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Executive Summary

**Title:** Report of Action Group on Meetings and Related Activities (AG-MRA)

**Authors:** M C Kennicutt and R Badhe

**Introduction/ Background:** SCAR supports, manages, and participates in a wide range of meetings and related activities that serve various scientific, administrative, and advisory purposes. This complex array of meetings and the activities necessary to plan and support them can create conflicts in scheduling and challenges for participation.

**Important Issues or Factors:** SCAR conducts its own biennial meetings and also presents scientific advice at Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings/Committee on Environmental Protection and CCAMLR. There is a range of other scientific meetings that have sessions on Antarctic and Southern Ocean science (e.g. AGU and EGU). In some cases the outcomes of one meeting inform the discussions of other meetings requiring coordination.

**Recommendations/Actions and Justification:** Delegates are asked to note recommendations in the report

**Expected Benefits/Outcomes:** A harmonized, strategic approach to planning of future meetings within the polar science realm would improve impact and participation and serve as a management and advertising tool for SCAR.

**Partners:** All major actors in the polar science/policy field, like IASC, COMNAP, CCAMLR, AGU, EGU, etc.

**Budget Implications:** None
Introduction

SCAR supports, manages, and participates in a wide range of meetings and related activities that serve various scientific, administrative, and advisory purposes. SCAR offers venues for the presentation of the latest scientific findings promoting cross-disciplinary communication such as the Open Science Conference, Symposia (Biology, Earth sciences, and Glaciology), and workshops. SCAR conducts biennial meetings where much of the organization’s administrative and financial business is conducted. SCAR presents scientific advice at Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings/Committee on Environmental Protection and CCAMLR. There is a range of scientific meetings managed by others that have sessions on Antarctic and Southern Ocean science (e.g. AGU and EGU). In some cases the outcomes of one meeting inform the discussions of other meetings requiring coordination. This complex array of meetings and the activities necessary to plan and support them can create conflicts in scheduling and challenges for participation. A harmonized, strategic approach to meetings would improve impact and participation and serve as a management and advertising tool for SCAR.

To develop a strategic framework for SCAR meetings and related activities, an Action Group of experts, experienced in planning and managing meetings, was assembled with the following Terms of Reference (membership attached):

- Compile a comprehensive list and description of SCAR meetings, meetings that SCAR has an official role in, meetings that SCAR has an interest in or that serve the SCAR community, and other meetings/activities where a SCAR presence is warranted or desired.
- Map out a 10-year schedule for the meetings identified above.
- Assess the timing, aims, and internal structure of the SCAR biennial meetings (satellite meetings, business meetings, Open Science Conference, and Delegates Meeting). Recommend an optimal schedule and structure for these two weeks of meetings.
- Consider, in totality, SCAR’s scientific meetings and related activities including: conferences, symposia, workshops, and other meetings and develop an optimal strategic plan for timing of these meetings over the next 10 years that creates the greatest synergy, minimizes duplication and conflicts in scheduling with other important non-SCAR meetings, and creates a coordinated and integrated portfolio of meetings that best serves the aims of all involved and produces the greatest impact and highest level of participation.

A 1 ½ day meeting of AG-MRA was convened by M Kennicutt at 8:30 AM on Tuesday, March 15, 2012 in Kings College, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, U.K. M Kennicutt welcomed committee members, asked each member to give a short introduction of their background, reviewed the Group’s Terms of Reference and asked for volunteer rapporteurs to assist R Badhe in recording the discussions. S Marenssii (AM 3/15), M Siegert (PM, 3/15) and B Storey (AM, 3/16) were appointed rapporteurs and R Badhe was charged with keeping a list of recommendations.

Meetings Overview

M Kennicutt and R. Badhe provided an overview of SCAR meetings, meetings that SCAR has an official role in, meetings that SCAR has an interest in or that serve the SCAR community, and other meetings/activities where a SCAR presence is warranted or desired (see Appendix 1). The group considered if the matrix of meetings was complete and provided additions. It was concluded that the matrix for planning purposes should not list all meetings. The list would be never ending making it less useful. It was agreed that prioritization of meetings most important to SCAR should be used to decide which meeting to include in the planning matrix. Many organizations and web sites have meeting calendars and SCAR should not duplicate what is already available. However, the SCAR web site should deliver information about meetings in an
effective manner. One measure of the importance of a meeting is whether SCAR invests funds in the meeting and/or actively co-sponsors the meeting with or without financial support.

