



# **Policy Document Analysis U.S. Climate Change Technology Program Strategic Plan, September 2006**

**Analysis Date 2007**

Prepared By

CassBeth Inc  
Cherry Hill, NJ, 08003

**Contact Information**

[www.cassbeth.com](http://www.cassbeth.com)

**Copyright © 2007** CassBeth Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, photocopied, stored on a retrieval system, or transmitted for commercial purposes without the express prior written consent of CassBeth. Non Commercial use is permitted as long as CassBeth is identified as the source of this work.

# Forward

Thank you for considering our tools. We believe that we have significant new products and technologies that will change the way we create and review documents. It is no secret that the computer and the Internet revolution have provided us with so much data that we are unable to effectively consume this data. Our products and technology address this serious issue and we are working so that they will become as common as word processing.

This document is a sample analysis of the U.S. Climate Change Technology Program Strategic Plan, September 2006.

**1.0 INTRODUCTION ..... 2**

**2.0 METHODOLOGY ..... 2**

**3.0 FINDINGS ..... 3**

**4.0 DATA..... 3**

## 1.0 Introduction

In late 2006 we used the Plan Language Analysis (PLA) Tool to analyze a Global Warming document from the European union: "GREEN PAPER A European Strategy for Sustainable, Competitive and Secure Energy". Our findings on the GREEN PAPER are published on the PLA web portal <http://www.cassbeth.com/pla>.

From that experience an effort was initiated to try to understand how individuals, organizations, governments and international entities accomplish things. The following new services for a Policy Document Analysis surfaced: Broad Approaches, Institutions, Organizational Tool, and Nation State Tools.

Early in 2007 we were introduced to the Stern Review: The Economics of Climate Change. We subjected the Stern Review to our Generic Document Analysis (GDA) tool. This effort took approximately 3 days to complete, including the writing of this report and updating the web portals. Our findings on the Stern Review are published on the GDA web portal: <http://www.cassbeth.com/gda>.

Early in 2007 we were also introduced to the U.S. Climate Change Technology Program (CCTP) Strategic Plan, September 2006. We subjected the CCTP Strategic Plan, September 2006, to our Generic Document Analysis (GDA) tool. This effort took approximately 1 day to complete, including the writing of this report and updating the web portals. Our findings on the CCTP Strategic Plan are published on the GDA web portal: <http://www.cassbeth.com/gda>.

## 2.0 Methodology

The CCTP Strategic Plan was analyzed as a single concatenated document. It was converted to text format. The Parse Text option was selected and all the display areas were disabled except for Accessed Patterns and Metrics. The follow steps were used to prepare for the analysis.

1. Converted the .pdf files to .txt documents. This was accomplished by:
  - opening the document in a PDF reader
  - picking the Text Select Tool button at the top of the menu area
  - under view selecting continuous
  - going into the body of the document
  - right clicking with the mouse and select copy
  - pasting into microsoft word
  - saving microsoft word in .txt format
2. Exported the metrics to an Excel spreadsheet.
3. Re-ran the analysis of the Green Paper and Stern Review with the metrics export option selected and output to the same Excel spreadsheet.
4. Opened the spreadsheet and prepared the formatted findings.

### 3.0 Findings

Just like the Stern Review, this is a very large body of work, and not because it has a large page count. The CCTP Strategic Plan and Stern Review are the opposite of the GREEN PAPER. When we first analyzed the GREEN PAPER from the EU we were disappointed to find that it did not have much meaningful actionable content. It pointed to vague references of markets, international efforts, and the people. Looking back on that result within the context of the Stern Review, it is clear that the GREEN PAPER was a cry out for help. It appears as though the Stern Review attempted to address that cry for help to some extent.

As stated in our previous analysis of the Stern Review, it is filled with strong words suggesting urgency. It is extremely broad in its treatment and attempts to offer some alternatives. It does appear that it was created in a time when the case for global warming was still a topic of discussion and so it makes the point of addressing that issue. While this report was being prepared institutions were being triggered and it is highly likely that the creation of the report resulted in information flow via external channels that global warming is real and must be addressed. So at the time of release much of its themes and threads dedicated towards making the case for Global Warming are not applicable.

