Draft response to GEO Program Board

[*This is the proposal for a structure of the response to the GEO Program Board. Text in italics is from the letter from the Program Board from 17th September*]

1. GEOSS

*[One of the criteria for accepting an initiative into the GWP is having “sufficient resources to achieve the stated goals”. Since it is stated in Section 7.1 of the proposal that “The pan-Arctic Observing System ... being coordinated by SAON includes a comprehensive data system”, the Board requests clarification on what “integration as a regional GEOSS node” would entail and what value it adds. Moreover, the proposal needs to detail the strategy, resourcing and success criteria for establishing an ArcticGEOSS. Contact information for the parties responsible for implementing and operating ArcticGEOSS, as well as the procedures that will be put in place to ensure Initiative progress should be provided]*

2. The relationship between SAON and GEOCRI

*[A clearer explanation and rationale for a new GEO Initiative in needed.*

*In particular, the Program Board wishes to learn about the ways in which GEOCRI is currently unable to support SAON’s goals, and why Arctic GEOSS would benefit from being a stand-alone Initiative]*

3. Financing the SAON Secretariat, including repository for project deliverables (SAON Objective 1.5)

*[Another major concern is the uncertainty and apparent low priority of the infrastructure element referenced in Objective 1.5 of the Implementation Plan: “Develop a long-term repository for relevant project deliverables – establishment of ArcticGEOSS”, which is given “Low” urgency, “None” regarding relationship with international/other organisations and resourced through the SAON Secretariat, funding for which is sought under Objective 3.3: “Secure funding for international SAON secretariat and operational costs”]*