



Meeting of the SAON Executive Committee	
When	21st January 2019, 16-17 CET / 10-11 AM EST
Venue	Teleconference
Participants	Allen Pope (Allen), Eva Kruemmel, Hannele Savela (Hannele), Jan Rene Larsen (Jan), Lisa Loseto (Lisa), Sandy Starkweather (Sandy)
Apologies	Thorsteinn Gunnarsson
Meeting notes	Jan Rene Larsen

#### Agenda:

1. Outcome of earlier SAON Board meetings:
  - a. ArcticGEOSS process
  - b. G3 Task Force ([Meeting notes from meeting 12<sup>th</sup> November](#))
2. SAON Board meeting 13th February. [Draft agenda and meeting documents](#)
3. SAON on the SAO meeting agenda 12-14 March. Documents must be submitted by 12<sup>th</sup> February.
4. Physical Board meeting: The ASSW 2019 will be held in Arkhangelsk, Russia on 22-30 May 2019
5. With the upcoming H2020 calls and parallel activities in Canada and USA, is it time to more formally engage in a dialogue with Asian partners on resource mobilisation
6. Circulating ESA call dialogues
7. Time slots for regular Executive meetings. It is currently third Monday every month 16-17 CET / 10-11 am EST.

## **Minutes:**

### Ad 1. Outcome of earlier SAON Board meetings

This topic was covered under agenda item 2.

### Ad 2. SAON Board meeting 13th February

#### Agenda item: SAON Strategy and Implementation Plan

Board members had been given specific guidance on how to prepare for this agenda item. Board members had been asked to answer specific questions with regards to SAON Objectives 1.1 and 1.3.

It was agreed to put the five questions into a Word document template and ask the countries to provide answers to these in advance. The instructions on how to fill in the questions would be on the top of the document with the formulations of the objective. The contribution should be no more than two pages and to the point

#### Agenda item: G3 Task Force

The Board has been asked to review and change or close the mandate of the Task Force.

Sandy proposed that group could be evaluated in the light of a meeting held at the recent AGU. The meeting had looked at the roadmap proposed in the CON objectives, particularly vis-à-vis the implementation and optimization remit of the Arctic Observing Summit. One of the things that emerged is that *roadmap* can mean different things; it would be good to be able to define what a useful roadmap for SAON would be. This could potentially be engaging funders. Having a group that could convene and develop a target definition for SAON as a whole could be useful. This could be based on examples from other communities. The recommendation that came out of the meeting was that members of the G3 Task Force participate in a broader road map task force together with members of both SAON committees. Members of the G3 Task Force could focus on the definitions in such a setting.

Hannele proposed a process similar to the ongoing data planning process initiated by the ADC. Through such a process, SAON would establish a roadmap panel consisting of SAON member but also with other initiatives and organizations like INTAROS. The panel should define the characteristics of such a roadmap.

Sandy agreed that part of the success ADC is that they have engaged with a broad community and they find ways to meet in person. One of the hopes of the AOS group would be to be able to meet more frequently and have a broader reach. The broader reach should also be about bringing more people into the SAON conversation but also making sure that SAON is well aligned with for example INTAROS.

Hannele: Such an initiative could also be embedded into the upcoming H2020 ArcticGEOSS call. It could be a work package in that.

Sandy: This alignment between H2020 and US funds that are currently being explored through for instance *Navigating the New Arctic* programme could be of relevance. If there is a mentality on cooperatively moving towards common goals under the context of SAON then something important will have been accomplished. A brief report will come out of the AGU discussion; it will have focus on a better definition of

a roadmap and it could be a useful task for the G3 Task Force to work on as a starting point. At the coming meeting of the G3 Task Force meeting, members could either decide if all want to continue meeting as one body or if a subset would want to take on board this wider task; this decision could then be taken forward to the Board. For the agenda for the coming Board meeting, the questions for the countries under the implementation agenda item could be expanded also with a question like “What would be a useful working definition of this roadmap” or “what should be roadmap include from the standpoint of your national funding bodies”. Moreover, the agenda item should read ‘National activities that should be brought into better coordination that are relevant for the roadmap’; this could also generate better participation in CON.

Hannele: This is a dialogue: ‘What can the national activities contribute to the roadmaps?’ and ‘How can the roadmap serve national activities?’ We should utilize existing definitions; this will also engage existing partners into the dialogue.

Sandy: Yes, we do not want to develop a definition that is out of sync with what the national activities are already doing. The example is that EU-PolarNet has a working definition of a road map; INTAROS has a definition; would national or multinational activities have a definition? US AON is working on a definition. It would be relevant to establish some kind of correspondence.

#### Agenda item: ArcticGEOSS process

Jan summarized the situation with regards to the ArcticGEOSS process: Attilio Gambardella, Mikko Strahlendorff and Jan had updated the response to the GEO Programme Board after the SAON Board meeting 9<sup>th</sup> December, and the text was now out for review among Board members. He explained that SAON had also been invited to submit a contribution to the GEO Work Programme 2020-22. The deadline for this would be 15<sup>th</sup> February 2019.

#### Ad 3. SAON on the SAO meeting agenda in March

It had been agreed that outcomes from ADC and CON should be presented to the SAO meeting. Jan had drafted a text on this and shared it with Mikko Strahlendorff and Thorsteinn Gunnarsson for them to pass it on to the current and coming chairmanships of AC (Finland and Iceland, respectively). This would be that *value tree analysis* process within CON and the *data planning* process within ADC.

✓ Action: Jan to contact Mikko Strahlendorff on the status of this topic

#### Ad 4. Physical Board meeting

Physical Board meetings have typically been held in the context of the ASSW meeting. The 2019 meeting is held in Arkhangelsk, Russia, May 22-30 May. At ASSW, business meetings are usually held during the first three days, while the science conference is after that. A request for rooms is planned to go out by the end of February.

Ad 5. Upcoming calls and formal engagement with Asian SAON partners

- ✓ Action: Jan to contact Mikko Strahlendorff on the status of this topic in order to investigate involvement from Korea in SAON.

Ad 6. Circulating ESA call dialogues

It was agreed that these could be circulated to the Board, if senders accept this.