Developing a Roadmap for Arctic Observing and Data Systems (ROADS). Version 30th August 2019. Review.

Lauren Divine, Aleut Community of St. Paul Island Tribal Government

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Line # | Comment |
| 10 | Suggest more clear wording than “responsible agencies” – “managing agencies”? |
| 10 | Coastal and riverine erosion should be included in the list here (riverine is not) |
| 16-17 | Would suggest rewording to something like ‘land and resource managers struggle with a lack of structured observational data to accurately or adequately inform modeling efforts”  |
| 24 | Suggest replacing “holistic” with “appropriate” or “culturally informed” |
| 24 | Add “multiple” in front of “scales” |
| 25-26 | Would reword to “Equitable partnership approaches with Arctic Indigenous Peoples and international sharing of observational assets…” |
| 36 | Could use “through grassroots efforts” rather than “the bottom up” |
| 59 | Fragmented science (which is still the operating norm given the current structure of funding processes) also leads to inaccurate interpretation of Indigenous Peoples’ IK in future related projects that perpetuate published ‘wrong conclusions’ of previous fragmented efforts.  |
| 100-101 | Unfortunately, this is the funding process that dooms sustained observational efforts—communities cannot be convinced to monitor what national funding and operational agencies deem as ‘relevant’. They must be priorities of the communities. These funding and operational agencies are far removed from the remote, rural locations of changes and events that need monitoring and observation. Those on the ground are the experts and should be leading efforts, including decisions on what is part of advancing sustained Arctic observations. Until there is broad support from policy makers to trust that those Indigenous Peoples in communities where observing efforts are desired and needed know what and how to sustain efforts, fragmentation of science data collection efforts will continue to be an issue. |
| 110 | “community-driven” |
| 114-115 | Is there Indigenous participation on this task force? If not, the previous sentence in 112-113 is not accurate. |
| 123-124 | Recommend moving this to the first bullet. |
| 140-142 | Recommend leading with identifying EAVs from existing efforts in communities led by Indigenous organizations as those are the important ‘priority’ variables to Indigenous Peoples, refine with catalog of other existing efforts and bringing in expert groups to maintain co-production approach. |
| 162 | ROADS Advisory Panel really needs Indigenous participation |
| 169 | Unclear what an Indigenous expert is defined as. |
| 172-174 | Is there an estimate on how often ‘convenes as required’ may be? Quarterly, monthly, other? |
| 181 | EAV development is a critical piece of co-production that seems to be lacking in the structure of the ROADS effort. In the section above, there is a framework for evaluating EAV, but here there seems to be outlined a fragmented, unfunded structure for taking what already exists (most of which likely comes from academia or agency driven, non-Indigenous involved ‘fragmented science’ efforts already occurring). Can anyone submit a proposal or will it be limited to those on the expert panels? Is Indigenous participation part of deciding who is appropriate for panels?  |
| 208-211 | Can more information on how evaluation will commence be provided in the section? |
| 218 | Combine into one sentence or remove “And” from second sentence here. |
| 221 | Missing a word after “organized”. |

General comments:

Great read- thank you so much for sharing with me. Most of my comments are relatively minor. However, there are some larger questions within the EAV development, expert panels, and how the structure of the Task Force may or may not achieve co-production. I’ve tried to ask concise questions on where I was left a bit confused after reading and re-reading those sections, but please let me know if something is still unclear! I hope these comments/questions help!

Best,
Lauren Divine