

### 5ht Telecon of the TTRA- May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020

#### Participants:

Daniela (chair), Silvina, Clare, Bill, Stefan, Xuebin, Ken, Peter, Beatriz, Narelle, Irene, Lindha, Seung, Paul

#### Summary of discussion points:

- The Lighthouse Activity "My Climate Risk" is what TTRA sees immediately a strong involvement of already existing regional activities of different flavours carried out within WCRP
- Information for regions and discussions around the WGRC, WGIRS and the FoCI are still valid
- There is a need for more flexible structures, e.g. time restricted activities which initiated bottom-up in a science-society dialogue could be fleshed through the WCRP, live for a couple of years and then terminate.
- The TTRA will not focus on elements or structures at this moment, but see the way forward regarding the Lighthouse Activities and the 4 pillars. The need of more coordination of existing WCRP activities is emphasised.
- Propose to extend the life of the TTRA in order to take advantage of the dynamics of the IP discussions. The TTRA is the organizing element to move forward the regional effort. Because it is disconnected from the rest, it is in the best position to the connecting elements in the elements and structures discussion to influence how the RC stretches through many those topics.
- CORA could have a central role as coordinating mechanism to move forwards in the regional effort.

#### Consensus:

Keep the TTRA's interim report, the minutes and the existing agreements, add what was discussed today and then focus on a roadmap in the next couple of months to implement the regional aspects of the pillars and the Lighthouse Activities within the WCRP Implementation Plan. In addition, connect the TTRA with the WCRP academy through the capacity development aspect and bring the connection to the stakeholders and the demand driven science. All these will be the contents of the TTRA's final report by the end of this year.

#### Actions:

- CORA from the TTRA and Clare from WGRC to prepare 1-2 slides for the TTRA presentation at the JSC-41 with what we discussed today and the way forward. Share with the TTRA for comments
- No other telecon before the JSC-41

<b>Transcript from the recording</b>
--------------------------------------

#### Agenda points

1. *Quick recap on the TTRA: progress to date and outstanding issues that need to be addressed. Comments on where we are..*
2. *Connect what we have discussed regarding the new development after the Hamburg workshop, i.e. first draft of LA where the "My Climate Risk" is the closest to the regional climate.*
3. *Discuss a way forward what we want to bring to the JSC as an outcome/output, do we need to write something in the coming 10 days in addition of what we have, i.e. how do we see our future*

Clare: Regarding the WGRC they are asked to report 5 min 2 slides. She thinks the WGRC reporting should relate to the work of the TTRA, in particular the current recommendations of the TTRA which is a modification of the WGRC, changes in membership and ToR. Whatever we do it needs to complement each other. The WGRC slot might be an opportunity to discuss further some of the TTRA related issues. LA climate risk has a lot of elements that relate strongly to the FoCI project.

Narelle: agrees the WGRC ppt shall discuss the issues with TTRA

Daniela: Should we see where we ended last time, e.g. revitalizing the WGRC. Are we still here to discuss the new development? I think the LA will not substitute the CP, but cross-cutting activities such as GCs. On Tue discussion shows that not everybody is enthusiastic of the LAs. Regarding elements and structures, we have not started the discussion whether we need working groups at all, or CP or LA. So, from RC point of view could be bring this forward, assuming we have the LAs then we see the regional community in its facets position, active integrated through the CP and bring this forward.

Clare: labs or cases form the LA-CR are quite close to the FoCI concept. We have not much time, so do not try to re-write the .... but in the main (final) report comment on how we will see these elements fitting in what is now being proposed. Highlight the LA-CR.

Peter: points out that the Regional climates science have much more aspects to this than the TTRA. The goal should be to foster regional science and the LA might be one aspect of it, while making sure that we do not lose focus or traction with all other activities that actually are doing much of work right. Point is the people will do whatever they want to do, regardless of what the TTRA says or suggest as priority. Is very curious of how the JSC will make these (LA) actually work, because with limiting funding and not steering the people with the right resources, they will continue to do what they want to do and not the right thing to do.

Daniela: agrees. Important that the TTRA do not connect too closely with the LA from a strategic point of view. It is unclear how long these LA will last. But to foster to regional scale, we can see the interest of the regional aspect and the connection to society has grown exponentially. The question is: how to organize in the best way around the elements we have, e.g. the FoCI and the WGRIS. This is one task for the TTRA. However, is there anything else the TTRA must enhance or bring forward to the JSC?

Xuebin: regardless of the LA, regional science is going to be very important in the future. Regarding climate change we are now in two schemes: adaptation and the other mitigation- Adaptation will be very important in anything we did. Therefore, we need some kind of way for this regional science, from the understanding of physics to the future. Important to push this. But if we have a climate for regional information working group, it might be too small, might not fit to tackle the kind of demand. We cannot tell how people should be doing things but need coordinated effort to work with stakeholders and users to produce the information. We must work together scientists and stakeholders/user, side by side in order understand what they need and then the researcher can produce scientifically sound and they understand it. It is very close work so that we work as one group...Another thing: regional science involves also the global aspect so one needs an element to integrate closely with other trajectories. For instance, GEWEX they have a lot of regional activities but there is a common goal to understand the global understanding. We lack a clear way of how to integrate activities, find a way to reduce overlap, it will not be sustainable in the long-term. Integration within and to the users

Daniela: From physics to the stakeholder, and the local to the global. In addition to what we have proposed, we could think of structures with dedicated cross-scales activities within regions and multidisciplinary. In addition a knowledge broker platform where the experience of the diff regions can be shared. e.g. regional knowledge hub/platform where we can exchange in a vivid way. So that we are more flexible...

Stefan: he finds Ted Shepperd's input is very closed to the TTRA. Much enthusiasm for this from a lot of communities, S2S, ... prediction community. There is an appreciation of the bottom-up approach, e.g. the knowledge hubs. The FoCI is a nice proof of concept but the more ambitious coordination mechanism to achieve the ambition of the LA, the devil is in the details: e.g. getting all the groups/activities cooperating across geographies.

Silvina: agrees with Xuebin and Stefan. We must focus on the LA and not on the WGIRS. Proposes to focus on the LA may be the pillars to build this cross-cutting group with expertise on regional/global/scales and understandings of regional dynamics future evolution of the climate. More seamless idea of how the info can be produced for the diff. regions. Thing is, we have been doing this all across the WCRP but not coordinated, so this is the chance to coordinated better and create a group that can take all this information focuses on the LA in order to drive the way towards bridging this gap of prod climate information for stakeholders.

Ken: Presented a proposal to the JSC about the connection between climate and covid-19. This is something the research board from WMO will set up, and that might involve the WCRP. This is an example of a bottom-up proposal given by the needs of the user e.g. countries of Argentina Peru, South Africa. Says this because he does not see this mechanism of bottom-up in the LA

Bill: the LA most compiling is the LA-CR which provides a theme to pull out actions that are already going on in the with CP CORDEX FPS to pull them together. Ted's notion puts this nicely together. Need for to fully engaged the user community, provide a 2-way flow of information to guide our scientific priorities.

Daniela: Since we have limited time to present at the JSC, should we try to extend the life of the TTRA say, beyond the end of this year at least (or longer) in order to take advantage of the dynamic development in the IP discussion. To better find the connecting elements in the elements and structures discussion to influence how the RC stretches through many those topics. Otherwise the TTRA will finish in 2 weeks-time.

Bill: if not TTRA who will do it. Possibly WGIRS will take over but we are not there yet. The TTRA has to a mandate to continue do this job. There have been sporadically among WCRP before this TTRA needs to continue because it is the organizing element to move forward the regional effort. Xuebin, Clare and Peter agree with this.

Silvina: Emphasis the strong influence/ contribution of CORA because it is bringing the coordination of regional activities. Strong emphasise that CORA has a central role to move forwards in the regional effort. In order to push the objective of actionable info

Peter: talking regularly is important and CORA has facilitated this quite good. Regardless of what the JSC decides, it is our responsibility of the CP to make things happen, because if we do not do it, nobody will. And if we need regular meetings like this, then he is all for that. Also in favour of more informal structures to make things happen because they last longer.

