

**Comments and Responses on SOCCR/SAP 2.2 Draft 1 (May 2006)
CHAPTER 5**

COMMENT FROM PEER REVIEWERS						AUTHOR'S RESPONSE						
Comment Number	Reviewer ID	Chapter	Page	Line	Comment Text	Acknowledged, but no further response or revisions are required	Revisions have been incorporated as suggested in the comment	Agree, but see "Notes on Response"	Agree, but elaboration is precluded by length limitations	Disagree; see "Notes on Response"	Beyond scope of report/chapter	Notes on Response
05-001	3	5	General		I found very few answers to my questions in the current version of the report—and nothing at all in Chapter 5, despite its title. In fact, I get the impression that tackling these tough but critical questions is being deferred in pursuit of a yet to be established (and perhaps elusive) process (see fourth paragraph on page 5-9). Several other synthesis and assessment reports (namely SAP 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3), organized under the heading "Explore the uses and identify the limits of evolving knowledge to manage risks and opportunities related to climate variability and change," were identified in Chapter 5, but, based on the descriptions of these activities given on the CCSP web site, they will not address my questions either.						X	This chapter's role is to clarify the processes and institutions to build a better connection/application of science to the needs of carbon management. Detailed discussion of specific research needs can be found in individual chapters. The chapter's introduction has been edited to clarify this point.
05-002	3	5	5-1 to 5-15		Although I don't have much to quibble about with respect to this subject or how it is presented in this chapter, I do question why an entire chapter is devoted to the subject of improved application of scientific information to decision support when so little is devoted to an assessment of where we are currently (see General Comments). Our "process" will never be perfect, but we have to tackle the difficult questions now in order to make continued, effective progress.						X	This chapter's role is to clarify the processes and institutions to build a better connection/application of science to the needs of carbon management. Detailed discussion of specific research needs can be found in individual chapters. The chapter's introduction has been edited to clarify this point.
05-003	3	5	5-3	1, 3, & 6	Replacing the words "normative," "actors in these sectors," and "entities" with simpler synonyms would help to improve communication with the more general audience for which the report is reportedly intended.		X					revisions made in line with suggested comments.
05-004	3	5	5-4	1-13	Why is there no mention of NOAA's role, i.e., the Climate Program Office and its activities?		X					There is now a mention of NOAA's climate program office and its role lines page 5-4 lines 11-14. Note that the CPO to date has not focused its efforts on usable carbon science, but rather seasonal to interannual climate information
05-005	3	5	5-4	24-28	I recommend "translating" the quote so that it is more likely to be understood by a member of the general public.		X					Sentence added to page 5-4 and 5-5 lines 29-2
05-006	3	5	5-5	16-18	I would recommend purging the word "salient" from your lexicon, and simply replace it with "relevant" or "particularly relevant." It is another example of unnecessarily complex wording, and is a very poor synonym for the parenthetical expression on lines 16 and 17, despite the assertions of Cash et al. In fact, I think deleting both "salient" and "legitimate" and eliminating the associated parentheses is not only simpler but more effective in getting your message across.		X					revisions made in line with suggested comments. Salient replaced with "relevant" and legitimate replaced with "responsive" throughout the chapter.
05-007	3	5	5-5	32	Would inserting the word "expanded" before the word "participation" communicate your message more effectively?		X					revisions made in line with suggested comments.
05-008	3	5	5-8	6	I think the acronym NGO needs to be added to the Text Box (see line 9 on page 5-15) since the definition of NGO is not given elsewhere in the text.		X					revisions made in line with suggested comments.
05-009		5	5-10	3	Same comment as # 05-006		X					Revisions made in line with suggested comments. Salient replaced with "relevant" and legitimate replaced with "responsive" throughout the chapter.

**Comments and Responses on SOCCR/SAP 2.2 Draft 1 (May 2006)
CHAPTER 5**

COMMENT FROM PEER REVIEWERS						AUTHOR'S RESPONSE						
Comment Number	Reviewer ID	Chapter	Page	Line	Comment Text	Acknowledged, but no further response or revisions are required	Revisions have been incorporated as suggested in the comment	Agree, but see "Notes on Response"	Agree, but elaboration is precluded by length limitations	Disagree; see "Notes on Response"	Beyond scope of report/chapter	Notes on Response
05-010	8	5	General		The entire chapter should be edited to improve readability. The title and a number of sections in the chapter require too many readings in order to understand them and grasp their points. The title should be shortened and simplified. The ideas are pretty diffuse and conceptual, and it is difficult to relate some of the sections to the main point of the chapter.		X					Extensive revisions made to improve readability and the title has been shortened.
05-011	8	5	General		The Chapter does provide a useful summary of the general barriers to linking carbon cycle science with solutions and offers possible approaches to overcome some of those barriers. However, the manner in which this chapter is written has the result that it is likely that it will only be understood, or considered relevant, by the science audience. Other audiences or stakeholders are unlikely to get much out of this chapter as presently written, which makes it unlike the rest of the report.			X				Chapter has been edited to clarify key points, and to communicate to decision makers the importance of improving the usefulness of carbon cycle science.
05-012	8	5	General		Although the chapter as written is not directly useful for applying science to management, it does shed some light on areas that most scientists don't think much about. With that in mind, the recommendations, as loose as they are, are appropriate insofar as they are directed at scientific organizations which may be able to implement or modify programs to enhance the utility of their science for carbon management.	X						