

## Peer Review Plan

Title of Review: Conservation Effects Assessment Program (CEAP) Database [ ] **Influential Scientific Information**

Agency: USDA, Agricultural Research Service [x] **Highly Influential Scientific Assessment**

Agency Contact: Mark R Walbridge, Ph.D., National Program Leader, Water Quality & Water Management, (301) 504-4731, 5601 Sunnyside Avenue, Room 4-2292, Beltsville, MD, 20705-5140

Subject of Review: The Conservation Effects Assessment Project began is a multi-agency effort to quantify the environmental benefits of conservation practices used by private landowners participating in selected USDA conservation programs. Project findings and results are used to report progress on the environmental effects of these programs, aid discussions on conservation policy development, guide conservation program implementation, and ultimately, help farmers and ranchers make informed conservation choices. The goal of this assessment is to provide a better understanding of the role agricultural conservation practices and programs play in achieving the nation's environmental objectives - clean air and water, healthy soils, and functioning habitat for wildlife. Improved understanding of conservation performance is also needed to improve future conservation programs and practices.

Purpose of Review: We anticipate that the external peer reviewers will possess an in-depth knowledge of research conducted. Reviewers will be expected to focus on areas such as:

1. The evidence provided and whether the conclusions and inferences are correctly supported by the evidence.
2. Evaluate the methodology. Is the approach and process appropriate for the analysis?
3. Are there data or other evidence complete? Have any important data or considerations been omitted?
4. Are all important assumptions identified and uncertainties clearly stated?
5. Identify any relevant data or evidence not contained in the report.
6. Evaluate the quality and completeness of the individual components of the analysis.
7. Comment on whether/where the document is difficult to read or understand.

Type of Review: [ ] Panel Review [ x ] Individual Reviewers  
[ ] Alternative Process (Briefly Explain):

Timing of Review (Est.): Start: Projected 3/2010 End: Projected 9/2010 Completed:

Number of Reviewers: [x] 3 or fewer [ ] 4 to 10 [ ] More than 10

Primary Disciplines/Types of Expertise Needed for Review:

