

International Polar Year 2007-2008
Planning Group Meeting 2 (PG2)
17-19 December 2003
ICSU, Paris, France

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY – TO BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT PG3

Present: Chris Rapley (Chair), Robin Bell (Vice-Chair), Ian Allison, Robert Bindschadler, Gino Casassa, Gerard Duhaime, Vladimir Kotlyakov, Olav Orheim, Hanne Petersen, Zhanhai Zhang, Michael Kuhn (IUGG), Vladimir Ryabinin (WMO), Thomas Rosswall (ICSU), Leah Goldfarb (ICSU), Daniel Rodary (ICSU), Tim Moffat (Secretary)

Wolfgang Eder (UNESCO) – standing in for Henk Schalke for IUGS item.

Apologies: Steven Chown, Prem Pandey, Ed Sarukhanian (WMO), Henk Schalke (IUGS).

Wednesday 17th December

WELCOME AND ORIENTATION

1. Introductions

The Chair welcomed members to the Second Meeting of the Planning Group (PG). This was the first time that a majority of the members had met. He reported that the first call for ideas issued in September had resulted in a very enthusiastic response, with more than 130 proposals received to date, and still more were arriving.

The Chair invited members to introduce themselves. Vladimir Ryabinin was representing Ed Sarukhanian (World Meteorological Organisation).

The Chair reported that Steven Chown was reconsidering his membership of the PG having recently accepted a prestigious and demanding national appointment. The Chair was concerned that if Steve were to step down, the PG would be left short of biological expertise. A decision would be delayed until the level of Steve's new workload became clear.

The Chair drew attention to the fact that the PG had no Secretariat. Because of this, he, Robin and Chris Elfring had drawn up and distributed the paperwork for the meeting. He apologised for any imperfections in the papers. BAS had sent out most of the papers electronically, including the Contact List. He asked members to check their contact details and give any changes to Tim Moffat, the Secretary for the Meeting. A compendium of proposals, which had arrived after the 15th Dec. deadline but before the Chair had left the UK was tabled. Additional late proposals were tabled as the meeting progressed.

The PG accepted that the summaries of the First Meeting, 31 July – 2 August 2003, prepared by the Chair and Chris Elfring were true records of the meeting.

2. Status of IPY Planning

IPY-PG Terms of Reference (PG2-02):

The Chair reminded members that the PG was a planning group because ICSU had not yet approved support of the IPY. ICSU had set the PG's Terms of Reference (ToR). The PG reviewed the ToR to ensure that they were all clear about their task. It was noted that in ToR (v) – “objects” should read “objectives”. Thomas Rosswall agreed that the presentation of a draft plan to ICSU Executive Board in February 2004 was too ambitious, and a progress report was more appropriate.

IPY-PG Meeting 1 Summaries (PG2-04/05):

For the benefit of members who had not attended the First Meeting, the Chair summarised the main outputs and outcomes of that meeting:

- An IPY vision had been developed and the justification for an IPY had been articulated as a set of “Why?” questions, each comprising a small number of condensed bullet points. PG members should use these as standard material to promote the IPY to ensure that everybody was giving the same messages.
- The IPY would be announced to the “community” by letters to the ICSU nations and bodies. This would include the first request for inputs of ideas.
- Three major and overarching themes were developed as a starting point to gather community input. Each theme had examples of activities.
- Communications, education, outreach and data access were important elements for the PG and the IPY. These would be discussed further at the Second Meeting.
- A planning timeline had been developed (PG2-06).

Overview of Activities To Date

The Chair reported that ICSU had sent out letters to their national contacts, Unions and other bodies on 3 September 2003, with a request for ideas by 15 December 2003. He had sent out similar letters to the European Polar Board and the International Arctic Science Council. The letters requested the following:

- A statement of intent on the communication mechanism, including the name of a point of contact.
- Comments on the three proposed overarching themes.
- Brief descriptions of proposed concepts for research activities, including an indication of the “added value” that could be achieved by being adopted by the IPY.
- Brief descriptions of concepts for crosscutting activities, with major logistical requirements.

The letters had resulted in a huge response.

The Chair reported that the domain name “ipy.org” had been purchased, and draft web pages had been produced at BAS. However, the IPY site would not be brought on-line until the key messages and text had been agreed by the PG.

