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**Agenda:**

1. Review RMTF mandate
2. Timelines and outcomes
3. Leadership
4. Inviting new members

**Minutes:**

Ad 1. Review RMTF mandate

The proposed mandate reads:

* On the basis of the document *Arctic Observing Summit - Observing System Implementation and Optimization Working Meeting*
  + Develop a definition for the SAON Roadmap that will serve to generate strong international investments in Arctic observing
  + Define how Arctic Societal Benefit Areas or other objectives should be used to shape the Roadmap
* Membership:
  + SAON Board members are invited, including G3 Task Force members
  + The Task Force should have members representing ADC and CON
  + Members representing funding opportunities/agencies are welcome
* The Task Force reports to the Board and CON

Sandy noted that there are a handful of efforts and initiatives underway to generate roadmaps, mostly through the EU Arctic Cluster; efforts in Japan and USA are also defining a longer-term vision. She also highlighted that INTAROS has a deliverable around this. She emphasized the importance of a collective process across these initiatives so that the outcome would have buy-in and be understandable.

Will noted that other bodies are engaged in the work and would like to avoid duplicating efforts.

Sandy acknowledged this and believed that the Task Force work should be a synthesis effort to review existing national or multi-national efforts in order to understand convergence and similarities. The work should inform a definition that could both help ongoing initiatives but also help new national efforts. Some of the larger indigenous organisations have broad and constructive products and thoughts that would likewise benefit a more collective SAON-level definition.

Sandy further believed that the expectations would be intellectual rather than high-volume oriented. The process would be consensus-intensive and getting the right people in the room would be critical. The AOS-WG2 group under CON would do the mechanistic implementation of how to take existing tools and strategies and pull them together in a more synthetic and interoperable way. The AOS-WG2 needs a strong definition to guide the process. A point is that the current SAON Strategy suggests that Societal Benefit Areas (SBAs) are useful things to look at, but it does not define a *Roadmap* in any ways to be constrained by SBAs. This would be an interesting decision for the Task Force to try to make. SAON has defined the SBAs, but has only been suggestive about how these should be invoked; such a decision would be of relevance to the implementation of a *Roadmap*. There are things that SAON in this respect could do to better define its Strategy so that it becomes more of a guiding tool.

Sandy further noted that INTAROS does not have a strong working definition themselves, and this would be an opportunity to influence and shape their definition while SAON is also improving its own definition. In the deliberations around the qualities of this definition, she would turn to the Global Ocean Observing System; they have a well-defined system for describing for instance system maturity. Deliberations around the *Roadmap* could include information about this as well. A similar discussion could be about data delivery, dissemination and data federation.

Jan and Nicole mentioned that there is also a *Roadmap* deliverable (for monitoring and modelling) underway from EU-PolarNet.

Ad 2. Timelines and outcomes

Sandy proposed that it would be most impactful and valuable if the Task Force work could be completed within 6 months, i.e. around September 2019. She also noted that the AOS-WG2 was working intersessionally and in parallel towards the next AOS to be held March/April 2020; a *Roadmap* working definition would be a prerequisite for the AOS-WG2 work.

The timelines for the INTAROS process was discussed; it is Task 1.5 under their Work Package 1[[1]](#footnote-1).

Ad 3. Leadership

Sandy accepted the nomination to be a leader of the initiative.

Ad 4. Inviting new members (Composition)

Sandy emphasized the importance of recruiting funders; they are the key audience for the *Roadmap*, and the product should be useful to them in terms of their own planning and decision making with national funding bodies. From a funding perspective, Attilio Gambardella (EC), Roberto Delgado or Kelly Falkner (NSF, USA) and Yuji Kodama (Japan) and were mentioned.

GEO, INTAROS, SIOS, the Synoptic Arctic Survey (an extension of the DBO), YOPP, WMO/GCW and the Arctic Council working groups (AMAP, CAFF/CBMP) were specifically mentioned. So where ADC and CON; nominations from the Board were also considered. Engagement from the indigenous communities should be ensured; Hajo Eicken has been in contact with Carolina Behe and Rachel Daniels. An effort should be made to engage ICC and Saami Council. Larry mentioned Søren Rysgaard as a representative from Greenland and INTAROS. Sandy mentioned Bo Danielsen(?).

Sandy asked Larry about a high-level body of national representatives as a follow-up from ASM2. The body would steward the ASM intentions and commitments between ASM2 and the next one. Given the emphasis on monitoring and data, this seems to be a key point for engagement. Would anyone from the group be interested in serving in the task force process?

Larry responded that he had had a talk with Kelly Falkner, and she would be involved, if this would be going anywhere. He supported the idea of a broad perspective; the work should involve observers, modellers, politicians, etc.

A concern was raised by Nicole, not making the group too large. She believed that the first step would be to define the needs. She also wanted customers, like the prediction community to be involved. Who is needed at an initial stage and who is need at a later stage?

It was decided that Sandy and Jan will draft a letter of invitation and a list of invitees for the first meeting of the Task Force to be held in the beginning/mid of April. This could be a primary and a secondary list. The group will approve by correspondence.

1. https://intaros.nersc.no/wp-panel [↑](#footnote-ref-1)