

**SEARCH SSC/AT Leads Meeting  
San Francisco, Marriott Marquis Foothill E**

**14 December 2015, 6:30pm**

**Summary Notes & Action Items**

Present: Brendan Kelly, Hajo Eicken, Caspar Ammann, Bob Rich, Helen Wiggins, Brit Myers, Lisa Sheffield-Guy, Steve Vavrus, Uma Bhatt, Ted Scambos, Henry Huntington, Jennifer Francis, Matthew Druckenmiller, Ted Schuur, Dave McGuire, Marika Holland (phone)

**Action Items:**

YEAR 2 PLAN UPDATE & DISCUSSION:

* **ACTION**: SEARCH will need to develop a coherent plan for ongoing IARPC engagement moving forward. (SEARCH Leadership)
* **ACTION:** The SIAT will need to provide clear examples in the year 2 plan of where various activities fit within the SIAT’s communication pyramid framework (SIAT)
* **ACTION:** SEARCH will need to clearly articulate in the year 2 plan how the communication efforts to the SIAT will result in the development of research communities working to drill down into the important topics/issues to produce science products that NSF can get behind. (SEARCH Leadership)
* **ACTION:** The role that the SSC Action Team Liaisons will play in moving things forward and facilitating cross-cutting SEARCH activities will need to be further developed in the year 2 plan. (SEARCH Leadership)
* **ACTION:** How will we advance cross-cutting themes? SEARCH needs to start that process in year 2 and identify an approach within the SSC. (SEARCH SSC)
* **ACTION:** Brendan encouraged the AT Leads to look over/read the full year 2 program plan, not just their sections to make sure we are communicating everything effectively. (AT Leads)
* **ACTION:** SEARCH should be explicit in the year 2 plan about the value that can result from ATs learning what works well from one another. (SEARCH Leadership)
* **ACTION:** Document the frequency/schedules of all planned SEARCH meetings & events in a timeline format for the year 2 plan. (SEARCH AT Leads & Science Office)
* **ACTION:** Add as a cross-cutting activity to the year 2 plan that we are also learning best ways of communicating with different stakeholder groups (SEARCH Science Office).
* **ACTION:** Year 2 Plan revisions and a budget for the Land Ice Action Team will be sent to Brendan as soon as possible, ideally by Dec 18. (Ted Scambos)
* **ACTION:** Each Action Team should clearly state their rationale for selecting its unique approach & how its activities will contribute to SEARCH overall in the first sentence of the AT’s year 2 plan section. (Action Team Leads)

SEARCH OBSERVING CHANGE PANEL IN YEAR 2

* **ACTION:** A year 2 plan objective must be to develop a process for OCP reconstitution. The Arctic Observing Summit will be an important opportunity to link to observing efforts happening later in the year (science ministers meeting, major EU funding opportunities). The SSC can aim on formulating a role for OCP prior to AOS. (SEARCH Leadership)
* **ACTION:** With NASA’s interest in system-level understanding of the Arctic, SEARCH leadership should plan to sit down with Tom Wagner (NASA) to discuss observing. (SEARCH Leadership)

ACTION TEAM UPDATES:

* **ACTION:** The Sea Ice Action Team should consider tasking SIPN with the production of an additional 1-page topic document(SIAT)
* **ACTION:** Brit will follow up with Christina to talk about what is needed re: the new PCN overview publication. (Brit)
* **ACTION:** The SSC/AT Leads should come back to the PCN overview document in a near-future meeting to discuss it as a model for sharing other AT efforts and developing a SEARCH-wide communication strategy. (SEARCH SSC & AT Leads)
* **ACTION:** Ted Schuur will request a statement from Steve Gray at USGS about why they decided to support a SEARCH/Permafrost Action Team post-doc. This will be used in the Year 2 plan to illustrate the utility of the SEARCH framework to other agencies. Having this in hand by Dec 18 is ideal. (Ted Schuur)
* **ACTION:** SEARCH should learn more about who is actually showing up to participate on the IARPC Collaboration Teams. (SEARCH Science Office)
* **ACTION:** During the last Sea Ice Collaboration Team meeting Martin Jeffries said it would be nice to have a team co-lead from SEARCH. Could Matt Druckenmiller do this? The Sea Ice Action Team will add this to their list of things to discuss at their upcoming meeting on Wednesday. (SIAT)

