



HORIZON 2020

Coordination and Support Action

Grant Agreement No: 652641



CONNECTING SCIENCE WITH SOCIETY

Deliverable No. 1.16

Minutes of workshop with international partners &
stakeholders at an Antarctic meeting

Submission of Deliverable

Work Package	WP 1
Deliverable no. & title	D1.16 Minutes of workshop with international partners & stakeholders at an Antarctic meeting
Version	Final
Creation Date	02.07.2019
Last change	01.10.2019
Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WP lead accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive Board accepted
Dissemination level	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PU-Public <input type="checkbox"/> PP- Restricted to programme partners <input type="checkbox"/> RE- Restricted to a group specified by the consortium <input type="checkbox"/> CO- Confidential, only for members of the consortium
Lead Beneficiary	IPEV (partner 6)
Contributors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 – AWI, <input type="checkbox"/> 2 – CNRS, <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - NERC-BAS, <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - CNR-DTA, <input type="checkbox"/> 5 – SPRS, <input type="checkbox"/> 6 – IPEV, <input type="checkbox"/> 7 - IGOT-UL, <input type="checkbox"/> 8 – RUG, <input type="checkbox"/> 9 - RCN, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10 – AEI, <input type="checkbox"/> 11 – CSIC, <input type="checkbox"/> 12 - UW-APRI, <input type="checkbox"/> 13 – BAI, <input type="checkbox"/> 14 – GEUS, <input type="checkbox"/> 15 – VUB, <input type="checkbox"/> 16 – UOULU, <input type="checkbox"/> 17 – RBINS, <input type="checkbox"/> 18 - IGF PAS, <input type="checkbox"/> 19 - IG-TUT, <input type="checkbox"/> 20 – AMAP, <input type="checkbox"/> 21 – WOC, <input type="checkbox"/> 22 - GINR
Due date	30 August 2019
Delivery date	01. October 2019

Minutes of the EU-PolarNet and European Polar Board side event at ATCMXLII and CEPXXII “Connecting European Polar Research with Antarctic Policymakers”

12:30-14:00, 1st July 2019, Prague, Czech Republic



Photo credits: R Badhe/EPB

Invitations were distributed among all national delegations prior to this side event (see Annex 1).

Introduction and Welcome – J. Chappellaz

Jerome Chappellaz welcomed all delegates to the event, outlining it as a unique opportunity for European scientists and researchers to engage with ATCM and Antarctic stakeholders for input to the work of EU-PolarNet and the EPB.

J. Chappellaz introduces himself, and then the panel – Renuka Badhe (EPB), Nicole Biebow (AWI), Antonio Quesada (AEI).

J. Chappellaz outlines the purpose of the session. ATCM delegates are those who manage and govern Antarctica. EU-PolarNet and the EPB are working to ensure European policymakers can get the most out of the latest science to help inform and guide decisions for Antarctic governance and policymaking. EU-PolarNet and the EPB would now like feedback from Antarctic policymakers – what are the main issues they see as important for science to tackle?

J. Chappellaz introduces R. Badhe for the first presentation.

“Towards greater coordination and collaboration in Polar research – a European perspective” by Renuka Badhe¹.

R. Badhe introduces herself as the Executive Secretary of the European Polar Board.

R. Badhe introduced the EPB. Formed in 1995 as part of the ESF, the EPB became an independent organisation in 2015. The EPB has a Dutch legal entity, with public benefit status in the Netherlands. The Dutch Research Council (NWO) in The Hague hosts the EPB Secretariat.

The EPB Strategy 2017-2022 includes a vision for the EPB as the strong and independent voice of European Arctic and Antarctic research, and sets out the EPB’s Mission to promote, coordinate and advance European research into the Polar Regions.

The EPB has 27 members from 19 countries, and includes abroad membership including research councils and funding agencies, research institutes, government ministries and departments, national academies, polar operators and national polar networks. Esteemed membership with scientific, logistical and managerial experience and expertise in both the Arctic and Antarctic.

Key strengths of the EPB come from the expertise of its members and a composite and comprehensive membership. Another key strength of the EPB is that it connects both poles since there are very few organisations connecting both these regions.

EPB provides a supporting structure for international cooperation, transfer of knowledge, and sharing best practices. The EPB is a single contact point through which all members can be reached. It is a forum for members to share information and to collectively address mutual challenges and opportunity as a coherent European polar research community. Members are very active in Polar Regions, and active in sharing knowledge gained from experience.