It was agreed that a “SCAR Planning Calendar” should be maintained separate from a “SCAR Meeting/Event Calendar”. The “SCAR Planning Calendar” should adopt a 10-year horizon and serve as a resource to those that organize meetings to assist in managing scheduling conflicts and increase coordination. The 10-year strategic meeting plan is to be regularly updated so that a 10-year view of meetings is always available. Within the Planning Calendar, meetings should be prioritized based on the importance and contribution to SCAR. Priority should be made obvious in the matrix using a colour code (e.g., red – highest priority, blue- second priority, green – lowest priority). Short descriptions of the subject and/or the focus of each meeting are to be included as an aid to minimizing duplication, encouraging joint meetings, and highlighting Antarctic science that is underrepresented. The calendars should be coordinated with SCAR’s capacity building and training activities to advertise the opportunities provided by meetings.

**Recommendation #1: CALENDARS - The SCAR website should include two types of meeting calendars.** A “SCAR Meeting/Events Calendar” that includes all meetings/events should be maintained by the Secretariat with input from the community (i.e., open posting). A “SCAR Planning Calendar” should be created on a managed webpage based on a matrix of priority meetings maintained by the Secretariat. This 10-year Planning Calendar should colour code meetings by priority and include short descriptions of each meeting’s focus/topic. Once instituted, the Planning Calendar should be used to develop materials that can be widely circulated using social media, emailing, and the web site to promote and advertise SCAR’s portfolio of scientific meetings.

**Recommendation #1A – SCAR should uniformly “brand” its meetings; improve their predictability by adopting standard formats, processes, scheduling, and periodicities; ensure recognition of SCAR’s participation and support in all meeting advertising and web sites; and establish the SCAR web site as the definitive source of information related to meetings that are important to the community that SCAR serves.**

It was agreed that first and foremost, SCAR planning of meetings should concentrate on those meetings it directly controls or ones where SCAR can influence scheduling decisions. Certain organizations such as ICSU and its Unions, the Antarctic Treaty System, CCAMLR, AGU, and EGU have established periodicities and timings that are unlikely to change. SCAR should use these benchmark meetings to anchor its schedule. It was also noted that several general, major scientific meetings either had or were developing polar science aspects to their programs that could be more effectively leveraged to the benefit of SCAR.

**Recommendation #2 – NON-SCAR MEETINGS - SCAR should schedule its meetings in juxtaposition to other major meetings that have an established periodicity and timing avoiding conflicts in timing. SCAR should explore ways to cooperate with major scientific meetings with significant polar components to complement and create synergy with its meetings. Opportunities for co-scheduling meeting at these major events should be used to leverage resources and broaden impact. The presence and visibility of SCAR at major scientific meetings should be increased. A cost-effective approach is to utilize SCAR people already attending these meetings.**

Regional Antarctic science meetings are becoming more numerous and important such as those of the central and northern Pacific Rim and South America. Regional meetings can extend the reach of SCAR, provide unique opportunities to interact with scientific communities, and serve as venues for presentations in the languages other than English.

**Recommendation #3 – REGIONAL ANTARCTIC SCIENCE MEETINGS - SCAR should include regional Antarctic science meetings in its 10-year plan and promote these meeting. The presence of SCAR at these meetings should be increased and used to improve communications about SCAR. One cost-effective approach is to utilize SCAR people already attending these meetings.**

**10-Year Meeting Schedule**

The Group considered the draft ten–year schedule of meetings asking: Are there too many meetings? Where is the greatest potential for scheduling conflict? Is there duplication? What are the opportunities for synergy/leverage? Is the timing of meetings optimal?
It was agreed that the proliferation of meetings was taxing everyone’s resources, both financial and time, and that SCAR should capitalize on opportunities for synergy and leveraging. In order to judge the relationships amongst meetings, an understanding of the objectives/purpose of meetings is necessary. For example, the biennial SCAR Open Science Conference (OSC) is foremost an opportunity for building the international Antarctic science community. The OSC is an important and unique opportunity to mentor, build capacity, and network. The OSC is a venue for communicating and presenting the latest scientific results but there are many other venues that serve this purpose equally well. For many in the community, the OSC may be the only time that they come directly in contact with SCAR. In planning the biennial meeting structure and timing, these objectives should be kept in mind.

There are a range of meeting types that serve differing needs – workshops, symposia, conferences, business meetings, joint meetings with other organizations, Executive Committee meetings, the Delegates meetings, and others. Each of these meetings has differing purposes and relate to other meetings in differing ways.

