8th Telecon of the Task Team on Regional Activities
14 July 2020, 14:00-15:20 CEST

Participants: Daniela Jacob, Silvina Solman, Clare Goodess, Jens Hesselbjerg Christensen, Ken Takahashi, Gwenaelle Hamon, Mike Sparrow, Narelle van der Wel, Beatriz Balino, Gaby Langendijk, Valentina Rabanal, Irène Lake, Bill Gutowski, Jing Li, Krishna Raghavan, Xuebin Zhang, Francisco Doblas-Reyes, Sonia Seneviratne, Lisa Alexander, Peter van Oevelen, Kathy McInnes, Anke Schlünsen-Rico

Silvina Solman chaired the meeting

Agenda

1. Introduction of two YESS representatives who will attend our Task Team meeting: Valentina Rabanal and Gaby Langendijk
2. Report on the meeting with TTRA co-chairs, Detlef and Helen
3. Restart with the 3 legs and the idea of targeting the discussions towards specific topics in the individual meetings
4. How do we discuss the idea of having a home for regional information for society? With whom and in which process do we want to discuss this?
5. Capacity development /Taking advantage from the activities within WMO? <mark>Not discussed</mark>

Main points of discussion

1. *Introduction of two YESS representatives who attended the meeting:*
   Valentina Rabanal and Gaby Langendijk

Valentina Rabanal: Scientist at University of Buenos Aires

Gaby Langendijk: Originally from the Netherlands but currently based in Hamburg, PhD candidate at the Climate Service Center (GERICS), research focus on urban climate change doing regional modelling, also working on the CORDEX framework with the Rainbow Model and the EURO-CORDEX data. Previously at the WCRP as a science officer. Very active in the younger scientists community and at the ICRC-CORDEX in 2019.

2. *Report on the meeting of July 14 with TTRA co-chairs Detlef and Helen*

Meeting with Detlef, Helen, some representatives from the JSC and the TTRA co-chairs about the issue to organize the new home for regional information for society and the idea behind it.

Detlef and Helen designated Jens as a liaison between the JSC and this task team, Ken will going to liaise the CORDEX community.

It was clearly stated that this new home should focus on regional information for society and not on regional activities. There is some uncertainty about how and when the focus changed from regional activities to information for society.

The scope, design and steering of the new home is still to be discussed and agreed. Please see transcript below for information.

Topics under discussion:

- Main task of the home: synthesis, and delivery of regional information produced by the different WCRP activities within the Core Projects for stakeholders and society in general?

- Role of the home in regional consultation, which could be focused on potential pilot studies?

- Establish a steering group: which expertise is needed in addition, Climate service providers?

- Connect CP to ensure that those are all flowing in the same direction as far as the information for society goes, and thus bringing added value for everybody?

- There are some concerns about being this group in the future some kind of climate service, which is not a WCRP activity. We should rethink and rather orient ourselves to make WCRP science more useable by society.

Production and further development of knowledge should not be disentangled from knowledge transfer to society – CORDEX is a kind of showcase example here. Since this was not kept clear in the discussion with Helen and Detlef, we should define the expectations and not let the JSC set the expectations for us. This is in fact the way how the recommendations to WCRP should run. We should be the ones that organize this home and set up the boundaries - it is like a bottom-up exercise (self-organization) for us to make the proposal on how the regional information home should look.

> **Kommentiert [PvO1]:** This is linear thinking while the problem is much more circular with knowledge and/or inputs/outputs going in both directions.
> I agreee very much with that the CP's and this task team should occupy and organize thid home and set the expectations.

Detlef and Helen suggested another call with the leadership of the regional activities. We could invite them to one of our calls as soon as our ideas are clearer - we need this room for thinking unbounded.

3. *Restart with the 3 legs and the idea of targeting the discussions towards specific topics in the individual meetings*

The idea with the 3 legs could be our umbrella under which we develop our discussion about how to organize this new home.

