



Meeting of the SAON Executive Committee	
When	24th June 2019, 16-17 CET / 10-11 am EST
Venue	Teleconference
Participants	Allen Pope, Eva Kruemmel, Jan Rene Larsen, Nicole Biebow (part-time), Thorsteinn Gunnarsson
Meeting notes	Jan Rene Larsen

#### Agenda:

1. H2020 call LC-CLA-20-2020: Agenda for Potsdam meeting
2. ArcticGEOSS: Mikko Strahlendorff and Jan Rene Larsen will have a call with the GEO Secretariat 27<sup>th</sup> June. Sandy Starkweather and Jan Rene Larsen will go to Geneva on 16<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup> July.
3. Roadmap Task Force (RMTF)
4. [Draft agenda for Board meeting 10<sup>th</sup> July](#)
5. On the composition of the Executive, [the terms of reference](#) reads "EC participation by the AC country member (...) will be rotational on a two-year basis". This has in practise meant that the AC country member follows the AC chairmanship. Since Iceland is now the chair of the AC this could mean a new EC composition.
6. Next Executive meeting is 15<sup>th</sup> July/16<sup>th</sup> September 16-17 CET / 10-11 am EST

**Minutes:**Ad 1. H2020 call LC-CLA-20-2020: Agenda for Potsdam meeting

Participants at the meeting will be David Velazquez, Jan Rene Larsen, Mikko Strahlendorff, Nicole Biebow, Rolf Rødven, Sandy Starkweather and Thorsteinn Gunnarsson. Participants staying overnight in Potsdam should book a room at the Mercure Hotel. Participants will meet in the morning at the hotel and walk to the meeting room at AWI. The meeting will be 09:00-16:00. Volker Rachold will participate from ArcticPassion.

In the morning, the group should discuss the role of SAON. Discuss what work and what objectives, SAON would like to fulfil, and the resources that will be needed from the proposal. Nicole believed that SAON has to be a full partner in the project as the SAON /AMAP Secretariat as the legal entity. It is, however, a tricky situation if one institution with the same people wants to partner with two consortia.

The morning meeting should be used first of all to discuss the call text to see what SAON could offer, independently of what the consortia will write in their call texts. What also will have to be discussed is how SAON strategically positions itself. If SAON wants to go as a partner for both proposals, this would double the work load for the proposal writing for the Secretariat. Alternatively, SAON could seek to estimate the proposal with the highest probability to be funded, and focus only on this.

Nicole believed that it would be a major disadvantage for the project if SAON is not involved because it is written in the call text 'to support the mission and objectives of the international initiative on Arctic observations brought forward by SAON'. She added that EU-calls are written so that there is a big interpretation possibility. She believed, however, that it was clear that SAON and Copernicus should be involved.

Nicole further believed that independently of the call text, any attempt to define an observing system in Arctic could not be done without SAON, and both consortia would probably have a certain interest in having SAON on board. SAON can contribute by establishing the link to other initiatives mentioned in the call text, like the mentioned USA programs.

Nicole believed that the ArcticPassion consortium would be very positive on having a clear role of SAON in the project in leading a work package with proper man-months. She had no information about the INTAROS-led consortium, but believed that the two consortia would not be prepared to reveal many details about their proposal, including structure, etc. Even though it could be difficult, in her view, SAON should seek to be a partner in both consortia in order to make sure that SAON plays a role.

Jan mentioned the ongoing work within the Road Map Task Force and proposed a strategy where SAON formulates a generic Work Package within the scope of the Roadmap and offers this to both consortia. In such a process SAON needs to reserve the right to share any text with the Board. Jan also mentioned the decision from the Board meeting in Arkangelsk to seek to merge the two consortia.

Nicole further cited the call text: "Improving and extending the terrestrial, marine, and cryospheric in-situ measurements and the community based monitoring systems necessary for the monitoring of the Arctic". In her view this would mean that an indigenous organisation should be a full partner in the proposal to

cover the community-based monitoring. It would have to be European, meaning either Saami or Greenlandic. In her view, a proper European indigenous organisation should be involved as a full partner to take care of the community based monitoring. The organisations will have to be engaged in the writing phase.

The draft agenda for the meeting will be shared with the consortia leads and will be discussed at the Board meeting 10<sup>th</sup> July.

Nicole finally informed the meeting that the call text will most likely be released in November. She added that SAON is also mentioned in the call text for EU-PolarNet II.

Actions:

- Jan to draft an agenda for the meeting and invite the two consortia leads.
- Eva to write a short text (bullets) on the envisaged/preferred engagement of Arctic indigenous people.

## 2. ArcticGEOSS

Jan explained about the current status in the dialogue with the GEO Secretariat on ArcticGEOSS and GEOCRI.