**Summary of Discussions & Action Items:**

1. **Year 2 Plan Update & Discussion**

* Formulation of SEARCH’s year-2 plan provides an opportunity to develop a communication strategy for discussing SEARCH activities with the broader community.
* Brendan, Caspar and Hajo have all had meetings with NSF over the last few weeks and it seems like some of the messaging that has been developed since the SEARCH planning meeting is starting to get through.
* Brendan also spoke to Neil about the new SEARCH ED + SSC structure/interactions.
* There is still a need to improve on our ability to communicate SEARCH’s successes and history.
* Brendan and Caspar have been involved in recent IARPC planning meetings.
* **ACTION**: SEARCH will need to develop a coherent plan for ongoing IARPC engagement moving forward. (SEARCH Leadership)
* The Sea Ice Action Team’s communication plan serves as an example of how SEARCH overall can reach out to various audiences/stakeholders.
* **ACTION:** The SIAT will need to provide clear examples in the year 2 plan of where various activities fit within the SIAT’s communication pyramid framework (SIAT)
* SEARCH’s knowledge to action efforts, such as the session at the Arctic Encounters symposium, are important, however, these activities may go beyond what SEARCH is formulating for NSF.
* Brendan’s direct feedback from NSF is that they recognize each Action Team has a different starting point and that they are ok with these different approaches or “experiments”… but only if it leads to progress being made on SEARCH’s science goals. Some risk is okay, but the SSC and AT leads will need to monitor closely to ensure progress is being made on desired outcomes.
* There was some NSF pushback on the initial communication focus of the SIAT by those who felt only 10% of project should be communications.
* **ACTION:** SEARCH will need to clearly articulate in the year 2 plan how the communication efforts to the SIAT will result in the development of research communities working to drill down into the important topics/issues to produce science products that NSF can get behind. (SEARCH Leadership)
* A breakthrough in promoting the value of the SIAT’s approach seemed to occur when we were able to convey the idea that the 1-page synthesis digests would be used to connect researchers across disciplines and with decision-makers and to facilitate cross-disciplinary syntheses. The idea that these communication efforts will help speed up the process of collaboration needs ongoing reinforcement.
* How we talk about it will impact how others think about it. We do need to maintain the courage of our own convictions with the decision to pursue these activities. SEARCH’s collective thinking about the links between science and communication are sophisticated. Our job is to help outsiders understand why it is needed/something they should want.
* The SIAT will carry the burden in year 2 of demonstrating the effectiveness of its vision/strategy.
* Are there things in the original proposal to point to? Is there a way to show the process that will take us through the communication pyramid from top to bottom?
* The Scientific Community has always been a key audience for the SIAT communication plan. SEARCH is using these communication tactics to glue the scientific community together, keep people talking, and make it easier for people to see how they fit into the larger context of a scientific issue.
* We have to be careful of leaving the impression that the 1-page documents are the ultimate/apex goal when the base of the communication pyramid is just as important. They also provide an opportunity to link into the work of other Action Teams and help develop momentum for workshops.
* We need to make progress so that we are not facing the same kind of challenges in our year 3 program plan proposal.
* **ACTION:** The role that the SSC Action Team Liaisons will play in moving things forward and facilitating cross-cutting SEARCH activities will need to be further developed in the year 2 plan. (SEARCH Leadership)
* **ACTION:** How will we advance cross-cutting themes? SEARCH needs to start that process in year 2 and identify an approach within the SSC. (SEARCH SSC)
* **ACTION:** Brendan encouraged the AT Leads to look over/read the full year 2 program plan, not just their sections to make sure we are communicating everything effectively. (AT Leads)
* In year 2, each Action Team will need to get enough info together on their specific science theme to allow them to interact across the action teams effectively in future program years. After this internal activity it will be possible to become more interdisciplinary. Iterative conversations will help to reveal the big picture. Until these interdisciplinary linkages are made our view/understanding of the science remains incomplete or “disturbed”.
* Action team activity timelines such as the one Ted Schuur shared at the Permafrost Carbon Network meeting would be a welcome tool for communicating the AT mechanics/structure to NSF.
* **ACTION:** Document the frequency/schedules of all planned SEARCH meetings & events in a timeline format for the year 2 plan. (SEARCH AT Leads & Science Office)
* There is value in networking the networks across the Action Teams to advance science questions. However, there is also value in learning from the successes of each AT’s approach. What are the other ATs doing well to build community that could be applied to mine?
* **ACTION:** Add as a cross-cutting activity to the year 2 plan that we are also learning best ways of communicating with different stakeholder groups (SEARCH Science Office).
* **ACTION:** SEARCH should be explicit in the year 2 plan about the value that can result from ATs learning what works well from one another. (SEARCH Leadership)
* Re: AT budgets, this year we are asking for status quo. In year 3, we can perhaps ask for additional funding if we have demonstrated progress made on science goals. SEARCH is viewed as a nimble approach by NSF to facilitate and stimulate science production. We should endeavor to remain as nimble as possible.
* Collaboration takes people and it takes time. We have to be careful about giving in to a lack of awareness about the human resource needs that are actually required to develop productive science communities/networks. We have to keep in mind what SEARCH is actually nimble in comparison to… SEARCH is a very small program compared to other research spending.
* **ACTION:** Year 2 Plan revisions and a budget for the Land Ice Action Team will be sent to Brendan as soon as possible, ideally by Dec 18. (Ted Scambos)
* **ACTION:** Each Action Team should also make sure they clearly state why they have selected their unique approach at the very beginning of their year 2 plan sections. (Action Team Leads)

