

STEPS	GUIDELINE DEVELOPMENT	PEER REVIEW PROCESS	SUPPORT USGCRP IN ITS CLIMATE PORTAL DESIGN
<p>1. Establish WG 6 membership and staffing with NOAA, NOAA Counsel, and USGCRP</p>	<p>NCADAC members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Hays, CSC(co-chair) • T.C. Richmond, GordonDerr (co-chair) • Mary Gade, Gade Environmental Group • Leonard Hirsch, Smithsonian Institution • Peter Kareiva, The Nature Conservancy • Richard Schmalensee, MIT • Marie O’Neill, University of Michigan • Lindene Patton, Zurich Financial Services • Andrew Rosenberg, Conservation International 	<p>Non-NCADAC members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Armstrong, USGCRP • Fabien Laurier, USGCRP • Emily Wasley, USGCRP • Nancy Beck (invited), OMB • John Keck, NOAA • Glenn E Tallia, NOAA Gen Counsel <p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anne Waple, NOAA 	
<p>2. Confirm charges of WG 6</p> <p><i>NOTE: WG 6 members may provide education to others on how to use Products; however, WG 6 is not charged with conducting the review of submittals</i></p>	<p><u>Establish standards or guidelines</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For public dissemination for use by potential contributors and technical input teams and by WGs and NCADAC; • For the review, categorization, and labeling of submitted materials; • For materials that are either to be incorporated into the NCA documents and website or supplemental to the NCA website; • To ensure consistency with the Information Quality Act and associated NOAA standards; and • To recognize that the NCA will use categories of information ranging from traditional peer-reviewed literature to non-traditional or ‘grey’ sources 	<p><u>Establish quality assurance process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For evaluation of the quality and limitations of important ‘grey’ source material; • For materials that are to be included in the NCA; • For providing quality assurance for ongoing updates; and • That has the characteristics of: maximum transparency and usability, interoperability, archiving, metadata standards and review. 	<p><u>Support USGCRP Portal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With both static and live data sources available to support the NCA; • For on-going long-term portal maintenance; and • For transparency of portal and data. • Note: USGCRP to determine responsibility for archiving the “snapshot data” (that is, data sources that are subject to change as new projections or scientific advances are made).
<p>3. Confirm expected Products of WG 6</p>	<p>1) Written guidelines in matrix</p> <p>2) Quality assurance in decision-tree format</p> <p>3) FAQ</p> <p>All made available in web-format for use by potential contributors to self-identify and for author team evaluations.</p>		<p>Highly accessible portal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With transparency of data; • That is compatible with and supports Guidelines and Quality Assurance Review process; and • Leads to greater utility of the NCA and supplemental material.

STEPS	GUIDELINE DEVELOPMENT	PEER REVIEW PROCESS	SUPPORT USGCRP IN ITS CLIMATE PORTAL DESIGN
4. Identify possible types of data and materials By August 15	Get a fuller picture from NCADAC members of the types of material that are likely to be submitted to the NCA authors, or sought by the authors. Examples include: original papers, literature reviews, reports or case studies generated by state governments or non-profit organizations, analyses of proprietary datasets (or even the datasets themselves), etc.		
5. Use 4. to develop case studies for types of materials and data	Develop examples / case studies for primary categories for input by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request For Information (RFI) Working Group • NCADAC including ex-officios • Informal inquiries on past problem submittals 		
6. Background and Education on legal requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOAA to provide background to WG members on application of IQA and NOAA guidelines to data and materials; • Review 2000 NCA foundation documents for process (processes from previous SAPs, National Academy reports); • Review IPPC guidelines on quality; and • Seek other review processes from EPA and CEQ. 		WG members to view 2009 NCA website
7. Develop Questions part of FAQ	Develop FAQ Questions for input of NCADAC.		
8. Categorization of inputs (e.g. original, synthesized, interpretive)	Identify categories or “buckets” for guidelines Identify categories of materials		
9. First Drafts Guideline-Matrix Decision-Tree FAQ By mid-Sept	Circulate for review and comment to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCADAC, • National Academies, • NOAA, EPA, USFWS • Comments by October 1 		
10. Final Draft By October 15	Distribute to NCADAC		
11. Public distribution			