

**Minutes of the  
SAON Board Meeting  
Helsinki, Finland, 10-11 April 2014**

**1. Opening of the meeting and introductions**

The SAON Chair, Tom Armstrong (AMAP), opened the meeting of the SAON Board at 13:00h on Thursday, 10th April 2014. He welcomed the participants noting that this was a busy week for everybody and that it was appreciated that the participants had spent their precious time on the Board meeting.

Tom Armstrong informed the Board that Helen Joseph had retired as Canadian national Board member and member of the Executive Committee (ExCom), and that David J. Scott (Canada) had taken over these responsibilities. Tom Armstrong had sent Helen Joseph a personal note and thanked her for the passion, energy and wisdom that she had brought into the SAON work.

The participants introduced themselves. The meeting adopted the agenda as proposed. The agenda is attached as Appendix 1 and the list of participants as Appendix 2.

**2. Actions and follow-up from the Vancouver Board meeting**

The SAON Secretary, Jan René Larsen (AMAP) went through the List of Actions from the Board meeting in Vancouver, noting that all actions had been met.

Tom Armstrong made reference to the SAON Terms of Reference (ToR), which states that "an external body will review SAON on a periodic basis to be determined by the SAON Board in consultation with the AC and IASC." This had been discussed at the Board meeting in Vancouver, and Tom Armstrong noted that a plan for this is needed at some point in time. He believed that when the ToRs were developed it was decided to evaluate SAON as the value starts to evolve. He also believed that this point in time had not come yet.

Jim Gamble (AIA) said that we are finally getting to this point. SAON is now doing more than just reporting back on the Tasks. SAON has provided value, but is not ready for an evaluation yet. It should be postponed until there is something to show from the Committees.

Erica Key (USA) stated that it might be worthwhile asking the Committees as the first thing to define activities that can be subject for evaluation.

Jackie M. Grebmeier (PAG) wanted a timeline for when this evaluation would take place, and this was decided as an action for the ExCom.

### **3. Relationship with Arctic Council – AMAP, CAFF and Arctic Council Scientific Cooperation Task Force**

Tom Armstrong explained that he had shared the plans for the reorganization of SAON with AMAP's Heads of Delegation at their meeting in Rovaniemi, Helsinki in February 2014. AMAP had welcomed this initiative. He also explained that the Arctic Council (AC) has established a Scientific Cooperation Task Force and that the Task Force had invited him to make a presentation at their meeting earlier in the week. Also the Task Force had expressed support for the work of SAON.

### **4. Relationship with IASC – Data Standing Committee and ICARP III**

Volker Rachold (IASC) explained that for IASC SAON is the main focal point for the cooperation with the AC. He provided information about the Third International Conference on Arctic Research Planning (ICARP III). ICARP III is a planning effort that that IASC undertakes with other organisations interested in Arctic science. It is a decadal process with 25-30 parties, including Working Groups of the AC and AC Permanent Participants. It is meant to be a roadmap for arctic research. He further discussed how SAON could feed into ICARP III, and that SAON could benefit from this work.

### **5. The International Polar Initiative (IPI)**

Volker Rachold provided information about IPI. This is a proposal for a long-term program, and he believed that SAON should consider how it can contribute. SAON should be aware that there will be a need for the type of observations that SAON can provide. It has to be planned carefully, learning from the International Polar Year.

### **6. The Belmont Forum call: Arctic Observing and Research for Sustainability**

Erica Key provided information about the Belmont Forum Call for Proposals on Arctic Observing and Research for Sustainability. The call is a subset of a global funding programme. It is based on a partnership model, and the process is still open for new partnerships. Partnerships need to be international, with at involvement of partners from at least three countries. The funding model is not 'a common pot', and each country specific funding organization funds projects within their countries fitting their mandate.

Mikko Strahlendorff (Finland) believed that SAON should investigate how it could connect to activities under this initiative. It could provide a fast track forward for documenting SAON benefits.

## **7. Introduction to the SAON Strategy**

### **7.1 Implementation of the SAON Strategy**

Tom Armstrong drew attention to the document “Implementation of the SAON Strategy” (doc. 11) and to the history of SAON. A group of founding fathers had formulated the initial vision of SAON and had developed the Tasks concept. In the past, a lot of time had been spent on discussing what the strategic goals of SAON should be. A lot of time had also been spent on putting together the ToRs so that it would fit the sponsors.