The Chair noted the need to revisit the “standard” text describing the IPY, as there had already been some divergence in presentations made by PG members.

The Chair then invited members to update the PG on their activities:

Vice-Chair: IPY had been presented by the Chair and Vice-Chair at the AGU-EGS-EUG meetings in Nice, at the Earth Science Symposium in Potsdam,

and by the Vice-Chair at the Fall AGU meetings in San Francisco. The latter included scientists and funding agencies representing both Poles. It was encouraging to see both communities coming together. The US National Academy had also established a National Committee for IPY.

Vladimir Kotlyakov: IPY had been discussed with Dr Bedritsky, the President of the WMO. The Russian Academy of Sciences and the Hydrometeorological Survey were in the process of preparing by next summer a unified, national IPY plan. A special working group had been established to cover all disciplines (including upper atmospheric and social sciences), which would meet in January. The establishment of a joint National Committee was under discussion, but the recent change in Government might delay any decision.

Hanne Petersen: The Arctic Council had given its support to the IPY. There would be a special IPY half-day session at the next Arctic Science Summit Week in Reykjavik, Iceland during April 2004.

Olav Orheim: Informal discussions had been held with the Russians, including the Chair of the Polar Committee. The big challenge for the Russians was getting some of their Arctic stations going again. A National Committee for IPY had been established in Norway.

Michael Kuhn: Austria was trying to create a virtual Polar institute. He had been involved in the recent AGU in San Francisco.

Robert Bindschadler: A number of space agencies had been contacted including NASA (USA), CSA (Canada) and NASDA (Japan). NASA was supportive but NASDA had not yet responded. The Canadian Polar Commission was also interested. IPY had been discussed at the International Glaciological Society Symposium in Milan, Italy.

The US National Committee to the IPY had several teleconferences and one meeting during the AGU. Although the Committee was very pleased with the breadth and depth of response from the US community, the big problem would be how the whole IPY be managed. The Committee was intending to publish a science plan in early spring, and this would be used to try and get funding from the US Congress.

Thomas Rosswall: IPY presentations had been given to NSF, NRC, the Dutch and several other members of ICSU. Initial discussions with the WMO had been very positive. Generally, there was a lot of enthusiasm for an IPY. ICSU needed to work the IPY into its strategy, and he would be surprised if the Executive Board did not approve IPY.

The Chair: ESA had been contacted and a positive response had been received. He and Chris Elfring had presented the IPY at the Arctic Science Summit Week in Kiruna in April. Strong endorsements were received from IASC (who had provided 10k euro to support planning activities) and SCAR, as well as wide interest from the delegates. Strong support was also received following a presentation by the Chair at the joint

COMNAP-SCAR meeting in Brest. A UK National Committee had been established.

Other Comments from PG Members

Thomas Rosswall reported that the Earth Observation Summit in July had gone well. As a result, an *ad hoc* Group on Earth Observation (GEO) had been established to prepare a 10-year implementation plan for a coordinated and sustained Earth observation system(s). The PG would need to keep track of this process.

3. Objectives and Tasks for this Meeting

The Vice-Chair outlined the objectives and tasks for the meeting. These were to:

- Introduce members of ICSU-appointed International Polar Year Planning Group (IPY-PG).
- Review IPY planning activities to date, timeline, tasks and objectives for meeting.
- Continue defining IPY principles and planning process.
- Review ideas submitted to date.
- Assign tasks to prepare a report to ICSU by January 2004.
- Set a course of action to guide continued IPY 2007-2008 planning

The PG decided to focus on the following:

- Further work was needed on IPY Vision and Guiding Principles: Why Polar? Why International? and Why A Year?
- The IPY Selection Criteria should be revisited
- The submitted IPY ideas should be reviewed, and the type and format of the feedback should be agreed.
- The report to ICSU in February 2004 should be discussed and Actions agreed.
- Linkages with other international groups, bodies and unions, especially the WMO, should be discussed.

4. Briefing on the WMO initiative

Vladimir Ryabinin of the World Climate Research Programme (WRCP) briefed the PG on the WMO's initiative for an IPY.

The WMO began to work out a comprehensive programme for the 3rd International Polar Year following the Russian Federation's initiative and proposal at the 14th International Meteorological Congress in May. The WMO would be making substantial contributions to the IPY, including observations (e.g. World Weather Watch), data holdings, logistical support (e.g. forecasts) and its own research programmes (e.g. WCRP and AREP).