We will need the fundamental science to not only produce regional information and fully understand regional processes, it is also important for assessing the confidence we can have in our information for society. Fundamental science should be the top of our work and then we should include the second issue related to "application inspired", the impacts and needs in order to understand how to produce the information as target to the specific impacts. The final part is then how to deliver or engage with different actors in order to shape that information for society.

Homes seem to be partly creating and working within homes and partly getting information through the dialogue with others. Some excellence science is carried out in the LHAs but within the homes and also for our home. If we agree that from the basic science to the delivery and the dialogues there will be an interaction with other homes, LHAs and communities we'll reach a consensus that all

should be covered from one home even though the emphasis should be on the 3rd leg (explicit agreement: Silvina, Daniela, Clare, Bill, Jens, Irène, Beatriz, Xuebin, Gaby).

The pilot projects are a way of showing how to have that flow through all 3 legs we generate for society. We probably would aim to get some lessons learned or some guidance on what can we transfer to other pilot studies because ideally the regional information for society will be produced in the regional context based on what is available and the best scientific knowledge.

The social scientists can help us a lot in all of those aspects, but we have to get them on board and in a dialogue. We should focus on who in WCRP needs to be contacted inside and outside.

> **Kommentiert [PvO2]:** I would include the economic sciences explicitly here as well. The resources question will drive a lot of these issues and interact strongly with the social environment as well

Moreover, we should include the representatives from the different Core Projects or activities within this home in order to be sure that we have the whole process included within our home.

The question is how to interact with current non-WCRP partners or agents as an organization? If the organization WCRP wants to be seen here as a big player, it needs to be picked up on an organizational level.

There will be also science, which has to be carried out by demand. There are some questions coming from society, which we cannot answer yet, we cannot produce the product because the scientific knowledge or data sets are not available. Either we have to create them in this new home or someone in other homes has to get engaged for creating scientific knowledge for those challenges - We should not repeat the same mistake: Most GCs failed because it was an add-on instead of an integrated activity and that's the organizational question.

Maybe we can start with a pilot example, we can take ANDEX for instance, which is more or less organized and has different components of WCRP, temporal scales, type of activities, within GEWEX and CORDEX. We can start the discussion with this group of people and try to build a pilot structure of this home. Maybe this example is not usuful for some regions but we cannot deal with all at the same time.

Even though we are not yet on the stage to think about how reaching out to society, it is worthwhile to point out that the CPs are already doing all kind of oa. training, summer schools and capacity developing workshops. It is also more and more popular to organize climate festivals where users are invited to listen seminars, discuss or see demonstrations. However, it is more effective that WCRP will establish collaboration with partners such as START already doing this kind of outreach to a wide range of stakeholders.

Outcomes

We are the ones that are going to shape and define this home.

All participants who have taken the floor here are in favour of the integration of the 3 legs in the new home.

The role of each leg should be clearly defined.

Leg 1: deals with basic research, which is already on going
Leg 2: co-design of actionable knowledge must still be developed and this group then masters

Leg 3: that will be developed as leg 2 develops its deliverables

There are a number of WCRP scientists doing already the co-design and co-production of climate information for climate services in a number of countries, e.g. Chris Lennard (CORDEX South Africa), Ken in Peru (?), Andrew Robertson (S2S, GC Near-Term climate Prediction), Daniela Jacob (EURO-CORDEX). A first step for this task team would be to question them.

Kommentiert [PvO3]: Again let us not forget the wider WMO

The pilot projects are a way of learning best practices, to make possible the flow through all 3 legs we generate for society. ANDEX seems to be a good example: starting with new people and identifying who can deliver the main issues from fundamental science questions, towards the impact issues and then the information to be produced for the societal needs. If we want to proceed from a more developed and successful example then its Global Water Future in Canada: where GEWEX, CORDEX and FE are involved in there and they have strong connections with stakeholders.

It might make sense to come up with a kind of template and define which part of the ANDEX/GWF-work corresponds to which leg and how the information flow was from 1 leg to the other and how the information comes from outside ANDEX/GWF to the legs and vice versa. This template would be applicable to other regions, whose communities could fill it out and we can eventually find some pattern and then develop further from there.