R. Badhe gives an overview of some of the EPB’s current Action Groups and projects.

Action groups, projects: Some examples of AGs (see [slides](#)).

- Action Group on Infrastructure – database and catalogue. Now working towards improved access to European polar infrastructure.
- AGs on International Cooperation.
- AG on Environment Impacts of Polar Research and Logistics

She highlights the catalogue of polar infrastructure, which is a co-production with EU-PolarNet. It is available as PDF or printed version via the EPB website. A related online database provides a more comprehensive information on European polar infrastructure, and updateability ensures sustainability.

She showed some examples of projects in which the EPB is involved: (see [slides](#))

EU-PolarNet, born out of the collaborative platform provided by the EPB, the EPB provides ongoing support to the project and will ensure its legacy is sustained.

CHOICEe, joint EPB-ESA project (possible through EPB-ESA MoU) – example of EPB as a single contact point in action. An expansion of work ongoing at Concordia (ESA-IPEV-PNRA collaboration). CHOICEe investigates the epidemiology of potential newly developed allergic reactions in polar expedition

¹ The presentation is available for download [here](#)

crews. Potential application for prolonged human space flight, and for bettering the health of the overwintering staff members

SO-CHIC – H2020-funded project due to start later in 2019. Investigating the role of the Southern Ocean as a component of the global climate system includes focus on the Weddell Sea polynya. EPB's role includes upcoming plans to communicate scientific results with policy makers, including at fora like the ATCM.

For more information, please visit the EPB website. In addition, the EPB has a mailing list and is active on Twitter (*details on [slide](#)*).

No questions for the EPB.

J. Chappellaz thanks **R. Badhe** for the presentation and introduces **N. Biebow**.

EU-PolarNet: Connecting science with society by Nicole Biebow²

N. Biebow introduces herself as project manager of EU-PolarNet and head of International Cooperation Unit at the AWI. She introduces EU-PolarNet – which is a coordination and support action implemented by the EC to provide advice to them on polar issues and to improve coordination of the European polar research community.

Though EU-PolarNet works on both poles –there is more focus on the Arctic now. Hence, EU-PolarNet is pleased to get more input from the Antarctic community at the ATCM.

EU-PolarNet has the following objectives;

- Ongoing dialogue with EC – they ask a question and we answer.
- Biggest deliverable – Integrated European Polar Research Programme
- Infrastructure access and usage plan.
- Strong involvement of stakeholders in all parts of the project

She introduces the consortium partners (see [slide](#)). The EPB is an affiliated partner, and the project works also with COMNAP and SCAR.

EU-PolarNet's approach to its research planning is to first look at existing strategies and policies. Then to launch a public consultation to get input from the society. EU-Polar Net's white paper process (see A. Quezada's presentation) is a good example for the approach. EU-PolarNet is currently building up the design process to develop the Integrated European Polar Research Programme.

Another key deliverable of EU-PolarNet is the Infrastructure catalogue, which has been developed with the EPB, and has been highlighted in the EPB talk.

Finally, EU-PolarNet put a lot of efforts on interacting with stakeholders and carefully defined it stakeholders (Definition of stakeholders, see [slide](#)). Basically, it means everyone, including scientists are stakeholders. Several workshops, a town hall meeting in Brussels and online consultations were used to gather input from (mainly Arctic) stakeholders. However, EU-PolarNet is still struggling to understand what Antarctic stakeholders want from research. N. Biebow hopes to get a much better insight during the ATCM meeting.

² The presentation is available for download [here](#)

The European Commission is funding Arctic research in H2020 with 200 million €. They are also supporting Antarctic research but by far not at the same level as Arctic Research. If we want to get more funding for Antarctic Research, we have to make clear how relevant the ongoing change in the Antarctic is for the society. EU-PolarNet can be a help here, as it has been for the new Antarctic project funded by the EC, **Beyond EPICA**, which wants to drill the oldest ice-core in Antarctica.

We have also recognised that parts of the research recommended in the EU-PolarNet White papers is already reflected in the last H2020 calls (see [slides](#)). This demonstrates that our input to the research process of the EC is well accepted and does have an effect.

End of presentation.

J. Chappellaz thanks N Biebow and introduces **A. Quesada**.

EU-PolarNet's strategic research planning – the white paper process by Antonio Quesada³

A. Quesada introduces himself as the executive director of the Spanish Polar Committee.

A. Quesada will explain the process of how the EU-PolarNet white papers have been produced.

It is less than a year since the white papers were published and already four have been taken into funding calls.