Workshops are meetings of groups of experts/interested parties focused on well-defined topics and usually targeted at specific outcomes (e.g., a science plan or a proposal). The number of participants and length of the meetings can be highly variable but usually it does not exceed 50 or so participants and the meeting last 1 to 3 days. Workshops are usually one-time events but may be recurring. Workshops typically originate from the community, organizers and participants self-assemble, and funds are raised to stage the meeting. SCAR may or may not provide financial support.

Symposia have historically been convened every four years. SCAR symposia are popular with and well supported by the communities they serve and are to a great extent self-organized and self–sustaining. SCAR’s two main symposia are Biology and Earth Sciences. The symposia vary in number of participants and the length of the meetings but attract anywhere from 150 to more than 500 attendees and usually last 4 to 5 days. The organizing groups (generally associated with an SSG) raise funds and SCAR provides modest financial support.

Assessing the hierarchy of meetings and considering relationships, if any, between the outcomes of one meeting and subsequent meetings, the following suggested measures will assist in optimizing meeting schedules and impact.

**Recommendation #4 WORKSHOPS** – The timing of workshops should be planned so outcomes are presented at SCAR Symposia and/or the OSC and this should be a part of the Terms of Reference. The ten-year plan should be consulted when planning and scheduling workshops to ensure optimal impact and communication of outcomes from the workshops.

**Recommendation #5 SYMPOSIA** - SCAR symposia are popular with the communities that support them and they should be a high priority for continuation. Symposia should not be scheduled in the year of the OSC. Symposia outcomes should aim to be a highlight of the OSC. Organizers of the OSC should consider dedicating one or more Keynote Addresses to highlight Symposia outcomes.

**Recommendation #5A** Based on the success and community support for Symposia, SCAR should explore if the current symposia (Biology, Earth Sciences, Glaciology in partnership with IGS) should be augmented by symposia that serve other sectors of the Antarctic scientific community.

SCAR’s relationships with its partner organizations have never been stronger and there are significant opportunities for synergy by planning meetings in consultation and coordination with SCAR’s partners. In particular, three organizations were considered COMNAP, IASC, and APECS.

**Recommendation #6 SCAR/COMNAP** - SCAR and COMNAP should continue the practice of biennial joint meetings to the benefit of both organizations. SCAR should explore ways to make the biennial joint meetings more integrated and increase synergy. The SCAR/COMNAP Executive Committees should continue the practice of joint meetings when possible. The SCAR Executive Committee, on occasion, should consider meeting in conjunction with major SCAR meetings to improve interactions and communications.

**Recommendation #7 SCAR/IASC** - SCAR and IASC should plan for a joint Arctic and Antarctic meeting every 4 or 5 years. SCAR should utilize BiPAG to facilitate and plan these events. The SCAR/IASC Executive Committees should continue joint meetings of opportunity.
Recommendation #8 SCAR/APECS – SCAR should closely coordinate the planning of capacity building and training activities with APECS. APECS members should be included in all phases of SCAR’s meetings. APECS should be asked to manage as much of these activities as they are willing to take on. SCAR should explore new and innovative ways to incorporate students and early career scientists into all of its meetings as a mentoring and capacity building opportunity.

Biennial Meeting Structure and Schedule

The group was tasked with considering SCAR’s biennial meetings in regard to timing, purpose, and internal structure. The biennial meetings consist of satellite meetings, SSG Business Meetings, Open Science Conference, and the Delegates Meeting over about a two-week period.

Since the first Open Science Conference in 2004, OSCs are held every two years. SCAR Symposia are held every 4 years and work quite well. There was no consensus whether a two- or four-year periodicity for the OSC provided significant advantages. Concerns were raised that a 2-year cycle causes the Secretariat to be in year-round meeting planning straining human resources. Since SCAR biennial meetings are scheduled 4 years in advance, it would take a period of time to adjust schedules to a 4-year cycle for OSCs. If OSCs were only held once every four years, there may be little interest in hosting the SSG Business and Delegates meeting in the off-years when there is no associated OSC (maybe off year meetings could be hosted by the Secretariat?). OSCs continue to be well attended so there has been little impetus for changing their periodicity. Ultimately the community will determine if the OSCs are too frequent by declining attendance, so far attendance is increasing. Given all of the considerations, there was no consensus at the present time that a change in OSC periodicity was warranted. However, SCAR should keep a close watch on attendance and listen to community feedback.

The length of the OSC has varied over the years but the current practice of a 4-day conference is a compromise between those that would like to see it longer and those that would like to see it shorter. While the overall length of the biennial meetings (two weeks) is still a concern, little advantage was seen in changing the length of the OSC (most attendees are only present during the OSC). The current length is comparable with other scientific meetings of this size. There was no consensus at the present time that a change in OSC length was warranted. However, SCAR should monitor community preferences.

The Group considered scheduling of meetings during the biennial assemblies. The most utilized model is for two consecutive weeks of meetings with timing as follows: satellite meetings – 2 days (workshops, program meetings, SCAR subsidiary group meetings), SSG Business Meetings – 2 days, Open Science Conference - 4 days, and the Delegates Meeting – 3 days; in that sequence. In 2012, the SSG business meetings will straddle the OSC meeting with one day before and one day after the OSC. In the SCAR re-structuring plan the SSG Business Meetings and the OSC were to be separated from the Delegates Meeting by 2 months. This separation was deemed necessary to allow the SSGs time to develop their reports and recommendations for the Delegates Meeting. This also allows time for the Delegates to review the SSG reports in advance of the meeting. This model was followed in 2004 but a majority of Delegates felt that attending two SCAR meetings in one year was not cost effective. The scheduling of SSG Business Meetings close to the Delegates Meeting compresses the time available for SSG report preparation and Delegate review. To address these issues, in 2010 procedures were adopted whereby draft SSG reports and budgets are due two (2) months before the Delegates meeting. Discussion of the draft report and budget and decision makings will still be conducted during the SSG Business Meetings that precede the Delegates Meeting and papers accordingly revised. With the creation of Scientific Research Programs much of SCAR science and budgets was transferred to these programs and reports by SRPs are generated far in advance of the biennial meetings. The majority of papers for the Delegates Meeting are posted to the website well in advance of the meeting as well. Much of the biennial budget is block granted to subsidiary bodies that have the discretion to allocate money so budgeting is less complex than in previous practice. The Group considered it still too costly to have two SCAR meetings separated by two months in the same year and that the separation might isolate the Delegates from the SSGs and the OSC. Better integration of the Delegates, the subsidiary bodies, and “working scientists” was one of the goals of the restructuring. The consensus, at the present time, was that there is no compelling reason to return to a split biennial meeting schedule.

The growing number of satellite meetings is encouraging as it signals that people see the biennial meetings as a place to accomplish several objectives during a single trip. However, the number of satellite meetings
being requested is becoming an issue. Satellite meetings could be scheduled before or after the SSG Business Meetings, within the OSC, or in the evening hours during the OSC. It was noted that prohibition of scheduling of satellite meetings during the SSG Business Meetings was being strictly enforced to encourage attendance at the SSG meetings. It was further noted that scheduling satellite meeting during the OSC might cause a reduction in attendance at science sessions. Evening hours during the OSC are already utilized for a wide range of activities such as banquets and social events so the OSC schedule is already full. There was no consensus that a change in the scheduling and timing of the satellite meetings was warranted. Future meeting planners should consider how best to manage and schedule this growing component of the biennial meetings while minimizing conflicts with the primary purposes of the biennial meetings - the SSG Business Meetings, the OSC and the Delegates Meeting.

In 2012 the SSG Business Meetings straddle the OSC due to limitations of the local venue. It was felt that this might be an improvement as the SSGs would assemble to consider their agenda then pause and listen to science presentations for 4 days and re-assemble to finish their business. There may be opportunities for sub-groups of SSGs to meet and resolve agenda items if needed. Some concerns were raised about continuity in the discussions and retention of attendees after the OSC concluded with a split meeting schedule. Another concern is that a split schedule further compresses the time between the SSG and Delegates Meetings. Once this SSG Business Meeting schedule has been tried in 2012 the advantages and/or disadvantages should be evaluated.

The Group considered the structure of the OSC itself and generally found that the OSC functions well. However, if an objective is to encourage interdisciplinary science and interactions, the OSC falls short of this as participants tend to attend sessions related to their disciplines. It was noted that the selection of Plenary Keynotes to be broadly appealing, the introduction of Mini-symposia and reduction in competing sessions, and the minimization of parallel sessions encourage people to attend sessions they might not have otherwise. SCAR should continue to consider new and innovative approaches that encourage interdisciplinary interactions at the OSCs.

Careful attention needs to be paid to planning and staging of the poster sessions during the OSC to ensure that these sessions receive proper recognition and are perceived as being as valuable as oral presentations. Posters sessions are opportunities for students and early career scientists to improve their presentation skills. Poster Sessions create a more intimate setting allowing for greater interactions amongst attendees. Adequate time and advertisement should be provided for poster sessions, oral and poster sessions should be closely co-ordinated, and virtual poster sessions should be considered (working closely with APECS).

