

From: Cristián Samper
To: Stauffer, Barbara
Date: 10/12/2005 8:30:43 PM
Subject: Re: Revised Arctic script

You are welcome Barbara, I think many of these are relatively simple fixes, primarily with the order of the ideas. Please get Igor, Sully and Hans to sign off....

Cristian

>>> Barbara Stauffer 10/12/2005 3:29:45 PM >>>
Cristian,

Thank you for sending me your comments on the revised Arctic script. I picked up Sue's comments this morning, and they are similar to yours. I'll be discussing both of your comments with Igor, Bill and Sully in the next day or two.

Hans, do you have any comments to add at this point? I'd like to consider all the comments at one time.

Thanks,

Barbara

>>> Cristián Samper 10/11 7:13 PM >>>
Dear Barbara,

Thanks for this revised version of the script. The changes you have made are helpful in resolving some of my concerns and the panel indicating the source of the data is very helpful. Here are a few comments:

I am still a bit puzzled with the order of some of the text. I am reading it as the linear text, so I recognize the layout may help. Start with the order of the questions in the introductory panel, why are past changes last, not first? I think one of the critical things we can do is provide a deeper time perspective. I would expect an introduction of what is the arctic early on (currently ARC-7 and 8), before we go into the changes. I would have thought the deeper time perspectives on Gallery 3 (ARC 45-51) would follow, and then go on to current and possible future changes. Then talk about impacts on people and wildlife.

Some specific comments on the introductory panel: are the data consistent with or based on the ACIA.....Did ACIA actually gather new data, or assess existing information?. Science assessments like IPCC and the MA normally review existing published information, but are not research projects per se. I am also not sure that an assessment is about reaching consensus, but weighing existing information and presenting our best understanding and also the main uncertainties. Maybe we restructure as a statement about how we do science, and how we use an assessment to gather and analyze science.

Please make sure that Igor and Hans sign off on this before you go ahead with the production. Silence is not enough.

I appreciate your efforts in taking into account some of these views. It is important that we get this right.

Cristian

>>> Barbara Stauffer 10/5/2005 11:54:05 AM >>>

We have now taken several additional passes through the script in which we looked for potentially contentious statements, noted places where the science could be made more transparent, and asked our scientific advisors for more clarification. We are confident it presents the complicated research produced

and summarized for the ACIA and SEARCH committee reports in a manner which is accurate, engaging, and informative to the general public.

Since you last looked at the script, the writer has refined some of the original changes and added others. All changes were made to ensure the scientific data, the uncertainty of modeling, and the historical and geological context are more transparent. For your information only, we have footnoted the script, but of course we will not include these in the actual exhibit. We'll hold on to the footnoted version of the script so we can answer any questions that might arise during the lifetime of the exhibit.

Also, we are proposing a take-home piece for visitors that directs them to our sources. It'll be entitled something like: "Where You Can Learn More" and it will list web sites and publications of ACIA, SEARCH, NOAA, NASA and all our other collaborators.

If we are to try and meet our new deadline, we have to have any comments by the close of business Friday. If we don't hear from you by then, we'll assume your questions and concerns have been addressed and move forward with final exhibit production.

Thank you,

Barbara

CC: Margolis, Carolyn; SUES, Hans; Sullivan, Robert