

# Arctic Observing Summit 2018



## Recap Day 2

- Plenary presentations
- Panel
- Working Groups
- Look for presentation files & other relevant AOS documents at <http://www.arcticobservingsummit.org/aos-2018-presentations>

# Plenary presentations



- Great examples of stakeholder and community-driven products:
  - Alaska Ocean Observing System (AOOS)
  - SmartICE: Application of a social enterprise business model to the delivery of sea-ice monitoring and information services
  - SIKU: Inuit Knowledge Wiki & Social Mapping Platform

# AOOS



Molly McCammon (AOOS Executive Director)

- Stakeholder driven, science-based, coordinate private sector, local, state and user-driven
- Developing goals starting with stakeholder concerns - to products needed - all the way to goals
- Important role of data management
- Need for local capacity to support work

# SmartICE



*Trevor Bell, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada*

- Responding to ice becoming unpredictable for Inuit traveling on sea ice. Started as university project, but became social enterprise
- Combining local measurements, satellite data to map safe travel routes on sea ice
- Helping community to adapt to sea ice change
- Can help sustain local economy

# SIKU



*Joel Heath, Arctic Eider Society, Canada*

- Pillars: community driven research, education, environmental stewardship
- Creating app, social media site for documenting observations - such as stomach content of seals changing from predominantly cod to shrimp
- Input topics include weather, sea ice, biodiversity etc. Can record GPS tracks.
- Can access weather, tidal, salinity, information from satellites etc.

# Funding Panel



- Simon Stephenson, National Science Foundation, USA
- Thorsteinn Gunnarsson, The Icelandic Centre for Research/Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks
- Hanne Sagen, Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Center, Norway
- Andrea Tilche, Head of Unit-Research and Innovation, European Commission, Belgium
- Henry Burgess, Natural Environment Research Council, United Kingdom
- Paul Holthus, World Ocean Council, Hawaii

# Funding Panel



## Synthesis:

- Efforts for industry engagement
- Funding mostly shorter-term, difficult to fund long-term monitoring - need commitment on this
- Political imperative missing for long-term measurements (UK)
- Need to change science community - how success is measured?
- Need for sustained funding and engagement of Indigenous Peoples at all levels - could be requested by funding agencies (as the case for NCP funding)
- Coordinated funding body for Arctic monitoring? Three-lateral agreement with EU, US, and Canada, but very different funding systems

# AOS 2016 Conference Statement



## Excerpt from statement:

### Recommendation #6:

- **Prioritize**, on an ongoing basis, **observations that should be started and maintained over the long-term** by operational and other relevant agencies. Collaborative, sustained observations need to be implemented through a combined research-operational system that extends across all scales relevant to those it serves, **making use of both long-term national/institutional funding and of project based competitive funding.**

# AOS 2016 Conference Statement



## Excerpt from statement:

### Recommendation #5:

- **Advance** a strategy for international funding, ideally with a single application and review process and contributions of resources from all partner countries, along with established national support mechanisms. **Full implementation of a pan-Arctic Observing System requires coordination of funding efforts to support a globally connected and internationally accessible network.**

# AOS 2016 Conference Statement



## Excerpt from statement:

### Recommendation #3:

- Create opportunities for **stakeholder engagement** as a critical component of an effective pan-Arctic observing system that includes strategies for improved communication, takes advantage of existing natural capital, creates avenues for research collaboration, **identifies resources for capacity building and participation of local and Indigenous knowledge holders**, and resolves jurisdictional, regulation and policy hindrances to active participation.

# Other considerations



- “Societal benefits” - depends on scale and how it is defined (who is asked)
- Danger of focus on products and needs only, need to keep in mind **process!**
- Benefits can be in HOW observations are carried out - example of NCP: partnership approach, co-production, involvement of Indigenous Peoples at all levels = creates measurable benefits at many levels (local up to global) and develops capacity