

Institutional Needs

- ◆ Where is OMB?
- ◆ Where are the ecologists?
- ◆ Data collection
- ◆ The organization of science
- ◆ Review
- ◆ Methods

OMB

- ◆ Legal concerns - silence
- ◆ Animosity/paranoia
- ◆ Interactions b/w NCEE & OMB
- ◆ A-4 - anything you want it to be - uncertainty for EPA - rumor
- ◆ Rules get passed without $\$B > C$
- ◆ Can we do something to help?

Ecologists?

- ◆ 1 name
- ◆ Talked to him, begged off RIA expertise
- ◆ OWOW, no economists < 1/5 ecologists
- ◆ Implications for analysis

Data Collection

- ◆ ICRs Information Collection Requests
- ◆ Surveys, CV
- ◆ "Biggest practical issue"
- ◆ Time pressure - court deadlines
- ◆ OMB review, public comment
 - ◆ +7 years
- ◆ EPA suggested protocol (denied)

The Organization of Analysis

- ◆ Program offices lead - and finance
- ◆ NCEE a centralized reviewer
- ◆ OAQPS - a dedicated economics shop
- ◆ SJ memo “a renewed effort to coordinate”

Review

- ◆ Takes many forms
- ◆ No consistency across reviewers/reviews
- ◆ Only “novel elements get reviewed”
- ◆ Time pressure
- ◆ A standing body?

Methods

- ◆ Skepticism over CV, BT
- ◆ Expert elicitation
- ◆ What endpoints should we measure?
- ◆ Inertia, challenge & litigation
 - ◆ Methods propagate
 - ◆ Mitchell & Carson
 - ◆ “Chase off the shelf methods”
- ◆ A contract with OMB to allow experimentation

Final Thoughts

- ◆ RIA & PART
- ◆ Money to develop robust tools
 - ◆ Not just money for an answer
 - ◆ Follow the money
- ◆ Forget methods, what about data?
- ◆ Should we be making organizational recommendations?