The main objective of EU-PolarNet is to develop the Integrated European Polar Research Programme. The difference to other programmes is its strong focus on societal relevance. Co-design is the key word, as well as co-creation of knowledge

The first step EU-PolarNet has made in its research planning process was assessing all existing polar strategies, national policies etc.. From that, we defined 10 over-arching research themes with several key questions and related societal relevance.

The second step was the identification of stakeholder needs. We have organised several workshops and a public online survey. The survey was translated into eight languages, including Arctic indigenous languages and sent to around 1000 destinations, individuals, organisations etc.

A. Quesada presented the results of this online survey, divided by type of respondent, location. The examination of the results clearly shows that different stakeholder groups have different priorities for future research.

EU-PolarNet took all this information (strategies and survey results) to the white paper workshop. It gathered 50 experts in a retreat-style atmosphere at *La Cristalera* near Madrid in September 2017. The experts went into the white paper workshop with a very flexible structure and an open mind. The work was divided into topical groups, but frequently exchanged ideas with other groups. At the beginning of the workshop, it was not clear how many white papers would be produced, or what the topics would be. At the end, the group agreed on five white papers and developed them further. The summaries for policy makers and the full versions are available via the EU-PolarNet website.

The White papers will also form the basis from which the Integrated European Polar Research Programme is built.

³ The presentation is available for download [here](#)

Where we are now for developing the research programme?

We have distilled what has already been done, sorted the stakeholder input and evaluated it by an external panel, clustered, and structured the input into six over-arching themes for the programme – see [slide](#). We emphasised that it focusses on research needs for both poles. The work on the research programme is ongoing, it shall be finalised by end of 2019.

Discussion



Photo credits: R Badhe/EPB

Discussion questions (previously provided via email and invitation):

- **What globally significant Antarctic issues do you feel would be most effectively addressed by an internationally coordinated research programme?**
- **What does your country expect from the scientific community as a contribution to the ATCM activities (governance, decisions, etc)?**
- **What are key areas in which scientific collaboration between the Parties of the ATCM can contribute to safeguarding the Antarctic environment for the future?**
- **How does your country integrate ATCM / CEP stakeholder needs in its own national research programming?**

J. Chappellaz opens the discussion: Science has to be at the service to stakeholders/society. There is a bias in Europe towards the Arctic. We are here to try partly to correct this.

Question to the audience:

As a country, how to do you interact between ATCM delegation and scientists? How do you see the benefit of working internationally?

J. Francis – one of the ways to get nations to join better in Antarctica is synchronisation of observations in the Southern Ocean. The aim is to have a coordinated synoptic observation of the Southern Ocean. There is enough capacity – but we need more coordination and cooperation to achieve it.

Questions from audience member:

1. Are you a funding agency?
2. On greater focus on Arctic than Antarctic in EU-PolarNet. Are there more people working in the Arctic?

N. Biebow – we are not a funding agency, but we are working for the EC, which is a big research funder in Europe.

Arctic - Antarctic – all over Europe there are more scientists working in the Antarctic, but there is currently more economic and political interest in the Arctic. From a purely scientific point of view, there is more interest in the Antarctic in Europe. From a political/economic/social point of view, there is more interest in the Arctic.

We are talking about Europe, but we should emphasise that European calls are open to other countries, e.g. the All Atlantic research alliance is a cooperation with international partners, like Brazil or South Africa for the Southern Hemisphere. There are several ways in which non-EU states can participate in EU funding calls e.g. by negotiations between governments and the EC to get access to the framework program or by offering infrastructure or other services.

J. Chappellaz - Transnational access is a focus of European infrastructure initiatives. This is really key to help support science in different countries.

R. Badhe – not only EC – Members of EPB are also some national funding agencies. Advice from this session and other stakeholder input can follow down to a national level.

G. Fenton – The Australian Antarctic programme works very closely with policy. It has a science strategic plan, developed with policymakers and other stakeholders. This helped them to focus what science we have to do with resources available, and how the science can make the most impact. He is very interested in the discussions from an Australian perspective.

J. Chappellaz notes that there are clearly some similarities in the processes for stakeholder input to strategic planning for science in Australia, Europe and elsewhere. It will be good to keep good communications ongoing to share knowledge and best practices.

N. Gilbert – New Zealand. Very interested in this discussion also.

There has been a big investment in NZ science recently over next few years. The programme was developed with intensive stakeholder consultation.

N. Gilbert stressed that working to ensure transfer of knowledge from sciences is very important. Communicating the science effectively to stakeholders so that it can be most useful is key also.

