

Maksimovich Elena, PhD student in the Arctic Meteorology.

Report on the EMS-2010 meeting

During five days various topics were covered. Naturally, some talks were very deep into the subject, some others were quite general, both aiming different audience and facing the problems of different complexity. I discovered the existence of many interesting research projects, for example, those by Steeneveld (Netherlands, experiment in hydrodynamics with laser and doppler measurements of the stratification within the mix of liquid with particules), by Grubisic (Colorado, innovative snow measurements), Pocahontas project by H. Sodermann and A. Stohl (Norway, NILU, on the cyclone moisture transport), WeatherBug (USA, private meteorological organization with about ten thousand weather stations around the World). As expected, during the conference I was mostly shifting to the ice, snow and modeling communities. The presentations gave me a few ideas for my own work, as well as for me personally. Evidently, to learn things the conference is not enough, several years of work (at least) in these domains is needed. As for me, just to see what exists is already very enriching!

The meeting was well planned, presentations well done and the panel discussion on Wednesday afternoon was exceptional! Incomparable animation by Prof. Huw Davies, who gave a good rhythm and made it talk & argue. Invited speakers had very professional and quite different opinions.

Within the abundant program, a few individuals were quite special (for me personally). Some speakers tried to convince us to do our job better. Another problem, even when the ideas sound nice, sometimes the speaker listens to himself first, thus creating a distance between him and the audience. Such as, Dr Martin Visbeck encouraged the scientists to work better, more objectively, superposed research and the communication. To my point of view, research and communication need one another, but the nice exposition can't replace the scientific work (with the same budget), as well as vice versa neither. Relative to my field of study, Dr. Visbeck expressed his point of view as well. The unprecedented recent decline in sea ice extent (observations) is considered by Dr. Visbeck as the result of decadal variability. For him the fact that the observed sea ice extent differs from the models is not surprising, because "the nature doesn't behave as linearly as our models do". I would argue, first of all, science and communication should be intelligent, and only then you can/should make it "sexy". His talk is now available on the ETH web-site www.multimedia.ethz.ch/conferences/2010.

My presentation was on the seasonal transition over the Arctic sea ice, where I focused mostly on the problematic of sea ice changes and demonstrated the approach developed during my PhD work. For sure, this was a good opportunity for me to begin the discussions on my study, which I am now finalizing. It was a big pleasure to see the eyes of the auditorium and realize that they try to understand with me the subject! I had great comments afterwards.

For the conclusion, In general during the meeting I felt a very friendly ambiance, and, for sure, not only me. Very different, happy, enthusiastic and brilliant personalities were there. I believe, together with the own research such meetings help to form the personal point of view, to express it and to feel that you are a member of this community with the certain moral and professional responsibilities. Thank you!