As stated in our previous analysis of the Stern Review, even though it offers some alternatives and options; it could use more work in that area. There is also minimal emphasis in the words relating to the technical approaches to the problem. Simulation, game theory, and modeling are part of the report, but other technical approaches to problem solving are not clearly visible. It is obvious that this is the next step.

As stated in our previous analysis of the Stern Review, it has strong references to policy and appears to look at the Global Warming problem holistically as evidenced by the sheer spread of hits of different topics addressed and surfaced with the mining. This may be why the report was split into different parts. So it would seem that future document analysis should considered the parts in a stand-alone fashion and drill down into each service for ad hoc findings encouraged.

Apparently the CCTP Strategic Plan gone beyond the Stern Review and postulated more alternatives. The alternatives are obviously not fully postulated, but the work has started. The document also places heavy emphasis on science and technology so it seems to attempt to move further away from broad based policy to an acknowledgement of the need to address the problem from a technical perspective.

### 4.0 Data

The following table shows the GDA Policy Analysis metrics of the 3 documents analyzed from the European Union, UK, and USA.

	<b>Services</b>	<b>Rules</b>	<b>US %</b>	<b>UK %</b>	<b>EU %</b>	<b>US</b>	<b>UK</b>	<b>EU</b>
1	Broad Approaches	Alternatives	3.63	2.35	2.51	214	312	9
1	Broad Approaches	Education	0.22	0.45		13	61	
1	Broad Approaches	Engineering	1	0.12		59	17	
1	Broad Approaches	Government	1.13	2.7	0.83	67	359	3
1	Broad Approaches	International	1.58	5.12	3.07	93	680	11

	<b>Services</b>	<b>Rules</b>	<b>US %</b>	<b>UK %</b>	<b>EU %</b>	<b>US</b>	<b>UK</b>	<b>EU</b>
1	Broad Approaches	Markets	2.6	6.05	24.3	153	803	87
1	Broad Approaches	People	0.23	2.47	1.39	14	329	5
1	Broad Approaches	Science	12.54	1.95	3.35	738	259	12
1	Broad Approaches	Systems	12.17	4.56	3.35	716	606	12
1	Broad Approaches	Technology	29.32	8.18	7.54	1725	1086	27
2	Institutions	Academia	0.49	1.09		29	145	
2	Institutions	Associations	0.06	0.2	0.55	4	27	2
2	Institutions	Government	6.51	6.39	6.98	383	849	25
2	Institutions	Industry	5.79	3.85	6.14	341	511	22
2	Institutions	Labs	16.25	3.18	3.91	956	423	14
2	Institutions	NGO	0.01	0.02		1	3	
2	Institutions	Non Profits						
2	Institutions	Popular Media	0.03	0.17		2	23	
2	Institutions	Technical Media	0.01			1		
2	Institutions	Think Tanks						
3	Societal Approaches	Peaceful	0.76	1.26	2.79	45	168	10
3	Societal Approaches	Sacrifice		0.06			9	
3	Societal Approaches	Stressed	0.17	0.06		10	9	
3	Societal Approaches	Violent		0.01			2	
4	Organizational Tools	Gestalts	0.95	0.62	0.27	56	83	1
4	Organizational Tools	Implementation	2	3.57	9.21	118	475	33
4	Organizational Tools	Management	1.71	0.93	4.74	101	124	17
4	Organizational Tools	Process	2.15	1.75	1.95	127	233	7
4	Organizational Tools	Technical	4.33	5.23		255	695	
5	Nation State Tools	Departments						
5	Nation State Tools	Deregulate	0.03	0.03		2	4	
5	Nation State Tools	Legislation		0.03	0.27		5	1
5	Nation State Tools	Military	0.08	0.01		5	2	
5	Nation State Tools	Policy	0.27	0.16		16	22	
5	Nation State Tools	Proactive	0.01	0.58	1.67	1	77	6
5	Nation State Tools	Regulation	0.15	0.9	0.27	9	120	1
5	Nation State Tools	Resources		0.11	0.55		15	2
5	Nation State Tools	Tax	0.11	1.85	0.55	7	246	2
5	Nation State Tools	Transparency		0.18	0.83		24	3
6	International Tools	Policy	1.59	8.3	9.77	94	1102	35
6	International Tools	Proactive	0.01	0.61	1.67	1	81	6
6	International Tools	Resources	0.01	0.18		1	25	
7	Social Warnings	Anger	0.95	3.5	1.11	56	465	4
7	Social Warnings	Earth	7.78	7.02	0.83	458	932	3
7	Social Warnings	Economic		0.03			4	
7	Social Warnings	Environment	3.62	3.51	3.07	213	467	11
7	Social Warnings	General	0.15	3.11	2.79	9	413	10
7	Social Warnings	Health	0.47	1.31		28	175	
7	Social Warnings	Human		0.57			76	
8	National Roles	Agriculture	1.32	2.3	0.27	78	306	1