Maybe CORA could support the development of this template.

Next telecon after the summer break

Main subject together with more input from Detlef and Helen should be the content and structure of this template.

A doodle poll and the corresponding chair survey will be launched in late August.

………………………………………………………………………………….

Silvina: We are almost 18 people, so we can start our 8th telecon of our Task Team on Regional Activities.

1. *Introduction of two YESS representatives who will attend our Task Team meeting: Valentina Rabanal and Gaby Langendijk*

The 1st item on the agenda is the introduction of 2 representatives who are stepping in the group from the YESS community, I would like to invite them to give a short presentation to the group so we all know who you are.

Valentina Rabanal: Scientist at University of Buenos Aires

Gaby Langendijk: Originally from the Netherlands but currently based in Germany, PhD candidate at the Climate Service Center (GERICS), research focus on urban climate change doing regional modelling, also working on the CORDEX framework with the Rainbow Model and the EURO-CORDEX data. Previously at the WCRP as a science officer and set a regional scoping workshop in 2016 - direct development to this group. Very active in the younger scientists community and at the ICRC-CORDEX in 2019, hope to feed some of that experiences.

2. *Report on the meeting with TTRA co-chairs, Detlef and Helène*

Silvina: Main point of this agenda is the meeting that we recently had earlier today with Detlef and Helen and some repres from the JSC concerning how to organize and the idea behind this new home for regional information for society. Detlef and Helen have set up some members from the JSC with the different activities and we are going to have Jens as a liaison from the JSC with this team and Ken is going to liase with the CORDEX community. We had a very clarifying meeting with Detlef and Helen where they presented what the idea of this new home they are initiating is about. It was put in a very clear way that this new home is focused on the regional information for society and not on regional activities which was something we were discussing within our task team during our last telecons. In this new paradigm, we should review our thoughts of the roadmap, we are supposed to move forward towards objective no. 4 of the new strategic plan - so we are not dealing with regional activities but we should dealing with how to reach society with the information produced by the different activities and Core Projects. This is the more salient outcome of the meeting. I will like to ask Daniela, Jens or Ken who were also in the meeting if they have to say something else to this quick wrap-up of the meeting?

Daniela: I fully agree to what you have said. It was a very good discussion, it clarifies several things however there are still some open questions for me, and I still see a bit of an unstructured process. The main point for me today here, in addition, how such a home would make a good sense, how could we get engaged … I am still puzzling with the change of the task of this task team - which I understood but maybe it was no change - . I still thought the task team was around regional activities and then Detlef said very clearly in December he stated it had changed and it is now around information for society. I think, it is good to do both but I am a bit puzzled with this and I would like to understand the history and would like to get your views on this because this are still different things. I think we are well positioned to discuss the home for information for society, I think that's a perfect task for us but in addition I like to understand how and where - and I assume Clare and Bill know more about this - this was shifted in the back, I have the feeling, it was shifted in the back and not discussed publicly but maybe it was and then I'm wrong and that's why I would like to see this as

a 2nd point for discussion, just for clarification of what we are doing in the next time because I thought we work on regional activities in this task team and develop the roadmap but now, we got the task, maybe in addition or instead and that's what I need to understand, to design such a home and what we all need for information for society.

Silvina: I don't think we are confused about if we are focusing on how to deal with the information for society or how to deal with the regional activities. I felt it was pretty clear that the regional activities are not going to be handeld by this group, the regional activities are within the different Core Projects which are I don't know they are going to keep as such or pillars but what I feel is the regional activities will be kept within these main projects and we have just to deal with how to handle this step that bridge climate information to society.

