

General notes

General notes

Hi Heidi.

We've had a productive writing retreat with some great progress on organizing ourselves so that you can successfully support our goals. As before, we still would like you to help us create:

1. [A public facing Handout document](#): The overall goal of the Handout is to have something high-level and accessible for a broad audience of those potentially interested in engaging in or funding the outcomes of the ROADS process.

Here are some additional notes on the Handout:

For now, we think that progress on this document should follow completion of Part I of the ROADS Practitioner's Handbook that is described next.

2. [ROADS Practitioner's Handbook](#): The overall goal of the Handbook is that someone could read Part I and gain a strong understanding of the purpose and value of the ROADS process, including the respective roles of the EPs, the AP, their connection to SAON, AOS, and the TANGIBLE outcomes of the process. In Part II, they would gain a more detailed understanding of how to initiate an EP and what is needed by the AP from EPs. Part II will include the content from our previously developed Guidelines documents, reporting templates and evaluation forms/criteria. In both Part I and Part II, we seek to balance between being concise and readable, yet detailed enough to serve as an on-going resource for EPs. We want to make it clear that the Handbook is not a substitute for on-going collaboration with the AP through things like our Open Partnership meetings and engaging with other EP leads through a Community of Practice like approach.

Here are some additional notes on the Handbook:

We believe that we have reached a good Table of Contents, annotated with things like the Purpose of each section, links to relevant content that you can totally copy or edit or throw out and start over or ask for help on. The Point of Contact (PoC) listed for each section should provide a good starting point. For some sections, we also flag the potential utility of graphics and estimated page counts (not sure how useful these are as we didn't all agree on what they should be and if we are describing pure text or text plus white space plus graphics).

We have also flagged what we think might be sidebar content: EP Facilitator Tips, Indigenous perspectives, unpacking the Guiding Principles, and EP Testimonials and Case Studies. The ROADS AP writing team will work on eliciting feedback from the various EPs to inform sections

in the Handbook where their information will be used. Heidi doesn't need to worry about these sections for now, but could perhaps review them toward the end of the effort or highlight from her own perspectives where these materials could support the text.

In Part II, where some of our more structured content belongs, we've got a lot of material to draw from where the language has been more carefully considered. Each "phase" will have a pretty uniform set of things we point to: guidelines, what to document, how evaluation work. We've recognized the value of concatenating the various documentation requirements into a single [ROADS Process Workbook](#). Pulling it together this way should make it a more useful, unified compilation that is augmented throughout the process and revised, where needed.

This area here has become an AD HOC collection of changes that have been captured for revising Phase I/II:

Notes for changes to Phases as we have been discussing.

[Address how we want to deal with core documentation that should be (re)completed at each phase, which largely relates to composition of the EP, but also relates to Guiding Principles. We want some version control so that we can see change over time, track how groups have revised their documentation based on AP feedback, etc. Broader question on how we submit/store/access on-going documentation. Might be using something like Zenodo Communities to implement as a doc repository and version control.

Also decide how we want to integrate some external review into the EP 4-Phase process. Have EPs recommend 2 reviewers to independently evaluate their submission at each Phase. Have it precede the AP review. In addition to completing basic questions about the content to be drafted by AP, reviewers can (approve as is, approve with changes) that the EP champion needs to assure happens prior to advancing the AP. The AP will see the SME review questions.

From Emily after testing the process, we need enhanced descriptions throughout the Guidelines to emphasize what the evaluation criteria include and how they will be applied to submissions]

We've scheduled three check-ins:

10-SEP 8:30 MT invite sent: early/mid, check in on vision/plans
24-SEP 8:30 MT invite sent: more detailed feedback
22-OCT 8:30 MT invite sent: wrap up

Roles in writing

- If Heidi feel comfortable taking lead writing to do so, utilizing from the material already there
- Heidi has full rein to move sections from the current guidance documents to other parts of the toolkit document.
- If not contacting a point of contact for questions and for that person to take the first take at writing and Heidi iterates/give feedback

- PLEASE FEEL COMFORTABLE SAYING NO/TELLING US WE'RE WRONG.

Handout document

“Public Facing Handout”

(Broad audience, including funders)

Single page, 2-sided format

Provide Heidi with the function of what we want the document to accomplish.

