**Wednesday SSC Meeting**

**Helens’ Rough Summary Notes**

**Morning Discussion on Activities (continued from yesterday)**

* Larry, George, Susie, Steve on phone
* Olivia summarized the discussion yesterday, which resulted in the ‘menu’ of activities
* Discussion of citizen science
* \*Susie will write a bullet for activity #13 (synthesis) – need a way to include importance and value of citizen science (e.g., an activity could be someone do a lit review or show how citizen science has been used successfully).
* George – reviewed his comments on the list of activities, which included activities focused on coordination
* Quite a bit of discussion on various levels of coordination, what is required, and what, if anything, needs to be done as a separate activity.
* Came to agreement that it is not a separate activity, but rather would be an integral part of other activities, such as workshops, etc. SEARCH can’t be in a position where it goes out to a community and says ‘we think you need to be coordinated’.
* \*Steve - one additional activity would be to issue press releases when a hot topic comes up (e.g., Greenland melt, etc.)
* \*This could be done by putting a result in the context of the various scientific efforts. E.g., for sea ice extent low, rather than just issuing a press release on the low extent, would put the NSIDC data in the context of all the other groups (e.g., Bremen)
* Press releases could point to short (a few page) white papers.
* Part of value-added of Arctic Report Card could be making the arctic report card accessible to the general public. Then links would go to more in-depth information. Also including human dimension measures.
* Our focus should not be “helping the scientific community’, but rather building bridges between scientific community, agencies, and stakeholders. Even with the best of intentions, people may see SEARCH as a busybody.
* However, individual researchers may not necessarily know what is needed in the big picture. It may be an AO is needed to move something forward, or a workshop, or an RCN-type activity. SEARCH could be a venue where some of these things could happen (without ordaining by the SSC how it will happen). Facilitate communication and communicate back to the agencies. SEARCH would be nimble on what we do to make things happen – resources for workshop, or other things.

**Presentation of Goal-Specific (e.g., land ice permafrost, etc.) Activities**

* Bob presented on land ice activities (see document he emailed to SSC)
* Karen discussed society/policy activities
* Susie noted a paper in development that might apply to activity 1.1.
* Larry discussed the importance of defining stakeholders widely. Also, one could start anticipation of societal response by looking at how society is already responding (increased resource development, etc.)
* \*Karen will take another stab at the activities and work with Larry and Susie on the next iteration
* Uma discussed permafrost activities (see document sent around this morning, from Uma)
* Uma and Dave will work on activities, with others
* Hajo discussed sea ice activities (see document sent around this morning, from Hajo and Janet)
* Side note: working proposal title from Bob “Changing Arctic Research for a Changing Arctic”. All activities should flow into providing stakeholders information

**Discussion on cross-cutting/integrating activity**

* A fair amount of discussion on what might be an activity or function that would integrate the current 4 goals – how to tie everything together.
* Might be looking at answering the question “Is the Arctic System Moving to a New State”? (from Understanding Change report)
* Could frame it as “What will the arctic be in 5, 10, or 50 years from now?”
* Might be talking about development of an ***overarching arctic system conceptual model***. Something like what Freshwater Initiative did for human dimensions – came up with a conceptual model by a literature review where could say ‘if precip does X, then lakes would do Y, which would have impacts of A and B”
* The steps involved in this might include: a review of component models and bring them all together. Then use different approaches to combine them. As a part of this, could make prioritized lists of what the important feedbacks in the system are and what science needs are.
* Frist activity might be meeting to bring people together (but ask for pre-work so that each disciplinary area comes to the meeting with a review and presentation of their component model(s)
* This would also help SEARCH represent the Arctic System Science community(ies)
* Build in an iterative process whereby stakeholders are engaged at each step – e.g, start a rough conceptual model, get input, refine, etc.
* Include community-based monitoring and citizen science
* \*Hajo, with others, will develop this idea

**Discussion on Structure and Process**

* Olivia showed the existing models
* Bob – SEARCH could be visualized as a Venn diagram, where the circles are the different ‘communities’ (agencies, scientists, stakeholders), and then SEARCH is at the intersection

**AON**

* Lots of discussion about AON and what he role of SEARCH should be in the steering of AON
* Questions about what SEARCH could contribute when there are so many agency committees focused on AON already (including in IARPC)
* Discussion about the science drivers of AON and what AON is trying to achieve
* AON could be seen as ‘taking the pulse of the Arctic’ and is important for that
* Could consider a role of the goal-groups to address the question “what do you need from AON?”
* Specific activities needed include organizing AON PI meetings
* Some discussion of whether a panel/working group is needed
* Also discussion about the lack of good AON data availability and translation into usable products
* \*Dave agreed to write up some text for an idea of synthesizing AON data – analyze if a trend is detectable
* \*\*Agreement that would start with an “***AON coordinator***”
* Would cut across all 4 goal-groups
* Would report to the SSC
* Could convene short-term ad hoc working groups, as needed, to tackle a specific topic or challenge
* Would also help ensure maximum utility of AON data; ensure flow of relevant data to working groups and to broader community
* And help assess the current needs for AON data management
* Could keep the Observing Change Panel going for another year or so

**Working Groups (or “GOAL GROUPS”) (the groups focused on the 5-year goals**

* Discussion on how these groups would work
* Dave – in some ways, each of these is an RCN. There is a chair that needs full time post-doc. Products that come out involve synthesis. Need travel support. Need meetings that are associated with the goal – maybe every year. Steering group that has particular activities they are pursuing. That is one model.
* Perhaps would ask 1-2 months support salary for the chair of the group
* Would also have a full time post-doc
* 1 month support time.
* The group for each goal might have 6 people – 2 scientists, agency peson, regulartory agency person, 2 from ‘citizen’ (3 pairs). Probably the lead would be on the science side. Then they would be the responsible for the implementation of activities. Conferences could come out of science office.
* Could populate the groups in an application/volunteer process, then the SSC makes the selections (this would also open it up to new people)
* Kick off meeting – everyone meets with everyone in the beginning (all goal-groups and SSC together).
* Then the groups would find ways to meet in person? (e.g., side meetings, etc.)
* Goal groups can spin off ad hoc working groups, as needed
* You could have non-NSF agency sponsors for some activities/working groups – like host a meeting. E.g, DOI/DOE for permafrost; NOAA for sea ice.

**SSC Functions/Duties**

* SSC is the holder of the vision
* Some SSC members could be on the goal groups as ex officio
* Right now have about 12 SSC members. This was agreed to be a good number
* Would need to look at future balance; consider someone with health-focus
* Should the SSC chair get support? Decided that it will depend on chair, which would be worked out with NSF as new chair(s) rotate in.

**Executive Director**

* Manager of the mission
* In charge of implementation
* Reports to the SSC (through the SSC Chair)
* Would be a full time position
* Would likely need support staff roles (in addition to an AON Coordinator)
* Not an ARCUS employee. Someone who has an arctic background, PhD, part of academic institution.
* DC presence? Could be, but affiliated with university.

**Other Functions of Science Office**

* Many of these would be served by ARCUS, in consultation with the Executive Director
* E.g., meetings, etc.

----Tomorrow/Thursday we’ll discuss the mechanics of the proposal and start writing.