In conclusion, the consensus was that the current scheduling and timing for the biennial meetings seemed to be working and there were no compelling reasons to recommend changes. However, SCAR should keep a close watch on community perceptions and feedback.

**Recommendation #8 BIENNIAL MEETINGS STRUCTURE AND SCHEDULE** - The current schedule of 2 days of satellite meetings/2 days of SSG Business Meetings/4 days of OSC/3 days of Delegates Meeting within a two-week period should be retained until there is compelling evidence that a change is needed or desirable. The Delegates may choose to consider the advantages and disadvantages of a return to separating the biennial meetings into two meetings, two-months apart. The internal structure of the OSC should continue to evolve and new and innovative approaches considered encouraging interdisciplinary interactions and thinking. Poster sessions should be planned and staged to optimize impact and create value.

**Biennial Meeting Finances and Management**

The management and finances of the SCAR biennial meetings are intimately intertwined. As the meetings have become more costly and complex, there has been discussion about the balance of responsibilities between the host and SCAR in both the management and financing of these events. Some believe more of the organization of the SCAR Open Science Conference should be moved to the SCAR Secretariat. Others have suggested that a model for SCAR to financially benefit from the meeting should be considered. These are complicated issues that involve a range of issues from financial risk, Secretariat workload and staffing, SCAR’s status as a Charity, and others. However, given the cost and frequency of the biennial meetings, the question must be asked - Will SCAR members continue to volunteer to host the meetings? The current model of subsidy by the host is only viable as long as SCAR members continue to volunteer to be hosts. The
increasing cost of the meetings will limit the pool of SCAR members with the financial wherewithal to host the meetings as well.

While a financial model to generate surplus funds from the OSC has some advantages, consensus was that potential disadvantages seemed to outweigh the potential for financial gain. However, the current financial model is critically dependent on SCAR member volunteering to assume the cost and risk associated with hosting the meetings. About 50% of the cost of the biennial meetings is underwritten by the host. While SCAR has assumed responsibility for assembling the science program and is developing an on-line system for submission of abstracts, financial responsibility and risk resides with the host. The consensus was that a 100%+ cost recovery model based solely on registration fees and paid events would result in a substantial increase in registration fees, probably by at least 50 to 100% given historical costs. In a full-cost recovery model managed by SCAR, SCAR assumes financial risk for any losses that might occur. Budgets for the combined SCAR/COMNAP biennial meetings are in the range of $500,000 to $750,000 which exceeds SCAR’s annual base income. After much discussion of “surplus generating models” it was concluded that there was insufficient quantitative understanding of possible outcomes to adequately assess the pros and cons of various scenarios. A wide range of iterations based on a “surplus generating” model are possible. The consensus was that more detailed financial analyses are needed to judge the viability of alternative approaches. There was consensus that the primary purpose of the biennial meetings was not to generate revenue for SCAR and that future changes should not compromise other valued objectives for the meetings.

**Recommendation #9 - BIENNIAL MEETING FINANCES AND MANAGEMENT -** Delegates should decide if they wish to further explore “surplus generating” models for the biennial meetings. If yes, the Secretariat and the Finance Committee should be tasked with providing more robust financial analyses of possible scenarios. The ideal model is a low risk, sustainable financial and management system for planning and staging the biennial meetings that allows all SCAR members to host the meetings if they wish to.

**The Cost of Hosting the Biennial Meetings**

A second consideration in the management and financing of the biennial meetings is controlling the costs of the biennial meetings. SCAR should work to reduce the cost of hosting the meetings to ensure that there will be volunteers in the future. Since meeting hosts are agreed 4 years in advance should the eventuality occur that no one volunteers to host the meetings, there is sufficient time to transition to a full cost recovery model if necessary.

A number of issues determine the cost of hosting the biennial meetings. Portions of the biennial meetings that conduct SCAR administrative business traditionally do not raise funds as the costs of these meetings are assumed by the host. This includes the SSG Business Meetings and the Delegates Meeting. Portions of these meetings, such as banquets, might be changed to paid events to reduce host costs. The OSC is the only portion of the biennial meetings that generates revenue for the host. Registrations fees and paid social events are the principle charges that are levied by the host. Trade shows fees are a potential additional source of revenue for the host.

