

DISCUSSION OF THE FUTURE WORK OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE

An informal meeting of interested Stakeholders was held on September 25, 2008, to discuss the future work of the Science Subcommittee. The Steering Committee has not established a work group to address these issues. Accordingly, no recommendations were made. However, a general consensus appeared to develop with respect to several issues.

- The discussions of the Science Subcommittee Issue Team and Recharge Facility Subcommittee suggested that several areas of the Program Operational Rules (PORs) may merit revision (*e.g.*, quorum and distinction between voting and non-voting members). It was the view that any changes would not require significant revision of the PORs. It was suggested that a small work group could meet and prepare a list of suggested changes for consideration by the Steering Committee and Stakeholders sometime after the first of the year. This work group would function independently from a Science Subcommittee work group.
- The Stakeholders at the meeting discussed a possible agenda for a Science Subcommittee work group based on a discussion document I prepared for the meeting. Attachment 1. There was general agreement that the document provided a reasonable starting point for the work group's discussions, but that the work group should prepare its own agenda. There was strong agreement that, while the work group could begin its work immediately, any final recommendations should await the issuance of the recommendations of the Science Subcommittee on the "k" charges and the peer review of those recommendations.
- The persons at the meeting spent a considerable amount of time discussing the process the EARIP should follow after it receives the Science Subcommittee's recommendations. Although the EARIP has not formally decided to have the recommendations peer reviewed, the persons at the meeting assumed that such a decision would be made at the October meeting. The meeting participants were in agreement with the following process:
 - Upon receipt, the Science Subcommittee recommendations would be promptly submitted for independent peer review.
 - The peer review process should include an opportunity for the reviewers to ask written questions of the Science Subcommittee, and the Subcommittee should respond to any questions in writing.
 - The Science Subcommittee would not make a formal presentation to the EARIP during the peer review process, and the EARIP would not participate in the peer review process.
 - At the completion of the peer review process, the (1) recommendations of the Subcommittee, (2) the written questions of the reviewers and responses of the

Subcommittee and (3) the peer review report would be presented to the Steering Committee and Stakeholders. At that point the EARIP will decide how to proceed with respect to these documents.

- No changes in the composition of the Subcommittee would be considered until the peer review process is complete.