Daniela: working plan? The TTRA is good to discuss because it is disconnected from the rest. Representing different communities, and should benefit for this. Good time to go along the LA but also the 4 pillars/objectives. This is an opportunity for us to forget about structures and see a way forward. This is a good statement that the TTRA can make to the JSC. Important now to implement vivid interactions and then see a posteriori, what structures and elements are necessary to stabilize us.

Another point to treat: Capacity development (CD): CD can be a glue that brings together diff interests in the regions. CD can be used as a unifying element to build up the structure, the way forward.

Narelle: Because of covid19 no need for the TTRA to present a final report

Daniela suggests we keep the interim report, the minutes and the agreements we have, then we add what we discussed today and then focus on a roadmap in the next couple of months to implement the regional aspects of the pillars/objectives and LA within the WCRP IP. Then we would have both: The interim report + roadmap by the end of the year and then bring this into a final document. In addition we could connect the TTRA with the WCRP academy (without structure or champion to bring this forward) through the CD and could bring the connection to the stakeholders and the demand driven science.

Peter: about the Academy but there are a lot of other organisations doing open education, distance learning, etc. So it would be more useful for us to find out who is doing what and how to connect to them (CORA action"). Also, the roadmap should include the connections primarily outside organisations. What to focus on: how do WCRP interact internally and WCRP interacts with the external world. Because until now these interactions have been ad-hoc, it is essential that we ensure the right connectivity with relevant boundary organisations. We should strive to do better.

Stefan: connectivity is tricky. Requires to build trust and collaborative effort with stakeholders, it needs the distinctive engagement of the people working in the regions. And this will be a major challenge for WCRP as an organisation, i.e. to understand the degree of ambition it will require to build the 4th pillar.

Daniela: agrees, important to emphasise the dialogue and cooperation, and not the transfer of information where WCRP has this one-dimensional way, and this is tough to discuss. In addition, the deep disciplinary side of WCRP is also needed and that not that everybody in WCRP has to become the dialogue specialist. To find a balance is critical >> this could be an interesting element for the roadmap, ie how do we get there. In addition to: with education and indices (how do you measure success), we should be more inclusive as possible

## Chat conversation (edited)

Peter: There is no need for some overlap to help collaboration. No overlap usually means no shared common ground..

Peter: The way GEWEX is currently are designing their Regionally hydroclimate projects (RHP) is to be very conscious of capacity development, e.g. collaboration with START, with CORDEX on convention permitting modelling, etc.

Xuebin: There needs to be flows among different projects as regional is also very cross-cutting.

Daniela: Design activities around capacity development

Peter: Capacity development, special in the less develop world, is important to WCRP, both in resources, infrastructure, and for community building

Xuebin: I also agree capacity development should be very important to us, it is in the less developed world that needs more help.

All: We should propose to extend the life of the TTRA, until WCRP agrees on a new element to take care of regional activities.

Peter: Regarding the Academia, it would be more useful for us to find out who is doing what with open education, distance learning, etc., and how to connect to them. Also, the roadmap should include the connections primarily with outside organisations, e.g. START / IAI / etc. What to focus on: how do WCRP interact internally and WCRP interacts with the external world. Because until now these interactions have been ad-hoc, it is essential that from now on we ensure the right connectivity with relevant boundary organisations.

Stefan: Connectivity can be is tricky. Requires to build trust and collaborative effort with stakeholders, it needs the distinctive engagement of the people working in the regions. And this will be a major challenge for WCRP as an organisation, i.e. to understand the degree of ambition it will require to build the 4th pillar.

Silvina: I wonder how can we try to pursue the interaction with these communities. Who is going to do it? Which people?

Peter/Daniela: think platforms, such as JPI knowledge hubs connected

Bill: The proposed Academy could be a way of developing links, especially links that will last a long time by engaging younger scientists

Narelle: Detlef and Helen are currently looking for people to develop the WCRP Academy