

D6.1 Procedure for ongoing collection and collation of European Polar observing capacities and activities, M12 (AMAP)

- What will be the sources of information? What will be the incentive to provide the information?
- What information should be collected?
- How should the information be collected?
- Should the information be made available to outsiders? How?
- Experiences from EU-PolarNet (1)
- EU-PolarNet 2 context
- Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks (SAON) context



SAON Committee on Observations and Networks (CON) context (I)

SAON Goal: Creating a roadmap to well-integrated Arctic observing system

SAON Objective 1.1: Conduct an inventory of national observational capacities: The purpose of the inventory is to give the countries an overview of the current observational capacities (...) to allow identification of gaps and overlaps to be addressed at regional, national or international level. The information will be gathered through national focal points, partner organizations and observing networks and maintained in an open database of - and gateway to - all Arctic observing activities.



SAON Committee on Observations and Networks (CON) context (II)

Polar Observation Assets Working Group (POAWG) facilitates the discovery and interoperability of information about research & monitoring assets in polar regions: sites, transects, observatories, projects, and networks or systems.

- Make asset information more Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable
- Promote best practices for interoperability “beyond the dataset level”
- Help span a spectrum across science planning, data management, & disciplinary or interdisciplinary science

Terms of reference, timelines, deliverables and modus operandi in development phase.

Leads: Bill Manley (University of Colorado) and Roberta Pirazzini Roberta (FMI, Finland)

What will be the sources of the information? / How should the information be collected?

- Existing facilities/catalogues with an API (like WIGOS)
- Existing facilities/catalogues without an API (like INTERACT)
- The ‘long tail’: Small institutions
- The ‘long tail’: National contact points (For SAON: National members of Board/CON (Arctic))

What is the incentive to provide information? Will it be ‘push’ or ‘pull’?



What information should be collected?

Candidate items:

- Networks
- Projects
- Sites



Should the information be made available to outsiders? How?

- Would there be a central storage facility of the information?
- Should quality control procedures be developed? (like duplicates, site location)
- Should this facility convert/process the information?
- Should this facility prepare products to outsiders?

Experiences from EU-PolarNet (1)

- Deliverable "Inventory of existing monitoring and modelling programmes".
- Most countries do not have an overview of their observing assets or a structured compilation
- Information exists in very different formats/structures
- For the 'long-tail', choose a low-tech solution
- Start by collecting very few key items (name/title/label, position (for sites), theme (simple), URL)
- Progress could be incremental
- Do not underestimate the standardisation/conversion/cross-walk challenge



EU-PolarNet 2 context

- Will other parts of the project be the consumer of the deliverable?
- Will sources/contact points be interested in providing information during the project?
Who will run the collection process?
- Will processes/procedures be refined during the project?
- The role of Community Based Monitoring?