SAON Arctic ROADS Advisory Panel evaluation of Phase II Wildfire documentation

Documents

- Phase II document (version 5th September 2023): https://drive.google.com/file/d/1O7OCb4QrZzi1T4gPWeR33apEBhFkT2k_/view?usp=drive_link
- Evaluation form: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSf0e8ubFXu6Smhcl76qZBnW9jUKSu161KSLhE47kqTdIAU1YA/viewform
- Full report (from Evaluation form):
  - .pdf: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1MKdoJoH4V0YSWzf3-BbmmuQKlDzwExW6/view?usp=drive_link
  - .csv: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jLmBYFTG9xxZucAkX-LWXewBnWRllEyU/view?usp=drive_link

Summary

Evaluation running in the period 6th October to 11th December 2023. There were 13 responses. One series of questions were on a linear scale, running from 1 (=strongly disagree) to 5 (=strongly agree), and most responses were 3 or above. Another series was simple text questions and answers. For these, there were many positive responses. In the below, those that could warrant further attention is highlighted.

Overall, the Advisory Panel concludes that the Expert Panel is ready to move into Phase III.

Phase II Methods

For linear scale questions, the responses were 3 or higher, which is a satisfactory result.

In question "*Specific comments on the approach"*, comments were:

- Lack of description on how the value tree was created.
- The geography was limited to only Scandinavian countries, so the culture of Indigenous livelihoods and traditional occupations, as well as, the Indigenous infrastructures were presented only by the Sami reindeer herders.
- Still seems that there is a misunderstanding or use of Indigenous and Traditional Knowledge interchangeably and it would be good to clarify and use appropriate terms where needed.
- There should be a synopsis from the document included. There were broken links.

In question "*Please comment on any improvements you feel are needed in this linked description"*, specific comments were:

- I was under the impression that the SAV is wildfire, where the document makes it seem like there are new proposed SAV's (ie ignition is a candidate SAV);
- There should be a synopsis from the document included.
- There were broken links.

Results of the Phase II Work

For linear scale questions, the responses were 3 or higher, which is a satisfactory result.

In question "*Further comments, questions or suggestions related to the results"*, specific comments were:

- How did the EP team feel about using the IAOAF? Did the team look for other frameworks? Why or why not? Why were no others used? What input would the team provide about using the IAOAF to others? (On the use of the *International Arctic Observing Assessment Framework* (IAOAF)).
- The value tree analysis does not make sense to me. The numerical weather prediction, climate prediction model, and hydrological model lead to little societal benefit (…) The EP should be working to strengthen societal benefits for products, as well as identify missing products.

In "*Further comments, questions or suggestions related to the results"*, specific comments were:
- The narrative supports the identified candidate SAVs.

In "*Further comments, questions or suggestions related to the relationships to other efforts"*, specific comments were:
- The documentation highlights that the EP has a good understanding of Finnish frameworks but lacks clarity on other national/ international initiatives
- Discussion (…) of the global reach the team is trying to establish and include.
- There is a lack of Indigenous participation and lack of understanding of Indigenous knowledge…

In "*Further comments, questions or suggestions related to the opportunities for the proposed SAVs"*, specific comments were:
- I am not convinced that there are opportunities for the remote Indigenous communities. (…) It should be relevant equipment and resources should be considered - technology that puts "the right information in the right hands at the right time."

Next Steps

The linear scale questions were:
- The revised timeline is realistic given the readiness of this effort
- The funding support outlined for the next steps is realistic for the needs of Phase III under this effort
- The communications and engagement plans outlined for the next steps are well-developed and clear.

and the response ranges for these were 2-5, 2-5, and 1-5 (all with mode 4), respectively, which is a satisfactory result.

In "*Comments on the Timeline"*, specific comments were:
- The timeline seems reasonable for this engagement (and around other planned meetings)
- Seems too rushed.

In "*Comments on funding support"*, specific comments were:
- Not clear. Perhaps a clearer explanation on how funding will be secured for the inclusion of work with the North American groups could be provided.

In "*Comments on communications and engagement plans"*, specific comments were:
- There should be greater access to these blogs to the SAON ROADS AP and beyond - I have not personally seen them come across my desk; communication plan is vague except for the mention that there needs to be more inclusion but not specifically outlining how

Readiness for Phase III

For the linear scale question, the responses were 3 or higher, which is a satisfactory result.

In "*Further comments on readiness related to the timeline, funding, communications and engagement"*, specific comments were:
- A clearly defined Expert Panel with representatives from the different types of group.
- I think they are trying very hard to get there, but could benefit from a bit more polishing of the current work to be better ready to go to Phase III.
- Methodology should be more comprehensive, transparent and detailed