**Goal 1.1: Conduct an inventory of national observational capacities**

**Goal 1.3: Provide recommendations for a roadmap for future Arctic observational capacities**

Norway has indicated a status “yellow” (intermediate capacity and capability) for these two issues. Rather than answering the 6 questions specifically, we chose to provide a more general reflection around our response.

As starting point we would like to underline that Norway currently concentrates its SAON efforts towards environmental observation needs, not so much social, cultural and economic observation needs – though recognizing that these are connected.

With this backdrop, we generally speaking believe we have a fairly good overview (inventory) of our national observational capacities, and that this capacity is in line with information that we have submitted and which is available in the SAON Inventory on web. We will prioritize further detailed inventorying efforts towards concrete and targeted needs when such arise.

Norway engages and have members in CON. However, at this stage we find greater value and benefit in concentrating our overall capacity into the work of ADC, which in our opinion has good progress and provides added value to Norway’s national work within this area.

We find that the mandate of CON is extremely wide, and unruly to get a good grip on an efficient process. We believe that further inventories, as well as developing a roadmap for future Arctic observational capacities could be best informed by approaching the question in thematic stages, preferably initiated/fuelled by specific needs articulated by relevant user groups (and maybe within specific SBAs). For example, we are aware that AMAP/CAFF are looking into the possibility of initiating an assessment process looking at climate change and ecosystems impacts in the near future, aiming for delivery in the 2021-2023 work plan period. To assist this process, it will be relevant for Norway to conduct a more in-depth assessment and inventorying of any ongoing observation efforts, in addition to those already identified in our inventory, that could feed into this assessment process. The results of such an effort could be feed into the SAON inventory. It seems sensible to us that SAON could use such an opportunity to consider the total inventory of observation efforts that could feed into such a pan-Arctic assessment effort, and to develop a thematic roadmap on basis of this (and maybe that the format, shape and content direction of such a roadmap would be defined by the needs that the process identifies).

We strongly believe that making the CON-mandate thematically based and phased is the only way to potentially achieve progress and concrete results. A thematically based approach would allow for the participation of relevant experts with a necessary overview of the state of affairs (ongoing observations and observation needs) within the specific theme area. We also suggest that the most efficient way to ensure progress within such a thematic approach would be for SAON to facilitate and create opportunities for meetings for such purpose.

Norway is looking at establishing a clearer national SAON structure to support CON, ADC and Board members, which also will strengthen the overall capacity to engage in the discussions.

**1. What specifically did you mean here?**

**2. Who is leading that activity?**

**3. Is this well coordinated?**

**4. What specifically are you doing that could be coordinated?**

**5. Are you currently engaged in CON?**

**6. What would be a useful working definition of this Roadmap. What should the Roadmap include from the standpoint of your national funding body?**