1 Climate Change Science Program

2 3

# **Draft Guidelines for Producing CCSP Synthesis and Assessment Products**

4 5

#### Introduction

 The Climate Change Science Program (CCSP) will produce synthesis and assessment products to serve a variety of audiences and needs. One or more designated agencies or departments will take the lead in producing each deliverable. The lead agency(ies) will collaborate with relevant CCSP Interagency Working Groups (IWGs), National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) subcommittees, and other national and international entities. To ensure scientific integrity and credibility, each deliverable will be produced in accordance with the following guidelines. However, specific implementation of the guidelines will vary from product to product.

## **Phase I: Scoping and Author Selection**

The lead agency(ies) for each synthesis and assessment product should involve the scientific community and the public in a scoping process to further refine the product's focus and objectives. This process should culminate in preparation and review of a product prospectus. The prospectus should address the following points:

- Description of topic, audience, intended use, and questions to be addressed
- Contact information for responsible individuals at the lead and supporting agencies
  - Required expertise of potential authors (including information on competitive solicitations for supporting authors, if relevant)
  - Proposed plans for further scoping (if needed), drafting, reviewing, producing, and disseminating the product
  - Proposed approach for evaluation and communication of uncertainty and confidence levels, where applicable
  - Relationship to other national or international assessment processes
  - Proposed timeline

 The interagency CCSP Principals should review the draft prospectus in a timely fashion. After approval by the CCSP Principals, the draft prospectus should be circulated for peer review and public comment for a minimum of 30 days. Notice of the comment period will be posted on the CCSP website and in the Federal Register. After revision and final approval by the CCSP Principals, the finalized prospectus will be posted on the CCSP website.

Selection of authors: Interested parties will have the opportunity to nominate authors, contributors, and reviewers during the peer review and public comment period for each

Revised: 29 March 2004

prospectus. Author selection is the responsibility of the lead agency(ies). Authors shall reflect a balance of scientific/technical expertise appropriate to the specific topic addressed in the product and shall be known for their scientific work related to the topic. Authors and contributors may be drawn from within or outside the Federal government and may include specialists from outside the United States.

### Phase II: Drafting

The lead authors will prepare the product according to the process described in the prospectus. The drafting process will be coordinated with the CCSP IWGs as well as relevant NSTC subcommittees and national/international governmental and non-governmental entities.

Authors should use published, peer-reviewed scientific literature in the drafting process. Authors should use the full range of relevant peer-reviewed information and incorporate, where appropriate, contributions from experts who submit materials for consideration. Lead Authors may request authorization from the CCSP Principals to include information that has not been published in the peer-reviewed literature (e.g., new model results, extensions of ongoing observational data sets, and manuals, handbooks, and other reports). CCSP Principals will review and respond to such requests promptly.

The draft will include a scientific/technical analysis as well as a non-technical summary for the public. The products should identify disparate views that have significant scientific or technical support. They should also provide confidence levels for key findings, if this is appropriate to the product.

The lead agency(ies) should provide the authors with the information quality guidelines issued by the Department of Commerce and NOAA.<sup>1</sup> (which also incorporate compliance with the overall OMB guidelines<sup>2</sup>), and the authors should prepare the products in accordance with these guidelines.

### Phase III: Review and Revision

 CCSP-sponsored products will have an appropriate and scientifically-rigorous peer review. The review process will include scientific/technical review by independent experts and opportunity for public comment. The review process for each product will be the responsibility of the lead agency(ies) and must be described in the product prospectus

.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The documents will be prepared in compliance with Section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-554) and information quality guidelines issued by the Department of Commerce and NOAA pursuant to Section 515 (<a href="http://www.noaanews.noaa.gov/stories/iq.htm">http://www.noaanews.noaa.gov/stories/iq.htm</a>). For purposes of compliance with Section 515, these documents are "interpreted products," as that term is used in NOAA guidelines.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> "OMB guidelines" refer to the document entitled *OMB Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by Federal Agencies.* 

and approved by the CCSP Principals. Appropriate peer review may range from the equivalent of that used in a scientific journal to formal review by an independent body of experts (i.e., a Panel of the National Research Council (NRC) or a special panel constituted under the Federal Advisory Committee Act). The lead agency(ies) should select peer reviewers on the basis of scientific and technical expertise and include as broad a range of expertise as necessary. Experts from government and/or non-governmental groups, as well as specialists from outside the United States, may serve as peer reviewers. For NRC reviews, the selection of reviewers will be the responsibility of the NRC.

The lead agency(ies) should provide a charge statement to reviewers to facilitate a probing, meaningful review. The charge statement should highlight issues to be addressed in the review and explain DOC/NOAA information quality guidelines.

If the review is equivalent to that used for a journal peer review, each reviewer should prepare an independent review. For more formal reviews, the reviewers should issue a single group report that includes any dissenting statements. Both individual and group report reviews should include a description of the names, organizational affiliations, and qualifications of reviewers, as well as any current or previous involvement with the lead agency(ies) or issues under consideration. The individual reviews without attribution or group report will be made available to the CCSP Principals when completed.