Clare: I don't see such a changing in emphasis from what I previously understood - I agree that the name of the task team on regional activities is confusing - it's always fundamentally embedded in the regional information aspects and strongly focused on objective 4. In terms of regional consultation it is not being said this task team or home cannot do its own regional consultation, it should but the emphasis on those would be kind of different and perhaps very strongly focused on potential pilot studies which we already talked about. One other thing that was clarified for me - I agree what Daniela said it was all a bit unstructured - is that the two homes, the modelling observation and information for society can have different organization structures because they have different purposes and they have to bring in different communities - this kind of flexibility is quite good. One thing that Detlef mentioned was the example that GEWEX has this scientific steering group and some sort of steering group could be something to think about it in terms of this particular home because this gives scope to bring in some provider communities.

Peter: There has been the general confusion about what we mean by regional activities, what belongs within different task forces. This is the chance cleaning up that mess and I do not think that we can have much more chaos than we have already had.

Clare: That is to me a good way of reaching out to the Core Projects, not to compete in any way or take over but it is kind of working in a collegial way and so we will bring added value for everybody.

Chat Mike:
From the JSC-41 Report: Daniela Jacob presented the interim report from the Task Team on Regional Information for Society (originally called the Task Team on Regional Activities), noting that a full report (taking into account discussions held during the JSC) would be provided by the end of 2020. A set of preliminary recommendations included:
- To re-frame the "Recommendations on a Framework for WCRP Regional Activities" (JSC-38/Doc.11) in the context of the proposed WCRP pillars/homes
- Proposal to replace the Working Group on Regional Climate (WGRC) with a Working Group on Information for Regions and Society (WGIRS)
- To use Frontiers of Climate Information (FoCI) projects as a vehicle for co-design and co-production with stakeholders of climate information for regions. The Core Project Initiatives could serve as the basis of a proof of concept (see e.g. Section 3.1)
- Identify organizations and communities WCRP should establish sustainable connections with, to bridge science with society, such as the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS), Future Earth, Climate Services, Social Science, Disaster Risk Reduction Communities, and others
- To draw on the experience and expertise of the regional chapters of WGI IPCC AR6 report

Bill: I always had the impression that in the Core Projects, everybody was going off in a wrong direction and that part of our job was to try to pull things together giving an emphasis on information

for society I guess it is fine because I thought that was always there anyway. The key issue in my mind is that there is a lot of disconnect between the Core Projects and this is an opportunity to really try up be the coordinating body to make sure that those are all flowing in the same direction, at least as far as the information for society goes. The whole notion on these pilot projects is a way of showing how this can be handled.

Silvina: We brought up this example of the pilot projects to focus on how to keep track on the flow of information to society and not on how to produce the information itself. It's a sort of different approach of what should we deal with in this new home, it's how to deliver the information, how to reach the stakeholders, in general society, from the regional information produced within the different regional activities done by the group within WCRP.

Bill: I have a concern with that: It starts to sound you are asking this group to be a climate service which is not a WCRP activity and I think there needs to be some caution how they gets approached.

Daniela: But it sounded like this, I have the impression, Clare did not, I have the impression they asked for a service and that needs to be very clearly discussed what actually the emphasis is.

Xuebin: My impression of that is we have a pretty wide margin what the home might be. My interpretation has been more or less beyond on you have been talking here, it's much more underlying as what we have heard mostly about this kind of information for society. I think certainly we have some communication issue there that within this group we have been thinking quite differently with regard on what this is, so I think it's good we have now a better clear idea. We cannot think in the older way saying "we are just going to accord an activity and we can't do this without thinking about service" - not like a weather forecast but communicate to make WCRP science more useable by the general society.

