

The Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) respectfully requests your review of the enclosed report, titled “Fagatele Bay National Marine Sanctuary Climate Change Site Scenario.” Sanctuary staff has identified you as a particularly suitable expert who could provide substantive comments that would improve the document prior to dissemination. We request your written comments within four (4) weeks of receiving this message. Your comments should be sent by email to bscheng@ucdavis.edu, or by mail to:

Brian Cheng
c/o Fagatele Bay National Marine Sanctuary
PO Box 4318
Pago Pago, American Samoa
96799 USA
Phone: 684-252-6743

In December 2004, the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued a Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review (OMB Bulletin) establishing peer review standards that would enhance the quality and credibility of the federal government’s scientific information. Among other information, these standards apply to Influential Scientific Information (ISI), which is information that can reasonably be determined to have a “clear and substantial impact on important public policies or private sector decisions.”

This document is the result of a collaborative effort that brought together local scientists to downscale current global climate change information into a regional climate change document for Fagatele Bay National Marine Sanctuary. This document is referred to as a climate change site scenario, with the goal of identifying relevant climate change impacts to habitats and biological communities American Samoa. The site scenario document will provide a foundation to guide development and prioritization of research and monitoring activities that will ultimately inform future policy actions.

Charge

We request your critical review of the document, along with written comments, paying particular attention to the following:

- Content and scope – Does the document contain material that is appropriate to the questions addressed, and is it broad enough in content diversity to reasonably support the purpose of the study?
- Appropriateness of methods – Was the approach used for collecting data and other information suitable for this type of study?
- Quality of data – Were the data used in the study reliable and robust, and were they the most fitting data for addressing the purpose of the study? Should additional data or information have been included or considered?
- Validity of analysis techniques and interpretation – Were the analyses applied suitable to the study? Are the techniques accepted practices within the scientific community? Were the interpretations made by the authors adequately supported by the analyses?
- Soundness of conclusions and recommendations – Did the authors make conclusions and recommendations that are logical and supported by the data analysis?

- Editorial quality – Is the report written in a manner that is understandable and uncomplicated?
- Organization and presentation – Is the document presented in a sensible order, with appropriate quantity and balance

Posting of Review Comments

Current OMB Bulletin guidelines require that reviewer comments, names, and affiliations be posted on the agency website:

http://www.osec.doc.gov/cio/oipr/pr_plans.htm

Reviewer comments, however, will not be attributed to specific individuals. Nevertheless, by agreeing to be a reviewer for this report, you must agree to allow your comments to be posted on the web, along with those of other reviewers, and have your name and affiliation posted, though the names will not be linked to specific comments.

Conflict of Interest

For this review process, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) adapted the National Academy of Sciences' (NAS) policy for committee selection with respect to evaluating conflicts of interest when selecting peer reviewers who are not federal government employees. Please read the attached conflict of interest policy and complete and return the attached Conflict of Interest form to the above contact.

On behalf of the staff of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, I thank you for taking the time to review this report. I am confident that your assistance will improve the quality of the document and ensure that management decisions can rely on the best available science and dependable judgments of knowledgeable experts.