SAON ROADS Advisory Panel Evaluation/Reviewing the Phase III Expert Panel Wildfire Documentation from FMI (version 21APR2026). Review from Advisory Panel meeting 19th May

Strengths Identified

Participants generally agreed that the document demonstrates substantial effort and maturity, particularly in:

- Identification and description of relevant datasets.
- Consideration of data integration.
- Engagement with Sami communities and local stakeholders.
- Development of a Shared Arctic Variable (SAV) framework for wildfire monitoring.

Key Feedback Themes

Indigenous Knowledge and Inclusion

Several members noted that Indigenous participation was well described early in the document but became less visible in later sections.

Comments included:

- Indigenous Knowledge appeared to become conflated with crowdsourced observations.
- Distinctions between Indigenous Knowledge, local knowledge, and community-based observations should be clarified.
- The role of Indigenous Knowledge in prioritization and validation processes was unclear.
- Indigenous Knowledge was categorized as a "nice-to-have" element in some appendices despite being described as important earlier in the document.

Clarity of Purpose and Communication

Several members found it difficult to determine:

- What specific observing gaps were being addressed.
- Which capabilities already exist.
- What new observing capacity is being proposed.
- How identified datasets would ultimately function as an integrated observing system.

Members suggested stronger synthesis and clearer communication of priorities.

User Engagement and Service Delivery

Ola Grabak emphasized the importance of identifying how outputs will reach users, particularly:

- Firefighters.
- Emergency responders.
- Meteorological services.
- Communities affected by wildfire.

Greater emphasis on operational uptake and preventive services was recommended.

Shared Arctic Variables and Data Quality

SUEYOSHI Tetsuo raised questions regarding:

- Definition and consistency of Shared Arctic Variables.
- Use of soil moisture as a wildfire-related SAV.
- Transferability of proposed approaches to other Arctic regions.
- Data quality and validation requirements.

Process Transparency

Several members expressed interest in understanding how Expert Panel discussions led to final recommendations and prioritization decisions.

Participants suggested that future documentation should better describe the decision-making process used within Expert Panels.

Preliminary Conclusions

The Advisory Panel agreed that:

- The document is strong overall and reflects significant work.
- Additional clarity is needed regarding integration, prioritization, and communication of outcomes.
- Indigenous Knowledge considerations require stronger and more consistent treatment throughout the document.
- Future reviews would benefit from participation by subject matter experts.