Daniela: I still have problems unfortunately with the dimension of what we are discussing: In the last 10 years I was turning from a pure WCRP regional climate scientist into a person which sits partly in Future Earth topics, partly in WCRP topics and which is developing information for climate services, either data or methods or products, I'm not running an operational service yet. With this background I fully live a scientific activity which cannot be disentangled from the production of knowledge to the use of knowledge. In CORDEX, I see both, I see the scientific progress and the delivery of information, which bridges towards society and then the interaction with society in order to support. With the discussion we just had with Detlef and Helen and with the home structure and with changing the name of the task team I still have the impression that it still is in some heads a separation of developing the information and the meaning for knowledge behind the information and deliver the information. I'm afraid there is a separation still somewhere in the WCRP setting which I thing should not be there because I think it's really important to bring this close together and then the operational service can be left apart, that's a different issue. However, in order to develop regional information for society we on the one side need the societal network, the engagement but on the other side we need the scientific network and they both come together. If they are both in this home or if the home's walls are so transparent that there is this interaction possible then I'm satisfied. Regional information is not only coming from regional CORDEX activities, it comes from global or from measurement activities, so the dimension is also very important to discuss and I fear that the flow will not be possible - maybe because of too much history. If we find mechanisms to utilize then I am fully satisfied.

Silvina: I agree with you, I think we need a clear idea of what they are expecting from us and it is not obvious, it is not fully agreed yet.

Peter: I agree with Daniela and I do think that we should actually define those expectations - not the JSC. WCRP has shied away from the operations part. If we want to do research operations really using developing knowledge and information and services prototyping is part of that process, means we have just to understand all the ins and outs and if it's feasible and useful. I think we have been too cautious in that respect, there is much more we should be doing. Most of us really did not do these regional activities from basically research to operations part, we didn't really develop the prototypes, the applications. I'm not saying that we as scientists, each of us, should do the whole thing but we should actually hold this pieces together in some framework that fits and that's not there. I think we should set the expectations and not after the JSC set the expectations for us.

Jens: That what Peter said is actually the key to what is going on. It should come from this task force is clearly mandated to come up with the ideas; it has not to figure out what somebody else anticipated. This could involve strong elements of bringing recommendations to who we should reach out. Mike showed a couple of phrases from the JSC report and it is talking about whom we could reach out. This is how the recommendations to WCRP should be that we somehow have a list of things that could be formalized, just not walking around in circles and seeing we miss this community, we need to reach out to them and make suggestions on how we could do that and on which level we then could involve - I think this is what we need with WCRP and this has not be clear before because WCRP was/is not going to Future Earth and that's why the pillar 4 is bridging climate science to society.

Silvina: I fully agree with this idea that we are the ones that should organize this home and give the boundaries, the main point which is "how to reach society" with the information produced by WCRP activities, regional, global whatever. We can start moving towards that idea. So if you agree we can move forward with our next issue on the agenda, this was just to let everybody know about the boundary condition that we have from the discussion this morning with Detlef and Helen. If this is the new focus of our task team which is becoming a home of regional information for society we should start thinking about how to fill in the activities, the people, the groups, the interactions with other homes, Core Projects, pillars or LAs.

Chat Mike: Detlef and Helen suggested another call with the 'leadership' of the regional activities, but perhaps we should consider inviting Detlef and/or Helen to one of these calls directly…

Chat Daniela: Mike, I agree to invite them as soon as we are clearer. We need this room for thinking unbounded.

Chat Clare: What came out for me very clearly from the discussion with Detlef and Helen is that it is really a bottom-up exercise (self-organization) for us to propose how the regional information home should look.

> *3. Restart with the 3 legs and the idea of targeting the discussions towards specific topics in the individual meetings*

Silvina: How to start working through the idea organizing this home? Which kind of interactions do we need with other Core Projects or activities and other actors that we should invite to get on board of this home in order to deliver the task that we are expected to provide with this "how to shape the information for society". The item with the 3 legs should be our umbrella under which we should start discussing how to organize. As mentioned before we need the fundamental science not only to produce regional information, understanding of regional processes. Fundamental science should be the top fundamental part of our work and then we should also include these 2nd issue related to "application inspired", the impacts and needs in order to understand how to produce the information as target to the specific impacts and the final part is how to deliver or engage with

different actors in order to shape that information. Having in mind these 3 different aspects that may help us to organize the home and the activities that we are trying to build in this home.

Chat Bill: Fundamental science is important for assessing the confidence we can have in our information for society.

