



Meeting of the SAON Executive Committee / SAON Retreat Organizing Committee	
When	16th May 2017, 16-17 CET / 10-11 AM EST
Venue	Teleconference
Participants	Allen Pope (AP), Christine Daae Olseng (CDO), Hannele Savela (HS), Jan Rene Larsen (JRL), Larry D. Hinzman (LH)
Apologies	Eva Kruemmel (EK), Jeremy Mathis (JM), Lars-Otto Reiersen (LOR), Nicole Biebow (NB), Peter L. Pulsifer (PP), Peter Schlosser (PS)
Meeting notes	JRL

Agenda:

1. Plans for the Retreat

Minutes:

Ad 1. Plans for the Retreat

1.1 Timelines

The timelines after the Retreat were discussed. It was agreed that the outcome of the Retreat should be submitted to the SAON Board, the AMAP WG and the IASC ExCom. It should be approved by the SAON Board before the end of the year, preferably at a physical meeting. A candidate for this could be the 'Arctic Change' conference in Quebec, Canada, December 11-15, 2017.

A draft document should be available at 1st June for review by the SAON Board.

1.2 Retreat structure / tools

HS and PP had compiled proposals for tools to be used before or during the Retreat:

- [SWOT \(Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats\) analysis](#)
- [Quadrant –analysis](#) (Importance vs. Effort mapping)
- [Participatory methods toolkit](#) (Handbook)

HS noted that Quadrant-analysis can be used to analyse projects and identify 'low-hanging fruits'. It should probably be used to analyse projects in the work plan.

AP shared some experience that he has had earlier about the use of tools. These had been used as a brain storming tool with subsequent follow up and analysis work.

CDO saw an opportunity to use the SWOT methods based on the already existing material that is/will be used in the process.

LH emphasized the importance to engage participants prior to the Retreat.

1.3 Retreat outcome/document

JRL had produced a mock-up of the expected outcome of the Retreat ('SAON Strategic Framework'). CDO was concerned about headings like 'Networks' and 'National committees' in the document and wanted to have focus on formulating a vision that could point to specific goals.

AP explained about the draft IASC strategy; the mission statement is mentioned up front and broken down into three pillars. He believed that the Retreat document's structure should explain, what SAON will do. The Mission and Vision should be concise, and the document should explain what the future looks like, if SAON exists. He believed that the mission and vision should be developed before the meeting, and that there should be a discussion, if these make sense. Explicit goals could be discussed at the Retreat and grouped according to the goals. They should be evaluated on how well the goals address mission and vision? This would also be relevant for the discussion about the national committees. Do these share the same vision? Do they work in parallel with the same goals?

LH wanted the document to be structured so that it in the future can be used to look back and analyse what was actually achieved.

CDO and HS believed that a values section should mention involvement of indigenous people.

HS wanted also to see a bottom-up process, like reflecting goals from the Committees. Goals have been proposed from the Committee members.

It was agreed to establish a number of sub-groups. Each of these should prepare a section for the Retreat document, and analyse input from the external review and the input to Board meeting in Prague.

On the Outreach and Communication part, CDO believed that AOS should be part of this and involve the networks in the planning of this.

Actions:

- ✓ CDO and LH to discuss the use of methods/tools at the Retreat.
- ✓ JRL to contact the established sub-groups.
- ✓ LH to contact Sandy Starkweather on the participation in the Retreat