	<b>Services</b>	<b>Rules</b>	<b>US %</b>	<b>UK %</b>	<b>EU %</b>	<b>US</b>	<b>UK</b>	<b>EU</b>
8	National Roles	Defense	3.65	7.1	6.42	215	943	23
8	National Roles	Education	0.79	1.53		47	204	
8	National Roles	Health	0.9	1.49	0.27	53	198	1
8	National Roles	Labor	1.53	0.57	0.83	90	76	3
8	National Roles	Money	0.08	0.49	0.27	5	66	1
8	National Roles	People	0.76	3.04	9.49	45	404	34
8	National Roles	Religion	0.05	0.02		3	3	
8	National Roles	State	1.7	3.2	5.02	100	425	18
8	National Roles	Wealth	1.36	3.15	1.67	80	418	6
9	International Roles	Academia	0.59	0.96		35	128	
9	International Roles	Community	4.57	4.73	21.2	269	628	76
9	International Roles	Government	3.43	5.13	6.14	202	681	22
9	International Roles	Industry	4.96	6.33	13.4	292	841	48
9	International Roles	International	3.84	9.75	8.1	226	1295	29
9	International Roles	Money	0.05	0.88	0.27	3	117	1
9	International Roles	People	0.18	2.28	1.39	11	303	5
9	International Roles	Time	2.26	3.48	3.63	133	463	13
10	Special Interests	Chemicals	2.44	0.23		144	31	
10	Special Interests	Communications	1.22	0.65	0.55	72	87	2
10	Special Interests	Defense	4.23	8.66	6.42	249	1150	23
10	Special Interests	Education	0.2	0.67		12	89	
10	Special Interests	Energy	22.03	10.92	62.3	1296	1449	223
10	Special Interests	Entertainment	0.49	0.58		29	78	
10	Special Interests	Environment	0.05	2.12	0.27	3	282	1
10	Special Interests	Financial	0.51	3.14	1.39	30	417	5
10	Special Interests	Food	1.53	1.77	0.27	90	236	1
10	Special Interests	Groups	0.35	1.63	1.67	21	217	6
10	Special Interests	Health	0.05	0.27		3	36	
10	Special Interests	Intelligence	0.28	0.4	10.1	17	54	36
10	Special Interests	Manufacturing	4.47	2.04	3.07	263	272	11
10	Special Interests	Mining	2.97	0.8	2.51	175	107	9
10	Special Interests	Non Profit	0.03			2		
10	Special Interests	Pharmaceuticals		0.15			21	
10	Special Interests	Property	3.09	2.11	1.95	182	281	7
10	Special Interests	Science	5.18	1.89		305	251	
10	Special Interests	Technology	19.16	4	4.74	1127	531	17
10	Special Interests	Transportation	3.97	3.05	1.39	234	406	5
10	Special Interests	Utilities	3.7	4.34	9.77	218	577	35
11	Emotions	Fear		0			1	
11	Emotions	Happy						
11	Emotions	Hate	0.01	0.03		1	5	
11	Emotions	Love		0.05			7	
11	Emotions	Sad		0			1	
12	Overall Reaction	Negative		0.03			4	
12	Overall Reaction	Positive		0			1	

<b>Services</b>	<b>Rules</b>	<b>US %</b>	<b>UK %</b>	<b>EU %</b>	<b>US</b>	<b>UK</b>	<b>EU</b>
Non Blank Lines					5882	13269	358
Percent of Rules Triggered		82	93	61			
Reading Level					12	10	15