The WMO plan for an IPY would include an observing component (land-based and satellite) and various scientific components such as polar stratospheric ozone, environmental pollution, weather forecasting research, climate projection, polar oceanography, and hydrology and water resources.

The WMO appreciated the quality; amount of work done and results achieved so far by the PG, and made some proposals for cooperation:

- IPY 2007/08 should be developed as a WMO and ISCU joint initiative based on the Resolution CG-XIV and decision of ISCU Executive Board (EB).
- The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) should be invited to participate.
- In co-operation with the ICSU IPY PG prepare a strong proposal for IPY as a joint initiative and present it to ICSU EB (Feb 04), WMO and IOC Executive Committees (June 04) for approval.
- Establish a joint steering body of WMO, ICSU and IOC to develop a Science Programme and Implementation Plan for the IPY.
- Seek a UN General Assembly (GA) Resolution on IPY 2007/08 in which the role of ICSU, IOC and WMO in holding the IPY would be clearly spelled out.
- Establish an office + officers in the responsible organisations.
- Continue preparations jointly, starting now.
- Invite others including the Arctic Council, NGOs etc.

The Chair thanked Vladimir Ryabinin for his presentation and for his positive proposal. He thought that if the IPY developed in this way, it would be important to ensure that all of ICSU's interests were included (e.g. across the full spectrum of the natural and social sciences) and not just the physical/hydrometeorological aspects.

Thomas Rosswall welcomed the proposal, but thought that getting a GA resolution might be problematical as the UN endorses lots of "Years". The Vice-Chair reported that the President of Iceland, Jeff Sachs (her boss) and Kofi Annan had given a positive reaction to the idea of an IPY, and it was possible that there would a session of the GA to discuss the IPY.

Olav Orheim said that IPY had a strong climate element and the WMO proposal was therefore compatible.

Hanne Petersen and Ian Allison were concerned about the balance of the proposal, as IPY was more than just ICSU, WMO and IOC. More governmental organisations must be involved, as well other programmes such as IGBP and IHDP.

The PG decided to return to the WMO proposal later on in the meeting.

ACTION: Vice-Chair to follow-up the possibility of the IPY being discussed by the UN General Assembly

5. Update on IUGG Progress

Michael Kuhn updated the PG on progress made by the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics.

The IUGG comprises seven scientific Associations, each responsible for a specific range of topics or themes, ranging from the Earth's interior to the upper atmosphere. One of these associations, the International Association of Geomagnetism and Aeronomy (IAGA), proposed that for the 50th Anniversary of the IGY, the scientific community should endorse and promote an "electronic Geophysical Year" (eGY). The objectives of the eGY were "to

revolutionise geophysical data availability and access worldwide through a coordinated international initiative, making full use of the capabilities offered by modern digital communications". The IUGG has supported the eGY concept, and believed that it could be incorporated into various other International Years such as the IPY, the International Heliophysical Year (2007), and the International Year of Planet Earth (2006).

The PG welcomed the web access to and exchange of data envisaged by the eGY, but was concerned about the relationship of the initiative with the World Data Centers (WDC) as there was potential for overlaps and working at cross purposes. Also the IHY would be coordinating observations from international space missions with data from ground-based observatories. There was scope to establish a "Joint Observing Programme", which would make everything accessible. This concept could be developed within eGY, IHY and IPY.

6. Update on IUGS Progress

Wolfgang Eder, Director of the UNESCO Division of Earth Sciences, updated the PG on progress made by the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS).

The IUGS and United Nations had jointly taken the initiative to proclaim an International Year of Planet Earth (2005/07). The aims of the IYPE are (1) "To demonstrate the fundamental contribution being made by the Earth Sciences to knowledge of the Earth upon which we are dependent, and to wiser use of Earth's environments and resources"; and (2) "To formulate and refine strategies that will ensure a safer and more prosperous Planet in the future"

The IYPE would comprise two major programmes: an Outreach Programme, including educational ventures at all levels, and a major Science Programme, concentrating on the "big issues" concerning the complex interaction within the Earth system, and its long-term sustainability. Preparations for implementing the initiative were fully in hand: the organisational structure of the project including a Management Team for overall direction and monitoring of progress, an Outreach Programme Committee and a Science Programme Committee.