N. Biebow – There are several ways by which NZ and Australia can be much more involved – negotiate with EC, also offer infrastructure. Non-EU countries can be fully funded and fully participate in certain EU projects.

A. Quesada – regardless of technicalities of funding etc. We are very interested in sharing knowledge and sharing contacts. This is free. Similar work is going on around the world. It is important to share knowledge and best practices.

J. Rumble – Talking about big questions. ATCM has the responsibility to preserve the Antarctic for science. Also, as an ATCM ‘customer’, science can sometimes look a bit niche, not always clear what the useful application of knowledge from the science is to policymakers. Need more applicable science for ATCM as a customer – science that will help with managing tourism and science activity, environmental protection, new technologies etc. is most interesting to policymakers.

R. Badhe – there has been various activities to interact with different Antarctic stakeholders, or “customers” in order to understand what is considered useful research in the Polar Regions for policy

makers. This has included interactions with social sciences (SCAR HASSEG workshop), that in turn included policymakers, and aspects of tourism. Through interactions like this session, we aim to understand the need, so knowing the ATCM representatives would like these aspects (as noted above) is important.

Turkey delegation lead provided a set of responses for the given questions.

1. What globally significant Antarctic issues do you feel would be most effectively addressed by an internationally coordinated research programme?

We believe that globally significant Antarctic issues would include increase of microplastics, sea ice decline, sea level change and ice sheet melting. EU funding mechanisms may give priorities to these research areas.

2. What does your country expect from the scientific community as a contribution to the ATCM activities (governance, decisions, etc.)?

Antarctic Parties should be encouraged to submit pre-season and post-season information to IES enables parties not to duplicate scientific efforts and limited financial resources.

3. What are key areas in which scientific collaboration between the Parties of the ATCM can contribute to safeguarding the Antarctic environment for the future?

By taking into consideration of the parties national programmes budgets, international collaborations both scientifically and especially in logistic aspects should be encouraged by all parties during the formulation of national scientific Project calls. We believe efficiency is the key word considering the logistic activities for safeguarding the Antarctic environment

4. How does your country integrate ATCM / CEP stakeholder needs in its own national research programming?

We already integrated SCAR's four major thematic areas into our 5 year National Polar Research Strategy. In this respect, we give priorities to international collaborations and we invite international scientists to our expeditions to Antarctica.

As Turkey, we feel globally significant Antarctic issues include microplastics, sea ice. Treaty parties should be required to produce pre- and post-season reports on activities to try to avoid duplication of research activities in Antarctic.

Efficiency is the key word for logistics activities for minimising environmental impacts and priority should be given to international collaboration in the Antarctic.

D. van der Kroef – Heard all these intentions for international collaborations.

What about building a single shared facility? Like ISS, CERN, etc. This could be done in Antarctica if the community organises itself.

Could be a big ambition for the scientific community to have a vision of a shared European facility. Big efficiencies could be gained.

N. Biebow – until now this has not been discussed in detail. However, it we shall explore this idea. Please, do not try to build a shared icebreaker as we have learned from the Aurora Borealis project but maybe more straightforward is a shared station.

R. Badhe – we already working to increase transnational accessibility to existing infrastructure (via the EPB AG on Infrastructure), shared facilities are maybe the end of that path.

J. Chappellaz – we must also remember satellites are key infrastructure for Antarctica. Sharing and access to data for these should also be considered.

J. Francis – we also should look at new technologies in Antarctica. For research and all other activities. We need to reduce our environmental footprint and improve automation of infrastructure in Antarctica. BAS is having success with winter automation of Halley. Maybe a joint call with industry to tackle this could be beneficial.

In addition, it is very important to look at new technologies for energy sources in Antarctica – geothermal in Antarctica?

A. Quesada – Efficiency is the key. Not only for logistics. People keep going to the same places and doing the same things. Coordinate better. Repetition is not a bad thing for science, but unnecessarily repeating logistics and duplicating efforts is a waste.

He suggests compiling new technologies and sharing resources between countries. We want to grow in terms of science, but we are not really going to grow in terms of budget. The only way is to coordinate and find synergies to be more efficient.

J Chappellaz – the risks are big in Antarctica. Technology is key. Technology can help to reduce risks, but is also necessary for certain research question – e.g. investigations under ice sheets. New technologies allow for new and necessary science.

S. Hain – You should also consider CCAMLR. They are grappling with many of the issues being discussed here. You should encourage DG RTD to engage more with DG MARE on this in the European context.