1. **SEARCH Observing Change Panel in Year 2**
   * We are not at a point where we can clearly define what will happen with the OCP, but it is important that the focus of the OCP’s efforts remain a part of SEARCH because of all the hard work that has been put into the OCP’s long history and the ongoing importance of this work to the scientific community.
   * Agency folks are also starting to rely on SEARCH leadership in this area.
   * Without funding in place for OCP work, it is difficult to identify specific next steps. Getting those specific steps outlined remains a priority for the SEARCH year 2 plan.
   * The OCP has not formally met in a long time.
   * **ACTION:** A year 2 plan objective must be to develop a process for OCP reconstitution. The Arctic Observing Summit will be an important opportunity to link to observing efforts happening later in the year (science ministers meeting, major EU funding opportunities). The SSC can aim on formulating a role for OCP prior to AOS. (SEARCH Leadership)
   * NSF is not the right agency for leading efforts on a coordinated Arctic observing network. With movement to plus-up NOAA’s budget in this area, it may be a better agency partner on this effort moving forward.
   * **ACTION:** With NASA’s interest in system-level understanding of the Arctic, SEARCH leadership should plan to sit down with Tom Wagner (NASA) to discuss observing. (SEARCH Leadership)
2. **Action Team Updates**

* Land Ice (Ted Scambos)
  + The GrIOOS workshop went well. Next steps include workshop report write-up and hiring a post-doc. Most of the post-doc’s time will be spent at WHOI, however there will also be some remote sensing activities undertaken at NSIDC.
* Sea Ice (Henry Huntington)
  + There will be a Sea Ice Action Team Meeting on Wednesday, 16 December. Three initial topics ID’d for 1-pagers will be looked at. Next steps for moving things forward and workshop connections will be discussed. 1-pagers will go around in advance of workshops to help develop interest.
  + A Sea Ice Prediction Network workshop is also taking place on Thursday
  + **ACTION:** The Sea Ice Action Team should consider tasking SIPN with the production of an additional 1-page topic document(SIAT)
* Permafrost (Ted Schuur)
  + An open meeting of the Permafrost Carbon Network took place on the Sunday before AGU. It benefited from ARCUS staff support.
  + The meeting format included presentations of proposed science synthesis projects in the morning followed by breakout sessions to advance these efforts in the afternoon. Real enthusiasm was demonstrated for all 11 projects and they are all moving forward.
  + There were approximately 120 people in attendance.
  + Christina has put together an overview document that describes the work of the PCN over the past 5 years. ARCUS support is needed getting this document out and maximize use as a communication tool.
  + **ACTION:** Brit will follow up with Christina to talk about what is needed re: the new PCN overview publication. (Brit)
  + **ACTION:** The SSC/AT Leads should come back to the PCN overview document in a near-future meeting to discuss it as a model for sharing other AT efforts and developing a SEARCH-wide communication strategy. (SEARCH SSC & AT Leads)
  + As Ted has started to discuss the development of the Infrastructure/Fish & Wildlife components of the Permafrost Action Team, he has heard suggested that NSF’s engineering directorate would be a more appropriate source of support for the Infrastructure activities. This is, perhaps, similar to a viewpoint that stakeholder-driven science should be paid for by the stakeholder who receives benefits from the products produced.
    - Chasing support for SEARCH’s core network building activities from the engineering directorate is not an ideal scenario. What we really want is to build networks that allow other agencies (like USGS w/ post-doc funding for Permafrost) to see how they can buy-in to various topics to further expand SEARCH activities. The network activities develop “hooks” for other funders/partners to engage. The USGS precedent will help to encourage other investments of this kind.
    - **ACTION:** Ted Schuur will request a statement from Steve Gray at USGS about why they decided to support a SEARCH/Permafrost Action Team post-doc. This will be used in the Year 2 plan to illustrate the utility of the SEARCH framework to other agencies. Having this in hand by Dec 18 is ideal. (Ted Schuur)
    - These kind of additional investments will help SEARCH learn more about different agency priorities.
    - Would it be helpful to have more agency representation on the ATs? No. Better to engage via the IARPC Collaboration Teams.
    - **ACTION:** SEARCH should learn more about who is actually showing up to participate on the IARPC Collaboration Teams. (SEARCH Science Office)
    - **ACTION:** During the last Sea Ice Collaboration Team meeting Martin Jeffries said it would be nice to have a team co-lead from SEARCH. Could Matt Druckenmiller do this? The Sea Ice Action Team will add this to their list of things to discuss at their upcoming meeting on Wednesday. (SIAT)