The PG discussed how the IYPE related to the IPY. The IPYE would focus on capacity building activities in developing countries, and have a looser arrangement by which people could do what they wanted under the umbrella. There was a greater emphasis on outreach and sustainable development. The IPY was an area-based initiative with global scope, and should build on the success of the IYPE by focussing on the polar regions as key elements of the planetary "machinery".

ACTION: The Chair to make contact with Professor Ed Derbyshire (RHUL), Chairman of the IYPE Science Programme Committee and member of the IYPE Management Team.

7. Links with Other Bodies

The PG discussed the value of linkages with other bodies:

Olav Orheim considered that the IPY/PG should strongly involve others like the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) and the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC). The Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP) was an important player, particularly in determining what science is achievable. Funding agencies should also be involved, as well as regional bodies such as the European Polar Board. Bringing all these bodies on board would serve to unite the Antarctic and Arctic communities and make for a stronger IPY. Hanne Petersen thought that the IPY could also be a model for European co-operation.

The Chair said that there would be opportunities for discussing the IPY at the forthcoming SCAR/COMNAP and Arctic Science Summit Week (ASSW) meetings. On the European front, a Specific Support Action (SSA) had been submitted under Framework VI with the aim of bringing together European and Russian interests in the IPY.

The PG considered that the relationships with bodies like SCAR and IASC might need to be formalised by letters of understanding/agreement. These bodies could have specific roles to play as plans for the IPY develop, such as representation on science steering groups or as science coordinators themselves. It was extremely important that the IPY left a legacy of improvement in co-operation, data access and systems.

CONINUED IPY PLANNING

8. Review and Revise Guiding Principles

The Chair reminded the PG that the guiding principles were a standard set of messages that all members could use when promoting the IPY. The following comments/suggestions were made about each principle:

Why Polar?

- More compelling arguments are needed.
- They are under-sampled and sources of uncertainty.
- Why should they be sampled more?
- Are they under-sampled? “There is a lot going on in glaciology”.
- What about societal impacts and a human dimension? The resources of the Arctic have been exploited for the benefit of western/eastern development. Regulations were being imposed to restrict exploitation (e.g. seals) based on “first world” ethics and views, and these had impacts on indigenous cultures.
- The poles are driving global change. This a controversial issue, and what does it mean.
- The word “holistic” is controversial in social sciences.

Why International?

- Need to cut through existing mechanisms of international collaboration
- Beyond capability of one nation to address.
- Processes are global in nature, so has to be international
- Shared costs and benefits in participation.
- “Harmony” is the wrong word.

Why a Year?

- Should be “Why 2007/08?” or both.

- We can do things now that were not possible.
- Each discipline can link with the others.
- Technological and political opportunities
- Annual cycles.

The PG also reviewed the Statement of the IPY Concept. It was suggested that (1) “polar researchers” should be replaced with “scientists and engineers”, (2) “policy-makers” should be “decision-makers”, and (3) “engages” was the wrong word. The PG were not enthusiastic about the suggestion for an IPY strap-line: “Create history, don’t just repeat it.”

The PG was divided into three groups and tasked to work on the principles as “homework”. However, pressure of other work resulted in the task not being completed, and an Action was subsequently placed on the Chair and Vice-Chair to do so.

ACTION: The Chair and Vice-Chair to agree and circulate definitive versions of the IPY Concept statement and the “Why?” bullet points for use in presentations and on the Website.

9.Desired Characteristics and Process for Selecting IPY Activities

The PG reviewed the IPY Selection Criteria agreed at the first meeting. It was decided that the criteria were more like desirable project characteristics than strict selection criteria. They were also deemed inappropriate at this stage to use them to review the submitted IPY ideas and activities. The PG was not “judging” the ideas, merely creating a synthesis of the ideas received-to-date.

At some point the PG would need to revisit the selection criteria.

10. Strategy for Considering IPY Ideas

The Chair suggested that the objectives of the review of the initial batch of submitted IPY ideas should be:

- To circulate a synthesis/summary to the Community as soon as possible.
- To thank each contributor by letter, and make them feel valued.
- To provide an impetus for the rest of the community to get involved.
- To determine the synergies and gaps in the ideas and activities.

