

## GeoHab Wrap-up, General Discussion

**Sergej Olenin:** Most of the talks presented use geology to correlate and predict biology. Is there a way to use the opposite, i.e. Biology to predict and correlate Geology?

**Roger Coggan:** Can modelers predict or tell how much sampling needs to be done for an area in order to make a habitat map?

**Richard Taylor:** Bureaucrats need to understand the map scientists are producing in order to use them. It is the job of the scientist to make sure this translation happens.

**Peter Lawton:** For future GeoHab, the organizers will have to restrict and tighten up the themes in order to catch the essentials, otherwise the meeting will end up in a 3 session meeting where Biology, Geology and Ecology will be divided and so will the scientists. GeoHab 2009 was a maximum capacity with 42 talks (20 min each) plus 4 keynote speaker presentations (30 min each) and 120 participants. In order to stay within the three day time frame, 11 of the first abstracts submitted for oral presentations had to be transferred to poster presentations.

**Oscar Pizzaro:** Is this GeoHab conference "state of the art" in the world. Is it representative of the habitat work that is being done in the world at the moment? How about Asia, South America and Africa? Are they doing any work that should be considered in a meeting such as this?

**Christian Wilson:** Should this work be published in more specific journals? As of today, the work on habitat is spread amongst many different journals, which make search of articles very difficult.

**Gary Greene:** Answer to C. Wilson: Thoughts have been brought up in past meeting about the scattering of the various habitat papers through multiple journals. The solution found in the past was to publish a book dedicated to marine benthic habitat mapping, which is now available through the Geological Association of Canada. Maybe it is time to publish a special publication in a journal such as Journal of Continental Shelf Research. About 10,000 US is needed to support such activity. Some of this fee could be covered through GeoHab funds collected over the years throughout the multiple meetings that have happened.

**Richard Taylor:** The temporal change question found amongst species is a subject that is still missing at the GeoHab meetings. There is mostly only snapshot data because it is expensive to survey/monitor multiple times.

**Ian Wright:** Environmental society and economists needs to be contacted in order to stand better chances to fund bigger projects

**Ceri James:** GeoHab website maybe the right place to put pdf of articles or to keep a publication list with appropriate web links.

**Glenda Wyatt:** Bring the oceanographers to the meeting. It is an important component that may not be taken into account enough at this point.

**Jacques Populus:** The funds are often quite limited for research. There is a choice to be made between "what's there and what's happening later". Small budget means small mapping projects. How much is budgeted for sampling and for mapping? Is there a way to narrow down what should be mapped and who should pick the areas?

**Jessica Sameoto:** Anthropogenic impacts highly affect substrate and ecology. We should encourage the incorporation of anthropogenic modification in habitat mapping, which would help explain some of the variability in the data be presented?

**Kari-Louise Sanders:** Industry has a huge amount of data and a community like GeoHab should be able to pressure the exchange and sharing of the data for scientific use.

**Geoffroy Lamarche:** New Zealand scientific community use industry data and funding, but stipulated with a promise to only use the data for publication and share our own data with industry.

**Heather Stewart:** If you contact the industry, you can find data, but otherwise it's pretty much impossible to know what is available.