



Emodnet Med Sea Check-Point – Indicators for decision- maker

Sophie BESNARD, Vincent CLAVERIE, and Frédérique BLANC
France (sbesnard@cls.fr)

Emodnet Med Sea Check-Point – Indicators for decision- maker

Authors:

Vincent Claverie (vclaverie@cls.fr), Frédérique Blanc (fblanc@cls.fr), and MedSea checkpoint partners.

Affiliations:

CLS, Toulouse, France

Abstract:

The Emodnet Checkpoint projects aim is to assess the cost-effectiveness, reliability and utility of the existing monitoring at the sea basin level. This involves the development of monitoring system indicators and a GIS Platform to perform the assessment and make it available.

Assessment or production of Check-Point information is made by developing targeted products based on the monitoring data and determining whether the products are meeting the needs of industry and public authorities.

Check-point users are the research community, the ‘institutional’ policy makers for IMP and MSFD implementation, the ‘intermediate users’, i.e. users capable to understand basic raw data but that benefit from seeing the Checkpoint targeted products and the assessment of the fitness for purpose.

We define assessment criteria aimed to characterize/depict the input datasets in terms of 3 territories capable to show performance and gaps of the present monitoring system, appropriateness, availability and fitness for purpose.

- Appropriateness: What is made available to users? What motivate/decide them to select this observation rather than this one.

- Availability: How this is made available to the user?

Place to understand the readiness and service performance of the EU infrastructure

- Fitness for use / fitness for purpose: Ability for non-expert user to appreciate the data exploitability (feedback on efficiency & reliability of marine data)

For each territory (appropriateness, Availability and Fitness for purpose / for use), we define several indicators. For example, for Availability we define Visibility, Accessibility and Performance. And Visibility is itself defined by “Easily found” and “EU service”.

So these indicators can be classified according to their territory and sub-territory as seen above, but also according to the complexity to build them. Indicators are built from raw descriptors in 3 stages:

[U+F0FC] Stage 1: to give a neutral and basic status directly computed from the raw checkpoint descriptors.

[U+F0FC] Stage 2: to get a more sectorial status, aggregating level 1 results for instance depending on processing level.

[U+F0FC] Stage 3: to synthesize and focus view at characteristic level for decision making and actions plan. They are computed from stage 2 indicators.

To produce this checkpoint information, we describe upstream data as input data sets which are uniquely identified as a combination of (variable, dataset, intended use) or of (geographical feature, dataset, intended use) depending on their nature. The information is called descriptors. The descriptors cover 8 sections:

1. Characteristics (= What)
2. Data sources (= From)
3. Overview elements (= Why for)
4. Spatial coverage (= Where)
5. Temporal coverage (= When)
6. Accessibility (= How)
7. Quality elements (= ISO 19113 quality elements)
8. Other information (= for administration/management needs)

Check-Point services should be permanent services, because:

- Monitoring systems will evolve and every few years there is need to re-assess;
- Different/more use cases of monitoring are required to really show gaps and complementarities in the monitoring system components;
- Monitoring system evolution for the European Sea and the global ocean require constant upgrade of the assessment indicators and descriptors;
- Need to establish strong & permanent links with intermediate and end users from industry to public authorities and 'regional' approach is appropriate and feasible.
- Need to maintain the process, methodology used and to be applied.