In the past, a lot of focus had also been put on the Tasks. What had become more and more obvious was that if SAON was taken away, this would not change what the Tasks are doing. They had not received any true value or welfare from being a Task. On the other hand, it has also not been clear so far if and how specific Tasks further the goals of SAON.

In the development of the SAON strategy the time was now ready to establish two Committees that would utilize the Tasks in such a way that they could provide coordinated value to SAON. The Committees are meant to have their own responsibilities for the development of the Committees, and their plans will be carried out through the Task. The Committees are meant to do coordination of existing projects and networks. It is important that there will be no redundancy, but that that work will build on existing things like the CAFF/CBMP indicator network. It is meant to leverage existing activities.

The Committee on Observations and Network (CON) will have two goals:

- Collection of data/information from Arctic social, economic, health and environmental sciences and observations, including permission to access geographical areas and platforms, and to present financial options for long term funding of platforms and operations.
- Establishment of a Circum-Arctic set of early warning indicators (an indicators network), focused initially on indicators of climate change that link to existing and ongoing Arctic assessments and provide the Arctic community with a status of the health of specific Arctic natural and human systems.

On the first goal, priority should be on access to geographical areas and platforms. On the second goal, this could be formulated as a circum-arctic ‘the canary in the coal mine’ thinking. As an example AMAP is currently conducting ‘Adaptation Actions for a Changing Arctic (AACA) and the Committee could consider how to be involved in this.

The Committee on Information and Data Services (CDIS) will also have two goals:

- Free and easy access to data and information.

- Integration and dissemination of data and information will be provided through a SAON-led Circum-Arctic Information System (CAIS).

The Committee should help the SAON Board to meet the first goal. The second goal is about an information system. This should not be a web site or a portal. It should be facility for the sharing and integrating of information. The Committee should also help to develop and promote the SAON metadata standards and QA protocols.

The existing Tasks have been preliminarily assigned to the two Committees. Other assets may come in and will be affiliated with the Committees. The Committees will also develop a process for how to bring in new Tasks into SAON.

Tom Armstrong explained that the Committees will be asked to develop their own detailed objectives and work plans. He noted that the work may require funding and human capital and Board members were invited to advocate for the resources necessary.

In the following discussion, Erica Key supported the principles outlined and noted that the value of this organization should be defined in terms of societal benefits and value added. She noted that the concept of Social Benefit Areas (SBAs) as defined by GEOSS (Group of Global Earth Observation System of Systems) right now does not speak to arctic needs. This is where SAON could be useful. SAON should work towards defining user needs in terms of societal benefits. She mentioned examples like tele-connections and food security where SAON could identify the data streams that can provide relevant information. If SAON could identify such gaps, this could also be of benefit to the AC.

Jim Gamble noted that AIA as a part of one of their projects, are now at the end of an observation series, and are starting a new. When it comes to the role of AIA in SAON, they saw themselves as a building block as well as an observer and consumer of data. The data are surveys and community based monitoring and with SAON's new focus on networks there would be lot of work that would be of interest. In the long term there is an interest in the continuation of networks and AIA could need help with getting a model in terms of sustainability and funding. In turn they can bring back information.

Takashi Kiyoura (Japan) explained that the mandate of GEO has been renewed and that the SBAs of GEOSS to be applied in the next decade are under discussion for. In general, the GEOSS SBAs are going forward towards UN goals, and SAON should avoid developing its own SBAs, but establish a dialogue with GEOSS.

Tom Armstrong noted that there is a dialogue ongoing with GEO.

Erica Key argued that there was a need for independent SBAs. As an example, she mentioned that one of the GEOSS SBAs is 'Water'. In an Arctic program, this would have very different meanings if 'water' was about fresh water or if it was about coastal protection. There was a need to define Arctic needs.

Eva Krüemmel (ICC) supported this view, noting that she had always been struggling with the term SBA, as it is not clear how they are defined and what exactly they refer to. There would be a need to specifically look at the people in the Arctic, what is important to them, and this cannot be determined at the global level. Arctic Indigenous peoples also need to be closely involved with the development of indicators of Arctic change.

David J. Scott noted that the previous interventions had reflected that the Committees should focus on arctic specific thinking and priorities. They need to base their work on Arctic expertise and this is a discussion that must take place in the Committees.