- Overview of the purpose of ROADS
 - The purpose of Arctic ROADS is to build new partnerships and strengthen existing partnerships between observers, processors, users, and funders to improve Arctic observing and data systems.
 - A community of practice to develop (or recommend?) protocols (or practices, recommendations, methods, systems, best practices, documentations, approaches?) to make Arctic observing more impactful.
 - Facilitate information sharing and community building around observing needs of common interest
 - Facilitate coordination in observing efforts where there is a particular need for coordination
 - Strategic planning for Shared Arctic Variables - toolkit with tools: SAV, BENEFIT tool, societal benefit frameworks, documentation and evaluation
- Provide clear, concise statements - have one summary sentence that describes ROADS
- (after Friday) Include ideas about graphics

Provide past examples

[Old 2-pager](#) - notes to improve

- Too wordy - needs a clear goal/purpose/mission for ROADS front and center
- Too technical language (too technical of concepts?) to translate it
- Too much focus on the history/organizations behind it - but keep that Indigenous people have been involved since in planning and throughout development
- Focus on what the product(s) are from the different phases: what is the ROADS process trying to accomplish? Why/Who/What/Where as relevant
- Why would you do the ROADS process for X problem?
- Star -> who and how (generally); Basket -> process (at the zoomed-out level)
- Should the guiding principles be on this document? It's a short description of what we're aiming at with the process, but they are very dense. Maybe put them in a box? Feels important to have
- Remove (regional to global) in Guiding Principles 3

[Policy version](#) from Arctic PASSION

ROADS User Handbook

“Process/User Toolkit Booklet” (focused audience for practitioners)
 TOC, as much as we can content documents that will go in there.

Overview/Introduction.....	2
PART I - Understanding Arctic ROADS.....	2
Background on ROADS process.....	2
What is a Shared Arctic Variable?.....	3
What are Expert Panels?.....	3
Integrated Advisory Process.....	4
PART II - Engaging in Arctic ROADS.....	5
What it takes to support an EP (aimed at writing grant proposals).....	5
○ Operational draftBudget template:.....	6
Engaging in the Integrated Advisory Process.....	6
Foundational practices.....	6
Phase I - Context.....	7
Operational draftGuidelines for Expert Panels. Phase I.....	7
(Version 1.0 for Phase I and II. Draft for Phase I).....	7
Operational draftFill out sections 1 and 2 in the ROADS Process Workbook.....	8
Phase II - Benefits.....	8
Operational draftGuidelines for Expert Panels. Phase II.....	8
(Version 1.0 for Phase I and II. Draft for Phase II).....	8
Operational draftFill out sections 2, 3, and 4 in the ROADS Process Workbook.....	8
Phase III - Requirements.....	8
Draft in progressFill out sections 2, 5, 6, 7 in the ROADS Process Workbook.....	8
Draft in progressGuidance doc for Phase III.....	8
Phase IV - Implementation.....	8
NotesGuidelines for Expert Panels. Phase IV (very rough draft).....	9
NotesPhase IV documentation - Implementation (Draft).....	9
Operational draftFill out sections 2, 8 in the ROADS Process Workbook.....	9
Evaluating Success.....	9
● PoC - Sandy.....	9
● Evaluation down the road (food for thought section) What happens after the ROADS Process?.....	9
Conclusions.....	9
● PoC - Sandy.....	9
● Offboarding the EP (for facilitators).....	9
APPENDICES.....	10
Compiled EP facilitator tips.....	10
Other Helpful resources.....	10
Glossary and Acronyms (some are also found here).....	10
Appendices.....	10

Audience:

Part I

Readable for a broad general interest audience, but preparing the ground in particular for “Practitioners” engaging in the ROADS process via a) Expert Panels or b) Advisory Panel, but also those asked to serve as reviewers

Part 2

More specific focus on “Practitioners”

Overview/Introduction

Notes ▾

PoC - Jan

- Page Length: ~1 page
- Graphic: TBD
- Purpose: To serve as an introduction to the handbook document through providing a high level introduction to Arctic ROADS concepts and why we’ve created a unified handbook to support those engaged in the ROADS process.
- Key Points:
 - Share enough about Arctic ROADS to be able to engage the audience around a high-level value proposition of the ROADS process. Point to some of the potential tangible benefits of the process like improved observing capacity examples that are sought by our partners in communities/local level, national level agencies/efforts, and global organizations. .
 - Describe who this handbook is for and what they can expect from reading it.
 - Introduce enough about the concepts of phases, AP, EP in order to support discussion about who the handbook is for, which is first the EP, second the AP, and third a broader audience of those with interests in ROADS.
 - Introduce the Guiding Principles here and mention they will be explored throughout the Handbook.
 - Describe at a high level the “Tools” in the ROADS process Toolkit
 - Present the idea that the ROADS Handbook has been informed by the Pilot Phase of the ROADS process and will draw from testimonials of past practitioners
- References: High-level context should be aligned with key points in the Handout document (See notes in [here](#)) and other high-level descriptions found in documents referred to throughout this outline document.

