ACAP – Arctic SDI Breakout Session

Chair's Summary – SAO Readout, Anchorage SAO Meeting, October 21-22, 2015

As part of the Joint Working Group (WG) meeting held in Tromsø on the morning of September 16th, ACAP worked with Arctic SDI to develop a breakout session titled, *Standardized Geospatial Data Management and Sharing*. The session was facilitated by Arctic SDI Lead Secretariat and National Contact Point, Lorna Schmid (US). Other Arctic SDI experts acted as "table leads" for the small group discussions composed of delegates from ACAP, AMAP, CAFF and PAME. The session began with two short presentations: one by Lorna Schmid that explained what an Arctic spatial data infrastructure (Arctic SDI) is and how it could be used to map working group information, and the second by US ACAP delegate Patrick Huber, who gave an example of how black carbon case studies were being mapped using Arctic ERMA.

Delegates were then presented with four questions meant to examine the challenges, opportunities and next steps related to geospatial data management and sharing. Discussion was lively and delegates provided many different points of view, not only from a "working group" perspective, but more generally as Arctic experts.

The main discussion points can be summarized as follows:

1. What challenges exist related to storing, access and updating geospatial data?

- There is a general need for greater awareness and access to data being produced by WGs.
- Coordinating data sharing requires a common standard/protocol, including an information policy, and sharing of best practices.
- The need for base maps, both marine and terrestrial, that are accessible and open for use, while at the same providing metadata to help ensure data is fit for layering and reused in an appropriate way.
- This leads to questions of map data ownership, maintenance and updating, all of which would need to be addressed in a standard way.
- WGs recognized the challenge of capturing qualitative data, for example TLK, in maps.
- The cost of producing, storing and maintaining geospatial data is a consideration.

2. What opportunities could be created for Arctic WGs by developing a common, long-term geospatial data management strategy?

- By having one protocol, that includes an information strategy and best practices, WGs would have the opportunity to contribute data in a consistent way.
- This would allow for greater awareness of cross-cutting issues, and take advantage of the various expertise within the WGs.
- By using a common strategy, duplication of efforts may be reduced as similar types of activities would be easy to identify.
- The opportunity to reach out beyond the AC, for example to the EU, BEAC, and SAON, becomes simplified if data is shared in a consistent fashion.
- While developing an information sharing protocol for the AC, it is important to use forums and expertise already available to us, like Arctic SDI and SAON.

3. What are the next steps for building a successful Arctic SDI?

- Arctic SDI should undertake outreach with all WGs to ensure a common understanding.
- Need for an expert group(s) with representation from all WGs to develop standards, best practices and a user guide. This should include coordinating with relevant external bodies, such as Arctic SDI and SAON.
- Develop trust between mapping agencies and stakeholders, including WGs, expert groups, and project owners.

Overall Break-Out Session Conclusions:

- Arctic SDI could be used as a tool to enhance coordination across Arctic Council Working Groups.
- Developing standards must be a collaborative process that is user needs driven.
- One protocol for capturing information should include an information policy along with best practices and a user guide.
- There is a need to establish experts group(s) to capture and share data in a coherent way across WGs.