

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910451960803321
Titolo	Review of CCSP draft synthesis and assessment product 5.3 [[electronic resource]] : decision-support experiments and evaluations using seasonal to interannual forecasts and observational data : panel to review CCSP draft synthesis and assessment product 5.3 : decision-support experiments and evaluations using seasonal to interannual forecasts and observational data // National Research Council of the National Academies
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Washington, D.C., : National Academies Press, c2008
ISBN	1-281-20933-3 9786611209339 0-309-11569-8
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (56 p.)
Disciplina	551.5
Soggetti	Climatology - Research - United States - Evaluation Climatic changes - Risk assessment Atmospheric carbon dioxide - Environmental aspects Electronic books.
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references (p. 40-42).
Nota di contenuto	""Front matter""; ""CONTENTS""; ""EXECUTIVE SUMMARY""; ""1 INTRODUCTION""; ""2 OVERVIEW ISSUES""; ""3 RESPONSIVENESS TO PROSPECTUS QUESTIONS""; ""4 SUPPORT FOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS""; ""5 ORGANIZATION AND ACCESSIBILITY""; ""References""; ""APPENDIX A Topics for Synthesis and Assessment Products of the U.S. Climate Change Science Program""; ""APPENDIX B Biographical Sketches of Panel Members and Staff""
Sommario/riassunto	This study offered an independent peer review for a synthetic document being produced for the CCSP. It found the draft document to be in a fairly early stage of development and noted several issues needing attention in the revision. The draft was inconsistent across sections with respect to whether or not it accepted two assumptions: that more skillful forecasts necessarily have greater value, and that the

most useful form of information is a projected future value of an outcome parameter with an uncertainty distribution. Available scientific evidence gives reason to question these assumptions, and the draft did not discuss the evidence. Among other issues needing attention, the review called for the revised draft to do more to substantiate its claims of the potential benefits of knowledge-action networks and to give more careful consideration to the appropriate balance of roles between governmental and private efforts.
