

**Puget Sound Update (deadline: spring 2010; lead: Mary Ruckelshaus)
discussion draft 3-2-09**

Description

The PS Update will be the ‘go to’, ‘one stop shopping’, state-of-the-science ‘document’ for the science supporting the work of the PSP. The content of the report will be fully electronic with perhaps short printed summaries to be determined (the details of how this will occur are being worked out.) It will be a primary scientific reporting document and will contain scientific information supporting the main work of the PSP. The outline of this document will be determined by the PSP Leadership Council, so that its content is ensured of being relevant to PSP priority needs. Key features of the PS Update include:

1. LC drives outline content and focal questions for each chapter (with input from SP). For example, for the highly regarded IPCC assessment reports and technical papers, the IPCC approves the outline and commissions the papers. The 4th Assessment Report completed in 2007 had 4 main documents: a synthesis and 3 sub-reports: “The Physical Science Basis”, “Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability”, and “Mitigation of Climate Change”. Tables of contents for each of these reports contain summaries for policymakers, a technical summary, and then specific chapters on observations, model results, and evaluation. The IPCC also has commissioned specific Technical Papers on specific topics (recent papers include ‘climate change and water’ and ‘implications of proposed CO2 emissions limitations’). Each of these reports and papers has a small group of authors who ensure that the work is done on time and represents a synthesis of peer-reviewed, current scientific understanding.
2. Again following the model of the IPCC process, a small group of experts will be selected to be the lead authors for each chapter of the report, and they prepare drafts and incorporate comments through the peer review process. Determining authorship for each chapter is key to the quality of the PS Update. As has been developed in the IPCC reports (that process has had 20 years to evolve), the PSP should design authorship so that it is a coveted role. Authors should be highly regarded scientists from academic institutions, agencies, and NGOs with relevant expertise and a demonstration of strong writing skills. The PSP’s goal is to set up a process for developing this report so that being identified as an author is regarded as an honor. The combination of incentives and financial support for author participation needs to be determined by PSP.
3. The content of drafts and final report for the PS Update will be the result of significant peer review to ensure that the content is current, accurate, and represents the highest quality scientific information available. Staff support will be needed to help catalog and organize peer-review comments that should be solicited through a combination of workshops and electronic opportunities to comment on drafts.

Key issues to resolve for process:

- What constitutes the body of science to be synthesized? Define as peer reviewed articles and peer-reviewed reports. Leave specifics to the

judgment of the authors and give them an opportunity to check in with one another as they get into their drafts.

- Dollar amount for paying authors? need to work out budget expenditure for PS Update (so far, includes 0.5 time fte, plus authorship, printing?)
- Choice of authorship—consider balance of views, seniority, name recognition.
- In order to make this ‘document’ web content in an electronic format (e.g., perhaps through a wiki-type page), procedures for gate-keeping the quality of science content and the frequency with which updates are produced need to be worked out.
- Need to decide the sequencing of content—which chapters are best to roll out first, which can/should wait until later so that more time to develop and review content is allowed?

Puget Sound Update 2010

Outline discussion draft

- I. Overview of this document
 - a. science content for iterations of PSP Action Agenda
 - b. consensus state-of-the knowledge report of scientific information in PS ecosystem
- II. Background and context: PSP goals, ecosystem framework, adaptive approach in Action Agenda
- III. Section 1: Understanding Future and Desired System States
 - a. Detecting changes in system function: Indicators
 - b. Defining 'healthy' natural and social systems in Puget Sound: thresholds of indicator response
- IV. Section 2A: The Biophysical Condition of Puget Sound
 - a. organize as species, habitats, water quality, water quantity. include-- Observations: physical, chemical and biological components; Changes in physical, chemical, and biological processes
 - b. Literature cited
 - c. List of authors and reviewers
- V. Section 2B: The Socio-Economic Condition of Puget Sound
 - a. analogous to 2A for state of social science: human well-being and human health
- VI. Section 3: Impacts of Natural Events and Human Activities on the Ecosystem
 - a. Natural and anthropogenic drivers and their impacts (e.g., DPSIR)
 - b. include: couplings between ecosystem components, processes
 - c. Ecosystem models and their evaluation
 - d. Future projections due to changes in natural drivers
- VII. Section 4: Strategies to Protect and Restore the System
 - a. Effects of protection and restoration actions on biophysical and socio-economic condition of Puget Sound
 - b. other sub-sections as above or as needed
- VIII. Synthesis: Implications of Scientific Findings for Adaptive Management of Action Agenda (think about authors for this? get guidance from LC on the kinds of guidance they seek)
 - a. Key findings of this report: Status, Impacts, Strategies
 - i. e.g., which strategies are most certain to change ecosystem condition or function?, what sequencing guidance, etc.?
 - b. Key remaining scientific uncertainties and research needs
- IX. Summary for policy-makers

Puget Sound Update 2010
Timeline discussion draft

March 2009	Leadership Council provides outline to Science Panel
April 2009	Selection of author teams by Science Panel
May 2009	Confirmation of author teams
June 2009	First lead author meeting, writing of first draft begins
September 2009	First draft submitted to technical editors
<u>December</u> 2009	First draft available to external reviewers for <u>4?</u> -week review period (also opportunity to provide comment during peer review meeting)
January 2009	Second lead author meeting. This meeting considers comments on the first draft and writing of the second draft starts immediately. (Note: literature to be cited needs to be published or in press by this time—note from IPCC process)
March 2009	Second draft available for external review for 4-week period (also peer review meeting for comment)
April 2009	Third lead author meeting, prepare revisions for final
<u>April</u> 2009	Final draft made available to PSP

Mary Ruckelshaus 1/28/09 11:12 AM
Deleted: November

Mary Ruckelshaus 1/28/09 11:12 AM
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 1.5"

Mary Ruckelshaus 1/28/09 11:11 AM
Deleted: 8

Mary Ruckelshaus 1/28/09 11:12 AM
Deleted:

Mary Ruckelshaus 1/28/09 11:09 AM
Deleted: June

more prep homework:

- guidance to lead authors—in writing and meeting with SP, LC?
- PSP procedures for preparation, review, acceptance, publication of PS Update
- desire for a summary report for policymakers?