David Hik (SAON vice-Chair, IASC) said that it is important that the work is linked to other initiatives, like the World Economic Forum.

Erica Key noted that she chairs the US national interagency implementation team for the Arctic. She believed that it would be helpful if SAON works on the basis of SBAs. If SAON had SBAs the national programs could buy in to these, and this would provide cohesion.

Tom Armstrong said that SBAs could be a way to add value in several directions, but would require the input from the Board on what SBAs should be in order to have value. He gave the Secretariat the action to coordinate with the Committees that they establish a set of SBAs that can be discussed with the SAON Board. These should be brought back to the SAON board for review.

## **7.2 A more active engagement role for SAON / The SAON Results Bulletin**

Tom Armstrong introduced the agenda item by noting that communication and outreach are important activities for SAON.

David J. Scott introduced the documents “A more active Engagement role for SAON” (doc. 24) and “SAON Results Bulletin example” (doc. 25). He believed that there is a need to strengthen the public profile of SAON among decision makers. He had followed SAON for five years and said that there is a need to demonstrate the significance of the work in order to attract funding. There is a long way to go in terms of demonstrating the value of SAON, but one way could be to introduce a “SAON Results Bulletin”. The Bulletin should document that the sum is greater than the components and that there is an extra value that makes a difference.

There is currently a similar Canadian initiative, developed in cooperation with APECS. David J. Scott proposed that SAON followed this initiative and made a decision once there was more information about this. He emphasized the need for feeding SAON contents into existing channels, but also to remain true to the scientific background. The information should be compelling, but fact based.

Eva Kruemmel (ICC) said that care should be taken to communicate in the right way, and that there needs to be some sort of control about what is communicated. As an example of bad communication she mentioned the story about the spread of the cat parasite to belugas due to climate change which was featured in David Scott's communication example.

Halldór Jóhannsson (Arctic Portal) drew attention to the fact-sheets produced by the Arctic Information Center.

Tom Armstrong thanked Canada for putting resources into this initiative and agreed that SAON should consider setting up a pilot for SAON.

## **8. Establishing SAON Committees and**

## **9. Discussion about work plan for the SAON Committees**

Tom Armstrong described how intersessional work had been done for the forward movement of the Committees. The documents "Implementation of the SAON Strategy" (doc 11) and "Terms of Reference for the SAON Committees" (doc 12) had been approved at an earlier Board meeting and would require no further discussion.

The purpose of the agenda item was to establish the Committees and ask them to begin the development of a work plan, which could be brought back to the Board. Tom Armstrong asked the Board to be engaged early in outlining the work plan. He said that it would require intersessional work, and since the Board is dispersed geographically, the work will be through emails and less likely through phone calls. The process will be that the Board will be given a reasonable amount of time to review the material provided, but that operation will be under the assumption that if there is no response, this will mean approval. Tom Armstrong added that the outline of a work plan should also include a capacity evaluation. As an example it should describe the capacity needed to develop the Circum-Arctic Information System (CAIS).

The Board reviewed the list of nominees for the Committees (an updated version of doc. 27), and agreed to accommodate all the nominations, noting that this is a startup and that the Board members are welcome to add candidates. It was agreed to allow flexibility in the nomination and membership of the Committees, since this would allow continuity and the recycling of institutional knowledge. It was noted that China had nominated the same two candidates to both Committees, and the Secretariat was asked to clarify this.

Eva Kruemmel noted that there may be a need for establishing sub-Committees and from this perspective there is no reason to limit the number of people, since many people may be needed to accomplish the tasks given to the committees.

Nikolaj Bock (EEA) noted that the ToRs for the Committees prescribe that Board members and Task Leads should also have a seat in the Committees.

Tom Armstrong responded that the composition had been determined by the countries, and should be seen as interim.

Tom Christensen (Denmark) and Peter Pulsifer (Canada) were proposed as interim chairs for the CON and CDIS Committee, respectively. The SAON Secretariat was asked to contact them.

Erica Key wanted the Committees to prioritise the development of the SBAs, and was also interested in knowing how coordination across the Committees should be done?

Jan René Larsen responded that he would join both Committees and support their work, and suggested that this arrangement could ensure coordination, at least in the beginning.

