This is what was found by PlatyPod at the University of Queensland on Policies for Working with Communities of Colour as well as plans for improved processes and/or needed resources.

In order to address these questions we first need to set a definition of what “working with communities of colour” is. For many geoscientists, their goal is to acquire knowledge of Place through time that is traditionally cared for by another group. This may, or may not, involve actually working with those communities. To us, “working with communities of colour” should entail:

- seeking permission to work on and acquire knowledge of Place, and Place through time;
- keeping the communities informed of this work;
- assuring communities will have equitable access to received benefits of the work;
- discussing and creating an agreement on ownership and/or custodianship of the final products of the work

We acknowledge interactions between the academy and communities of colour, non-profit organisations and communities of colour, and industry and communities of colour are different and that each require their own framework, especially if third-party commercial entities are involved.

For this deliverable we cannot talk about SEES as a whole and can only give limited personal experience. The group has not had direct interaction with local communities of colour and is therefore having difficulties addressing what does and does not work.

- **Audit of previous interactions with communities of color at our organization:**
  As a small group and within the groups career stage we have not had the opportunity to work with the local communities of colour at UQ, although we do presently work with information and materials acquired from or with other non-local communities of colour.

Member 1: Much of my research involves working with South and East Asian geologists (India, China, Vietnam, Bhutan, Myanmar) who are offered a space to participate in the research field work, lab work, collaborative writing process, and as co-authors. Much of this work acquired material locally under an agreement and analysed it remotely. As a postdoc, I have no funded proposals yet with these collaborators. Some but not all collaborators were listed as co-PI on older projects.

  My research in Australia does not yet include Indigenous Australian researchers or communities, nor do many of my colleagues. Many day-to-day operations do acknowledge the Traditional Owners and Custodians and pay their respect to Elders past, present and emerging. However, in my personal opinion, many colleagues treat this as a rote formality rather than a true acknowledgement sometimes.

Member 2: In the past I have done research on environmental perceptions of First Nation (FN) people in New Brunswick, Canada. We approached this research where the FN people were the owners of all the people involved in the research. My research is now located in South Africa and with a scientific and industrial nature instead of one within the social sciences. The work I do involves people of colour, but is
restricted within the industry and their rules of engagement where also the property we work on has an established history of ownership by the particular company - though not without conflict.

At the University, the institution acknowledges the place where it stands and has had workshops on working with First Nation communities. This is something that has become commonplace.

- **What worked well in these interactions?**

Member 1: In my interactions with communities of colour during my PhD, agreements were already made or were inherited that involved just acquisition of samples. This was similar with my postdoc, although I have worked over the last two years to include my colleagues and their students in the entire research planning and analytical process.

  I sought to avoid Buddhist, Muslim, and Hindu religious holidays for meetings and embrace preferred culinary and cultural customs. Avoiding research fieldwork during Ramadan and Tet/Lunar New Year. I use traditional names as much as possible but this can be very challenging when working with colleagues in politically contested regions with recent histories of violent acquisition and minority exclusion.

Member 2: In my visit to South Africa we worked within the confines of the industrial partner. We did not have choice in who we engaged with.

- **What did not work well, and how can this be better addressed in future plans?**

Member 1: Many collaborations ended after the immediate project, in part due to colleagues moving to non-research government sectors. It would have been good to develop proposals with my overseas collaborators as PI. Some countries require a number of publications written in local language national journals—which factor into their long-term funding at the national level and in the wide dissemination of the work with colleagues and students. This is rarely recognised in some English-speaking funding organisations (i.e., NSF, ARC). It would be good to factor this into future international proposals that always push big, international journals that may not be entirely beneficial to PIs.

Member 2: I'm not sure what has not worked well. However, it does not appear as though there is any drastic improvement in diversity from other communities at the industry decision making level.

- **Are there ways to improve the outcome of projects already undertaken?**

Member 1: Based on my response above, and to support colleagues with national standing and proposal funding, we are publishing some of our work in local language national journals. I am also corresponding more with colleagues (outside of working projects) and communicating about community issues. It is anticipated that I will acknowledge the Traditional Owners on the lands in which I do research while I work in Australia in my future presentations and publications.

Member 2: I have asked that my colleagues make a better effort to do the land acknowledgement because it is often something that is missing in scientific panels and conversations. In my current project Industry argues that this research will benefit all of mankind since it is proposed to offset carbon emissions. However, data collected are not immediately accessible to all people because data must first go through a vetting process that is intended to immediately benefit the industry stakeholders.
• Are there specific resources or guidelines that are needed to improve the process for planning ahead and working with communities of color?

Member 1: UQ SEES recently ran a workshop series (5 seminars) in how to better partner with Indigenous Australian students, researchers and communities. UQ further has a ‘point-of-contact’ committee and a series of workshops/training for researchers looking to connect with communities, while under a UQ-affiliation.

Indigenous Australian researcher opportunities are improving but still not great at all in geosciences. There are some school level (SEES), university-level (at UQ) and national funding level schemes (ARC, CSIRO) specifically designed to support Indigenous Australian PIs and community-focused STEM research. During covid-19, there has been a significant increase in medical and medical ethics research funding including Indigenous Australians.

Member 2: In my experience in previous research I know that FN communities and potentially other “non-western” communities are not concerned about outcomes, results, and time. This is a problem when working with university deadlines. There is a large time investment that the university should take into consideration when evaluating the labour of academics and students. The University may also consider relinquishing some control and ownership of data and products.

It has occurred to me while thinking about this deliverable that a lot of the data we work with has come from places where people lived, and is not necessarily devoid of a human relationship. It would be beneficial for me and other researchers to ask about and investigate where the data has come from and who that extraction has impacted - both positively and negatively.