Daniela: I agree that we should not go back to the 3 leg discussion by itself nevertheless I think it would be good to reach a 1st kind of consensus of what we think here belongs to the home and how we can get a process to understand and get others engaged in the discussion what they think what belongs to such a home. So I think we really need to discuss today how we organize the process. Nevertheless I understood that homes are partly creating and working within homes and partly they get information through the dialogue with others. And I also understood that some excellence science is carried out in the LAs but I also understand that excellence science is carried out within the homes and for our home - if we could agree - to that the 3 dimensions/legs belong all to this home then I'm fully satisfied. If we come up with saying, only one leg belongs to the home then, I think, we need a big discussion. That is why I would like to get a feeling of what you here, the 22 people think, if we agree more or less that from the basic science to the delivery and the dialogues this all belongs to the home - acknowledging that we cannot do all of course - there is an interaction with other homes, LHs and other communities. That would be one point, which I would be very interesting to understand what will others are thinking. If we have a consensus reached on this then we can see how the way forward is.

Silvina: I agree, Daniela. Maybe we can open the floor to get input from all of you?

Bill: The whole point of these pilot projects that we talked about was that they earned the whole range. The fundamental science is vital for having any confidence in the statement the information we generate for society, so we have to be pulling it out together. In my mind, the pilot projects were a way of showing how you do that, how you have that flow through all 3 legs we generate for society. If we lose this connection, we really lose the whole point of what we are trying to do here.

Chat Jens: Me too. This is also, why clear linkages with the right links with the non-WCRP part of "society" must be a key.

Chat Clare: If we are talking about the 3 legs, all 3 are relevant but the emphasis is more on the 3rd leg. Similarly, if you consider the 4 science objectives, all 4 are relevant, with the emphasis on the 4th.

Chat Bill: Yes - I agree with Clare on the emphasis, but we still need to be working with all three.

Silvina: I agree but recall we are not producing information here, we should contact the groups that are producing the regional activities and deal with the information they produce.

Irène: Agree with Daniela, it is impossible for us to reach in leg 3 and information for society unless we have very clear and strong connections to the other 2 parts because how we should convey and communicate this if we don't fully understand and are involved in what we are actually communicating. I see that completely necessary and essential to have all 3 parts involved.

Peter: We do already have partners in this context that have that experience. The question is how do we in the context of these Core Projects or homes and these other activities, how do we make a really strong case of how WCRP as an organization will tackle this and how do we interact with the current Non-WCRP partners or agents. I think that is our task, it is not that we are not doing it in individual or smaller groups; it's how we do as an organization. I think we have some ideas, the pilot studies is a great way.

Irène: In CORDEX we do a lot of this with both, training workshops and different capacity developing workshops and reaching out with all kinds of things. One thing that is pretty popular in some larger projects for instance is to have climate festivals where users and those that we want to reach out or actually invited, to listen seminars, discuss or see demonstrations and, of course, there are lots of other ways to do it but some of other organizations are already doing a lot of kind of activities that is not only workshops but larger events where they directly targeting the users. I'm not saying that we should organize climate festivals but I'm saying is there are all kinds of different ways of thinking how to reach out to them, so not to limit ourselves too much to what we are usually doing.

Silvina: I think we are not yet on this stage of thinking how to reach. We are on a more basic discussion right now on whether we are going to include the 3 different aspects of the problem or whether we are going to focus only on the 3rd leg. We should include all the 3 issues because they are all important: The fundamental science, the impacts analysis and how to reach stakeholders or society are the steps needed to reach the final outcome. We should at least include the representatives from the different Core Projects or Core activities within this home in order to be sure that we have the whole process included within our home.