Tom Armstrong proposed to continue to keep an option open, which would allow Board members to participate in the Committees. This would also ensure coordination.

Volker Rachold (IASC) informed the Board about the IASC Data Standing Committee, which has been established to ensure that IASC activities meet basic data standards. He had noted that there is some overlap with the CDIS and suggested that it should be considered how to connect the two committees. He believed that it would make sense to link the committees and and/or to merge them.

Tom Armstrong responded that there should be a SAON Committee, but that the same members could also be a part of the IASC Data Standing Committee. The aim of the SAON Committee is to identify the SAON goals, needs, and membership and to develop and an Arctic data community.

Mikko Strahlendorff proposed that a common plan should be developed. The committees may have different plans, but should end with a system. There may be different objectives, but the people may be the same, and there may be two different reporting routes. He believed that a sustaining network perspective may be different from the IASC perspective.

Erica Key believed that the important issue in the interaction with IASC is the value-added, which should be formulated in terms of information and data services. She offered that USA will provide candidate names, once the plans for the work are better developed.

Volker Rachold added that SAON does not have a data policy and that this should be the first thing for CDIS to look at. He believed that in a combined committee, it could be foreseen that certain task would only be of relevance to IASC. This could be solved by a sub-committee arrangement, and may be eased by the fact that IASC may also ask Peter Pulsifer to chair the IASC committee.

David Hik made reference to the outcome of the meeting of the Polar Data Forum, held in October 2013. Developments in the Forum are already moving ahead and this should be endorsed. He supported the idea that the two committees are combined.

Tom Armstrong summarized the discussion by noting that the ExCom will provide initial guidance to the Committees: The first thing to do will be to develop a work plan and this first plan will be a

modification to the existing work plan. In the plan, there should be timelines on products and deliverables for the short medium and long term. The plan should also hold statements about the resources needed. The Belmont Forum is one opportunity, but there is a need to think across countries and organisations. For the relationship with the IASC committee, an open dialogue on the resources and people needed will be established.

## **10. The future of current and coming SAON activities and initiatives**

The ExCom had asked the SAON Tasks to provide a status reports to the Board prior to the meeting. Nine Tasks had provided reports (doc. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22). In addition, the The Svalbard integrated Earth Observing System (SIOS) had submitted an application to be accepted as a SAON Task (doc. 3).

The Board discussed the role of the Tasks in relation with the Committees and Tom Armstrong expressed the view that the first thing to do would be to link the Tasks with the Committee structure. He believed that the Tasks are the reason why SAON should exist. SAON should integrate and disseminate data and information and the Tasks should be used as test beds for the ideas that will be developed in the Committees.

There should be a closer connection between Task and the Committees. One of the first things in the Committees work plan is to consider how the Tasks are relevant for their work plans. It was noted that some of the Tasks may not be relevant to the work of the Committees, and in this case there is no need for simple reporting from the Tasks. It should be known how the Tasks add to the work of the Committees and vice versa. At some point in time it will found that there are Tasks that are not relevant to either of the Committees. In that case the Task provides no value to SAON or the Committees or vise-versa and the Task should no longer report to SAON.

In addition, there should be a shift away from the concept of 'Tasks'. This should be driven by a set of criteria that will be developed within the Committees and the Tasks should align with these. The Committees should begin evaluating the existing Tasks, but the criteria will also apply to future Tasks. Tasks should provide benefit to the Committees. If a Task does not, this says nothing about the value or importance of the Task, but only of its relevance to SAON. As part of the paradigm shift, the term 'a SAON Task' will be abandoned, and the activities should be named 'SAON projects' or 'SAON networks'. The SAON 'building blocks' are now the Committees.

Mikko Strahlendorff pointed out that 'networks' and 'sustainability' are the key words in SAON. He believed that the CON Committee should focus on creating networks and finding a way to obtain sustainability for these

## **11. Review of Arctic Observing Summit 2014 and looking ahead to AOS 2016**



Peter Schlosser (ISAC) noted that the Arctic Observing Summit (AOS) was set up as an experiment, and that it had evolved into a success from the first to the second Summit. The Organising Committee (OC) had had three co-chairs, one from SAON, one from ISAC and one from the Local OC, and this is a model that is worth continuing. Another thing that was changed from the first and to the second Summit was that once the themes were identified, individual members of the OC were put in charge of these.

