IASC NAG meeting 2021

Date: January 26, 2021
Location: Online

Meeting programme

- 13:00 – 13:10: Welcome
- 13:10 – 13:40: Presentation Koji Fujita (Nagoya University, Japan) - Physically based summer temperature reconstruction from melt layers in ice cores
- 13:40 – 14:10: Presentation Ruth Mottram (Danish Meteorological Institute, Denmark) - Forecasting future declines: High resolution SMB for Arctic glaciers
- 14:10 – 14:40: Presentation Shawn Marshall (University of Calgary, Canada) - The transition to temperate firn and the development of a deep firn aquifer at Kaskawulsh Glacier, St. Elias Mountains, Yukon
- 14:40 – 15:00: Coffee break
- 15:00 – 16:00: Open forum

Open Forum Minutes (summary)

Led by Ward van Pelt, note takers: Natalija Nikolic, Lauren Samo and Wesley Van Wychen

Synthesized meeting notes:

Meeting Format	For comments	Against comments
Hybrid light	Protects publishing interests Support for physical meetings over online meetings	Travel footprint Budget costs
Hybrid medium	Works well for small groups Increases amount of potential participants Cheaper for budgets Online networking sessions, like breakout rooms	Potential connectivity issues Concerns for showing preliminary results to larger audience Difficult to present posters

Hybrid plus	Reduces travelling footprint	Potential connectivity issues
	Easier to attend	Concerns about facilitating communication with a larger participant base

Key comments and outtakes from Meeting Format discussion
- Connectivity (bandwidth, internet) and technology issues of host location
- Travel footprint of physical meetings and easier accessibility for virtual format
- Difficulty with virtual and physical poster sessions of hybrid plus
- Hybrid light is better to preserve preliminary results for publication interests that should not be shared with entire community
- In person benefit of networking OR option for virtual networking sessions (creates relationships between early career researchers and established researchers)
- Majority of people prefer hybrid medium option

Key comments and outtakes from List of National Contacts discussion
- Need to fill gaps for Italy, India, Portugal, South Korea, Czech Republic
- Paco suggests that some countries are focussed more on other working groups (Portugal large focus on permafrost, South Korea is active in many fields)
- Olaf suggests contacting Kyle Megunte(?) from italy, asking to help us put into contact with potential contacts

Key comments and outtakes from Website discussion
- Website should be checked for typos and mobile compatibility
- Many agree that the website could be used as a repository for information (current and historical) rather than something that should be updated and maintained. Analytics of users might be useful for this decision.
- Data section hasn't been updated since 2003, perhaps it could be changed to links to updated databases instead of posting data to it
- Publications, project documents, and proposals should have a dedicated space so that they do not get lost. Also, instead of posting funding applications we should be posting project information and received funding.
  - Glacoidyn and Magics section can be replaced with something else.
- Concern about adding a News section as it must be maintained, suggested that there can be updates section including a social media feed instead.
- Consolidate the meetings and workshop pages
- 4 people confirmed they use the website only for checking workshop/meeting information

Open Forum (full notes)

Part one – Meeting format:

- 3 Hybrid meeting ideas:
  - Light – physical meeting with recorded presentations available after the meetings
  - Medium – physical meeting with live stream available
  - Plus – physical, live stream, virtual participation as well
- Comments by attendees
  - Andreas: We might have an issue, the locations don't always have the strongest internet connection, something to consider when discussing which kind of meeting to plan, geat opportunity though
  - Meetings in person usually have technological issues (ie set up), vs individual zoom, everyone seems to have it working now
  - Hester: Bethel, Maine IASC NAG, used medium hybrid, which worked well for small groups
  - Jack Kohler: Travelling footprint + tougher budget. There probably won't be an immediate return to normal for at least a year, so virtual meetings are a lot more attractive, lots of merit
  - Jack Kohler: Curtail travel: impossible to make it to all meetings, particularly further away.
  - Ward: didn't add only digital because there isn't much support for digitalization of this meeting, hybrid is the most digital it will probably get, recordings of this are not demanding and are allowed, so recording and uploading later doesnt isnt affected by internet, but then others wouldn't be able to participate if they are not there, difficult to find out if you have the right bandwidth for this
  - Virtual is not technologically demanding for individuals on zoom/teams, but livestream depends on location, organization may not have required bandwidth
  - Dariusz: We need to be careful because we are showing prelim results that should only be available to our community, thinks we should go for light version and only share those who consent to having theirs shared
  - Olaf: Better to not return to "old normal" and travel all over. Conferences should all now have virtual option, everyone should have the opportunity to join remotely if they prefer to join that way for a variety of reasons, we should be able to accommodate all of these options, including joining remotely, hybrid increases the number of participants, strongly arguing for hybrids as it may be cost-friendly for people

