

Chantal Donnelly

MINUTES of 1st Post Baltex Working Group

Attendees: Chantal Donnelly, Andreas Lehmann, Thomas Neumann, Piia Post, Zita Gasiūnaitė, Ben Smith, Markus Meier, Eduardo Zorita, Birgit Hunicke, Karol Kulinski, Anna Rutgersson

Chairperson for Meeting: Markus Meier proposed by Anna Rutgersson, seconded by Ben Smith

Markus:

- More people involved
- Perhaps lobbying (white papers rather than science plan)
-

Brainstorm – what do we get out of group

- Networking for multidisciplinary projects (CD)
- Define common Scientific goals (AL)
- Write strategic research papers (white papers) (M M)
- Original Baltex science plan still of use (AL)
- Not convinced on idea of science plan – review what has already been written? Is it worth it? Does anyone pay attention? (ie funding agencies etc) (TN)
- Lobby to affect the BONUS science plan (living document – opportunity for inputs) (MM)
- Need to define what we do and also what we don't do, Baltex shouldn't only worry about BONUS (PP)
- Use review of what was achieved in Baltex phase 1 and what is still left to achieve? (PP, AL)
- Network and lobbying towards BONUS (ZG)
- Use experience of Baltex success – e.g. network as worked well, conferences, publications. Science plan has not seemed useful. (BS)
- Earth System science seems to be group's focus, but what is the extent of the group's scientific goals? Social science? Should pure and/or applied research be included? (BS)
- Inclusion of post-Baltex in a larger scientific program (BS)
- Need to have a concise definition of what BALTEX is (EZ)
- Advantage of long time-scales – set some long term (10 year) goals. How should state of science look in 10 years? This time scale is often ignored by other groups (EZ)
- Baltex could be an interface for dissemination/outreach. Expand newsletter? Journal? Popular Science Journal? (EZ)
- What is Baltex's relation to funding groups? (BH)
- Who actually read the Baltex phase 2 science plan? (BH)
- What about abridged science plan used as guide for affecting funding agencies? (CD)
- Responsibility to achieve a science plan connected to a white paper – though workshops (AG)
- Baltex needs science plan to identify ourselves (KK)

- Baltex as network, not to seek funding as whole group, but to find partners for projects (KK)
- Lobbying (KK)
- Outreach is a good idea, but to whom? Decision makers? Public? How (KK)
- Need to constrain/focus what science is included?
- Science document should be 'living' ? Connected to workshops? (AG)

Markus summarises:

1. Continue with Baltex
2. Not to draw boundaries on membership, but maybe to constrain scientific focii
3. Agreed only a shorter 'living' science plan is required, complemented by white papers
4. Continue with newsletters and conferences
5. Outreach a good idea, if secretariat is willing?
6. Relation to funding agencies – still unclear? Science or policy driven?
7. Embedding in a larger science program?
8. Administration of WG

Go through Markus' points:

1. Yes to continuing. Need for new name, but should keep relation to old name? Baltex is a well known name associated with a lot of goodwill, but also a need to 'end' Baltex. How to communicate a new name if we change?
2. Core area, – Earth system dynamics of Baltic Sea and its catchment, what about atmospheric dynamics and chemistry?
Focii – need for *regional* earth system approach (Global already ongoing, regional would be unique),
 - modelling on short and long time scale, observations, processes, some focus on pure science (rather than applied),
 - Further development of community models (e.g. HARMONY, NEMO, HYPE),
 - Use of network to optimise process descriptions in earth system models – removal of parameterisations,
 - Observations and testing of new data sets and data sources (e.g. satellites),
 - Defining requirements for new sorts of observations,
 - Optimise work with common data sets, Need for resources for data management.
 - Perhaps postBaltex should restrict itself to influence databases rather than manage them ourselves. Creation of a meta database for Baltic Data. Portal via secretariat?
 - Sharing resources (eg for data collection) – make sure 2 ships from different organisations don't do same thing
 - Create a 'state-of-the-Baltic-Sea' monitoring project (coordinated experiment)Boundaries - focus defines somewhat the boundaries, social science on the boundaries of what we do, but social science will become more relevant as future projections become more realistic.
 - Allow social science to conferences, not excluded, To include them by defining the social science relevant gaps in the knowledge.
 - Biology – how much? There already exist Baltic Marine Biologists within Baltic Sea Science Conference? Should they be involved in setting up and validating models? Do we need to do more to attract more biologists? (e.g. roll of fish in Baltic ecosystem dynamics). Perhaps utilise the already existing networks via joint working groups?
3. Science Plans and White Papers: - scientific driven research. Also approach policy driven research funding agencies as this the reality of research funding, management related research is not focus of program.
 - White Paper: who and when? Think about and report back next meeting.

4. Secretariat, BACC & Conferences – keep own conferences, but change frequency so has not to clash with Baltic Sea Science Congress
5. Outreach – Summer schools was success of Phase 2.
 - See outreach as direct/ indirect way to lobby policymakers.
 - Baltex has had influence on BONUS, need to sustain that influence
 - press releases?,
7. Embedding in other Scientific Program – no longer a strong connection to GEWEX, p9 of previous minutes has Deliang Chang's information of new programs of relevance, Need to delegate a task to WG to evaluate relevant programs.
8. Future structure of WG –
 - How often we meet – Another meeting just before deadline for finalisation. Rest by email.
 - Next meeting – March, Copenhagen (before/after BACC meeting)
 - In 1 year – need for white paper or science plan, suggested to have prelim plan prior to this (in ca 9 months, June?)
 - One person can take meeting notes and summaries. Circulate and allow WG members to fill in gaps
 - Anna Rutgersson elected as chairperson
 - Andreas Lehmann elected as co-chair.