N. Biebow – ESA and EC are in discussions for a joint polar strategy. ESA looking to provide platforms for research, and EC to fund the science using those platforms. A joint conference to move this idea forward is planned for 2020.

No more questions or comments.

J. Chappellaz thanks the panel and all of the audience for their useful input and discussions.

End of session.

SUMMARY OF A RELATED SIDE MEETING: EPB, EU-PolarNet and Latin American countries

EPB, EU-PolarNet and Latin American representatives to the ATCM and CEP met on 5th of July, 2019 for an additional side meeting. This event was a follow-up to a side event organised by EU-PolarNet and EPB on 1st of July, which prompted interest in the work carried out by European organisations. Representatives from Latin American countries approached EU-PolarNet and EPB to inquire about the potential for collaboration. Under this premise, an informative/discussion meeting was organised to provide further information and answer questions on possibilities for cooperation on a European-/EU-level within projects. All Latin American countries present at ATCM (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Uruguay) were invited in person and in writing. The meeting was bilingual (English/Spanish) and informally arranged.

Agenda

Presentation on EU-projects dynamics
Presentation on EPB facilitation
Example EU-Arctic (Polar) Cluster
Possibilities for future interactions (new FP)
How to deal for interactions
Q&A

Attendees:

Antonio Quesada, Spain, organiser
Nicole Biebow, EU-PolarNet
Renuka Badhe, EPB
Brazil, representative
Chile, representative
Colombia, representative
Peru, representative
Spain, representative
Uruguay, representative

Apologies:

Argentina sent apologies as their presence was needed in other meetings happening in parallel.

Conclusions

All participants indicated their interest in cooperating with European researchers in European projects. They are happy to recommend to both their funding agencies and diplomatic machinery to establish formal and informal links with the EU and European countries to tighten scientific and logistical links for polar (particularly Antarctic) projects in different areas of interest.

In general, a further development of the cooperation is considered a win-win relationship for both sides. European projects can benefit from the Antarctic expertise, scientific quality and logistical strength of Latin American countries, who in turn can benefit from participation in large consortia with

substantial budgets for projects focused on topics of importance and relevance at national, regional and international levels.

The meeting participants considered several upcoming European initiatives as highly relevant for future cooperation. Part of EPB's mandate is to act as a single contact point for all its member organisations in Europe. EPB can bring the different European Antarctic Programs in contact with Latin American countries to help with their requests and questions. A closer relationship of the EPB with the Meeting of Administrators of Latin American Antarctic Programs (RAPAL) is strongly anticipated, noting that Chile will host the upcoming RAPAL meeting in October 2019.

The short meeting was successful, and it is proposed that a follow-up should be organised at the next ATCM, or an earlier suitable occasion.

Annex 1. Invitation to the event:

EU-PolarNet and the European Polar Board invite the national delegations at ATCM and CEP to attend the side event:

“Connecting European Polar Research with Antarctic Policymakers”



Date: 1. July 2019

Time: 12:30 – 14:00

Venue: TOP HOTEL PRAGUE, Congress Hall II

Attendees: Heads of delegations plus one other

A light lunch and refreshments will be served

Annex 2. Agenda of the event:



Invitation to the EU-PolarNet / EPB side event at ATCM:

“Connecting European Polar Research with Antarctic Policymakers”

Date: 1. July 2019

Time: 12:30 – 14:00

Location: Congress Hall II

Rationale:

The side event is co-organised by EU-PolarNet and the European Polar Board (EPB). EU-PolarNet is an EU funded Coordination and Support Action project that develops and delivers a strategic framework to prioritise polar science, while providing tangible benefits for society. The EPB promotes, coordinates and advances polar research by providing a collaborative platform for the European polar research community.

© EU-PolarNet Consortium

01/10/2019

The objective of this side event is to stimulate discussions with ATCM delegates to identify societal relevant research needs in the Antarctic as an important contribution for national and international programmes. This effort is expected to be useful as a roadmap for the international management of the Antarctic continent at policy and operational levels. The societal relevant research needs will be included in the European Integrated European Polar Research Programme, which EU-PolarNet is currently developing and which will be the basis for directing Polar research funding in the next EU framework programme Horizon Europe. Horizon Europe has a proposed budget for funding research of 100 billion Euros for 2021 – 2027.

