Reserve Technical Questions 2:

I’m not aware of published studies that the Reserve has not already considered. I’m also not aware of projects underway that are specifically calibrating/validating to Tier 2 or 3 approaches...other than to say that there is an ongoing effort in Canada to continue working with models such as DNDC and DAYCENT to improve their ability to represent Canadian agricultural conditions. There are also several research projects that are just in the start-up phase that will address aspects of the impact of nitrogen management on N₂O (rate, timing, advanced N fertilizers).

Reserve Technical Questions 3:

I would have issue with accepting these additional datasets “as equal” to peer-reviewed studies. That being said, I would expect that there is, and will be, high quality data collected that does not end up being published because it is not “unique” enough, or the objective of the publication is very targeted and some (much?) of the data that was collected is not utilized. This data could well be as credible as published data and be of great reference value to the purposes of the Reserve. Thus, I think entertaining “non-published” data could be acceptable, as long as there is some rigorous internal review process in place at the Reserve to verify the credibility of the data.

Reserve Technical Questions 17:

Discussion should not only include amounts but also distributions of precipitation (i.e. 100 mm of rain over a couple of weeks is quite different than 100 mm of rain in a 24 hour period), and how such event(s) influenced the final loss estimates.