

G E O P H Y S I C I S T S

In Memoriam

PAGE 270

Francis "Tony" Dahlen, Jr., 64, 3 June 2007; Fellow, Inge Lehmann medalist, Seismology, 1990

Alasdair G. McKay, 63, 17 October, 2006; lifetime member, Seismology, 1990

Robert L. Prendergast, 71, 27 April 2007; Ocean Sciences, 1972

Harry E. Rector, 60, 7 June 2007; Magnetospheric Physics, 1975

Kurt Servos, 78, 29 April 2007; Volcanology, Geochemistry and Petrology, 1991

Honors

Hiroo Kanamori, professor emeritus at the California Institute of Technology, will receive the 2007 Kyoto Prize in Basic Sciences in

November in Kyoto, Japan. The award, which is presented by the Inamori Foundation, honors Kanamori's significant contributions to understanding the physical processes of earthquakes and developing seismic hazard mitigation systems to protect human life. Kanamori's accomplishments include the 1977 introduction of the "moment magnitude" scale to measure the magnitude of an earthquake in a standardized and quantitative manner.

MEETINGS

A Scientific Synthesis and Assessment of the Arctic Carbon Cycle

AMAP/CliC/IASC Arctic Carbon Assessment Workshop, Seattle, Washington, 27 February to 1 March 2007

PAGE 270

The Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), along with the Climate and Cryosphere (CliC) Project and the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC), sponsored the Arctic Carbon Cycle Assessment Workshop, at the Red Lion Hotel in Seattle, Wash., between 27 February and 1 March 2007. The workshop was held in a general effort toward the scientific synthesis and assessment of the Arctic system carbon cycle, as well as to generate feedback on the working draft of an assessment document. The initial assessment was prepared by the Arctic carbon cycle assessment writing team, which is led by A. David McGuire (University of Alaska Fairbanks) and includes Leif Anderson (Göteborg University, Sweden), Torben Christensen (Lund University, Sweden), Scott Dallimore (Natural Resources Canada), Laodong Guo (University of Southern Mississippi), Martin Heimann (Max Planck Institute, Germany), Robie MacDonald (Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada), and Nigel Roulet (McGill University, Canada).

The workshop brought together leading researchers in the fields of terrestrial, marine, and atmospheric science to report on and discuss the current state of knowledge on contemporary carbon stocks and fluxes in the Arctic and their potential responses to a changing climate. The workshop was attended by 35 scientists representing institutions from 10 countries in addition to two representatives of the sponsor agencies (John Calder for AMAP and Diane Versegny for CliC).

The members of the writing team introduced the topic of the Arctic carbon cycle assessment and provided the framework for subsequent discussion by presenting on the current state of knowledge regarding the stocks and flux in the system. These presentations included a definition of the Arctic carbon cycle and a synthesis of published data on carbon stocks in terrestrial and marine systems of the Arctic. Results of Arctic region studies on carbon dioxide and methane flux estimates between the land and atmosphere, land and ocean, and ocean and atmosphere were also presented.

The discussion sessions were organized around three breakout groups, categorized as (1) a marine processes group, (2) a terrestrial and terrestrial to marine processes group, and (3) a sensitivity group. All three groups were asked to consider the key leverage points of the system and evaluate these potential sensitivities. The complete group reconvened following these sessions, and each breakout group provided a summary presentation on their respective discussions to the rest of the group.

In general, the scientists attending the workshop were very positive and enthusiastic about the assessment. The discussions were very useful for identifying which parts of the carbon cycle in the Arctic were most sensitive to climate change in the next 50–100 years. The scientists offered some advice for technically improving the representation of the current state of the Arctic and identified steps to be taken to improve our understanding of responses of the Arctic carbon cycle. The group agreed that to move forward on this topic, the assessment document and future research should identify key data gaps and focus on the most sensitive components of the system.

The full text of this meeting report can be found in the electronic supplement to this *Eos* edition (http://www.agu.org/eos_elec/).

—DANIEL J. HAYES, Department of Biology and Wildlife, University of Alaska Fairbanks; E-mail: ffdjh1@uaf.edu; LAODONG GUO, Department of Marine Science, University of Southern Mississippi; and A. DAVID MCGUIRE, Department of Biology and Wildlife, University of Alaska Fairbanks.