Because there were so many submitted ideas, the PG divided into three review groups to consider about 50 ideas each. The Chairs of the groups were Ian Allison, Gino Casassa, and Gerard Duhaime. Each group would summarise and classify the ideas using the pre-prepared Excel spreadsheet and an agreed set of criteria.

The PG discussed at length the criteria to be used in the grouping or clustering the IPY ideas. As no consensus could be reached, the PG agreed a “quick notes” template (in Excel) that could be used to describe each idea in terms of:

- Proposal Number
- Author

- Comments on General Themes
- Idea Summary
- Logistics
- Comments – Clusters
- National Contact – Yes or No.

The template would allow the groups to have a first cut at forming thematic clusters. These would be discussed at plenary session on Thursday.

Thursday, 18th December

REVIEW OF SUBMITTED “IPY IDEAS”

11. Plenary of Review Groups

The three review groups reported back to the PG on their first cut at clustering the IPY ideas. Ian Allison’s group proposed the following classification:

- Atmosphere-Ocean-Cryosphere Interactions (A)
- Biogeochemistry (B)
- Climate and Weather (C)
- Ecosystems and Biodiversity (E)
- Humanities and Social Sciences (H)
- Land Ocean Interactions (L)
- Palaeo-Climate (P)
- Solid Earth (S)
- Upper Atmosphere and Sun-Earth Connections (U)

The PG adopted the classification and added the PG’s overarching science themes:

- Understanding Change at the Poles (CHANGE)
- Decoding Polar Processes (DECODE)
- Exploration of New Frontiers (EXPLORE)

and some geography factors:

- Antarctic only (ANT)
- Arctic only (ARC)
- Bipolar (BIP)
- Global (GLO)

The three groups were invited to complete their reviews using the agreed classification and feed their results to Ian Allison, who would prepare some preliminary statistics.

12. Preliminary Analysis of Ideas

Ian Allison presented his preliminary analysis of the submitted ideas (final statistics, completed by Ian after the meeting, are given in Annex A):

	<u>No. Of Ideas</u>	
Atmosphere-Ocean-Cryosphere Interactions	45	
Biogeochemistry	13	
Climate and Weather	46	
Ecosystems and Biodiversity	24	
Land Ocean Interactions.....	4	
Palaeo-Climate	9	
Humanities and Social Sciences.....	4	
Solid Earth.....	14	
Upper Atmosphere and Sun/Earth Connections.....	19	
	<u>Single Multiple</u>	
Understanding Change at the Poles.....	28	60
Decoding Polar Processes	42	77
Exploration of New Frontiers.....	19	41
	<u>No. Of Ideas</u>	
Antarctic only	46	
Arctic only.....	33	
Bipolar.....	73	
Global.....	7	

Tim Moffat also reported that ideas had been submitted from 22 countries. Those SCAR members that had not submitted were: Chile, Brazil, Ecuador, Korea, Peru, Poland, Spain, Ukraine, Uruguay, Bulgaria (Assoc.) and Pakistan (Assoc.). Those IASC members that had not submitted were: Iceland, Poland and Korea.

13. Messages to Report Back to the Community

The PG discussed what messages or statements could be reported back to the community as a result of the analysis. Suggestions were:

- There had been an overwhelming response from the community.
- A summary of science areas that had been included.
- Examples of areas that had not been included (e.g. social sciences, astronomy and meteorites)
- Neutral and qualitative statements on the themes and statistics.
- Request contributors' permission to post their ideas on the IPY web site.

The PG discussed possible reasons for the poor response from the social sciences community. Gerard Duhaime made the following points:

- The invitation letter and call for ideas had not been sent to the right people.
- The structure of the IPY was alien to the social science community.
- The national processes for funding and conducting natural and social science research were different.
- Social scientists are not well linked into the Unions, international associations and national committees. Consequently there tended to be dominated by the natural sciences.
- Social science had in the past often been included in research as a token gesture; and so social scientists tended not to work with natural scientists.

Gerard Duhaime reiterated his first point and said the PG would get a better response if it communicated with the right individuals, associations and unions.

ACTION: Gerard Duhaime to send e-mail list to the Chair.

