

# NUAP Concerns

Tom Hartquist and Michele  
Dougherty (Chair)

# NUAP Exercise Science-Driven

- 7 high priority questions identified
- They form backbone of a coherent science strategy
- Resources and facilities prioritised for each
- Strong astrobiological component associated with non-Aurora research noted

# Much Consultation of Community

- Close to 100 individual experts consulted non-publicly
- 3 public calls for electronic input
- Town meeting
- 310 responses to final (Oct) call for electronic input – statistical and narrative summaries in final (Nov) NUAP report

# Major Discrepancies

- NUAP: Grants and Fellowships the very highest priority – STFC: cuts
- NUAP: Current in situ space plasma facilities high priority for 3 of 7 high priority questions – STFC: withdrawing support of them
- NUAP: High priority for N Hemisphere OIR access for 2 high priority questions– STFC: closes
- NUAP: Aurora/ExoMars lower middle priority for 1 high priority question – STFC: funds

# Grant Awards Science-Based

- From NUAP document: “The science program can (and should) be broader based than the science program that UK facilities can address ...”
- I. E. - Grants should be awarded on the basis of the quality of the science and the feasibility of achieving it and not on what facilities STFC decides to fund

# Why the Discrepancies?

- Why do such important discrepancies exist?
- How did PPAN use the NUAP document which took into account 1000s of hours of effort of those who responded to calls for input?
- What is the PPAN equivalent of the strategy that NUAP's 7 high priority questions define?