



Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, May 27, 2014

CG1, 3131

2 PM

Attendees: Joan Burkepile, Rebecca Centeno Elliott, Roberto Casini, Giuliana de Toma, Alfred deWijn, Mausumi Dikpati, Yuhong Fan, Sarah Gibson, Phil Judge, Michael Knoelker, Hanli Liu, Gang Lu (Chair), Astrid Maute, Scott McIntosh, Liying Qian, Art Richmond, Steve Tomczyk, Mike Wiltberger, Qian Wu, Valery Yudin

Minutes: Sheryl Shapiro

1. Name change for HAO: Pros and Cons

Pros

- There is more going on here than the name HAO implies, which may be a worthwhile reason to change our name.
- Our science has evolved over the past 70 years, and our name just does not reflect what we do now. We can become bigger than HAO if we identify who we are and what we really do.
- HAO is smaller than the other labs but we aren't treated as less important when issues concerning NCAR are discussed. This is our opportunity—Jim Hurrell views us as part of the NCAR family. Changing our name to be more in line with other labs at NCAR would make us better fitted with the organization that we have identified as our home.
- A name change would reflect that we are trying to become viable within NCAR. It will reflect a refocusing and rebranding of ourselves.
- We should determine who we are rather than waiting for a new leader to come in and decide for us.
- If we don't want to get merged with NSO in the future, a name change will make us to align better with NCAR and distinguish us from NSO.

Cons

- HAO is a recognized brand name. A name change could create a lot of expense (letterhead, website, branding), which is counterintuitive when money is tight.
- We don't want to lose the connection to the strong lineage of science and our name. We are well known in the scientific community (even though the name may be confusing to bureaucrats), and a name change to align ourselves with NCAR might have confusing consequences in the broader community.
- It's okay if the name HAO doesn't accurately represent us; the name has been here for over 70 years.
- If we're worried that we're going to merge with NSO or get kicked out of NCAR, it would not matter what our name is.
- HAO's negative connotation is minimal.
- A name change carries responsibility and may invite closer scrutiny.

Discussion/Considerations

- What problem are we trying to solve? Our name doesn't reflect who we are. The general public doesn't understand what it is that we do when they hear our name. We have to talk about how to best position ourselves in the future.
- What is the motivation for changing our name, and what is the best way we can do it and be better fitted within NCAR?
- Does the name HAO accurately represent who we are and what we do? Does it set us apart from the rest of NCAR's labs?
- We agree that our name doesn't represent the substance, so what do we stand to gain and lose by changing our name?
- Is the historic value stronger than a new, clearer identity?
- Does the HAO name still work under the current funding environment? What is best for us in the long run?

It is decided to table the name change issue for now and revisit it in a few months.

Action Items: 1) The group will talk amongst ourselves and with the outside community and think about what would be best for our future. Revisit the issue in a few months.

2. Planning for the new Strategic Plan (2016-2020)

The new NCAR strategic plan is online. HAO representatives Mike Wiltberger and Sarah Gibson were actively engaged in the process and worked hard to make sure our science was integrated throughout the entire plan. They got input from the external HAO advisory committee as to how it read from an external viewpoint. The plan reflects broadly who we are and what we want to do.

We need to reexamine our current 2015 strategic plan to see where we should be in terms of developing our next strategic plan. Should some of the frontiers become imperatives or imperatives become frontiers? We need to focus on the science question first—identify who we are and what we can do to make the best achievements internationally and nationally in the solar terrestrial area. We will revisit the decadal survey after we figure out what we want to do for ourselves.

For funding agencies that are relevant to us (NSF, NASA), decadal surveys are taken as a coherent voice of the science—what is important and what should the priority setting be. Then the research entities should align themselves with those identified priorities. It can be very effective if done correctly.

Action Items:

1) Each section will discuss this and try to identify their plan for the next five years. Reconvene in August to see where we are and to identify the big items. The one-page document on new scientific directions and visions for HAO could serve a guideline for developing a new strategic plan.

2) Brainstorming sessions at the end of summer—section meeting and section head meeting.

3. Sun-Climate Connection Initiative (Sarah, Scott, Phil, Giuliana, and Stan)

The purpose of the initiative is to better coordinate among ourselves, to identify the "big" questions or tasks that we want to undertake in the coming months/years, and to determine what resources are needed to support those tasks. What is the plan and how can we best coordinate among labs and other local entities?

There have been two sun-climate and solar-stellar workshops this year.

Phil's Solar-Stellar Workshop put together a white paper recommending that solar-stellar research was in need of funding, and for the university community and some observatories, that agencies consider new line of funding for solar-stellar work to understand large-scale dynamo action. They are waiting to hear back from program managers in response to the paper.

Scott gave a seminar to CGD on how we may want to go about pursuing the sun-earth connection on short- and long-term timescales. The purpose was to start a dialogue, and it seems to have been welcomed within the community. Rich Behnke asked Scott to draft a white paper on the sun-earth connection, the idea being that AGS is trying to leverage money out of climate people to support an institute or programmatic augmentation to NCAR or for NCAR to act as vessel for the community.

Giuliana met with colleagues in the climate community in February. They identified two key areas and plan to have two smaller working groups that will work on: 1) providing better physical constraints to Maunder Minimum TSI, and 2) testing sensitivity of atmospheric models to solar spectral variability.

Sarah's space-climate initiative concept is to use the dynamo to do long-term variation of the solar magnetic field, and from this determine spectral irradiance and heliospheric magnetic structure in order to investigate impacts on terrestrial and space climate. This subject is of growing interest to the solar dynamo and broader space climate communities, and we need to continue to reach out and become involved with efforts such as SCOSTEP/VARSITI. It is also relevant to solar-stellar studies investigating the range of dynamo and irradiance characteristics, with significance to habitability studies of extra-solar planets and utility for testing terrestrial climate models under extreme scenarios. As a national center we can help organize and facilitate meeting sessions and workshops in the future pertaining to sun-terrestrial climate drivers and space climate. In addition, within NCAR we can start having conversations across labs so that we can consider current solar inputs to CESM, and what can HAO do to help move forward.

Action Item: Groups will share information and possibly coordinate different activities since there is some overlap.

Distributed after the meeting: Sarah's decadal survey document.