

Evidence essay · Observation and data

Maintenance is the next observation

Samuel Adeyemi · 21 September 2026

Fictional author and institute · Editorial demonstration, not peer reviewed

ABSTRACT

A durable observation record depends on funded maintenance, skilled people, and governed stewardship as much as on an initial sensor purchase. This essay uses a fictional station budget to identify omitted costs such as calibration, communications, processing, handover, and removal. NOAA's network assessment provides evidence for the wider importance of expertise, infrastructure, and product continuity, without serving as a live account of programme finances. Missing seasons and lost instrument overlap cannot simply be restored by buying replacement hardware. The National Inuit Strategy on Research also informs attention to priorities, capacity, and budget authority. The discussion recommends comparing contributions and dependencies openly, including responsible closure where justified. Support should sustain usable evidence, not purchase predetermined conclusions, exclusive knowledge, or unsupported claims of deployment success.

Keywords: observing continuity · maintenance funding · data stewardship · research capacity · programme closure

Adapted from the Still North field journal. Original article. A source-based editorial text, not a report of original Still North research. Examples and imagery are illustrative.

A new sensor is easy to photograph. A renewed maintenance contract is less photogenic, although it may protect more useful evidence. For a long observation record, the question is not only whether an instrument can be installed. It is whether someone can keep the measurement comparable, recover it safely, check it, document it, and make the result available after the launch announcement has disappeared.

Short funding cycles can favour a visible beginning over a reliable continuation. That is a design problem for funders and institutions, not a reason to celebrate researchers working unpaid hours. If a programme depends on one person's goodwill to bridge routine costs, its continuity is weaker than a working dashboard suggests.

Budget for an observation, not an object

A fictional proposal for an automatic station might include the instrument and freight while omitting calibration, communications, spares, inspection, insurance, data processing, and eventual removal. Those omissions do not make the station cheaper. They move costs to another budget, an unpaid contributor, or a future period when the equipment is already difficult to abandon responsibly.

Compare options over the period for which the record is meant to remain useful. A lower purchase price may come with unavailable parts or a data format dependent on a subscription. A more capable instrument may require maintenance skills that the proposed team cannot sustain. Cost comparisons should name these dependencies rather than reduce unlike systems to a single price per device.

The NOAA assessment of the Arctic observing network identifies sustained investment, specialised expertise, ageing infrastructure, and continuity of data products as central concerns. It describes risks present at the time of its assessment. It should not be treated as a live ledger of every programme's current finances, but it makes the

dependency clear: observations rely on people and institutions as well as hardware.

A missed season cannot simply be bought back

Replacing a failed sensor restores future collection, not the season that passed unmeasured. Other evidence may help estimate conditions, but an estimate is not the original observation. The cost of a gap depends on its timing, the other records available, and the use of the series. Losing a transition between old and new instruments can be especially consequential because the missing overlap may also weaken comparison across the change.

For that reason, a funding review should ask which tasks protect continuity before asking which new locations would look impressive on a map. That does not mean every existing station deserves permanent funding. Some may no longer serve an agreed purpose, duplicate better evidence, or carry unacceptable costs. The decision should compare their contribution and dependencies openly, with a plan for closure where appropriate.

Protect the work between readings

Data stewardship needs scheduled staff time. So do training, documentation, permissions, and contact with the people who use the record. A repository without a responsible curator can accumulate files while losing interpretability. A local monitoring role without reliable payment can become an obligation that competes unfairly with other work. Neither condition is fixed by calling a programme collaborative.

The National Inuit Strategy on Research calls for funding aligned with Inuit priorities and capacity for Inuit Nunangat research. For outside funders, a practical implication is to examine who can set priorities and exercise budget authority, not merely who supplies observations.

This article does not specify arrangements for a community. Those must be determined through the relevant Inuit institutions and project governance.

- Identify the minimum funded work needed to preserve a comparable record.
- Separate confirmed resources from hoped-for renewals and in-kind assumptions.
- Name responsibility for equipment, data, agreements, and staff handover.
- Include a safe, governed reduction or closure plan if support ends.

Ask a better question of support

A donor or procurement committee can ask what a contribution supports, how restrictions affect priorities, and how continued costs will be met. It should not expect to purchase a desired scientific conclusion, exclusive access to community knowledge, or a guarantee that no equipment will fail. Good reporting distinguishes resources spent, work completed, observations available, and effects that have not yet been demonstrated.

The Sponsor a sensor page describes this demo's support concept, not an achieved deployment. Open observations explains the stewardship behind a usable record. When reviewing an observation budget, look for the second winter and the handover after it. That is where a purchase becomes, or fails to become, a public record.

References

1. NOAA assessment of the Arctic observing network (arctic.noaa.gov)
2. National Inuit Strategy on Research (itk.ca)