

# Needed for implementation of CryoNet

The coordination and setting up work can't happen on a voluntary base: need operational secretariat office (we gladly answer coordinated questions though!)

Clarify roles and split of responsibilities between GCW and CryoNet

Browse/discover and include existing data not represented here, giving an ID number, better involving non-European regions

Reality check: site requirements vs. results of the inventory

Contact potential national and international data providers

Also include significant but discontinued series

Implement a structured way to directly involve stakeholders (national policymakers, operational forecasting agency, NGOs, ...)

Evaluate existing sites in terms of **long** (in time), **broad** (spatially representative) and **deep** (multidisciplinary in the ecological sense, process oriented)

Focal point of contact for cryosphere in each country

Define an application structure for becoming a site, advertised through cryolist

Plan for visibility within AGU, EGU, ...

# CryoNet objectives

Provide an Interface to available information

single-stop web portal within the GCW portal:

- for data repositories

- For addressing users needs (metadata,coordination,

- For disseminating products

End to end design from data-in to general public and policymakers usability

Should we have 'data mentors'?

Minimum quality standards for all sites

# Structure and site types of CryoNet

What adds value to the existing data and sites?

Long (in time), broad (spatially) and deep (multidisciplinary, process oriented)

Different quality requirements?

Supersite?: is long, deep, open access, accessible,

Observation/baseline (detailed info), Reference (long time), Integrated sites (several cryosphere elements, cal/val capability) ?

Broad = broad coverage in time and or space?

'Observation' is not sexy → 'baseline'?

Growth path?

'Flagship'?

# Requirements for site inclusion

**Observation/baseline (detailed info)**, = a cryosphere or cryosph.-related (AWS, chemistry) observation

-Standardized: comparable data, data steward, usability level + discovery level incl. provider and citation metadata, minimum quality requirement TBD, quality attributes descriptively as part of metadata? Metadata is also photographs where available, ...

-versioned

Data quality: self consistency (changes must have sufficient overlap)

-open access

**Reference (long term)**,

-all what is for observation sites, plus:

-Long relative to threshold TBD specific to each cryospheric component

Continuity is not a requirement

-have a local met data source available

**Integrated sites (several cryosphere elements, cal/val capability)**,

-all what is for observation sites, plus x out of n:

-have a local met data source available

-suits the needs of process understanding and model calibration

-covers at least two or three cryospheric components (reference status not required)

-transnational accessible infrastructure with logistic support for min 2 persons

-online data available and real-time for selected components

-interdisciplinary beyond cryosphere elements

# Standards, guidelines, best practices

Already discussed last year

Most practical solution is for all participant to forward applicable documents