



## Steering Committee Meeting Horta, 18-21 April 2002

---

### WP1: EMBiF sites

#### Geographical coverage

Several sites have been proposed to fill in the gaps that have been identified in the past:

- Gulf of Trieste (Adriatic)
- Malta
- Ustica (N.W. Sicily)
- Two site at N.W. Spain (Damia Jaume)
- North Portugal (Isabel Sousa Pinto)
- Gulf of Rego, Baltic (Henn Ojaveer)
- Gulf of Finland (Henn Ojaveer).

R. Warwick

During the workshop the colleagues from the Atlantic-Artic group will be asked to evaluate the additional proposed Flagship sites and decide which sites will be eligible for this qualification. The proposers of these selected sites will be contacted to fill out the secondary questionnaire.

Madeira is still missing. The institute that could propose the site did not respond.

Also the coverage in the Italian region is not very well. It could be possible to upgrade some of the proposed EMBiF complementary sites. The self-evaluation of the sites will give insight in the possibilities for this. The site proposed by Naples should be upgraded and the institutes could be invited to fill out the secondary questionnaire.

F. Buchholz

There is a gap in the transition zone between the North Sea and the Baltic. Colleagues from Kristineberg will be contacted and asked whether they will be able to propose sites in this region.

D. Jaume

The proposers of the Galicia site will be informed about the fact that their site can be regarded as a potential Flagship site if they restrict the area to the islands. In this case they will be invited to fill in a secondary questionnaire.

However, the serious gaps have been filled in. There could be a specific paragraph in the final report explaining the reasons why some sites have not been included in the network.

It has to be decided whether the proposers will be asked to fill out the secondary questionnaire.

The IMBC proposed a EMBiF complementary sites (Gulf of Heraklion) that is not yet shown on the map. The map should be updated.

Propositions for additional sites were discussed during the regional meeting.

#### ATBI sites

GC

According to Jan-Marcin Weslawski several regions have not been covered by an ATBI site: Eastern Mediterranean, NW Atlantic and the North Sea. Also there seem to be some doubles (e.g. Cabrera/Port Cross, Scilly / Molene). The GC will try to find a solution for these problems after the appeal procedure.

The coverage will be linked to the 8 geographical provinces considered by OSPAR. It will be attempted that each province will be represented by at least one ATBI.

#### EMBiF complementary sites

GC

The EMBiF complementary sites will be evaluated using the same set of criteria that has been used to evaluate the EMBiF Flagship sites. The proposers of the sites will be asked to fill out the questionnaire in return the form to the GC with 3 weeks after the questionnaire has been received. In the same email the institutes have to indicate their intent of commitment for marine biodiversity research at the site to the network.

GC

#### Appeal procedure Flagship sites

After the regional meeting there will be a possibility to give notice of **appeal** to the outcome of the evaluation of the proposed Flagship sites. A special paragraph will be added for the sites that have a label as special site, but without specification. If the appeal does not succeed, the sites will be downgraded. The deadline for the application of the appeal will be three weeks after the reception of the email. A form will be added to the appeal procedure in which the intent of commitment can be specified. After the appeal procedure the general coordinators will produce the list with Flagship sites and provide a nomenclature of the special sites.

### Database

The WP1 database will be updated as soon as possible.

R. Warwick

### Commitment

Commitment is an important item in the selection of the Flagship sites. An expression of interest/ letter of commitment will be developed.

F. Buchholz

### Nomenclature

The Flagship sites are divided in three subcategories (ATBI/LTER/SSBI). These subcategories should be better defined. A proposal has been formulated by Carlo Heip.

R. Warwick

### Evaluation criteria

The evaluation criteria of the EMBiF sites have been updated according to the comments mentioned during the steering committee meeting and the regional meeting.

GC

### Maps

The maps will be produced using MAPINFO. The additional sites will be added and the maps updated

C. Emblow

### Description of the sites: Templates

It is planned to present the selection of sites in a glossy brochure. Templates will be developed for the description of the EMBiF sites. Two A4 will be available for the description of the EMBiF Flagship site, 0.5 A4 for that of the complementary sites.

R. Warwick

### EMBiF complementary sites / former EFS sites

The proposers of the EFS will evaluate their own sites. A procedure will be started after the regional meeting. Deadline four weeks after the email has been received.

GC

### Deep sea.

In the final report/publication(s) it should be explained why deep-sea sites do not make part of BIOMARE and the network.

C. Heip  
R. Santos

### Water framework directive

We should get insight in the activities and progress of the Water Framework Directive (WFD). The link to this programme should be established through the national representatives of the WFD. The GC will contact representatives of the WFD and ask for more information (relevant issues and indicators)

GC

### Other Initiatives

The general coordinators will link to other initiatives, like OSPAR, ICES, HELCOM.  
See also remark 3.1 of table 1.

GC

### Regional centres

It was proposed to work with regional centres that take the lead in the development of regional research. Large institutes with internationally acknowledged competence could play an important role in this network. The institutes could be linked with the OSPAR provinces (ATBI sites ?) and function as an operational unit (linked with commitment)

### Weather station

The idea proposed by Wulf Greve could be adopted by BIOMARE. This has to be discussed.