14. Preliminary Clusters

Having completed the initial analysis of the submitted ideas, the PG brainstormed some preliminary suggestions for clustering IPY topics. These were:

- Intensified Hydrological Cycle / changes in Polar Ice Masses
- Geophysical Slices of Polar Regions
- Thermohaline Circulation / Interaction with Ice and Climate Instability
- Genomic Fingerprinting of Polar Ocean
- Ecosystems
- Genomic Study of Polar Adaptation
- Exploration of Sub-Ice Ecosystems
- Solar Activity and Polar Atmospheres
- The Collapsing Magnetic Dipole
- Polar Biodiversity and Ecosystem Response to Global Change
- Studies of Deep Basins (BIO and GEO)
- Polar Climate Connections
- Robotics and New Technology – “New Windows”
- Revitalisation of Polar Observing Networks.

Plus a particularly important cluster that was missing from the first set of ideas submitted:

- Global Forces on Peoples of the North

It was recognised that the preliminary list was incomplete and required further thought.

15. Next Steps

The PG discussed the next steps and priorities for the coming year. These were:

- Acknowledge input of ideas, and invite further inputs with a deadline of 12th March 2004.
- Develop a draft Science Outline (changed from “Plan” – ToR (iv)) from now to the end of March 2004.
- Obtain community feedback on the Science Outline, at ASSW (April 2004), SCAR (July 2004) and the International Congress of Arctic Social Sciences (May 2004).
- The PG to hold its 3rd meeting (PG3) in Paris on 1-3 April 2004, arriving on 31 March 2004 to complete the analysis and synthesis of inputs and to agree the Science Outline.
- The PG to hold its fourth meeting (PG4) in Paris on 15-17 September 2004.

16. Role of the Planning Group

The PG also discussed its role in developing the IPY.

As the PG was a body without funding for projects, it would not be in a position to direct or implement IPY activities. The role of the PG was to assemble all the information (e.g. planned or suggested activities) into a framework and vision for the IPY, and decide on what should be the priority areas. The PG could provide international leadership and a coordination role in bringing people and national programmes together.

How much science and activity the PG would be able to steer and coordinate was not clear. The PG could give birth to the IPY, maintain a vision of what the IPY was, and oversee the “working groups” developing the core science programmes. Other organisations would be responsible for carrying out what actually happens during the IPY.

Friday, 19th December

DECISIONS

17. Clusters and Statistics

The PG reviewed progress that had been made on the analysis of the ideas and the selection of clusters. The PG concluded that it had had insufficient time to read all the ideas, and further work was needed before deciding on the final set of clusters.

ACTIONS: Chairs of review groups to complete single page summaries of all ideas by 9 January 2004 and send them to Daniel Rodary (ICSU).

Daniel Rodary to collect existing single page summaries, and send out electronic copies of these, together with a collated set of later submissions (12d onwards) and the list of clusters document.

PG to discuss, identify and refine the themes/clusters via e-mail during the first week of the New Year (starting 5 January 2004). Robin Bell to look into setting up a web-based discussion forum.

18. Change Decode and Explore

ACTION: Chair and Vice-Chair to review the overarching science themes, and assign themes to the submitted ideas.

19. WMO Proposal

The Chair summarised the main issues as follows:

- ICSU’s scientists have a major involvement in climate-related science and a joint programme with WMO would provide resources to support this.
- If the structures established through collaboration with WMO, such as weather stations, scientific bases etc were made available to support additional science and monitoring, this would be a major asset.
- Collaboration with WMO would help a push for a UN resolution. (clarification from VLADIMIR RYABININ + others : ICSU could also do it alone, through a country proposing the resolution)

- ICSU is non-governmental, while WMO is a governmental organisation. Such a combination can be powerful (e.g. WCRP), but in the eventuality of a joint activity, rules of procedure should be as light as possible
- WMO representation in ICSU IPY PG should be proportional to the importance of climate in the IPY programme.
- The inclusion of IOC as a joint sponsor should not be pursued as organisations such as SCAR, SCOR, etc, could argue justifiably that they merit equivalent status.

The Chair added that:

- WMO will carry out an IPY anyway (in response to the recommendation of its General Assembly)
- Cooperation is essential to avoid divergence of purpose, dilution of effort and the possibility of competition
- A formal relationship is needed

Vladimir Ryabinin commented:

- Often, rules of procedure have been established with a purpose and are not all bad.
- WMO is not only interested in climate

Vladimir Kotlyakov pointed out that UN resolutions for “The year of Water” and so on are not scientific. They are more political, or for education/outreach. An IPY UN resolution should be more focussed on science.

