

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

Sea Basin Checkpoints - Arctic

FEBRUARY 14, 2017



Contacts



BELINDA KATER
Marine biologist

M +31 6 46129879
E belinda.kater@arcadis.com

Arcadis Nederland B.V.
P.O. Box 137
8000 AC Zwolle
The Netherlands

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	4
2	ARCTIC STAKEHOLDER SESSION	5
3	CONCLUSION	7

1 INTRODUCTION

The First EMODnet Stakeholder Conference has brought together EMODnet experts and interested stakeholders to consider whether marine data collected via current observation and monitoring activities in Europe serve the needs of those who rely upon marine knowledge derived from observations and monitoring data. The Conference presented the findings of the EMODnet Sea-basin data stress tests (Checkpoints) and considered how to strengthen open data repositories serving users who face real problems. The participants discussed possible solutions and ways forward to improve and better coordinate the existing and future monitoring and observation activities in Europe.

The Conference took place on Tuesday 14 and Wednesday 15 February 2017 at the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium for Science and the Arts in Brussels, Belgium. More information on the conference and PDFs of the presentations can be found on the EMODnet website: <http://emodnet.eu/emodnet-sea-basin-checkpoints-stakeholder-conference-0> .

Part of the conference was a break-out session with stakeholder meetings for the individual Checkpoints. This report describes the session for the Arctic checkpoint.

2 ARCTIC STAKEHOLDER SESSION

Three stakeholders were present during the session:

- Serge Scory – Head of the Belgian Marine Data Centre Operational Directorate Natural Environment
- Vidar Bøe – Section manager of the Norwegian Hydrographic Service
- Simon Jennings – Chair of the Science Committee (SCICOM) of ICES

During the session members of the Arctic Checkpoint team presented parts of the project, after which there was time for discussion. The presentations can be found in Appendix A. Below, the discussion per topic will be shortly described.

Introduction to the project

No questions or discussion.

Data Adequacy Report

No questions or discussion.

Marine Protected Areas

Some discussion about the stability of the data. Finding information on MPAs is always a snapshot. Usually when MPAs are imbedded in legislation the boundaries are fixed and quite stable. It cannot be excluded that the boundaries presented in this challenge will change at some point

Offshore Windfarm Siting

A short discussion ensued on the available resolution to adequately answer the questions in this challenge.

Fisheries Management & Impact

Several topics were discussed on this challenge:

- Is Russian data available? No, this poses a problem in this challenge. There are Russian fishing quota available in Norway on governmental sites, Mr. Vidar Bøe can help with this.
- There is overlap between the Arctic study area and the ICES areas. The full ICES areas were used for this challenge, not parts of them.
- Are AIS (commercial) data of use in this challenge? Yes, they could be but it's not always available.
- Check site of Global Fishing Watch / CATAPULT for relevance. Would it be interesting for EU to pay for this data?
- NGOs such as Greenpeace might be able to add data or information.

River

No questions or discussion.

Bathymetry

- Are low resolution data on depth an average or min/max depth? mainly average but also exact depth at a certain point/line.
- Can depth profile of multibeam data for habitat mapping being used here? Yes.
- Norway has an enormous amount of data, but it's not available (eg. military restriction). 0-30 m data will soon (this year?) become available.

Climate Change

- We interpret internal energy as heat energy in this challenge
- Are temperature data used from Seadatanet? Network of European marine data sets; not yet but could be useful for phase 2.
- Phytoplankton: important for climate change. is it better to focus on a specific area and relevant phytoplankton species or focus on a more generic proxy of effects of climate change in the Arctic (eg. chlorophyl)?
- How to monitor traditional way of life? Traditional way of life, not only affected by temperature change or species abundance directly.
- Changes in currents and wheather (wind) will affect species and the traditional way of life as well.

Oil Spill

- Why were there 2 models used?
- How is ecological sensitivity info stored (e.g., polygons, points)?

Coasts

- Are data from different stations in the same format and/or do they use the same protocols?
- Did this challenge use sea level information from satellite data?
- Do all stations take land movement into account?

Alien Species

- Biodiversity research in the Arctic is quite patchy.
- IMA monitoring?
- How to monitor invasive species in the Arctic? Knowledge gap and data need.

And on a more general note the following topics were discussed:

- Are good monitoring systems missing for habitats and biodiversity in the Arctic? Can Shell monitoring in Chuckchi help for that area? How long is that dataset? Good example for how to do this?
- Datacentres for the Arctic (and Antarctic) have a networking group. Contacts will be made.

After the session some individual talks let to the following conclusions regarding possible follow-ups to this contract:

- The current checkpoint projects can considered as pilots, it shows what works and what doesn't. For possible follow-ups it's important to pick out what works and disregards what doesn't.
- The network built during this project is key for any future developments. It takes time for people to find and work with new developments such as EMODnet, it would be a waste to let this experience and network go after the end of the project.
- The websites built in the checkpoint projects will provide links to data sources and datasets, as the websites do not hold the data themselves but link to the sources, if the sources are kept up-to-date the upkeep of our websites will be minimal.
- Having local global contacts can be very useful (e.g. Russia).
- If similar projects will be made in the future, the challenge questions should be more focused on what is important and why this is important. For example, looking at possible windfarm sites is only useful if there is a need for wind energy in the area. Another example is instead of looking at platforms for the oil spill challenge, look at oil spills from ships and how to deal with oil and sea ice.

On Wednesday all checkpoints presented their findings in a short presentation, which can be found on the website (linked above).

3 CONCLUSION

Even though the workshop for the Arctic Checkpoint was not very crowded, it did cover various useful topics of discussion. Valuable contacts were made and beneficial suggestions came up. As part of the larger EMODnet conference, this meeting served its purpose in sharing and gaining knowledge and building a useful (Arctic) network.



Arcadis Nederland B.V.

P.O. Box 137
8000 AC Zwolle
The Netherlands
+31 (0)88 4261 261

www.arcadis.com

APPENDIX A PRESENTATION SLIDES