

Notes from CAPARDUS online workshop 25 February 2021, 1400-1700 CET

Aims:

1. Aligning our understandings of methods/processes related to co-design and co-production
2. Agreeing on a process to use within CAPARDUS, including in the documentation of practices and in the library

Participants: B. Poppel, J. Pearlman, F. Pearlman, M. K. Poulsen, F. Danielsen, N. Johnson, M. Reinhardt Nielsen, P.L. Buttigieg, P. Pulsifer, O. Lee, S. J. Khalsa, M. Parsons, M. Enghoff, S. Stach, H. Sagen, S. Sandven.

The presenters were asked to provide one slide addressing:

- 1) What is the meaning of the term co-design/co-production in your context?*
- 2) What are in your experiences important for a respectful and effective co-design/co-production process in your context?*

Finn Danielsen chaired the workshop, Stein Sandven made notes and gathered the presentation slides.

Finn pointed out that the project involves several different activities and scientists from a variety of disciplines. This means the terminology and methods can be quite different. We hope the workshop can help to clarify some of the terminology and method issues.

Stein presented the objectives and scope of the project, describing what EU expects from the project. The project addresses practices, standards and regulations within selected topics of importance in each of the regional case studies. This means that we are working with Indigenous Peoples as well as other groups living and working in the Arctic. To work with the Indigenous communities requires a formal approach which is not strictly fulfilled because of the way the project was designed.

One problem is the use of terms “co-design” and “co-production”, which is causing confusion among the partners. The terms were not used in the proposal, but were introduced in the Scoping document, which was prepared in March-April 2020.

Noor presented slides (attached) to explain how knowledge co-production (KCP) is understood and developed in North America. Key terms are trust, equity and reciprocity in the relation between scientists and local communities. It was proposed that we do not use the term “co-design” in this project, because community partners were not engaged in the proposal preparation and we don't co-design anything with community partners during the project. Olivia summarized the co-design/co-production issue in a slide (attached), pointing out that the case study in Alaska is about scoping of community-based monitoring and information needs. It is not about co-design or co-production of knowledge. The situation is similar in the other case studies, so the project should not claim that we are co-designing or co-producing anything.

When we used some terms, we need to define what the term means in the relevant context, which is different between local communities, international and thematic communities. Terminology is a standardization issue and ICC (Inuit Circumpolar Council) has done some efforts to help clarify terminology.

Martin E. pointed out that the project is not directly involved in co-production of knowledge. The project is searching for a method to establish a fruitful process to enable co-production of knowledge. A key issue is to show how Indigenous and local knowledge can contribute to decision making. An Arctic Practice System should have this as a main objective. The case studies should be used to identify what a roadmap for an APS should address, taking into account that the communities we are engaged with are highly different. Martin's points are summarized in two slides (attached) with focus on the situation for Russian indigenous groups.

Michael K. P. presented a case where a CBM programme designed for cruise expedition vessels is in a planning phase. The idea is to collect environmental data by tourists and guides as part of the expeditions and to register the data in Arctic data repositories. The CBM planning has started in collaboration with AECO and is relevant for the Svalbard area, but also around Greenland and other areas where cruise expedition vessels are operating. This work is ongoing under the INTAROS project and will continue under CAPARDUS (see attached slide).

Pier-Luigi B. described the work to develop a roadmap for an Arctic Practice System (APS). This is an ongoing activity collecting information from the partners on what should be the requirements for such system. The question is how to design an APS with a variety of user groups who can have very different ideas of what the system should do. Usually, there are focus groups, expert groups and others who prepare requirements for the system to be developed. In this project it is mainly the case studies that will provide requirements from those communities that are involved. To make progress with the roadmap work, a few core questions are formulated to help identify user requirements when we start a dialogue with the user groups:

1. How do you store your methodological knowledge / knowhow?
 - a. Examples
 - i. Documents
 - ii. Videos
 - iii. Audio recordings
 - iv. Dedicated human experts
2. How do you manage your methodological knowledge / knowhow?
 - a. Examples
 - i. Document archive or library system
 - ii. Human knowledge stewards
3. How do you share methods with other communities?
 - a. Examples
 - i. oral transmission
 - ii. visits and in-person training
 - iii. Online

4. What capabilities in methodology management, development, or sharing would you like to have?
5. What concerns do you have about pan-Arctic methodology/knowhow sharing?
 - a. Examples
 - i. Theft of protected knowledge
 - ii. Intellectual property management across different sovereign jurisdictions

A working document is in preparation, see: <https://tinyurl.com/apsRoadmap>

Jay P. Presented slides on how to make progress with the APS by building on the experience of the Ocean Best Practice (attached slides).

It was pointed out that we should document our assumptions when we enter into dialogue with different groups. The expectations of various groups to an APS can be very different, depending on the interests and priorities of the groups. An APS cannot include everything because Arctic topics are very broad. The roadmap for APS should be target to certain topics (e.g. resources, traffic, tourism) in order to be relevant. Furthermore, the ingestion of information into the ASP must be user friendly and consider that online access to the system is often not possible. Thus, there is a need to describe the operating environment and infrastructure of the case study communities. An APS for the Indigenous communities cannot be designed by others.

Terminology is a key issue because the same work can have different meaning in different communities. For example "Indigenous" is not used in Greenland except by scientists. "Stakeholder" has a negative meaning in some communities, and Indigenous organizations and representatives often point out that Indigenous peoples are rights holders (not simply stakeholders) because they have sovereign rights vis a vis states that are additional to citizenship rights.