In terms of synthesis, the second Summit had better ideas about what to do and what to avoid. There is still a need to try to include key players in the synthesis of the Summit. Work should also be done on converting intention to cooperation and to put this into real action. In the longer term a better description of what AOS should be is needed. There is a need for providing more information between the Summit, and also to keep the momentum going between the Summits. This also applies to the continuity in the organizing units.

Eva Krüemmel believed that AOS had been particularly successful in bringing stakeholders together, and highlighted the importance of the indigenous representations. She believed that it had been fruitful to have representations from all the different stakeholders in the panel discussion: Indigenous peoples, scientists and the industry. SAON should be aware of the recommendations from the AOS and try to implement them.

Mikko Strahlendorff found that it will be useful to have a two year period before the next AOS, to allow for more time to organize the event. He believed that there is a need for intersessional activities, which could be web-based and used to build an arctic observing system.

Larry Hinzman will be responsible for organizing the next AOS and asked for strong inputs from SAON and ISAC. He wanted themes and visions to be formulated, both for the coming Summit, but also a vision that could establish a trend for the 2018 and 2020 Summits.

Tom Armstrong told the Board that he had just completed the US 'National Climate Assessment', and that the lessons learnt from the assessment was that the moment you end the current assessment, you should start the next. SAON should be prepared to start thinking of the pragmatic, low hanging fruits that can be harvested. He did not see the AOS as just being an outreach tool, but it could also provide feedback to the SAON Committees.

Lars-Otto Reiersen (AMAP) believed that AOS had been successful. He also believed that SAON and AOS should be aware of their niches. It should be to combine indigenous people, science, and politicians. Further, he believed that SAON needs funding and that the Belmont Forum may be a way to identify funds.

David J. Scott believed that SAON is an umbrella for already structured activities. SAON is the 'magical glue' that make connections and make things happen. The work of the Committees will be to establish those connections and link the components.

Erica Key said that the branding of AOS should also be the branding of SAON. There should be focus on how others can feed into AOS and SAON, not just Tasks. She believed that ArcticHub could be a platform for this.

Jim Gamble believed that SAON could act as a two way street where organizations like AIA that work at the community level can inform the networks which comprise SAON what communities see as important factors for observation, but also that SAON can act as a conduit to let organizations like AIA know what data networks are missing, so that perhaps there could be focus on this in their the ground research. AIA will submit the CONAS project as a proposal for a SAON Task.

Halldór Jóhannsson believed that it is very important to try to simplify SAON. SAON should be a facilitator mechanism, and marketing is important. He drew again attention to the fact-sheets produced by the Arctic Information Center as an example of information that can be pulled in.

Vito Vitale (Italy) said that one of the main expectations to SAON is that it can raise the voice of the communities in order to secure sustained funding.

Takashi Kiyoura (Japan) said that Belmont Forum should play not only as CRA funder but also as catalyst which stimulate national funding in wider sense. SAON can contribute this process with sharing information.

Tom Armstrong responded that this should be the purpose of the CON Committee. It should formulate a strategy for the communication with the political level. Earlier on there had been discussions about the Belmont Forum, and hopefully this initiative could be relevant. There were some concern about the duration of the funding since it is short-term, and should not be a substitute for a long-term sustained monitoring effort.

He emphasized the importance of internal and external communication as well as the branding of SAON. One of the important things needed for a communication strategy is a common way of talking about SAON. The structure and function of SAON is still under development and a communication strategy and branding will be the focus of the work in the ExCom. ExCom will seek to identify assets, systems, and human resources who can assist with this, especially when it comes to communications. The Board was asked to be prepared to provide volunteers as resources for this.

Jackie M. Grebmeier suggested that highlight results from some of the SAON networks should be fed into the next AOS.

## **12. Any other business**

(None)

### **13. End of meeting**

Tom Armstrong closed the meeting at 15:00h on Friday, 11th April 2014 and thanked the Board members for their participation.