Daniela: I think this was a really interesting comment you made, Peter, what have we learnt from our work, in the individual institutions which we can probably use to inform an organization like WCRP to be more visible in this 4th objective, and of course, we can all discuss about capacity development but there are a few things inherent in WCRP and one I put there which are prerequisites in the information for society because I assume the 4th objective will not only create regional information for society but we would also to have it used, it should be used and picked up. I think one point here is within WCRP, the all steps in between have to be acknowledged as important as all other activities it was in WCRP, meaning they have co-designing information from data sets, from scenario, from modeling, together with stakeholders for a dedicated purpose, must be acknowledged on the same level of importance carrying out the experience itself. When we went to this process 10 years ago, the first 2 years we failed because the opening between the natural and social science did not fully work at the beginning and the 2nd was we failed because we had to rely on information from others which was given to us and which we then used to develop information for society, this means we had to build in-house capacity to judge on the quality of the information which we get, we had to trust the scientific deliverers, those who are developing the scenarios or measurements that they do it with their best knowledge and capacity and we had to understand in-house how it has been designed and which purpose can this data set fulfill. So there was a very important dialogue between the scientific creator of the data/information and that synthesizing the data into a useful product and this dialogue is important. If the organization WCRP would like be seen as a big player in this, it needs to be picked up on an organizational level. The second point is: There is also science, which has to be carried out on demand. There are some questions coming from society, which we cannot answer, yet, we cannot produce the product because the scientific knowledge or the data sets are not available. Either we have to create it in this new home - which I think is impossible - or there must grow an understanding that someone in the other homes has to get engaged about creating scientific knowledge for those challenges and not only for their own. This is why the challenge 10 failed on 9 - we had a GC on regional information, it failed completely because it was an add-on instead of an integrated activity and that's the organizational question.

Chat Jens @Irene: Those activities are not likely going to be central to WCRP. I suppose it is more likely that WCRP will establish good collaboration with partners already doing the outreach to a zoo of stakeholders, etc.

Chat Irene @ Jens: Then I am maybe not still clear over the tasks as I interpreted it as we were actually doing the outreach even if maybe not the actual services….

Chat Jens @Daniela: "Information being used" - yes we will like this, but WCRP should only structure activities to ensure this, if fitting into a scientific agenda. Many if not most WCRP scientific programs are not co-developed with the users. This is where leg 4 will always have to redefine itself!

Peter: I agree what Daniela said. I feel we are going around in circles, we should find a way to get out of that mode and the practical way forward for me is taking just the case and figuring out how we as an organization would do it. The pilot study might not be ultimately the way we will do it but it might give us some handles on how we could approach it. If we do not go into that exercise, we just keep on theorizing and we will not get much further because ultimately, we will run to some things that have not been done before - maybe FE is on the table to doing it but they are not doing it or they are not doing it right for us. In addition, all these aspects we have to go through and co-design is simply to collapse. So we really need to talk to users, but firstly we have to figure out what our role is in that whole process, and one of the roles is that we should have a clear house "what is good data for information" and "how we can use that". The World Bank is providing some regional climate studies, they use only 1 model. If you looked at a climate scientist say how validly is this we got our criticism going through it. This is where we really can plan a much stronger role and actually developing the services.

Chat Irene @Peter: Yes, this is partly of what I was trying to say - we should start with a pilot and try to find new ways of how we do things and actually communicate with society!

Silvina: I think we can go back to those pilot examples, to think about our road map, how to structure the flow of information, trying to include the co-designing idea in the middle of the way forward. With a pilot example we can try to understand the best practice that should be consider in order to go from the fundamental science towards producing information that is useful for society. Maybe we can start with that example. We should start dealing with real actions.

We need to know if we are going to include the 3 components within our home. From those who have already made comments I understood that the 3 components should be part of our home, maybe not directly within our home but with connections with other activities within WCRP but shaped in the way of including some user flavor, in order to drive the production of information to be used for society. These work groups of different areas should be on board of this home because we are a group of researchers from the WCRP community and we definitely need some people from the social science. In order to bridge this gap we need experience from other researchers. We may think about how and who to reach to invite to these discussions to start putting the social view on our discussion. I know there have been some examples in the working group from regional climate because the members of that group included some representatives from the regional science. Maybe Clare may help trying to remind how the experience of interaction with this group finally was. We should try to identify some social scientists that can help us to shape this discussion.

