

1 February 2007

David Hik
Canadian IPY Secretariat

**Some thoughts about the next steps for securing the Legacy of IPY (2007-2008):
background for discussion at HAIS-2**

This note updates some previous thoughts regarding IPY legacies, originally circulated by myself and Karen Kraft Sloan last fall.

The central question is remains – “How will we harness the efforts, resources, and momentum of IPY to ensure that its impact is substantive and long lasting?”

Legacy has always been part of the IPY vision, and is clearly identified in the Framework Planning document (see Appendix 1, separate file). Most IPY researchers attempted to identify legacy elements during the process of proposal endorsement (see Appendix 2, separate file).

Issues around legacy are increasingly part of the discussion at IPY-related meetings. These legacies have most often been articulated follows (with reference to recent progress):

- Establishment of permanent observation and monitoring networks (note recent activities of SAON)
- Managing the explosion of data that IPY will create, and ensuring access to it (plan of action is based on recommendations of IPYDIS)
- Raising the public profile of the polar regions (numerous EOC activities)
- Training the next generation of polar researchers (a focus of EOC activities, and efforts of University of the Arctic and other IPY partners)
- Sharing logistical information more broadly and more efficiently (coordination has been ongoing through organizations like FARO, etc)
- Coordination of funding for polar science by various national and international agencies
- Increasing the capacity of Arctic residents to support and engage in research activities (e.g. Arctic Council initiatives of the Permanent Participants; University of the Arctic, Antarctic Universities Initiative).
- Improving the links between observation and monitoring and modeling
- Environmental initiatives like the Greening of IPY (see <http://www.ipy.org/index.php?/ipy/author/environmentipy>)

In most cases there is a recognition that there must also be a “broader” legacy for IPY beyond its scientific outcomes, by working to enhance international Arctic and Antarctic science cooperation beyond 2009 and to enable scientists, policy-makers, and Arctic residents to continue to work together to understand and to address the big scientific outcomes of IPY.

Accomplishing this objective will require cooperation within nations and internationally, to create and maintain a broad, inclusive dialogue on legacies of the IPY; create a focus within and

outside IPY to identify and address polar challenges beyond 2009; set the stage for political and policy discussions on polar issues for the post-IPY period; and to create a forum where science and policy come together to act.

Activities that are proposed to focus and encourage IPY legacies should not displace existing initiatives, but rather to provide a forum for this discussion during IPY. What is clear (at least in my view), is that achieving these legacies of IPY will require as dedicated, coordinated and wide-reaching an effort as the development of the IPY program itself.

What organizations (and individuals) are best able to lead this effort? How do we ensure an effective, open and transparent process that engages all stakeholders from the very beginning? How can we reconcile the various national priorities with international efforts? Any model for coordinating an IPY legacy would have to score well against criteria that might include: transparency, identity, accountability, and effective action.

Suggestions for Improving Coordination of IPY Legacy Activities

To address the wide ranging interests in IPY Legacies there needs to be a ‘declaration’ of the priority being placed on post-IPY planning, there must be some over-arching ‘strategy’ for achieving these outcomes, and a ‘plan of action’ needs to be developed as a means of encouraging and facilitating participation by all IPY partners.

Given the interest of HAIS in this issue, it might be useful to establish a working group of HAIS to further develop a paper that would consider and evaluate various legacy outcomes and mechanisms for achieving them. This document could be submitted to the Joint Committee, IPY host organizations (ICSU & WMO), National IPY Committees, IASC, SCAR, Arctic Council, ATCM, OECD Global Science Forum, G8 Science Ministers, etc, for comment.

Other short-term activities that could provide focus and urgency to the discussion of IPY legacies might include:

- 1) Creating a network of “Legacy Champions” who will lead, instigate and moderate dialogues in their own countries, constituencies, networks and organizations, as well as at the international level.
- 2) Developing and operating an on-line forum for focused discussion targeted at major stakeholder groups and the broader public, and bringing forward the product of these discussions to relevant policy forums.
- 3) Generating, gathering and exchanging information, for example through commissioning discussion papers and linking to other legacy-related initiatives within and outside the IPY. There are several examples of recent initiatives, like the OECD Global Science Forum study. Other high profile opportunities may also exist.
- 4) Preparing a set of recommendations and roadmap for implementation for policy-makers and scientists.