# Appendix 1: Agenda

## Meeting of the SAON Board Helsinki, Finland, 10-11th April 2014

### Thursday (Sykloni meeting room in Dynamicum building (Kumpula campus))

13:00-13:15

1. Opening of the meeting and short introductions around the table

13:15-13:45

2. Actions and follow-up from the Vancouver Board meeting
3. Relationship with Arctic Council – AMAP, CAFF and Arctic Council Scientific Cooperation Task Force
4. Relationship with IASC – Data Standing Committee and ICARP III
5. The International Polar Initiative
6. The Belmont Forum call: Arctic Observing and Research for Sustainability

13:45-14:15

7. Introduction to the SAON Strategy

*Comment: The SAON Strategy was approved at the meeting of the Board on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2014.*

14:15-15:30

8. Establishing SAON Committees

*Comment: The Terms of Reference for the two Committees was approved at the meeting of the Board on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2014. The meeting should focus on establishing the membership of the two Committees, based on nominations made prior to the meeting.*

15:30-16:00: Break

16:00-16:30

9. Continuing discussion about work plan for the SAON Committees

16:30-17:30

10. The future of current and coming SAON activities and initiatives

*Comment: The Board members are invited to review existing SAON activities ('Tasks') and provide their views on how individual activities support the SAON strategy.*

**Friday (Auditorium III in the Helsinki University Main building (City center))**

14:00-14:30

11. Review of Arctic Observing Summit 2014 and looking ahead to AOS 2016

14:30-15:00

12. Any other business, including possibilities for new SAON funding, SAON communications efforts, etc

15:00-15:15

13. End of meeting

## Appendix 2: List of Participants

Affiliation	Country	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Phone	Fax	e-mail
<b>Chairmanship</b>								
AMAP, Chair	USA	Thomas	Armstrong	US Global Change Research Program Executive Office of the President	1717 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Suite 250 Washington DC 20006	+1 202 419 3460	+1 202 223 3065	tarmstrong@usgcrp.gov
IASC, Vice-Chair	Canada	David	Hik	University of Alberta Biological Science	Z 1007 Biological Sciences Edmonton, AB T6G 2E9	+1 780 492 9878	+1 780 492 0493	dhik@ualberta.ca
<b>Countries</b>								
Canada	Canada	David J.	Scott	Canadian Polar Commission		+1 613 943 8605		davidj.scott@polarcom.gc.ca
Finland	Finland	Rautio	Pasi	Finnish Forest Research Institute (METLA) Rovaniemi Research Unit	P.O.Box 16 FIN-96301 Rovaniemi	+358 50 391 4045		pasi.rautio@metla.fi
Finland	Finland	Mikko	Strahlendorff	Finnish Meteorological Institute				mikko.strahlendorff@fmi.fi
Germany	Germany	Nicole	Biebow	Alfred-Wegener-Institut für Polar- und Meeresforschung	Am Handelshafen 12 GE-27570 Bermerhaven	+49 471 4831 1011		Nicole.Biebow@awi.de
Iceland	Iceland	Thorsteinn	Gunnarsson	RANNÍS The Icelandic Centre for Research	Borgir við Norðurslóð 600 Akureyri	+354 460 8519		thorsteinng@rannis.is
Italy	Italy	Vito	Vitale	Institute of Atmospheric Sciences and Climate (ISAC)	Via Gobetti 101 40129 Bologna	+39 051 639 9595	+39 051 639 9652	v.vitale@isac.cnr.it

Affiliation	Country	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Phone	Fax	e-mail
Japan	Japan	Tetsuo	Ohata	Northern Hemisphere Cryosphere Program Research Institute for Global Change Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology & National Institute of Polar Research	Natsushima-cho 2-15 Yokosuka Kanagawa 237-0061	+81 46 867 9250	+81 46 867 9437	ohatat@jamstec.go.jp
Japan	Japan	Hiroyuki	Enomoto	National Institute of Polar Research (NIPR) Arctic Environmental Research Center (AERC)	10-3 Midori-cho Tachikawa-shi Tokyo, 190-8518	+81 42 512 0644	+81 42 528 3195	enomoto.hiroyuki@nipr.ac.jp
Japan	Japan	Takashi	Kiyoura	Ocean and Earth Division, Research and Development Bureau, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT)	3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 100-8959	+81 67344442		<a href="mailto:tkiyoura@mext.go.jp">tkiyoura@mext.go.jp</a>
Korea	Korea	Byong-Kwon	Park	Korea Institute of Ocean Science & Technology	707 Haeanro, Ansan 426-744 Korea	+ 82 10 3467 1261	+ 82 31 400 6587	bkpark@kiost.ac
Korea	Korea	Yoo Kyung	Lee	Arctic Research Center Korea Polar Research Institute (KOPRI)	26, Songdomirae-ro Yeonsu-gu Incheon, 406-840	+82 32 760 5530	+82 32 760 5509	<a href="mailto:yklee@kopri.re.kr">yklee@kopri.re.kr</a>
Korea	Korea	Eun Jung	Sohn	Ministry of Oceans & Fisheries				sonenjung@korea.kr
Norway	Norway	Birgit	Njåstad	Norwegian Polar	Fram Centre NO-9296	+4777750636	+47 77 75 05 01	<a href="mailto:Birgit.njastad@npolar.no">Birgit.njastad@npolar.no</a>

