with the level of collaboration with Sea Grant.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
My input was reflected in Sea Grant's actions.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sea Grant encouraged ongoing dialogue with me.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

How can Sea Grant enhance and better leverage its partnership with you and/or your organization?

Sea Grant Constituent Engagement Survey

General Sea Grant Questions

How likely are you to suggest Sea Grant's products, services and information to others?

- ◯ Extremely Likely
- ◯ Likely
- ◯ Undecided
- ◯ Unlikely
- ◯ Extremely Unlikely
- ◯ N/A

What was your overall level of satisfaction with Sea Grant?

- ◯ Extremely Satisfied
- ◯ Satisfied
- ◯ Undecided
- ◯ Unsatisfied
- ◯ Extremely Unsatisfied
- ◯ N/A

What Sea Grant products, services and information did you use?

How could Sea Grant improve the products that most interest you or the products you are interested in but find challenging to use?

Do you have any other suggestions for improving Sea Grant's accessibility, responsiveness and respect for partners?

Sea Grant Constituent Engagement Survey

General Questions

Which best describes you? (Select only one response)

- ◯ Business/Industry
- ◯ Coastal Ecosystem Learning Center
- ◯ Coastal Zone Management
- ◯ Cooperative Institute
- ◯ Fishing, Commercial
- ◯ Fishing, Recreational
- ◯ K-12 Education
- ◯ Local Government
- ◯ National Estuarine Research Reserve
- ◯ National Estuary Program
- ◯ Other (please specify)
- ◯ News media
- ◯ Non-Governmental Organization
- ◯ Oil and Gas
- ◯ Other Federal Agency
- ◯ Ports and Harbors
- ◯ Private Citizen
- ◯ Retiree
- ◯ Sea Grant
- ◯ State Agency
- ◯ University faculty/staff

We may follow up with some respondents to obtain more information. May we contact you to follow up on this survey?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Would you like to see a copy of the results of this survey? If so, please provide your contact information below.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Your name and email address are requested but are not necessary for your response to be included.

Name:

Organization:

State:

ZIP/Postal Code:

Email Address:

Sea Grant Constituent Engagement Survey

Paperwork Reduction Act Information: In accordance with Executive Order 12862, the National Performance Review, and good management practices, Sea Grant offices seek to determine whether their customers are satisfied with the services and/or products they are receiving and whether they have suggestions as to how the services/products may be improved or made more useful. The information will be used to improve Sea Grant's products and services. Responses to this survey are completely voluntary. No confidentiality can be provided for responses, but you need not supply your name or address. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Sarah Brabson, CIO-PPA1, Station 9826, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910.

Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

Thank You

Thank you from Sea Grant. We value your opinion.

Referrals from political organizations and any documents containing references to partisan political activities (including political contributions) will be removed from an applicant's submission and not considered during the selection process.

Timeframe for Recruitment and Applications

Mission recruitment will be conducted in an open and public manner, including publication in the **Federal Register** (*http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr*), posting on ITA's business development mission calendar (*http://export.gov/trademissions*) and other Internet Web sites, press releases to general and trade media, direct mail, broadcast fax, notices by industry trade associations and other multiplier groups, and publicity at industry meetings, symposia, conferences, and trade shows.

Recruitment will begin immediately and conclude no later than Friday, September 13, 2013. The Department of Commerce will evaluate applications and inform applicants of selection decisions as soon as they are made. Applications received after the September 13th deadline will be considered only if space and scheduling constraints permit.

How to Apply:

Applications can be completed online or downloaded from the business development mission Web site (*http://export.gov/MexicoMission2013*). You may also request an application by contacting the Office of Business Liaison.

Contacts:

General Information and Applications: The Office of Business Liaison, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Room 5062, Washington, DC 20230, Tel: 202–482–1360, Fax: 202–482–4054, Email: *BusinessLiaison@doc.gov*.

Elnora Moye,

Trade Program Assistant.

[FR Doc. 2013–19391 Filed 8–9–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–FP–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; 2013 NOAA Engagement Survey Tool

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before October 11, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *JJessup@doc.gov*).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Sami Grimes, Director of Planning and Evaluation, NOAA National Sea Grant College Program, 301–734–1073 or *sami.grimes@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This request is for revision and extension of a current information collection. NOAA supplies the nation with information, products and services that are essential public goods used in public and private sectors, science institutions and households around the world. Because NOAA's information, products and services are important to both the nation as a whole and to the daily lives of U.S. citizens, NOAA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) has identified a need for more effective two-way communication between its programs and the customers and clients it serves. This survey instrument will be used by the National Sea Grant Program to obtain information used to assess NOAA's accessibility, responsiveness and respect for partners. These parameters are three of the seven parameters included in the Kellogg Engagement Test, which the SAB recommended NOAA use for assessing engagement with constituents. One objective of the survey is to collect responses to provide NOAA Sea Grant with information and feedback from its constituents that will lead to greater emphasis placed on the needs of NOAA Sea Grant partners, techniques to improve the products and services, and general improvement in the accessibility and responsiveness of NOAA Sea Grant to constituents.

Revision: The survey will be conducted by the Sea Grant Program rather than the Office of Education and the Gulf of Mexico Regional Collaboration Team, as it was originally.

II. Method of Collection

Primarily, respondents will be asked to complete the survey online through the web-based survey tool ''*Survey Monkey*'' (*www.surveymonkey.com*). Alternatively, a print version of the survey will be made available upon request, which can be returned by mail or facsimile.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648–0615.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission (revision and extension of a current information collection).

Affected Public: Non-profit institutions; Federal, State or local government; business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 3,000.

Estimated Time per Response: 15 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 750.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $50 in record keeping/reporting costs.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: August 6, 2013.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013–19408 Filed 8–9–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–KA–P