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| Line # | Comment |
| 110 | “several pilot partnership efforts are emerging to begin ROADS development” Could you clarify, which pilot efforts you are meaning? |
| 112-113 | “they must also include funding for equitable partnership with Indigenous Peoples from inception through implementation” It should be made clear that this really depends on the type of EAV. For most (all?) atmospheric variables, Indigenous People cannot provide any input in any possible way, so their partnership in the discussion about these variables does not make any sense to me. Also in the other fields, the contribution of Indigenous Peoples (in making observations, in presenting observational needs, and in the design of the observing system) is limited to a certain number of variables. |
| 143-144 | “practices of knowledge co-production” What do you mean? Could you clarify what these practices are? |
| 156-157 | “Arctic Indigenous People need to be recognized as rights holders in the Arctic, and research in their homeland needs to be conducted in partnership with them”  I feel that this is going too far. For instance, do FMI asks Helsinki citizens (bus drivers, backers, construction workers, …) or authorities (major, municipal administration, police department, …) to be partner in the measurements FMI carries out to monitor and study air quality, weather, climate, soil, water, etc. in the Helsinki region? Of course not. Nevertheless, the society is the ultimate beneficiary of services and results produced from FMI measurements, and in my view the same should happen in the Arctic. I wonder, is this “partnership” really wanted by the Arctic Indigenous communities, or is it just used for political slogan? I recommend reformulating the concept. For instance, I would agree with the statement that the collaboration with the Arctic communities needs to ensure that the services produced from the observations are translated into a knowledge that integrates the traditional one and contributes to improve their well-being. |
| 183.184 | “Self-organization of the community, with funding developed through peer-reviewed process, will be …” Do you mean through dedicated project calls from International Funding Agencies such as EU and NSF? I would specify, otherwise “Self-organization of the community” sounds quite puzzling. |
| 187-206 | Is there a timeline? I think it is quite important to provide a timeline in the context of the expected disappearance of the Arctic summer sea ice. E.g. phase I and II cannot last 10 years…  Also, as the Arctic is drastically changing and new instruments are continuously developed, it is reasonable to presume that in 10 years from now it will be relevant to measure variables that now are now not-measurable or not considered relevant, and that requirements will change. I think there is need to update both the EAV list and the requirements |

General comments:

I think that the scope and structure of ROADS is clear. My main concern is related to the role of Indigenous People. I think it should be better clarified in which domains and terms the interaction of ROADS and Local Communities will take place. It is quite obvious (to me) that Local Communities cannot in any way contribute to certain (several?) branches of science, and this should not be hidden behind general statement about their partnership with ROADS. Otherwise, the whole ROADS loses credibility and meaning. Instead, I see a clear role of local communities in identifying services that respond to their needs. On the basis of the identified services, the scientific community (and clearly NOT the local communities) will then evaluate which EAV are required to produce those services. Is this a too simplistic vision?