PART I - Understanding Arctic ROADS

Background on ROADS process

Notes ▾

- PoC - Sandy, Alice
- Page Length: 2 pages (ish)
- Purpose: Describe what the ROADS process is and why it was created.
- Key Points:
 - Describe the problem ROADS was created to solve along with who is invested in solving this problem.
 - Present the key concepts and ties to SAON and the AOS.
 - Emphasize where the guiding principles came from, including a decade of progress and dialog at the Arctic Observing Summit, and how grounding they are to the practices.
- References: [Report on SAON Progress in ROADS](#), [Starkweather et al. 2022](#) and other documents linked here
- Sidebar: A “Box” about SAON and its role in Arctic ROADS, including creating the process and appointing Advisory Panel members; its Board ultimately ‘owns’ the results of the process and should play a key role in engagement around implementation strategies.

What is a Shared Arctic Variable?

Draft in progress : [here](#)

- PoC - Alice1
- Page Length: 2 pages
- **Graphics: TBD existing or revised SAV (Alice has an idea about compiling docs)**
- Purpose: Help the EPs understand where the overall process is going and why SAVs are used as a coordinating concept.
- Key Points:
 - Why is the Arctic ROADS process organized around SAVs? And what will they accomplish?
 - What is the vision for SAVs? How do they compare to essential variables? Similarities and differences.
 - How some of the tools in this Handbook, referring to the ROADS Process Workbook, convey (at a very high level) what the process builds toward in terms of SAVs. The journey and the destination...
 - Highlight SAVs relationship to Guiding Principles: “broadly shared benefit,” “Complement and integrate...”
- References: Definition of an SAV, [Bradley et al. 2023](#) Deliverable for ArcticPASSION on the development of their SAVs (Ilkka - Jan to complete information).
- Sidebar/box: About the AOS; emphasize that the concept for the SAV evolved at the AOS 2020 and that the AOS continues to play a central role. + provide examples from pilot EPs.

What are Expert Panels?

Notes

- PoC - Emily, Margaret
- Page length: 3 + 3 ish pages of case studies of current EPs

- **Graphics: Boundary spanning prism graphic**

- Purpose: To understand what EPs are and why they are called by SAON to engage in the Arctic ROADS process (grassroots, agile, foundation for Indigenous leadership in Arctic observing, community of practices)
 - Key Points:
 - Why does ROADS call on Expert Panels?
 - What they are responsible for: ultimately, producing well-partnered implementation plans for data collection and sharing around a key Arctic thematic area
 - What is the appropriate scope for an EP: Centered around a thematic scope of broadly shared benefit where there is a strong need to advance implementation for observing systems. We describe the scope of an EP as a theme or thematic area, which can be topical (e.g., sea ice, permafrost - similar to 'scientific' areas of focus), regional (e.g., North Pacific ecosystems, boreal wildfire), issue-driven (e.g., microplastics, HABs) or a combination. It may be less important to strongly define these types of thematic foci than to give examples of them
 - Highlight how ROADS EPs relate to Guiding Principles: "equitable inclusion of Indigenous," "broadly shared benefit," "complement and integrate"
 - Who makes up EP members: EP leads, EP members, and broader AON community. Subject matter experts on Indigenous communities, data management, funding, research scientists, decision makers)
 - How do they interact with the ROADS AP?
 - What are best practices/guidance for EPs (see example/case studies)
 - EP member recruitment - value proposition for the EP - why would someone want to join an EP?
 - Example ToR or charter - [Salmon already done](#)
 - Examples from past EPs - e.g. case studies (can be disbursed through text or be a sidebar)
 - Examples of types of EP: topical, issue, regional
 - Examples of types of members
 - Examples of products/outcomes (maybe somewhere else)
 - Examples of past value propositions (maybe somewhere else)
 - References: more resources are [AOS and](#) ASSW notes from [AOS 2022](#) Working Group
- 4

