Questions for National SAON Board members on Goal 1 Objectives 1.1 and 1.3

National Board members have filled in the *capacity/capability matrix* where they indicate the national capacity/capabilityto contribute to SAON Goal Objectives.

As a follow up, National Board members are now asked to report on activities that need coordination and that are relevant to [Objectives 1.1 and 1.3 under SAON Goal 1](https://www.arcticobserving.org/images/pdf/Strategy_and_Implementation/SAON_Implementation_Plan_version_17JUL2018_Status_approved.pdf):

* *Conduct an inventory of national observational capacities (1.1*)
* *Provide recommendations for a roadmap for future Arctic observational capacities (1.3*)

Board members are asked to fill in the template below and prepare themselves for verbally reporting on this. The answers should be no more than 2 pages in total.

1. What specifically did you mean here?

Objective 1.1: France has a contact point (national representative at SAON). Although we have gathered pieces of information, an up-to-date inventory of the observation and monitoring capacities in the Arctic is still to be undertaken.

Objective 1.3:

In 2016 France has published a Science Plan in the context of the national Arctic Initiative but this would need to be updated. Concerning observation in the Arctic, the document identified the needs of the national research community and provided recommendations to meet these but it did not reach to the point of providing an actual roadmap.

2. Who is leading that activity?

Objective 1.1: CNRS

Objective 1.3: CNRS

3. Is this well coordinated?

Objective 1.1:

So far there is nothing coordinated. France, under CNRS leadership, coordinates a pool of Observing Services for the Earth System, as well as initiatives in Life and Human sciences. Most of these are dedicated to disciplinary research and the regional dimension (e.g. the Arctic) is not addressed. Addressing such a dimension would require additional effort to build a multi-disciplinary, regional view of our observation capacity the Arctic. Such a support is not available today.

Objective 1.3: An update of what has been done in 2016 should be undertaken. The coordination for this does not exist today but CNRS is currently taking initiatives to build a polar working group which could support such activity.

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

Objective 1.1: SAON guidelines on the selection and organization of the relevant information to be collected in the national inventory would help harmonize the work according to international standards

Objective 1.3: Generally, France only maintains few infrastructures in the Arctic. A coordinated access to internationally available polar infrastructures would be a major step forward for all scientific communities. As an example, due to lack of ice-going research vessel, access to the Arctic remains a big challenge for French scientists.

5. Are you currently engaged in CON?

No, but France is willing to participate and could propose a list of two or three scientists to participate in the CON activities

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

From the national standpoint, it would be useful if the Roadmap addresses questions such as how national initiatives could optimally contribute to the development and coordination of joint Arctic infrastructures and observing networks.

Beyond the national priorities in Arctic observation that France will identify in the context of the CNRS polar research initiative, France observational capacities are largely organized so as to contribute to the European programming in terms of observation networks and infrastructures. A SAON action towards the European Arctic roadmap would certainly provide to France an opportunity to contribute to the SAON roadmap.