Chat Beatriz: There are a number of WCRP scientists doing the co-design and co-production of climate information for climate services or the like in a number of countries. The few I know are Chris Lennard (CORDEX South Africa), Ken in Peru (?), Andrew Robertson in S2S, GC Near-Term climate Prediction. A first step for this group would be to learn from them…

Chat Peter: There can be more than one road that leads to Rome. We do not have to only have one pathway.

Chat Beatriz: I think the 3-legs should be included

Chat Gaby: I think it would be good to include all 3-legs, but it would be useful to clearly define the role in each leg of the TTRA

Chat Daniela: The regional info will be produced depending on the regional context. We need quality guidance... this would help a lot. How do we go forward?

Chat Irene: in CORDEX we do have some experience both in Africa and Asia for instance.

Chat Xuebin: I do think there need to be three legs even though the three legs may not of equal lengths.

Daniela: We probably would aim, when we go through pilot studies, to get some lessons learned or some guidance on what can we transfer to other pilot studies because ideally the regional information for society will be produced in the regional context based on what is available and the best scientific knowledge. If we could as scientists come up with some guidance, some quality needs, this would already help a lot. The question for me is how we go forward here. The social scientists can help us a lot in all of those aspects, but we have to get them on board and in a dialogue. We should focus on who in WCRP needs to be contacted inside and outside. I really like the idea of how we get an organization into this; it is different than an institution.

Silvina: Maybe we can start again with a pilot example, we can take ANDEX for instance, which is more or less organized and have different components, temporal scales, type of activities, within GEWEX and CORDEX, within different components of WCRP. We can start the discussion with this group of people and try to build a pilot structure of this home. Maybe this example isn't usual for some regions and not for others but we cannot deal with all at the same time. I think ANDEX is a good example: It's good to start with new people from the beginning and try to identify people who can deliver the main issues and try to discuss the main steps towards the production of information to be useful for society, beginning with the fundamental science questions, the impact issues and then the information to be produced for the societal needs.

Chat Xuebin: I am not sure it has to be social science as the third leg, there are many other aspects such as engineering (which is hugely important for adaptation).

Daniela: I think ANDEX is a good example. Would it make sense to come up with a kind of a template and say which part of the ANDEX-work belongs to which leg and how the information flow was from 1 leg to the other and how the information comes from outside ANDEX to the legs and vice versa? If we have such a template we can also do it somewhere in Africa, we could do it for a pilot in Europe and for different cultural contexts. We agree that the basic science is as important as the stakeholder demand in order to make the information useful. If we can categorize this along the idea of the 3 legs - maybe we have to bring more categories in between - and say then what comes from WCRP and which parts of WCRP and what comes from the outside and how the flow is then we can fill it in also for WASCAL or SASSCAL in Africa, we could also find something in Asia. It could then by the regional communities fill in and we can see if we find a pattern and then we can develop further from there.

Peter: I like ANDEX but it's still a baby. If we want to have a look to a more successful example then its Global Water Future in Canada, CORDEX and FE are involved in there. On the other side - ANDEX is a blank canvas. How we can transform that into an organizational level?

Chat Beatriz: Leg 1 deals with basic research and that is already on going. Leg 2: co-design of actionable knowledge is the one that must be developed and this group master that Leg 3: will be developed as leg 2 develops its deliverables.

Silvina: Global Water Future have very strong connections with stakeholders, so that makes it perhaps easier for us to establish the template with different specific activities that may help us to produce the flow of information. We can start with GWF, ANDEX or both.

We made a good progress. Some ideas for the next telecon should be how to build this template, what kind of activities do we need to include into the different aspects, to be undergone by the groups to reach this gap we are trying to fill. This might be the main issue for next telecon together with more input from Detlef and Helen.

It's clear that we are the ones that are going to shape this home and we are not going to have input from WCRP.

Daniela: I think that will be supported by CORA and maybe also the development of the template could be supported by CORA. I guess we'll meet next time in fall.