Integrated Advisory Process

Notes ▾

- PoC - Sandy, Margaret (evaluation)
- Page Length: 2
- **Graphics: Key Graphic about IAP, similar to basketweave but may be updated**
- Purpose: Describe the Arctic ROADS Integrated Advisory Process and how it operates in practice
- Key Points:

- Lay out phases of the process in simple terms - 1 sentence each - which exemplify good practices for developing obs/data implementation plans
 - [Foundational](#)
 - [Context](#) (Phase I: Form an EP)
 - [Benefits](#) (Phase II: Societal Benefit Assessment)
 - [Requirements](#) (Phase III: Requirements)
 - [Implementation](#) (Phase IV: Implementation Strategies)
 - [Evaluation](#)
- Lay out the roles (EP v. AP) and how these both uphold the guiding principles. Grassroots and distributed stewardship. Include citations on polycentric governance and how it relates to distributed stewardship of Arctic observing.
- What is the purpose of the AP, who is on it and SAON's role in appointing them (Box 1 on SAON in Background section), Advisory Panel - member organizations (pointing toward the [documentation website](#))
- How EPs with the AP interact through the IAP, but also engage in thought-partnership through the Open Partnership Meetings. Concept of AP Champions for each EP.
- About Evaluation - How the two groups relate to each other through evaluation. Include concept of independent outside review.

PART II - Engaging in Arctic ROADS

[Graphic for this section might include a high-level “swimlane diagram” - show deliverables how they move to other phases and build upon each other]

What it takes to support an EP (aimed at writing grant proposals)

Notes ▾

- PoC - Alice, Emily
- Page length: 2-3ish
- Purpose: Give people looking to fund/support an EP the necessary information to establish communications with the AP and to write a proposal.
- Key points:
 - What are the key roles to support? Summary of work required for each role in the EP

Notes ▾

- Facilitator(s) : this role is a lot of translation between the process and the EP and their language/thought processes, but it also means going back and forth, guiding the EP conversations to fill in pieces in the SAV process

- Indigenous participation (pull from HABs group + salmon EP also has a SoW for Indigenous members]
- **Operational draft** [Budget template](#):
- **Notes** ▾ Links to sample text that proposers can use
 - [Document aimed at funders](#) (numbers are not accurate at this point)
- Example on how a current EP is funded
- Workshops are recommended \$ - two workshops (phase 2 and phase 3) where you bring experts together
- How can the advisory panel help? Letter of support, input/coaching in proposals,
 - Warning: advisory panel membership can be seen as a conflict in evaluating project outcomes to reviewers, write it carefully!

Engaging in the Integrated Advisory Process

PoC - Sandy

Page Length - 1 page

Purpose: Describes how a prospective facilitator would engage with the AP, the role of the EP-AP Champion, the need for external reviewers and the flow of the documentation evaluation process.

Graphic: We have an old flow chart that need to be updated to illustration

Draft language for this can be found in Phase I Guidelines on “Role of the AP in Phase I” but should be made more generic.

Additional notes:


- Each EP will have a ‘champion’ on the AP that helps to supervise their flow through the Advisory Process. This person will receive the documents from the EP and work with the 2 reviewers suggested by the EP to review their content at each Phase prior to the full AP evaluation
- The 2 reviewers per phase should be subject matter experts on the thematic area and be able to speak to any subject-specific content for accuracy and effectiveness.
- The champion will summarize the feedback from the reviewers and include it with the materials that are evaluated by the AP.
- The champion will summarize the AP evaluation and response to the EP if any major changes need to be addressed in their documentation - gaps, broken links, etc. and also provide feedback and advice from the AP.
- Note that it is expected that in subsequent phases the EP will explicitly address how it modified its work, if needed, to respond to feedback from the AP..

