



Updated 24 April 2006

Decision-Support Experiments and Evaluations Using Seasonal to Interannual Forecasts and Observational Data

Public Review Comments on the Draft Prospectus for Synthesis and Assessment Product 5.3

Comments received from
14 December 2005 through 30 January 2006

Also available as
[PDF version](#)



Also available:
CCSP Synthesis and Assessment Products. Four-page background document (dated September 2007). In addition, it is available as a [PDF file](#) and can be ordered in hardcopy from the [GCRIO Online Catalog](#)

REVIEWERS:

Name: Lenny Bernstein
Organization: L.S. Bernstein & Associates, L.L.C.
Mailing Address: 488 Kimberly Avenue, Asheville, NC 28804
Phone: (828) 250-0245
Fax: None
E-mail: Lsberns@worldnet.att.net
Area of Expertise: Climate change policy

Name: Michael MacCracken
Organization: Climate Institute
Mailing Address: 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20036
Phone: 202-547-0104
Fax: 202-547-0111
E-mail(s): mmaccrac@comcast.net
Area of Expertise: Climate Change

GENERAL COMMENTS

.....
Michael MacCracken, Climate Institute

First General Comment:

While the title is quite broad, the actual scope of this product is much narrower, focusing only on the water cycle. The title of the prospectus needs to be changed to conform to its scope in order not to be misleading to the public, Congress, or the scientific community.

Second General Comment:

I would suggest that this Prospectus, as written, is not consistent with the requirements and process of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). In particular, the description included in Section 5 about the drafting process and the description in Section 6 on the review

information wanted.

Page 6, Line 25: By FACA rules, all documents considered by the advisory committee need to be available for public inspection throughout the process, whether they are drafts or not.

Page 6, Line 34 to Page 8, Line 2: It is not at all likely that this process is consistent with FACA. The advisory committee needs to prepare its report, solicit review comments (and they can come from the agencies), and then prepare its final report, which it submits to the lead agency. NOAA and the agencies can then choose to endorse it or take exception—it is an advisory report. In the end, the full advisory committee, not just its leaders, need to indicate its concurrence or to make any final revisions, include appropriate dissenting views, etc.—but this needs to be the advisory committee’s report (and the report gains its credibility from the credibility of the overall process and the credibility of each author—and so each member of the committee is entitled to a final review of the report). REMEMBER, this report is NOT the agencies report—it is an advisory committee report that agencies can choose on their own to adopt in full or not on their own. Insisting that all agencies formally agree to it seems inappropriate to me—each agency is likely to want to incorporate the advisory committee’s findings into their considerations in their own specific manner. It would be fine to encourage all agencies to read the report and to indicate how they are incorporating its findings, but insisting that all agencies formally agree on everything seems a formula for delay and inefficiency.