Ian Allison commented that any UN resolution on the IPY should be branded “science”

Gino Casassa commented that science means more money, by 2 or 3 orders of magnitude, than communication. This should be made clear to all.

Zhanhai Zhang confirmed that WMO intergovernmental sponsorship would significantly assist active Chinese participation in the IPY. Gino Casassa agreed that this would similarly help the participation of South American nations.

The PG discussed the WMO proposal for cooperation and agreed a modified version (Appendix I).

The PG then adopted the following declaration:

“The Planning group believes it is important to work actively to develop appropriate relationship with those organisation that have defined interests in polar regions.”

20. St Petersburg Meeting

The following PG members would be attending:

- The Chair
- The Vice-Chair
- Vladimir Kotlyakov (organiser)
- Olav Orheim (possibly)

The PG requested through Vladimir Kotlyakov that the organisers send a letter of invitation to all National Points of Contact who responded to the IPY letter, in order to :

- Inform them

- Formally invite them (even if it is too short notice)

21. Plans for the 2004 Arctic Science Summit Week

- At the April meeting of the PG, clusters should be agreed
- Science Outline should be worked on in-between meetings, discussed at April meeting, then presented at ASSW
- Clusters and General Progress report (or science outline if ready) will be presented to science committee (Hanne Petersen)
- FARO will be attended with presentation on logistics by Olav Orheim
- At the end of ASSW, there should be a wrap-up meeting between attending members of the PG to reflect and feedback to everybody before next meetings

22. Plans for the SCAR Science Conference and SCAR-COMNAP meeting:

- Similar approach as to ASSW
- Time should be booked at the session
 - The Chair contact point for SCAR
 - The Vice-Chair contact point for COMNAP

23. Arctic Social Science Congress

- Gerard Duhaime will present IPY
- Other members of the Planning Group should also attend - maybe Robert Bindschadler

24. Website / Logo

- Text of the website needs to be revised: Ian Allison, Robert Bindschadler + Chair and Vice Chairs will form Editorial Board
- Daniel Rodary will provide ICSU templates
- Publication online will be done on BAS server in Cambridge
- Robin Bell will work on map-based logo
- Robert Bindschadler will investigate possibilities for other graphic artists work at NASA

It was agreed that the “IPYn” form of title for the IPY should be dropped, since the PG had adopted “IPY4” and the WMO “IPY3”. Instead the form “IPY 2007/08” would be used.

25. Outreach and Education

- It was agreed that an Outreach and Education (OE) subgroup would be formed, led by Hanne Petersen with help from Robin Bell. However the subgroup will have to wait for the Science Outline to be drafted.
- The Chair drew attention to the fact that he has submitted a proposal to the UK Natural Environment Research Council which, if approved, would include funding for a full time Webmaster / Information Officer
- WMO will provide support for its own small Secretariat staff.
- Daniel Rodary mentioned an expression of interest from the World Federation of Science Journalists, meeting October 2004. Hanne Petersen + the Chair and Vice-Chair will follow up, with email from Daniel Rodary.

26. Report to ICSU

- The Chair and Vladimir Ryabinin will ask Thomas Rosswall about details of the presentation to EB:

- Duration?
- WMO proposal/representation?
- The Chair will circulate his presentation prior to the EB, for input from PG
- Content of the report:
 - Context/objectives
 - Nations which responded and established national committees
 - Unions which responded (Chair to compile)
 - Summary of Responses (proposals)
 - List of presentations done by IPY members in all meetings up to now.
 - WMO proposal for collaboration
 - Describe process/progress (update and next steps)
 - Preliminary Clusters
 - Draft decisions
- 12 nations that responded are South Africa, Canada, Australia, Japan, Russia, Finland, Denmark, Germany, Belgium, Norway, UK, US
- At least five other are believed to establish National Committees soon: Chile, China, Italy, New Zealand, Argentina
- PG members agreed to inform Daniel Rodary of presentations they have made on the IPY
- Vladimir Kotlyakov will contact the IGU to take the floor and present IPY at the next IGU meeting
- The Chair will make a presentation to the ICSU Unions on the day before the EB.