Foundational practices

Notes ▾

- PoC - Margaret and Lauren
 - Margaret works on a more detailed outline
- Purpose: facilitators walk away feeling well-equipped to pull together a good EP member list and productive team that aligns with the Guiding Principles of ROADS
- Page Length - 4 pages

- Graphic: TBD, potentially Indigenous Artist expressing the purpose of ROADS from a community perspective

- Key Points
 - Context matters - Arctic Indigenous Peoples, defining Arctic (disciplinary/cultural boundaries),
 - Point to some resources
 - Building relationships
 - Indigenous leaders
 - Agencies
 - Other interested groups
 - Co-production of knowledge
 - Informal discussions, building trust, then formalizing partnership
 - Aligning goals
 - Value proposition
 - Societal benefit assessment - frameworks - why we start here
 - Unpacking the guiding principles - referencing key literature
 - Ethical and equitable engagement
 - Supporting Indigenous self-determination, sovereignty, cause no harm, Free Prior and Informed Consent
 - Engagement and collaboration strategies - facilitation, decision-making within EPs
 - Unpacking the guiding principles - referencing key literature
 - Data management and ethics
 - open (FAIR),
 - data sovereignty (CARE)
 - Polycentric governance - What it is and how it shows up in the ROADS process.
- Notes on slide:  Starter kit
- References
 - [Indigenous Guidance Documentation](#) -
 - Margaret's AOS 2022 CPK Short Statement
 - Margaret's MOOC - which is a CoObs product
 - Sandy's polygovernance paper in draft
 - Margaret's success metrics paper in draft

Phase I - Context

Draft in progress ▾

PoC - Sandy, Margaret

Purpose: Setting the context for the Expert Panel, which includes scoping a clearly defined thematic focal areas for the group and the observing and data collection issues that impact progress. Scoping includes recognizing different groups and perspectives operating and benefiting from the thematic areas of focus. There should already be a high-level conceptual understanding of the shared societal benefits of relevance.

Operational draft Guidelines for Expert Panels. Phase I

([Version 1.0 for Phase I and II](#). [Draft for Phase I](#))

NOTE: need to make sure the EP addresses the core obs/data issues, this is maybe too implied and not emphasized enough in the present language.

Operational draft Fill out sections 1 and 2 in the [ROADS Process Workbook](#)

Operational draft [Evaluation form for Phase I](#). Translation from Google Form

Phase II - Benefits

Draft in progress

PoC - Margaret and Sandy

Purpose: Linking the way people use information to culturally-relevant societal benefits (e.g UN Sustainable Goals, Indigenous well-being, food security, etc.) as a way to identify priority areas for further coordination (SAVs, EP discussions)

Operational draft Guidelines for Expert Panels. Phase II

([Version 1.0 for Phase I and II](#). [Draft for Phase II](#))

NOTE: need to make sure to introduce the concept of use cases at this point in the process. .

Operational draft Fill out sections 2, 3, and 4 in the [ROADS Process Workbook](#)

Operational draft [Evaluation form for Phase II](#). Translation from Google Form

Phase III - Requirements

Draft in progress

PoC - Alice

Purpose: Describe the observations and data systems necessary to meet the needs described in

Phase II

Draft in progress Fill out sections 2, 5, 6, 7 in the [ROADS Process Workbook](#)

Draft in progress [Guidance doc for Phase III](#)

Notes Evaluation form for Phase III

Phase IV - Implementation

Not started

PoC - Sandy

Purpose: Articulate a vision or plan(s) for turning (some of) those requirements into reality. Note for Heidi: In the absence of having unified guidelines for this Phase, we propose to use this section in more of a vision section to help folks understand where the process can and should lead.

ROADS Examples List:

1. Sea Ice Expert Panel - Seeking to influence the definition of the global sea ice ECVs
2. Wildfires - e.g. Mikko's wildfire APP
3. Salmon - counting towers and Guardian drones

non-ROADS Examples List:

1. Backyard Buoys (AOOS) Example

2. Distributed Biological Observatory

Notes - [Guidelines for Expert Panels. Phase IV](#) (very rough draft)

Notes - [Phase IV documentation - Implementation](#) (Draft)

Operational draft - Fill out sections 2, 8 in the [ROADS Process Workbook](#)

Not started - Evaluation form for Phase IV

Evaluating Success

- PoC - Sandy
- Evaluation down the road (food for thought section) What happens after the ROADS Process?

Conclusions

Not started ▾

- PoC - Sandy
- Offboarding the EP (for facilitators)

APPENDICES

Compiled EP facilitator tips

Notes ▾

PoC - Sandy, Margaret

Some of it is in “[Starter Kit](#)”

Other Helpful resources

Notes ▾

[Glossary](#) and Acronyms ([some are also found here](#))

Appendices

References ([some are also found here](#))

FAQ (see [FAQ](#) tab)