Affiliation	Country	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Phone	Fax	e-mail
				Institute	Tromsø			
Poland	Poland	Agnieszka	Beszczyńska-Möller	Institute of Oceanology PAS Physical Oceanography Dept.	Powst. Warszawy 55 81- 712 Sopot	+48 58 7311914		abesz@iopan.gda.pl
Russia	Russia	Igor	Ashik	Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute Department of International Science Cooperation	38, Bering str., St. Petersburg, 199397	+7 812 337-31- 47	+7 812	ashik@aari.ru
Spain	Spain	Oscar	Bermudez	National Polar Data Center (IGME)	Rios Rasza 23, 28003- Madrid	+34 913495889		d.bermudez@igme.es
Sweden	Sweden	Ulf	Jonsell	The Swedish Polar Research Secretariat	P.O. Box 50005 S-104 05 Stockholm	+46 8 450 25 13  Cell: +46 70 228 64 49		<a href="mailto:ulf.jonsell@polar.se">ulf.jonsell@polar.se</a>
USA	USA	Erica L.	Key	National Science Foundation	4201 Wilson Blvd Arlington, VA 22230	+1 703 292 8029	+1 703 292 9082	ekey@nsf.gov
<b>Arctic Council Permanent Participants</b>								
AIA	USA	James	Gamble	Aleut International Association	333 West 4th Ave., Suite. 301 Anchorage, AK 99501	Voice:+1 907- 33- ALEUT(3325388)	+1 907 332 5380	aia@alaska.net
ICC	Canada	Eva	Kruemmel	Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC)	Suite 1001 75 Albert Street Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5E7	+1 613 563 26 42	+1 613 565 30 89	EKruemmel@inuitcircumpolar.com
<b>Organisations</b>								
AMAP	Norway	Lars-Otto	Reiersen	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat	Gaustadalléen 21 N-0349 Oslo	+47 21 08 04 81	+47 21 08 04 85	Lars- otto.reiersen@amap.no



Affiliation	Country	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Phone	Fax	e-mail
AMAP	Norway	Jan René	Larsen	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat	Gaustadalléen 21 N-0349 Oslo	+45 23 61 81 77		jan.rene.larsen@amap.no
Arctic Portal	Iceland	Halldór	Jóhannsson	Arctic Portal	Skipagata 12 - 600 Akureyri	+354 461 2800 /Gsm + 354 899 2828		halldor@arcticportal.org
EC (European Commission)	Belgium	Franz	Immler	European Commission DG Research & Innovation I4	CDMA 03/130 B-1049 Brussels/Belgium	+32 229-55436		franz.immler@ec.europa.eu
EEA	Denmark	Nikolaj	Bock	European Environment Agency	Kongens Nytorv 6 DK-1050 Copenhagen	+45 29 65 25 48	+45 33 36 72 72	Nikolaj.Bock@eea.europa.eu
GEO	Switzerland	Yubao	Qiu	GEO - Group on Earth Observations	7 bis, avenue de la Paix Case postale 2300 CH-1211 Geneva 2	+41 22 730 8505	+41 22 730 8520	yqiu@geosec.org
IASC	Germany	Volker	Rachold	IASC Secretariat	Telegrafenberg A43 14473 Potsdam	+49 331 288 2212	+49 331 288 2215	volker.rachold@iasc.info or: iasc@iasc.info
IPA	Germany	Karina	Schollaen	International Permafrost Association-Alfred Wegener Institute Helmholtz Centre for Polar and Marine Research	Telegrafenberg A43 Potsdam 14473	+49 331 288 2217	+49- 331 288 2188	Karina.Schollaen@awi.de
IPA	USA	Vladimir	Romanovsky	University of Alaska	P.O. Box 750109, Fairbanks, AK, 99775	+1-907-474- 7459		veromanovsky@alaska.edu
ISAC	USA	Peter	Schlosser	International Study of Arctic Change c/o The Earth Institute	405 Low Library, MC 4335 535 West 116th Street New York, NY 10027	+1 845 365 8707 (8737)	+1 845 365 8176	schlosser@ldeo.columbia.edu

