

## ABOVE Full SDT Telecon – July 2, 2013

Attendees: Natalie Boelman, Josh Fischer, Scott Goetz, Peter Griffith, Guido Grosse, Forrest Hall, Bob Harriss, Dan Hayes, Eric Kasischke, Libby Larson, Dave McGuire, Juha Metsaranta, Chip Miller, Mike Rawlins, Rob Striegl, Matthew Sturm, Colm Sweeny, Ruth Varner, Diane Wickland, Stan Wullschleger;  
Rapporteur: Elizabeth Hoy

### Topics Discussed:

#### 1) Update of Homework Assignments (Dan)

1. Homework 2 (individual): Everyone turned in this homework. The themes from this were used to better organize the first few chapters of the ACEP. Dan H. and Eric K. have a draft of Chapter 1 based on this information.
2. Homework 1 (group assignment): The text that the groups have provided has been helpful in crafting Chapter 2 and a draft of this chapter is in progress. Dan H. is still working with some groups who have not provided their input yet.

#### 2) Discussion of Strawman SDT Strategy

1. Dan H. provided an overview of the Strawman SDT Strategy document which Eric K. sent around to the team. Four ecosystem impacts groups are proposed, with a 5<sup>th</sup> group to address societal consequences and responses.
  - Each working group would be responsible for 2 tasks at the SDT meeting in Fairbanks: 1) Identify key science question (Day 1) and 2) Begin to look at the types of research needed (Day 2). A final task responsibility of the SDT will be to plan a strategy to determine the study design (Day 3).
  - Time will be left for the entire SDT to synthesize questions and make sure that the questions are broad enough to cover the depth of research that will need to be done. (Eric K.)
2. Purpose of this telecon: discuss and agree upon a process for determining the key science questions and the overarching study design strategy needed as an outcome of the Fairbanks meeting.
3. Comments from the SDT on the proposed approach:
  - SDT Member Comment: Comfortable with the proposed plan. Determining 5 to 6 questions will be a useful and challenging exercise for the SDT. Once the key questions are identified, 2<sup>nd</sup> tier questions could then be used to better dictate the opportunities for research funding. The reformulation of the vulnerability framework diagram was helpful.
  - SDT Member Question: if the team is in groups, then will Dan H. and Eric K. be synthesizing the top tier information? Dan H. – Response: This will be the responsibility of the entire group and will be done during the afternoon on the 1<sup>st</sup> day when the group comes together as a whole.

- SDT Member Comment: It is important to avoid stovepipe thinking within the individual working groups. Eric K. – Response: The afternoon session will be used to synthesize material as a group.
- SDT Member Comment: Will there be coastal research as part of ABoVE? It is not currently well captured in one of the working groups. Eric K. – Response: Coastal processes were not included in depth in the individual responses to the homework assignments. Land processes may influence coastal processes and then these interactions may be addressed by ABoVE, however unless there are other coastal-focused groups that partner with NASA, then it is not likely that this will be a focus of the project.
- SDT Member Comment: Significant emphasis needs to be on scale to ensure the right questions are answered.
- SDT Member Comment: A working group on scaling could be important, the current groups are narrowly focused. Should there be a biogeochemistry group (vegetation, permafrost, and soil carbon in one group)? Eric K. – Response: Is scaling a research question or is it something important to take into consideration when determining the ACEP? If the latter, then have scaling be an important factor in writing the ACEP, but not a science question or group.
- SDT Member Comment: scaling, remote sensing, modeling – these 3 are important and we should be thinking about them throughout the discussions. Eric K. – Response: use the Day 1 afternoon session to integrate these themes across the key questions.
- SDT Member Comment: The approach suggested by Dan H. and Eric K. to determine working groups is a reasonable one.
- SDT Member Comment: Land-atmosphere interactions were mentioned by some in La Jolla. Will these be addressed using the proposed structure for the working groups? Response: These interactions are crosscutting enough that they can be addressed within the proposed working groups.
- Dan H. asked the group if they thought the proposed working groups were the right groups, and aside from the comments mentioned above, the group agreed. The SDT will proceed to the Fairbanks meeting using the proposed groups and agenda structure.

### 3) Discussion of Proposed Agenda

Eric K. provided a summary of the agenda for the Fairbanks meeting based on an agenda document he had passed out prior to the meeting. A short discussion followed. Highlights include:

- Volunteers are needed for each of the proposed working groups.
  - **Action Item:** Peter G. will create a google doc so the SDT can sign up for working groups
  - **Action Item:** SDT members should review the ABoVE materials and Tier II questions developed at previous ABoVE workshops which pertain to their working group
- Eric K. offered a tour of the Bonanza Creek LTER and there was some interest for this

#### **4) Additional Business**

Discussions are ongoing for additional ABoVE activities including representation at AGU and IBFRA. Also, there is a trip planned for the NW Territories in late August (for the SDT leadership committee) to familiarize this group with the region. Finally, the ABoVE website is now live ([above.nasa.gov](http://above.nasa.gov)).