## Remarks on deliverables

C. Emblow

### 1.4. Review of available data (species and habitat lists, maps, collections, publications) for sites with background data on biodiversity and ecosystem function in Europe

The deliverable will be developed by the WP3 leader based on the information that is already available (database).

P. Avesaath  
R. Warwick

### 1.5. Comparisons of species lists for best studied sites and deduce what they indicate regarding habitat diversity, research efforts

The deliverable will be based on the best studied Flagship Sites. It will be initially based on the list of publications that have been mentioned in the secondary questionnaire. GC will provide overview of the seven best-studied sites. Helgoland will be added to the list because it has been extensively studied. A table could be produced for the sites listing all the species that have been found. The habitat diversity could be deduced from this, or from the database. When possible the table could be differentiated for the different habitats. Fred Buchholz offered to make a concept. The proposers of the sites will be asked to fill in a list per habitat (species, total mayor phyla, n species) and list the available habitats.

R. Warwick  
C. Emblow

### 1.6. Criteria for accessibility, and compatibility of data-banks connected to (potential) reference sites

Chris and Richard will develop the criteria for accessibility. This will be based on the criteria developed by GBIF and other networks.

### 3.1. Expanded network of students, researchers and managers on marine biodiversity (including links with members of MARS)

Connection with other Initiatives:

It should be discussed whether EPBRS is able to use the MARINE -B listserver.

- EUROGOOS

Silvana Vallerga takes part in the EUROGOOS cluster meetings and should be consulted whether and how it will be possible to link to this initiative.

- OSPAR/UNEP/EEA/ICES/HELCOM

GC

We should ask information about these initiatives to determine the position of the BIOMARE project. Also links with initiatives from the US and CANADA should be established.

GC

### 3.2. Improved dissemination through - a) an internet web-site, including an electronic newsletter, - b) reports and publications in scientific and applied journals for specialists and non-specialists

The BIOMARE website could be adopted by MARS or MARBENA. This should be discussed.

BIOMARE could be 'kept alive' by MARS as a brand. This could also be done also for the newsletter.

P. Avesaath  
C. Emblow

### 3.3. Overview of ongoing research programs, facilities and equipment of European institutes involved in marine biodiversity research

The database will be based on the results of a survey that has been conveyed by MARS some years ago. The survey is too detailed and will be reduced.

A CDrom could be made with all the output of the project (websites, brochures, databases etc.). This should be done at the end of the project (after the final workshop).

Brochure of the EMBiF sites

The brochure could be linked to future research. In this case the flyers will remain useful and up to date also after BIOMARE has been concluded.

### 3.7. Protocols on integration of - a) different formats used for databases (incl. those used at reference sites (deliverable 1.6) and those used in other relevant related studies (e.g. for monitoring or species registration)), and - b) socio-economic questions, e.g. on the impact of tourism or fisheries on marine biodiversity

Ricardo Santos showed an example of this deliverable. This could be used for the production of the BIOMARE deliverable.

## **Work Package 2: Indicators**

---

The most important now is to have insight in the actual indicators that are available for marine Biodiversity research. The shown tables should be filled in, and protocols should be collected. Biomarkers will be considered by BEEP and it was suggested that they will not be a part of BIOMARE. It should be discussed how to incorporate and combine indicators of marine biodiversity and ecosystem health.

J-P Feral  
M. Fourt

## **Work Package 3: Dissemination and capacity building**

---

### Website

There are no funds available to maintain the BIOMARE website after the project has been concluded (November 2002). It is important too keep BIOMARE alive (as a brand). The website could be adopted by preferably MARS, or MARBENA. Possibilities for this should be discussed by the boards of these initiatives. At the end of the project, the website has to be completed and present the outcome of the project (i.e. EMBiF sites, Indicators, protocols, databases and reports).

### Newsletter

The newsletter has been sent to 275 addresses. The quality of the newsletter is very good. It was suggested to continue the newsletter, even after BIOMARE. The newsletter could also be adopted by MARS.

### Database (deliverable 3.3)

In the past it has been decided to fill the database with information gathered during a survey (questionnaire) organised by MARS. During this meeting, the information was handed over to BIOMARE. The MARS questionnaire was considered too exhaustive and will be adapted by Chris. The adapted questionnaire will be sent to the institutes as soon as possible.

### Publications

Fred will check possibilities for the publication of the BIOMARE results in the journal Helgolander Sea Research.

### Flyer

If the flyer links to future research it remains up to date after the project has ended. Approximately 1000 copies will be printed.

### Brochure

This has been discussed in WP1.

### Observers

It was mentioned that the names of the observers that participated in the workshops and/or regional meetings should be mentioned at the website as well.

## **General coordination**

---

### Second payment

Soon the second payment will be arranged. As agreed upon during several meetings, the budget of the individual participants will be compensated for the travel effort. A budget is available for travel and subsistence for the participation of two representatives of each institute during BIOMARE events. The budget will be reduced if during the meetings the participants were represented by only one person. The changed budget will be adjusted by the second payment.

## **Workshop**

---

Location: Tromsø or Svalbard.

Date: 8-11 September