Affiliation	Country	First name	Last name	Institute name	Mailing address	Phone	Fax	e-mail
				Columbia University				
NSF	USA	Falkner	Kelly					kfalkner@nsf.gov
PAG	USA	Jackie M.	Grebmeier	Chesapeake Biological Laboratory University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science	P.O. Box 38, 146 Williams St., Solomons, MD 20688 ph., fax	+1 410 326 7334	+1 410 326 7302	<a href="mailto:jgrebmei@umces.edu">jgrebmei@umces.edu</a>
WMO	Switzerland	Raymond	Le Bris	World Meteorological Organization	7 bis, Avenue de la Paix, Case Postale 2300 1211, Geneva			rlebris@wmo.int

### Appendix 3: Meeting documents

Agenda Item		Document No	Document Title	Document author
		01	<u>Invitation</u>	Executive Committee
1	Opening of the meeting	23	<u>Draft agenda (3APR2014)</u>	Executive Committee
		19	<u>Draft List of Participants (2APR2014)</u>	Secretariat
2	Actions and follow-up from the Vancouver Board meeting		<u>Board Meeting Minutes 29APR2013 (Vancouver)</u>	Secretariat
		10	<u>Board Meeting Minutes 6MAR2014 (Teleconference)</u>	Secretariat
6	The Belmont Forum		<u>The Belmont Forum call: Arctic Observing and Research for Sustainability</u>	Belmont Forum
7	The SAON Strategy	11	<u>Implementation of the SAON Strategy</u>	Board
		24	<u>A more active Engagement role for SAON</u>	David J. Scott
		25	<u>SAON Results Bulletin example</u>	David J. Scott
8	The SAON Committees	12	<u>Terms of Reference for the SAON Committees</u>	Board
		27	<u>Nominations for Committee membership (07APR2014)</u>	Secretariat
10	The future of current and coming SAON activities and initiatives: New initiatives	03	<u>SIOS Task Proposal</u>	SIOS

10	The future of current and coming SAON activities and initiatives: Ongoing initiatives	04	<u>Circumpolar Health Observatory</u>	Kue Young
		05	<u>Distributed Biological Observatory (DBO)</u>	Jacqueline M. Grebmeier
		06	<u>Arctic Marine Biodiversity Monitoring Plan (CAFF/CBMP)</u>	Mike Gill
		07	<u>IPA workshop on data user requirements definition for permafrost observing GTN-P</u>	Georg Schwamborn
		15	<u>GTN-P database report 2014</u>	Vladimir Romanovsky
		09	<u>WMO Contribution to the Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks (SAON) through the WMO Rolling Review of Requirements</u>	Etienne Charpentier
		14	<u>Arctic Ocean Structure</u>	Gleb Panteleev
		16	<u>An International Review of Community-Based Monitoring in the Context of Sustaining Arctic Observing</u>	Noor Johnson, Eva Krümmel
		21	<u>Sharing and integrating environmental information to support a coherent Arctic knowledge and evidence base (Revised EEA Task proposal)</u>	Nikolaj Bock
		22	<u>Sharing and integrating environmental information to support a coherent Arctic knowledge and evidence base (Progress report 31MAR2014)</u>	Nikolaj Bock
		20	<u>Coordination of metadatabases (Progress report 07APR2014)</u>	Jan René Larsen

## Appendix 4: Action list

No	Action	Who
1	Define a timeline for when the evaluation of SAON will take place.	ExCom
2	Nominate members for the Committees	Board
3	Contact the proposed interim Committee chairs	Secretariat
4	Develop guidance to the Committees on the development of work plans, priorities and resource allocation. Prepare statements on the anticipated length of service for the Committee chair and members.	ExCom
5	Coordinate with the Committees that they establish a set of SBAs and that these are brought back to the SAON board for review.	Excom
6	Clarify the fact that China has nominated the same two candidates to both Committees	Secretariat