The Phase II documentation from the Wildfire Expert Panel. Additional evaluation

Background

At the Advisory Panel meeting 19th December, it was decided that future evaluations should (also) include advice, structured like:

- What are 'immediate' issues (Resolve before proceeding)
    - Clarity edits
    - Missing information
    - Deficiencies in process execution, including inclusivity
        - (not related to a highly regionalized approach, this is acceptable)
- What are 'future work' issues (Address in future Phases/Iterations)
    - Networking and inclusivity opportunities for next steps, including broadening from regional to broader geographic extent.
- The Advisory Panel evaluation
    - Changes in guidance
    - Changes in evaluation

The Phase II documentation from the Wildfire Expert Panel was made available to the Advisory Panel on 6th October 2023, and the evaluation ran until December. The first draft evaluation was produced as a draft, dated 11th December. The evaluation on the two following pages should be seen as a supplement to this.

Immediate issues

Methods

- The use of Indigenous and Traditional Knowledge: Clarify and use appropriate terms where needed. Using Traditional Knowledge would suffice. Capitalizing "Indigenous" in all uses.
- Is the SAV wildfire? The document makes it seem like the candidate SAV is ignition.
- Links were not accessible, so it was difficult to review in detail.

Results of the Phase II Work

- Rrelationships to other efforts:
    - There is some discussion of the global reach the team is trying to establish. This could be built out more.

Timelines

- More specificity in the timeline would be good.
- In terms of Indigenous partnership development, it is on a different timing track.

Funding

- A clearer explanation on how funding will be secured for the inclusion of work with the North American groups could be provided.

Communications and engagement

- There should be greater access to these blogs to the SAON ROADS AP and beyond.
- Communication plan is vague except for the mention that there needs to be more inclusion but not specifically outlining how.
- I see a list of workshop participants, but I do not see a clearly defined Expert Panel.

What are ‘future work’ issues

Methods

- Methodology should be more comprehensive, transparent and detailed. The overall approach was evident, but the specifics - particularly how equity was addressed, were not evident. Lack of description on how the value tree was created/how the framework assisted (reproducibility is lacking if other themes want to follow).
- The culture of Indigenous livelihoods and traditional occupations, as well as, the Indigenous infrastructures were presented only by the Sami reindeer herders. A map and the culture of Indigenous group with the description of particular livelihoods. More Indigenous participation.

Results of the Phase II Work

- On the use of the IAOAF:
    - How did the EP team feel about using the IAOAF? What input would the team provide about using the IAOAF to others?
    - Did the team look for other frameworks? Why or why not? Why were no others used?
- On the results:
    - There was less discussion of the fire-prone terrain and what types of observations or partnerships might be needed to better understand that.
    - The Expert Panel should be working to strengthen societal benefits for products, as well as identify missing products.
    - The tree is not clearly visible but highlights a myriad of potential variables.
- Relationships to other efforts:
    - The documentation highlights that the EP has a good understanding of Finnish frameworks but lacks clarity on other national/ international initiatives.
- The opportunities presented by developing these SAVs are clear and well-justified?:
    - I think the opportunities are presented, but it's not clear from the text if the EP sees them as opportunities for them to address or not.

Communications and engagement

- To assess the strengths and weaknesses of the process approach it would be the most appropriate and effective to include the Russian Indigenous communities and Russian scientists into the context.

The Advisory Panel evaluation

Relationships to other efforts:

- There is no not much of this in the Phase II documentation. There may be a need to ask more specific questions or add more specificity and detail into the template to get at this aspect.