

**Ideas for "final products" of the SCAR Scientific Research Programs
AnT-ERA and AntEco
based on the discussion during the side event of the SCAR Biology
Symposium, Leuven, 12 July 2018**

To use resources most efficiently final products should:

- (1) enhance significantly the **visibility** of SCAR activities and
- (2) be **unique** in a way that the "output" had not been produced without the SCAR background and SCAR support.

For the structure of SCAR see: <http://www.scar.org/about/organisation>.

Some proposals (below) might be SRP specific others can be realized as joint AnT-ERA – AntEco "products".

A **special volume** with synthesis papers following the organisational structure of the SRPs.

Comment: High value for the scientific community but (other) stakeholders will not read most of the text. Low visibility of the SRPs because papers are nowadays used as PDFs and not in form of a book with the names and logos of the SRPs on the front cover.

A **panel discussion** with scientists and stakeholders: what scientists can provide and what stakeholders need (tax payers represented by journalists, science managers, e.g. ATCM, politicians, teachers).

Comments: An (almost) unique event with dissemination to stakeholders being the main focus. Problem is to attract journalists and politicians from a broad range of countries and not only from the host country of the event. Science managers s.l. (CEP, CCAMLR, ATCM, NGOs?) could (relatively easily) be invited. If attached as side event to a SCAR conference the audience would be broader than in a separate meeting.

Data workshops.

Comment: Scientists are invited to propose and held such workshops at any time under the roof of AnT-ERA and AntEco. Exchange of such information within the scientific communities is a major SCAR objective! However, data workshops alone -if not having a very focussed but also broad approach- are not suited to be convincing "final products".

Assemble AnT-ERA and AntEco data sets.

Comment: In connection with a scientific synthesis such data sets could be of high scientific value. The nature of such data sets has to be discussed and defined. This idea can be combined with the proposal of data workshops.

Proposals for amphipolar proposals.

Comment: Ideas for amphipolar proposals are always welcome independently of the end of the existing biology SRPs. They are generally valuable because they are still rare. An amphipolar side-event planned for Polar2018 is a good opportunity for such discussions.

Multidisciplinary "final products" or final events.

Comment: Since truly interdisciplinary approaches are still underrepresented but highly demanded by stakeholders e.g. in the context of nature conservation and climate change, such event(s) can have a unique character, as the cross-disciplinary Barcelona workshop in 2015. However, such product or event should be scientifically focussed, either e.g. on specific interdisciplinary syntheses or should be stakeholder-orientated. Just a multidisciplinary session during a SCAR conference would contribute less to the visibility of the SRPs and their achievements.

Art and illustrations.

Comment: The success would depend on personal relationships between scientists and artists or on specific capabilities of single persons, e.g. in photography. Some examples in the past demonstrate that a connection between art and science can be quite successful.

A synthesis workshop embedded in a broader scientific and stakeholder orientated approach. SC members (and guests?) would meet to synthesize the achievements during the SRP's life period and write abstracts for synthesis articles in both, a scientific and a popular style. The popular abstracts can be used as **fact sheets** for stakeholders also to be used as handouts during a **panel discussion** (see above). Maybe support by experts in popular writing is necessary. The **scientific abstracts** can be used as a basis and frame for writing scientific synthesis papers for a **special volume**.

Comment: The synthesis workshop would be a unique event This approach should serve two purposes, to inform the scientific community and stakeholders. The output of such a brainstorming (what did we achieve, what were the important results?) be summarized in fact sheets. To write scientific synthesis papers is another challenge, which -in this context- is only worthwhile if most of the topics of the SRPs are covered following the SRP's structure. This can be realized in several papers or only one per SRP.

Julian Gutt, Huw Griffiths, Enrique Isla