Agenda:

Chair: *Jérôme Chappellaz* (French polar institute IPEV, member of the French delegation at ATCM and CEP)

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 12:30 – 12:40: | Towards greater coordination and collaboration in Polar research – a European perspective by <i>Renuka Badhe</i> , EPB member of the Dutch delegation at CEP and ATCM) |
| 12:40 – 12:50: | EU-PolarNet: Connecting science with society by <i>Nicole Biebow</i> (Alfred Wegener Institute AWI, member of the German delegation at CEP and ATCM) |
| 12:50 – 13:00: | EU-PolarNet’s strategic research planning – the white paper process by <i>Antonio Quesada</i> (Spanish Polar Committee, member of the Spanish delegation at the CEP and ATCM) |
| 13:15 – 14:00 | Discussion |

The discussion will focus on the following questions:

1. What globally significant Antarctic issues do you feel would be most effectively addressed by an internationally coordinated research programme?
2. What does your country expect from the scientific community as a contribution to the ATCM activities (governance, decisions, etc)?
3. What are key areas in which scientific collaboration between the Parties of the ATCM can contribute to safeguarding the Antarctic environment for the future?
4. How does your country integrate ATCM / CEP stakeholder needs in its own national research programming?

A light lunch will be served!

Annex 3 Participant List



EU-PolarNet and European Polar Board side event at ATCMXLII and CEPXXII

“Connecting European Polar Research with Antarctic Policymakers”

12:30-14:00, 1st July 2019, Prague, Czech Republic

Name	Delegation	Signature
Gwen Fenton	Australia	Gwen Fenton
Jan Gunnars	Australia	Jan Gunnars
François ANDRÉ	BELGIUM	Fr. A.
Claire Christin	ASOC	Claire Christin
Maurizio Azzaro	ASOC	Maurizio Azzaro
MAURIZIO AZZARO	ITALY	Maurizio Azzaro
ROBERTA TECCHI	ITALY	Roberta Tecchi
Idoia Mota	BDI	Idoia Mota
Christo Pimpirev	Bulgaria	Christo Pimpirev
Lina María Ofano	COLOMBIA	Lina María Ofano
Julian Quintero	Colombia	Julian Quintero
Justina Ddu	Sweden	Justina Ddu
Carole SEMICTON	FRANCE	Carole SEMICTON
AMANDA LYNNES	I AATO	Amanda Lynnes
Fang Chang	CHINA	Fang Chang
Ellen Oseth	Norway	Ellen Oseth
Andrii Fedehuk	Ukraine	Andrii Fedehuk



EU-PolarNet and European Polar Board side event at ATCMXLII and CEPXXII

“Connecting European Polar Research with Antarctic Policymakers”

12:30-14:00, 1st July 2019, Prague, Czech Republic

Name	Delegation	Signature
Bow Ozsoy	Turkey	
Ilknur Inam	Turkey	
Piotr Stowach	Poland	
CHAPPELLAZ Jérôme	France	
LE VAN Julien	FRANCE	
BARBIER Sandrine	FRANCE	
João Xavier	Portugal	
DAVID BARCEL	IGRFI	
Phillip Richter	IGRFI	
Stefan Heitz	Germany	
HAMISH KIRK	NEW ZEALAND	
Ossi Oksanen	FINLAND	
DICK VANDER KROEF	NETHERLANDS	
LE BOHEC Céline	MONACO	
Cyrill Martin	Switzerland	
Maximo Gowland	Argentina	



EU-PolarNet and European Polar Board side event at ATCMXLII and CEPXXII

“Connecting European Polar Research with Antarctic Policymakers”

12:30-14:00, 1st July 2019, Prague, Czech Republic

Name	Delegation	Signature
J. FRANCIS	UK	<i>J. Francis</i>
M. PURDAS	UK	<i>M.C. Purdas</i>
J. RUMBLE	UK	<i>J. Rumble</i>
M. SPARROW	WMO	<i>M. Sparrow</i>
R. Bork	Poland	<i>R. Bork</i>
M. TOTOLCA	Poland	<i>M. Totolca</i>
L. VAL JENTO	FINLAND	<i>L. Valjento</i>
NEIL PILBERT	NZ	<i>Neil Pilbert</i>
A. Shalleh Mohd Nor	Malaysia	<i>A. Shalleh Mohd Nor</i>
Nor Air	"	<i>Nor Air</i>
Souta Ramos	Spain	<i>Souta Ramos</i>
Xu Hongyan	Chinese	<i>Xu Hongyan</i>
Keepikov A.	Russia	<i>Keepikov A.</i>
Lisa Kelley	IAATO	<i>Lisa Kelley</i>