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Scope of white paper

• Mechanisms to facilitate communication with all stakeholders (inside and outside climate community)
• Use of internet tools and web presence
• Maximising productive input and debate (and minimising controversy and confusion)
• Identifying desired stakeholder input
How can we engage stakeholders and maintain rigour of scientific process?

• Different stakeholder groups to consider

• (a) Those in community already or with other relevant technical expertise (e.g. statistics, metrology, data processing)

• (b) Active users of derivative products for decision-making

• (c) Others likely to provide limited technical input (e.g. policy makers, general public)
How might an engagement structure work?

New media/IT tools provide many new opportunities for engagement.
What active input might we want?

• Ideas on methodologies for data collection/analysis
• Information on the data (e.g. identification of errors, provision of metadata)
• Data rescue/digitisation?

• There is a need for transparency and visibility throughout the process.
How might the model work?

• A “cloud” based data set not tied to any one institution?
• Would need a process for managing and dealing with comments
• Will need comments to be from an identifiable source

• Do we look to provide full access to all data sets and support information for others to analyse in their own way?
How do we engage non-technical users?

- Possibly different portals aimed at different levels of users?
- Integration with tools for visualisation? (e.g. Google Earth)
- Local-scale community experimental projects? (e.g. with schools, interested amateurs)
- Potential for crowd-sourcing digitisation?
Accessibility of data

- Will need data to be in a consistent format with consistent metadata/quality descriptors
- This would depend on data suppliers allowing open access and taking responsibility for its quality
- Desired outcome is for sufficient information (e.g. data, algorithms) to be available to replicate work if required
Communication channels

- Specialist channels (e.g. journals, scientific magazines) – for engaging technical users
- Mainstream media
- Social media
- Blogs
- Visualisation tools (e.g. Google Earth)
- Others?
Outreach (1)

- Outreach will involve multiple groups (e.g. funders, data providers, users, policymakers, educators, media)
- Need it to be a two-way process
- To do outreach properly will need some level of investment
- Will need an outreach team of some kind
Communication

• Web presence should have an active blog, regularly updated with news on data, interesting derived info (e.g. articles on notable historical anomalies)
• Will need a group to manage and moderate it
• Also need to take advantage of other communication opportunities as they arise, both new and traditional media
Portals

• Should have multiple layers of portals for different levels of users (technical and non-technical)

• Hosting of data is not the hard part, building interfaces is
Role of visualisation tools

• Visualisation tools important for building engagement with community
• Involves tools we’re involved with ourselves, and making our data available to third-party applications: how much control do we want?
Crowd-sourced digitisation

• Agreed that this should be pursued
• Need to think about what will motivate people to participate – follow lead from previous successful projects
• Building the system architecture to support digitisation will not be trivial
• May also be able to take advantage opportunistically of funding opportunities at a local level