The lead authors should revise the draft product to incorporate the peer review comments, as they deem appropriate. If some aspects of the peer review comments were not incorporated, the authors will prepare a brief explanation for the CCSP Principals.

When revised, the lead agency(ies) will send the draft product to the CCSP Principals. The CCSP Principals will review whether the product was prepared consistently with the process approved in the prospectus, and whether the summary accurately conveys the findings of the scientific/technical material and describes the findings in a context understandable by the public.

 Once approved by the CCSP Principals, the draft will be released for public comment. A notice of the availability of the draft for public comment will be placed on the CCSP website and in the Federal Register. The public comment period will last a minimum of 30 days. The website and Federal Register notices will make clear that the posted material is a draft for comment and does not represent agreed findings of the CCSP or its participating agencies.

Lead authors will revise the draft product to incorporate the public comments, as they deem appropriate, and the CCSP Principals will review the product a final time. Once final approval is given by the CCSP Principals, the product will be distributed for formal clearance through the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) process. This

step may be conducted concurrently with the final review by the CCSP Principals if so arranged.

#### Phase IV: Production and Release

Each synthesis and assessment product will be identified as a CCSP-sponsored product, will be published in a consistent format to ensure that all deliverables are seen as part of the family of CCSP-sponsored synthesis and assessment products, and will indicate the Federal agency or agencies that led its preparation. Production may be handled by either the lead agency(ies) or the CCSP Office. The lead agency(ies), working with the CCSP Office, will develop a communications plan for each product for approval by the CCSP Principals. Final products will include a statement that indicates the product was prepared according to the DOC/NOAA information quality guidelines. Final products will also include a list of authors, contributors, and reviewers, with their affiliations.

# Roles of Lead and Supporting Agencies

Lead agencies are responsible for developing products in conformance with these guidelines. They will take responsibility for all phases of product preparation, reporting regularly to the CCSP Office. Supporting agencies will contribute to this process, including by providing inputs, supporting analysis and/or authors, drafting sections, assisting with the review process, or other phases of report preparation and dissemination.

### **Roles of CCSP Interagency Working Groups for Science (IWGs)**

In most cases, IWGs will be able to contribute significantly to the preparation of a deliverable because it is closely related to core activities of the group. In some cases, IWGs may play a limited advisory role related to scoping and/or reviewing. Synthesis and assessment deliverables will be prepared in a fashion that makes use of and contributes to further development of CCSP IWGs. Potential roles (subject to agreement among lead agency(ies)) include:

- Identify assets and inputs across participating agencies
- Identify candidate researchers or groups for drafting or review process
- Provide expertise for related science planning
- Coordinate, and/or integrate relevant inputs
- Draft sections of reports
- Assist with review process
- Assist with product dissemination

#### **Roles of CCSP Office**

The CCSP Office will assist the lead agency(ies) in several ways to ensure effective planning, management, and integration of the entire set of synthesis and assessment products. Specific responsibilities will include:

• Collect, maintain, and disseminate comprehensive schedule and status information on the entire set of products

• Assist agencies and working groups in identifying interested members of the scientific community or the public, to help define their role in the production process, and to facilitate their contribution to the synthesis products

• Coordinate internal government review processes (including prospectus and drafts)

Coordinate external interactions for public comment periods and expert/public reviews

• Coordinate across IWGs where necessary

• Facilitate the agreed upon process for preparation of the products

Additional responsibilities, as requested by lead agencies, could include, for example, supporting lead authors, arranging meetings, and contributing to drafting of summaries.

Revised: 29 March 2004

### 1 INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REVIEW 2 DRAFT GUIDELINES CCSP SYNTHESIS AND ASSESSMENT PRODUCTS 3 4 Public Comment Period: 29 March 2004 – 7 May 2004 5 6 Please follow these instructions for preparing and submitting your review. A sample 7 format sheet is provided below. Send your comments as an e-mail attachment to 8 <comments@climatescience.gov> by 7 May 2004. 9 10 In making comments: Provide complete contact information should we need to seek clarification. 11 12 Separate "general" comments from "specific" comments, and collate comments by 13 page number and line number, as per the sample format below. Insert your name and 14 affiliation after each comment. Provide specific language for deletions/additions/amendments. 15 16 Avoid auto-formatting and do not embed comments in tables. Do not number your comments and avoid using terminology such as "ditto" or "see 17 above", since your comments will be collated by page and line number into a larger 18 19 set -- rendering such references difficult to understand. 20 **Sample Format for Comments Background Information** Name: Title: Organization: Mailing Address: Phone/Fax: E-mail: Area of Expertise: **General Comments** - First General Comment Reviewer's name and affiliation - Second General Comment Reviewer's name and affiliation **Specific Comments** Page 1, Line 5 Comment Reviewer's name and affiliation Page 2, Line 32 - Page 3, line 5 Comment

Reviewer's name and affiliation