**DRAFT**

**Key points from discussion among Community Based Monitoring practitioners in CAPARDUS 21 Jan. 2020**

Agenda topics:

1) Exchange thoughts about Arctic Best Practices System model and how it might best be informed by CBM practice.

2) How could CBM workshops best inform the ABPS without being disruptive to workshops, themselves?

3) How will ABPS be sustained?

4) How will success be evaluated? Are there specific indicators we want to suggest?

Participants: Noor, Olivia, Hanne, Michael, Martin E, Martin N, Nikita, Stein, Finn

Next steps. The meeting participants agreed on the following proposed next steps for connecting CBM efforts with the ABPS:

Connect with the participants in previous Intaros CBM workshops. Circulate an invitation where we explain the ABPS, governance aspects, and long term perspectives (half page). Focus on: community based natural resource management, monitoring and planning. We invite interested CBM practitioners and facilitators in the 8 Arctic countries to a virtual meeting to discuss ABPS objectives in relation to CBM, use of ABPS for CBM, and to begin think about design principles, useful documents and filters.

To begin get an idea of possible documents for inclusion in the ABPS, we will prepare a provisional list of potential documents within the focus area (community based natural resource management, monitoring and planning). To quick-start this process, each of the participants in the meeting today is encouraged to send 10 citations or ideas of documents to Michael (mkp@nordeco.dk) by the end of this week (28 Feb).

 Proposed action plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Timeline and responsibilities**  | **Completion time** | **Responsible** |
| Identify contact persons each region | March 15, 2020 | North America: Olivia/NoorNordic region: Finn/Michael/Martin N/Lisbeth Russia: Martin E/Nikita |
| Draft invitation | Draft March 20Final March 30 | Draft: All CBM practitioners in Capardus, but lead by Finn and Olivia/Noor |
| Virtual meeting | April or early May |  |
| Compile list of documents | Feb 28, 2020 | Michael and Finn |

Other points to consider in the process are listed below.

**1) Exchange thoughts about Arctic Best Practices System model and how it might best be informed by CBM practice.** Who are likely potential users? What CBM documents should be included in the repository?

The ABPS should be seen as: a repository and search system for documents. In some countries, like Greenland, in the near and medium term, the users are likely to be limited to scientists and students. A suitable target audience may be the participants in the Intaros CBM workshops/courses in the Arctic countries. It is useful if we in this way can follow up with the same people we have worked with in Intaros.

In order for CBM practitioners to use the system, it will need to be seen as both useful (i.e. – containing relevant documents that it would be difficult to find otherwise) and legitimate (i.e. – the process of determining which documents to put into the repository must be transparent and robustly participatory). In addition to the participants from INTAROS, it would be good to do some outreach to other important organizations such as the Permanent Participant organizations to get their input on both design and content, if they have time and are able to engage.

The scope of the documents in the system should not be narrowed to monitoring but be broadened out to cover also management of natural resources and planning. E.g. in Alaska Capardus will include consideration of infrastructure as it relates to coastal hazards. Existing repository and search systems tend to have few contributors. If the ABPS is to be useful, it will be important to have multiple points of entries of docs into the system. Readers must immediately see that the docs that are there are useful for you. The interface needs some thought and we might need a separate workshop/meeting for those who are interested in co-designing a portal relevant to users, when we have found out what are the needs, how would one like to have it. There are already well-functioning repositories for academic papers. To be really useful, non-academic documents should be included in the repository.

Language is often a barrier in the Arctic, and translation is important. It would make a huge difference if documents and search functions could be available in the key languages used (English, Russian, … … ). The initial screens one sees when opening the repository are important. They should be immediately meaningful to the viewer. They should therefore be in a language and format that make the viewers among the community members interested in seeing more. This would require adjustments to the existing Oceans repository. Perhaps access should be at different levels (scientists, community members, government staff, students). (Or there should be different interfaces/points of entry for different end users).

It was agreed that the discussion participants would each contribute 5-10 examples of documents they find useful for the system. It could for instance be simple manuals, sharing stories of experience of community monitoring and management.

To be useful, 100 documents or more are needed on a topic. Most planners do not usually extract information from so many documents. Keywords are a central part for us to develop.

Probably the most novel part of the ABPS is that of convening and gaining input on the development of the ABPS and making it available as a public resource. How to control brown bear attacks may be useful to obtain information about for Russian communities. In North America, the protocols for how communities want to see others work together with them may be useful to include. In the Nordic region, information from Canada on how tourists can visit cultural sites without disturbing will be useful information. Information in technical reports about lessons from the use of digital apps may also be relevant information. An important added value will be to compare across countries how to go about various challenges.

**2) How could CBM workshops best inform the best practices platform without being disruptive to workshops, themselves?**

In most countries the relationship with the community members is a delicate process that has been developed over many years. We think it is not going to be useful to discuss ABPS at the CBM workshops. An exception is Svalbard. A workshop on Arctic shipping is planned in Longyearbyen in autumn 2020, and here it is proposed that discussion with local stakeholders about requirements for the repository are undertaken.

**3) How will platform be sustained? and 4) How will success be evaluated? Are there specific indicators we want to suggest?**

There will always be new documents that need to be included. We briefly discussed how we can ensure somebody will put them into the ABPS. There is in general no such thing as sustainability of any database, we probably have to accept that (no public host, no institutional anchoring). On the other hand, maybe we don't need to worry about sustainability, as we will be learning, and others will take over when they see the usefulness of the ABPS.

The final results of the project may be an outline (or design) of a repository and search system for documents – or it may be searchable system with documents covering one or more topics of relevance to the Arctic. In the latter case, an indicator of success may be the number of documents in the repository.