- ○ Paco: Supports the idea like Olaf, allow people to have the possibility to participate online is a good idea, but having too many people in the meeting makes it harder to interact with others. A larger format would make things more difficult, wants hybrid medium, would allow people to have the same possibilities, would be more difficult for the posters though because you don't have the socialization, instead it would be breakout rooms which wouldn't be as successful
  - ○ Ruth: Agrees with Paco. Hybrid is important but difficult for both online and physical poster sections but having a virtual option is very important. Benefit for these smaller meetings of in person is for early career researchers to network, this should be taken into consideration. Option to have online networking sections
  - ○ Jack: Enforced breakout rooms of Nordic Branch meeting was a great opportunity (randomly placed in breakout room with other people), posters are difficult and don't work well in online experience, really likes randomly assigned breakout rooms for older and early career researchers
- ● Post poll
  - ○ Needs to be discussed with the location if live streaming is a possibility
  - ○ Jack: a zoom meeting is straight forward, doesn't affect other people if your own internet sucks, but if you get into a venue a meeting can get thwarted through problems with the setup, hard for organizers to do things properly and not leave people out by accident
  - ○ Ward: good to introduce it so that we can figure it out and find a way to make it work, something to discuss with Marius in Szczyrk and the Hotel people
- ● Poll results

Meeting style	Results (%)
Physical	7
Hybrid Light	10
Hybrid Medium	71
Hybrid Plus	12
Other	0

Part two - List of National Contacts:

- Need to fill gaps for Italy, India, Portugal, South Korea, Czech Republic
- Ward suggests we leave the list alone, but try to fill the gaps that we still have
- Is there anyone from the missing countries that would be the national contact?
    - Olaf suggests contacting Kyle Megunte(?) From italy, asking to help us put into contact with potential contacts
    - Keep as it is, maybe more thoroughly next year in person
    - Francisco: people may not be interested because they are interested in other things, like permafrost, we can advertise but might not be possible, Portugal and Czech may not have potential candidates, India focus more on antarctic

Part three – Website

- Questions: Is it outdated? Room for improvement? Necessary to keep data? Glaciodyn and Magics, removed or replaced?
- Comments from attendees
    - Ward: outdated, room for improvement, skeptical about keeping the Data section the way it is .. there is no unique data and only goes up to 2003, no recent data, all of it is available elsewhere, data section is not necessary anymore
    - Ward: publications now includes extended abstracts as per last year's consensus, we have funding for ISBN numbers (?), should we change key publications format? Glacoidyn and Magics could be removed or replaced with something else
    - Francisco: clarification about publications, there are a few, but some mention that they are developed within IASC, only those papers were included on the publications list, this is good to keep this way for funding purposes as a network, keep track of papers that explicitly mention it
    - Carleen: before this website, we thought it would be better if website was hosted by IASC, then we already had the discussion of what should and shouldn't be on the website, at the time we wanted to put the data there and we had the intention to update the data but that never happened
    - Ward: poll about the current status of the website
        - Layout and content rated ⅗, means there is room for improvement
    - Ward's personal suggestions: Data section isn't helpful anymore due to them being published elsewhere, no motivation to keep the section anymore - add a

news section about funding or meeting dates, can be posted there and then it is clear what the newest information is - fix typos - unclear about what to do with the key publications and project documents and proposals (maybe project documents and proposals can be removed)

- ○ Jon: key publications are outdated and random, Data section can be a list of links to running updated databases
- ○ Carleen: hard to keep news section update, maybe it shouldn't be called news and add newest information on the front page instead because news has different expectations for maintenance
- ○ Carleen: projects documents and proposals is a nice way of archiving this information
- ○ Ward: good to keep it somewhere maybe if it becomes relevant again, maybe it doesnt have to be online
- ○ Carleen: maybe instead they could be funding information rather than just asking for funding
- ○ Andreas: should be a repository rather than a website due to maintenance for updates
- ○ Olaf: follows up what carleen said - recommends not to add a news section due to the turnover time, embarrassing if news is from 6-12 months ago, which makes us look inactive, want something more persistent over time, put stuff like news in social media channels, if you have news it is expected to be posted every other week
- ○ Luke: store old publication elsewhere (makes it sound like we have a consensus about this)
- ○ Hester: Consolidate meetings and workshops (this is a good idea), should check how it looks on mobile devices
- ○ Natalija: make a connection to twitter for #IASC instead of news section, it would self update
- ○ Wesley: do we have any analytics for how much traffic we have? Maybe we could send out a poll to see what the expectations of interactions are with this before we put too much energy into this, we don't interact with organization websites unless we need specific information
- ○ Francisco: extremely important to keep the website for archive on past activities because we are not formal and if we do not have this information up we will die and we will lose historical information, would be nice to keep repository of publications and activities, difficult to maintain if it is not on a website because we can easily lose it if not on website, even if there is no traffic
- ● Wrap up - anything else that wants to be discussed?

- - Ward: shift everything by a year, we don't have to apply for funding because we haven't used it this year
- Poll results

Layout Ranking	Results (%)
1 (very bad)	0
2	14
3	37
4	43
5 (very good)	6

Content Ranking	Results (%)
1 (very bad)	3
2	14
3	34
4	46
5 (very good)	3

Anything Else to Discuss?

Nothing raised.