27. Letters to the community

- Content (2 versions: 1-“Thank you”, 2-“Please answer”, to be respectively sent to those who responded and those who did not)
 - Statistics on responses
 - Preliminary clusters
 - Request for Additional feedback
 - Comment on number of responses
 - Request permission to post individual proposals on the web
 - Mention that next step will be mentioned in next message
 - Mention deadline of March 15 for answers
 - Invitation to answer
 - Mention website, to check out regularly from then on.
 - To whom?
 - NPOC (National Points Of Contact)
 - Individual which responded
 - ICSU’s unions and IB + non ICSU organisations.
 - PG members should assist in identifying NPOC, when they know about them + Gerard Duhaime should provide Social Sciences POC
 - Arctic Council, ATCM

28. Next PG meeting (PG3)

- Agreed dates are 1-3 April, 2004
- In Paris as it is convenient, but ICSU rooms are not available on the 1st. Daniel Rodary should look for other room on the 1st.

Objectives are:

- Finish Science Outline
- Map the way forward, specially on relation with other organisations (WMO and others)
- Start Outreach/Education activities
- Agree on the Logo
- Agree on detailed approach to ASSW, SCAR-COMNAP
- Developing relation with WMO , including funding/secretariat issues

Timeline:

Date	Topic
January 5-9	Discuss clusters (by email)
January 15	Circulate Letter
January 22-23	St Petersburg meeting
February 10-11	Union meeting – EB Meeting , ICSU, Paris
February	Update letter
March 12	Deadline for input
April 1-3	ICSU PG next meeting (Paris)
April 15	Science Outline ready
April 21-27	ASSW
May 19-23	Social Science Meeting
July 26-30	SCAR – COMNAP meetings
September 15-17	ICSU PG next meeting

Assignments summary

Topic	Assigned to
Logo	VICE-CHAIR, ROBERT BINDSCHADLER
Web	CHAIR, VICE-CHAIR, IAN ALLISON, ROBERT BINDSCHADLER
St Petersburg meeting	VLADIMIR KOTLYAKOV
1 page summaries	IAN ALLISON, OLAV ORHEIM send to DANIEL RODARY for compilation
ASSW	HANNE PETERSEN, OLAV ORHEIM
SCAR/COMNAP	CHAIR, VICE-CHAIR
1 st letter - Cluster	All
Education Outreach	HANNE PETERSEN, GINO CASASSA, ROBIN BELL
Science Outline	CHAIR, VICE-CHAIR, MICHAEL KUHN
List of past presentations	All, send to DANIEL RODARY for compilation
WMO-ICSU link	THOMAS ROSSWALL, ED SARUKHANIAN, VLADIMIR RYABININ, THE CHAIR
Presentation to Unions and EB	CHAIR
Minutes	TIM MOFFAT +DANIEL RODARY

Meeting of interest	All, send to CHAIR, VICE-CHAIR
Circulate 12d + rest	DANIEL RODARY

Appendix I : Agreed form of WMO proposal for cooperation:

- IPY 2007/08 is an ICSU and WMO joint initiative based on the Resolution of Cg-XIV and expected decision of ICSU EB.
- Through cooperation of the ICSU IPY PG and the WMO *ad hoc* group on IPY, to prepare a proposal for IPY *as a joint initiative* and present it to ICSU EB (Feb 04) and WMO Ex. Council (June 04) for approval.
- Amend the existing ICSU PG to become a joint ICSU and WMO body to develop IPY further, with an agreed appropriate balance of representation.
- Continue preparations in a joint mode, starting now
- When possible, to establish an Office and/or Officers
- Seek for a UN GA Resolution in support of IPY 2007/08, insisting on science.

Annex I : Final Statistics of First Round Responses from Ian Allison

A. REGION

Arctic only	50 submissions
Antarctic only	36 submissions
Bi-polar	42 submissions
Global	8 submissions

B. THEME

A submission may fit more than one category

Change	55
Decode	70
Explore	37
and	
Monitor	23

C. DISCIPLINE CLUSTERS

A submission may fit more than one category

Atmosphere-cryosphere-ocean interaction	20
Biogeochemistry	14
Climate and weather	44
Ecosystems and biodiversity	37
Humanities and social science	7
Land-ocean interaction	8
Palaeo-climate	19
Solid earth	18
Upper atmosphere and sun-earth interactions	17

As we noted at the meeting, some of these clusters might be combined.