

NOAA Peer Review Approach for the Expert Review of the Climate Change Science Program Synthesis and Assessment Product 2.2: North American carbon budget and implications for the global carbon cycle

March 2007

Background

In May, 2006, NOAA conducted an expert peer review of the Climate Change Science Program Synthesis (CCSP) and Assessment Product 2.2: North American carbon budget and implications for the global carbon cycle. This report is a Highly Influential Scientific Assessment, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Bulletin on Peer Review (December 2004). Production of this report was charged to scientists at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (run by Battelle Memorial Institute). This team has coordinated all aspects of production of the report, following production of the Prospectus. The prospectus for the report is available at the CCSP website: <http://www.climate-science.gov/Library/sap/sap2-2/sap2-2prospectus-final.htm>. During the public comment period to review the draft prospectus, the public was invited to nominate expert reviewers by April 30, 2006. No nominations were received. The draft report prepared for the expert peer review was 385 pages long, consisting of three sections and fifteen chapters.

Approach

NOAA worked with five other federal agencies to identify reviewers with suitable technical credentials to participate in a mail review. 88 experts were invited by NOAA to participate in the mail review of the report: eight were invited to review the Executive Summary and the report as a whole; the remaining reviewers were asked to focus on one or two chapters, assigned based upon their expertise. 31 experts participated in the review, representing perspectives from academia (both nationally and internationally) not-for-profit organizations, and private industry. An alphabetical list of the reviewers and their credentials is attached. All reviewers complied with NOAA's Conflict of Interest Policy, which was adapted from the National Academy of Sciences Conflict of Interest Policy, available on NOAA's Information Quality website: http://www.cio.noaa.gov/itmanagement/NOAA_PRB_COI_Policy_110606.htm.

The draft report was available to the peer reviewers beginning on May 18, 2006. Reviewers had until June 30, 2006 to submit their reviews. All reviews were received by July 17, 2006. All expert reviews were collated and anonymously provided to the coordination team for distribution to the authors by August 3, 2006. The full peer review report, including bios for the reviewers and responses to the expert review comments, is available on NOAA's Information Quality website: <http://www.cio.noaa.gov/itmanagement/prplans/ID20.html>.

A second draft of the report was prepared in response to the expert review and was made available for public review on September 19, 2006. The public comment period was scheduled for 45 days and ended on November 3, 2006. The comments generated during the public comment period were provided to the coordination team for distribution to the authors. A third draft was prepared and submitted to NOAA for final government clearance. The authors prepared a similar response to the public comments that is posted on the CCSP website: <http://www.climate-science.gov/Library/sap/sap2-2/default.htm>.