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| Meeting of the SAON Executive Committee |
| When | 18th February 2019, 16-17 CET / 10-11 AM EST |
| Venue | Teleconference |
| Participants | Eva Kruemmel, Jan Rene Larsen, Mikko Strahlendorff, Peter Pulsifer, Sandy Starkweather, Þorsteinn Gunnarsson |
| Apologies | Allen Pope |
| Meeting notes | Jan Rene Larsen |

**Agenda:**

1. Outcome of SAON Board 13th February
	1. Tour de Table on Objective 1.1 and 1.3.
	2. Road Map Task Force (RMTF)
	3. Physical Board meeting during ASSW: Draft agenda
2. Agenda for SAON Board meeting 13th March
3. ArcticGEOSS application
4. Value tree analysis workshop, Helsinki on 28.2.-1.3
5. SAON reporting to SAO meeting in Ruka, Finland, 12-14 March 2019
6. SAON reporting to EC-PHORS-9 meeting Geneva, Switzerland, 27-29 March 2019
7. SAON presence at Arctic Circle China Forum, May: <http://www.arcticcircle.org/forums/china/>
8. Request from AMAP on marine litter and microplastics
9. Next Executive meeting is 18th March 16-17 CET / 11-12 am EST

**Minutes:**

Ad 1. Outcome of SAON Board 13th February

1a. Tour de Table on Objective 1.1 and 1.3

Only a few Board members had prepared contributions to the *tour de table on Objectives 1.1 and 1.3*. It was agreed that the discussions are fruitful and is a useful mapping exercise. This topic should also be on the agenda for the 13th March Board meeting.

Eva expressed concern that several countries had not provided information. Among those that had, some of these did not have a national SAON organisation. She believed that the ministers at the 2nd Arctic Ministerial had given endorsement, but she was concerned about the national follow-up. She also believed that the PPs should be invited to contribute to the exercise.

Mikko acknowledged the analysis and responded that this is the reason why the Strategy talks about strengthening the national structures.

Sandy believed that it had been a useful exercise, and believed that it was worthwhile to hear from the countries that had not provided an input what the reason was: Did they not have time or did they not see the point in the exercise? From a CON perspective this could be a list of people that could participate in the Committee.

Thorsteinn added that the exercise should be expanded also to involve the international organisations.

Peter Pulsifer believed that for some countries the lack of a policy mandate prevented these from engaging into international activities like SAON. It could worthwhile exploring what different countries do require.

Eva responded that for the next ASM, it would be worthwhile to ask ministers to track countries’ contribution to SAON, not only with funding, but also with commitment in terms of in-kind and activities.

1b. Road Map Task Force (RMTF)

At the Board meeting, there was also a discussion about the *Road Map Task Force* (RMTF) to be established.

Sandy believed that a chair for the task force should be appointed and that a time frame for the work should be defined.

It was decided to re-convene the *G3 Task Force*, asking them to appoint a leader, define timelines for the work and draft an invitation.

The composition of the task force was discussed. Candidate members are the existing *G3 Task Force* members and representatives from the Committees, from the AOS WG2, from international initiatives and organisations like INTERACT, INTAROS, EU-PolarNet, WMO, and from the funding agencies. Asking Board members to appoint new members of the task force was also considered.

1c. Physical Board meeting during ASSW: Draft agenda

The draft agenda for the physical Board meeting during ASSW was discussed.

Thorsteinn believed that the Board meeting should have focus on the follow up from the 2nd Arctic Science Ministerial. He noted the presentations that Hajo Eicken and Peter Pulsifer had made to the ASM2 follow-up teleconferences that had been held. He also wanted this to be part of the preparations for ASM3. He also believed that it would be worthwhile revisiting the contributions from the different nations to the budget of the SAON Secretariat. He saw the need for a discussion of the upcoming SAON-related funding opportunities coming out of H2020 and NSF. He finally wanted to make sure that information from Russia could be made available at the meeting; Russia should be invited to make a presentation at the meeting on their Arctic observing system.

3. ArcticGEOSS application

A draft application had been submitted to the Board meeting 13th February. An accompanying table contains details about person names and deliverables. The names of the chairmanship of the Board and the Committees had tentatively been added to the table.

Peter asked for the deliverables how to indicate the *chain* that is created to get to the deliverables. As an example, there are a number of ADC deliverables, but ultimately ADC is doing part of that work, but the work is also done by other organisations. In the case for instance of the upcoming Polar Data Forum, FMI is going to host it and some EU groups are helping to organise it locally; how to ensure that there is visibility for these contributions? It would not only be about recognition, but also about responsibility.

Mikko responded this would be the solution – in the note part explain that this is coordinating a set of contributions. A deliverable could also be a proposal for funding.

Peter agreed and mentioned the Polar Data Planning Summit that was explicitly funded to contribute to SAON. Filling in the table could identify opportunities to get more direct funding. He asked about the ADC activities listed as contributions to GEOCRI.

Jan responded to the latter that the existing contributions to the GEOCRI work programme (2017-19) are listed in word document that is the main body of the application.

Peter acknowledged this and believed that the more technical and implementation oriented activities would be in ArcticGEOSS while the more community building oriented activities might be more in GEOCRI.

It was agreed that Peter and Mikko would provide input to the table to Jan, who would compile the information and submit it to the GEO Secretariat.

4. Value tree analysis workshop

The workshop would be held in Helsinki on 28th February - 1 March. The outcome will be a full value tree to present, which will capture how physical atmosphere and ocean variables can contribute to the value tree. An important aspect will be to distribute the different value amounts; this will be costs incurred at the different starting points in the tree. The report is planned to be available in April.

5. SAON reporting to SAO meeting

Thorsteinn will attend the SAO meeting in Ruka, Finland, 12-14 March 2019 on behalf of SAON. The presentation will make reference to SAON’s Goal 1 and 2. It will present the *Roadmap* and the *value tree* discussion and the workshops that ADC has been engaged in.

6. SAON reporting to EC-PHORS-9

AMAP and SAON have been invited to report to the WMO EC-PHORS-9 meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, 27-29 March 2019.

Mikko believed that ArcticGEOSS should be mentioned in the report with emphasis on the potential future delivery of data or information.

7. SAON presence at Arctic Circle China Forum

Thorsteinn saw an opportunity to present SAON at the Forum, either to submit a proposal for a plenary session or a break-out session. Peter had indicated that he would attend the Forum; in addition a speaker from China could be identified. China has strong Arctic and Antarctic programmes and has recently signalled an interest in getting more involved in SAON. SAON should seek to identify also speakers from Japan or Korea.

It was agreed that Eva, Mikko, Peter and Thorsteinn (lead) would formulate a side-event description to be submitted to the organisers.

8. Request from AMAP on marine litter and microplastics

AMAP is preparing work on the monitoring of marine litter and microplastics and has asked if SAON is interested in being engaged at whatever level is possible, either with information or expertise that the countries or organisations may have.

It was decided to add this topic to the agenda for the coming Board meeting.