RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Frank Maisano < fmaisano@PCGPR. COM> (Frank Maisano < fmaisano@PCGPR.COM> [UN

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-FEB-2003 19:08:52.00

SUBJECT:: Fwd: George Marshall Comments on NAS Report

TO:Dana M. Perino (CN=Dana M. Perino/OU=CEQ/O=EOP@EOP [CEQ])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Date: Tue, 25 Feb 2003 18:46:11 -0500

From: "Frank Maisano" <fmaisano@PCGPR.COM>

Subject: George Marshall Comments on NAS Report

To: "Frank Maisano" <fmaisano@PCGPR.COM>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_MsGdRf/MZ61X2N1 \$9IwJ1w)"

Friends,

Here are comments from the George Marshall Institute, who commented extensively to the NAS...Many of their comments wereincorporated into this report.

You may wish to contact Bill O'Keefe c. (202) 251-4625

Best,

Frank Maisano c. (202) 297-1502

February 26, 2002

MARSHALL INSTITUTE COMMENDS NATIONAL ACADEMIES' CLIMATE SCIENCE REVIEW:

Stresses Need to Prioritize Climate Research

Today's National Academies report, Planning Climate and Global Change Research, provides a valuable service by providing a constructive critique of the Administration's draft Climate Change Strategic Plan.

"We join the Academy in commending the Administration for its outreach to the broader scientific community and agree that these efforts indicate a strong interest in developing a plan that is responsive to national needs," Marshall Institute President William O'Keefe said.

The George Marshall Institute also examined the Administration's draft plan in detail. Based on comments submitted to the Department of Commerce in mid-January, Climate Change Science: Marshall Institute's Review of the Draft Climate Change Science Program Strategic Plan, the Institute lays out its recommendations for improving the draft Strategic Plan (available at http://www.marshall.org).

The Academy comments also reinforce those made by a majority of the participants at the Workshop convened last December to engage stakeholders in the planning process.

In convening that Workshop, Assistant Secretary Mahoney provided a valuable context by indicating that the draft had been designed to

provoke discussion and comment. His measure of success for the effort was the extent of change made to the draft. By omitting this context, the Academy risks a widespread misunderstanding of its review and the Administration's efforts.

In the end, the Academy report, as well as others from the scientific community, reaffirm a few basic facts:

- * Our current state of knowledge is inadequate for distinguishing human impacts from natural variability,
- * Progress in improving our state of knowledge is tied to a commitment and funding to improve our observational data system, and
- * For models to be more useful, they must be based more on confirmed scientific facts and less on unvalidated hypotheses.

The George Marshall Institute (GMI) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization founded in 1984 to encourage the use of sound science in making public policy. Decisions and conclusions about many public policy matters are shaped by advances in science and technology. For that reason, unbiased and scientifically accurate assessments of the significance of these advances for policy are critical.

George Marshall Institute 1625 K St, NW Suite 1050 Washington, D.C. 20005 202/296-9655 info@marshall.org

TEXT:

Unable to convert NSREOP0102:[ATTACH.D34]SREOP01300E6ILJ.001 to ASCII, The following is a HEX DUMP:

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dot{932313531203030303030206E0D0A3030303030303 32333132203030303030206E0D0A3030303030303032383536203030303030206E0D0A3030303030 3032383836203030303030206E0D0A3030303\$\dot{9303032393237203030303030206E0D0A30303030 303032393739203030303030206E0D0A30303\$\dot{4303030333323039203030303030206E0D0A303030 30303033343333203030303030206E0D0A3030303030333393835203030303030206E0D0A3030 3030303036323537203030303030206E0D0A3\$\phi3030303036323830203030303030206E0D0A30 303030303036353131203030303030206E0D0430303030303036393935203030303030206E0D0A 30303030303037323032203030303030206E0D0A303030303037323638203030303030206E0D 0A30303030303339323438203030303030206±0D0A3030303036363333934203030303030206E 6E0D0A30303030303835303939203030303030206E0D0A30303030383539353720303030303 206E0D0A30303030303031333834203030303030303030303030303030313638362030303030 30206E0D0A747261696C65720D3C3C0D2F53697A65203133360D2F496E666F2031303520302052 200D2F526F6F742031303920302052200D2F5072657620313235393432200D2F49445B3C363131 6265323336336561366364373262303037366\$316336353330653434643E3C3031616666316565



February 26, 2002

Contact: Mark Herlong (202/296-9655)

MARSHALL INSTITUTE COMMENDS NATIONAL ACADEMIES' CLIMATE SCIENCE REVIEW: Stresses Need to Prioritize Climate Research

Today's National Academies report, Planning Climate and Global Change Research, provides a valuable service by providing a constructive critique of the Administration's draft Climate Change Strategic Plan.

"We join the Academy in commending the Administration for its outreach to the broader scientific community and agree that these efforts indicate a strong interest in developing a plan that is responsive to national needs," Marshall Institute President William O'Keefe said.

The George Marshall Institute also examined the Administration's draft plan in detail. Based on comments submitted to the Department of Commerce in mid-January, Climate Change Science: Marshall Institute's Review of the Draft Climate Change Science Program Strategic Plan, the Institute lays out its recommendations for improving the draft Strategic Plan (available at http://www.marshall.org).

The Academy comments also reinforce those made by a majority of the participants at the Workshop convened last December to engage stakeholders in the planning process.

In convening that Workshop, Assistant Secretary Mahoney provided a valuable context by indicating that the draft had been designed to provoke discussion and comment. His measure of success for the effort was the extent of change made to the draft. By omitting this context, the Academy risks a widespread misunderstanding of its review and the Administration's efforts.

In the end, the Academy report, as well as others from the scientific community, reaffirm a few basic facts:

- Our current state of knowledge is inadequate for distinguishing human impacts from natural variability,
- Progress in improving our state of knowledge is tied to a commitment and funding to improve our observational data system, and
- For models to be more useful, they must be based more on confirmed scientific facts and less on unvalidated hypotheses.

The George Marshall Institute (GMI) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization founded in 1984 to encourage the use of sound science in making public policy. Decisions and conclusions about many public policy matters are shaped by advances in science and technology. For that reason, unbiased and scientifically accurate assessments of the significance of these advances for policy are critical.

George Marshall Institute
1625 K St, NW
Suite 1050
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/296-9655
info@marshall.org
http://www.marshall.org