Developing a Roadmap for Arctic Observing and Data Systems (ROADS). Version 30th August 2019. Review.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Line # | Comment |
| 8 | Should be “adaptation” not “adaption” |
| 9 | “that outpace the demands of responsible agencies” –it’s not clear to me what this means, who the responsible agencies are etc. Would recommend deleting this part, since this sentence is very long. |
| 10 | The “local impacts” either “are” coastal erosion etc, or you should remove the “local impacts” and say “These changes result in…” |
| 17 | “are too limited”: add “both spatially and temporally” |
| 40 | Change to “outlined the following guiding principles to achieve its vision” |
| 74, 75 | Delete apostrophe from “SBA’s”  |
| 110 | Should be “community-driven” |
| 120 | Should be “regional or global” |
| 128 | Perhaps “Essential Arctic Variable Strategy” would be clearer |
| 132, 135, 138, 141, 142, 191 | Delete apostrophe from “EAV’s” |
| 142 | Add to “global and regional networks” (e.g. Essential Ocean Variables, Essential Climate Variables, Essential Biodiversity Variables)” |
| 149  | Add “procedures” |
| 177 | Should say “EAVs” |
| 179 | Should say “most likely” |
| 180 | Expand “AMAP” and “GCW” as they haven’t been previously introduced |
| 188 | Add “EAV development” before “activities” to make it clearer |
| 200 | Sustainment –should be “sustainability”? Add “s” to “infrastructure” |
| 211 | Should be “every” 5 years? |
| 215 | Use “EAV” instead of “Essential Arctic Variable” |
| 221 | Should be “organization”, not “organized” (or organized what?) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

General comments:

This document offers a well thought-out approach to the definition of EAVs for Arctic observing. It is not entirely clear how the system will be governed and managed overall, or how the data will managed, shared, made available etc. It proposes a very bottom-up approach, with the danger of it becoming a collection of individual organisations managing their EAVs separately and possibly not talking to one another. I also think the Expert Panels should be pre-defined by the Roadmap and not open to proposals from the community. I would recommend having these centred around topics/themes (possibly SBAs) but not Arctic sub-regions. Perhaps the governance and data issues are the next steps (is this the prelude to a more detailed Roadmap?) As noted in the document, there are many individual observing efforts being conducted in the Arctic, with separate and short-term funding streams, and which are not necessarily communicating with one another, sharing their data etc. SAON and the Roadmap should really push for integration of all these efforts and ensure that they are contributing to GOOS, GEOSS etc.