

WE ARE SURPRISED THAT;

- LEARNING IS MISSING;
- THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT LINK IS MISSING;
- THERE ARE NO QUALITY CRITERIA;
- THE SKY IS THE LIMIT, WITH 'OTHER EVALUATIVE KNOWLEDGE'.

WE WONDER

- IF REPOSITORY IS THE RIGHT TERM. FEELS STATIC → 'A SPACE'?
- IF IT SHOULD GO BEYOND 'SUPPORT'. SHOULD WE NOT 'IMPROVE'?
- WHETHER ACADEMIC RESEARCH FALLS UNDER 'EVALUATIVE EVIDENCE'.
- IF THERE SHOULD BE 'LEARNINGS' FROM RELATED (THOUGH NOT PURELY ENVIRONMENTAL) FIELDS. (AND HOW).

... TO GO BOLDLY ...

# In general

- > it's okay
- > deceptively vague
- > passive (not in active voice)

## ... Except -

- > Gov't language - not successful
- > 1st line okay, goes south thereafter (no impact to Australia)
- > "improved housing & wages" not inspiring
- > uses "inside" language
- > needs a real "purpose" - desired outcomes

## On one hand, on the other

- > not just a repository, more a marketplace
- > 'evaluative knowledge' suggests insight/meaning but not clear how to get from data to knowledge
- > 'repository' is good but not enough (think: marketplace)

## Surprised that

~~I'm still awake~~

- > says nothing about people (wars or 'targets')

## Wonder

- > if Abolition be analysed/synthesized
- > should it be static or dynamic (e.g. marketplace)
- > what is "evaluative knowledge"
- > what is "evidence-based practice"

|| is this a tool for  
or practitioners or  
|| how evaluations can  
provide more ques-  
tibility

In general...

- Doesn't go far enough to speak to outcomes
- phrased as "how it could be used/could approach"
- implies ArchEE allows variety of synths from many perspectives

- exceptions  
- "env mgmt"? exclusionary?

- Contradictions -  
- evidence and knowledge - the same?

- Surprising or "has been" analyze + synth  
- "can be" or "has been" analyze + synth

- Questions  
- What is evaluative knowledge? Use of it?  
- IS EK about eval practice, mgmt, other  
- IS ArchEE a dumping ground?  
- What could analysis + synth mean?

in  
>  
on  
bra  
> spec  
>

In general ...

> its vague

> its wuddy

> assumes relationship btw knowledge ;  
Practice

in general, except ...

> need more explicit acknowledgement of  
user

on one hand ...

> broad/open re: "event knowledge" BUT

> specific/narrower re: "evidence-based"

> trying to bound to evaluation BUT  
expands beyond evaluation.

i wonder ...

> "use" → is this an aspiration? purpose?

> about unexpected uses.

> if "management" isn't too narrow. We need to go beyond this. (?) what does management include?

> what is our ability to be dynamic?

> Where is the room for change?

> how dynamic is the platform itself?

i was surprised ...

> to see open-access upfront