Thorsteinn believed that one of the most important topics to discuss with the GEO Secretariat would be the H2020 call, since this is a win-win situation for ArcticGEOSS and SAON. GEOCRI defines the Arctic as a part of the cryosphere, but lacks the human aspect; this is where SAON can contribute, both from the indigenous perspective and from other people living in the Arctic. He believed that it is important to continue the dialogue.

It was agreed to follow the plan outlined: Mikko Strahlendorff and Jan should have a telephone conference with the GEO Secretariat on 27<sup>th</sup> June, and Sandy Starkweather and Jan should travel to the GEO Secretariat end July.

## 3. Roadmap Task Force (RMTF)

The work is progressing according to plan.

## 4. Draft agenda for Board meeting 10th July

The agenda covers the standard topics. Emphasis will be put on the cooperation with WMO, initiated through the presentation that Etienne Charpentier made at the Board meeting in Arkhangelsk.

Eva pointed out that a discussion is needed about the capacity that SAON needs in order to develop the proposed cooperation with WMO.

5. Composition of the Executive

The agenda item was discussed, but no decision was made.

Appendix. Draft agenda, SAON H2020 Task Force meeting, 17<sup>th</sup> July 2019, 09:00-16:00

The purpose of the meeting is to get an overview of the situation and initiate the first dialogue with the two known consortia.

Meeting structure:

- Morning (9-12)
- Lunch (12-13)
- Consortium 1 (13-14)
- Coffee break (14-14:15)
- Consortium 2 (14:15-15:15)
- Follow-up task force meeting (15:15-16)

Morning session

The purpose of the morning session is to 1) Analyse the call text, 2) Define SAON's envisaged role, 3) Defining funding, resource needs, and 4) Prepare for the afternoon session

The discussion would be structured around these items:

1. Background for proposal – why has it been formulated in the first place? (10 min, Nicole)
2. H2020 calls in general, addressing these questions (20 min, Nicole)
  - a) What is a H2020 call?
  - b) What is the structure?
  - c) Who can be engaged and how?
  - d) Is it possible to sub-contract work? Also to non-European sub-contractors?
- 3 The actual call: Review and discuss the actual call text as it is known. What does the text say about (30 min, all):
  - a) Envisaged objectives
  - b) Envisaged deliverables
  - c) Engagement of institutions and initiatives.
    - i. European?
    - ii. Non-European?
    - iii. Indigenous (European and non-European)?
  - d) Timelines for the drafting of a response to the call
4. SAON's role in the project - what does SAON want to gain from this? (30 min, all)
  - a) How does SAON wants to be engaged?
  - b) What would engagement mean in terms of what parts of the SAON structure that should be engaged? How to engage the SAON network, including non-European institutions? SAON could be the umbrella to establish links to the other initiative mentioned in the call text.

5. SAON's role in the project – what is it SAON can offer (30 min, all)

- a) What is it SAON can offer in terms of expertise, support, strength to the consortia?
- b) Engagement of institutions and initiatives.
  - i. European?
  - ii. Non-European (Asia, North America)?
  - iii. Indigenous (European and non-European)? AC Permanent Participants (ICC for example offers networks into Europa, North America and Russia , at least to some extent)?
  - iv. International partners, like WMO

*[Comment: It would be detrimental to SAON to 'pick-and-choose' among institutions; all members should be offered an opportunity to be engaged and contribute. On the other hand side, partners that will work within the envisaged work package should be specified by name and person. How should indigenous organisations (European and non-European) be involved?]*

6. Strategical consideration towards the two calls (30 min, all):

- a) Should SAON seek to estimate the consortium with the highest probability of success?
- b) Should SAON seek to be a partner in both calls?
- c) If yes, would it be possible to formulate a generic work package description that can be offered to both consortia. And would it be possible to formulate this without detailed insight into the two proposals?
- d) In any process, SAON needs to reserve the right to share any text with the Board.

7. Resources/funding (15 min, all)

8. Message to the consortia (15 min, all)

*[Comment: The message to the consortia afternoon session will be agreed]*

Agenda for afternoon- session with consortia

1. Consortium presentation (20 min)

Questions to the consortium: Please provide a presentation of what role would you like SAON to play. How do you see SAON in the proposal?

You will be asked only to share information that SAON can share publicly. It is realised that it is difficult for the consortium to share many details, but could you for instance share the list of partners? It will give SAON an overview of the 'landscape' that we are navigating in.

Could the consortia envisage a structure where SAON is a partner and lead for a generic work package, offered to both consortia? This could for instance be based on the Roadmap structure currently being developed within SAO.

What are the envisaged timelines?

2. SAON presentation (10 min)

An indication from SAON based on the outcome of the morning's deliberations. What kind of role does SAON believe that it should play? What is it SAON can offer in terms of expertise, support and strength to the consortia. Funding/resource needs.

3. Joint discussion (30 min)

Joint discussion. What is the next step?