OSC registration fees are the primary mechanism for raising monies to support the meetings. It has been a goal to keep registration fees as low as possible to assure access but this may not be justified when balanced against the impact on costs borne by the host. The overall costs of attending a meeting include airfare, food and lodging and therefore, registration fees are a small contributor to the total cost of attendance (usually less than 20%). Increases in registration fees might be more palatable to attendees if some of the funds support those with the least resources to attend meetings, particularly students and early career scientists. In 2012 a surcharge of $25 was added to the registration fee to finance 200 free student registrations and this practice should continue in the future. Almost all meetings have a tiered system of fees and it is not the highest fee that determines the amount of funds raised, it is the actual amount paid per attendee. The structure of registration fees determines the “effective” fee paid by attendees. A strategic setting of fee schedules such as higher late fees, lesser differential between early bird and full registration, and fewer complimentary registrations can increase the “effective” fee.

Some functions are more effectively contracted to others than trying to create (or recreate) the service solely for the biennial meetings. In 2012 the International Glaciological Society (IGS) is processing registration fees for the OSC using their on-line system at a reasonable cost. While the host country has final say on
financial decisions, SCAR should encourage hosts to work with IGS as a preferred partner serving complimentary communities. Other commercially available services that support meetings are available, such as Copernicus, that may offer competitive pricing and more comprehensive services and these should be considered as well. In the past, external management companies have been engaged to manage the biennial meetings but have generally been considered to be expensive for the size of the meetings and/or as making excessive profits.

The balance between responsibilities and duties assumed by the host and the SCAR Secretariat can reduce costs to the host but it may only shift costs and not reduce them overall. While SCAR has not traditionally provided direct funding to the biennial meetings, significant Secretariat time and energy is devoted to the biennial meetings that is not recovered as a cost of holding the meetings. The cost-effectiveness of creating systems internal to SCAR that require staff time and resource investments need to be carefully considered in relation to the cost of out-sourcing these services. Shifting more responsibility to the SCAR Secretariat has serious ramifications for SCAR resources and staffing that need to be carefully considered. Increased use of the Secretariat to defray the costs of hosting the meeting ultimately shifts these costs to SCAR members.

Another way to reduce cost to the host is from donations by sponsors. In the past, trade shows have been staged and are a potential source of revenue for the host. Trade shows are most relevant to COMNAP but as long as the biennial meetings are jointly staged savings would accrue to the host benefitting both organizations. In 2012 private sector companies such as Google are providing some financial support. Hosts should be encouraged to work with SCAR and COMNAP to recruit sponsor support, particularly from the private sector. The establishment of long-term relationships with sponsors that endure for more than one meeting would be most beneficial.

**Recommendation #10 –THE COSTS OF BIENNIAL MEETINGS -** SCAR should continue to search for and adopt practices that reduce the overall cost of the biennial meetings as well as those costs borne by the host by maximizing cost recovery through fees, building meeting support capacity in the Secretariat, outsourcing services, and staging trade shows. SCAR, in partnership with COMNAP, should work with hosts to recruit sponsors from the private sector.

**Recommendation #10A -** Registration fee schedules should be optimized to increase income to the host.

Revenue streams based on surcharges to fund activities that support SCAR’s mission and increase access to the meetings should be continued.

**Recommendation #10B -** Opportunities for people to make charitable donations to SCAR should be developed and implemented.

**Summary**

The Action Group considered a wide range of issues associated with SCAR meetings of various kinds. It was agreed that the scheduling, structure and management model for various meetings could be improved to increase impact and attendance and recommendations were made. Coordination amongst partner organizations and with other major meetings could increase organizational reach. As SCAR’s marquee event, the biennial meetings are functioning effectively but the goal should be continuous improvement based on feedback from the community, adopting and adapting best practice, and reducing overall costs and costs borne by the host. The current subsidy model for the biennial meeting is only sustainable as long as SCAR members continue to welcome the opportunity to host the meetings. SCAR should continue to closely monitor its 10-year strategy for meetings learning from experience and adapting its approach to meetings to optimize impact and improve participation. These activities should be revisited on a regular basis but no less than once every 5 years. The AGMRA urges SCAR Delegates to adopt this report’s recommendations. M Kennicutt thanked the group for their service and the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM Wednesday, March 16, 2012.
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Timetable of meetings:
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The timetable given in the link above is an “at-work” draft – this is edited in real time as feedback is received by the SCAR Secretariat about meetings being planned. Please let Renuka Badhe (rb302@cam.ac.uk) know if you hear of any meetings which are not given in the 10 year matrix.