

# TEMPLATE FOR NEW AND CHANGED PEER REVIEW PLANS

## General Information:

ID number: \_\_\_\_\_ HISA \_\_\_\_\_ or ISI \_\_\_\_\_

Line Office: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Information Product \_\_\_\_\_

Keywords \_\_\_\_\_

## Contact Information: (Will not posted on Peer Review Bulletin website)

Lead Contact Person Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Divison/Branch Office \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Back-up Contact Person Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

## Estimated Project Timeline (Give actual date, not time period.):

Project start date: \_\_\_\_\_

Start date of the peer review: \_\_\_\_\_

Dissemination date of the peer review report: \_\_\_\_\_

Dissemination date of the final work product: \_\_\_\_\_

**Peer Review Information:**

Review Type:

A panel

Individual letters

Rely directly on the principal conclusions and recommendations of a report produced by the National Academy of Sciences

National Academy of Sciences Review

Adequate prior peer review (Consult with your IQA rep before checking this.)

Alternative procedure approved by OMB

Number of Reviewers:

3 or fewer;

4-10, or;

More than 10.

Reviewers will be selected by:

The agency;

A designated outside organization; Specify:

Will the public, including scientific or professional societies, be asked to nominate potential peer reviewers?    Yes            No

Will there be opportunities for the public to comment on the work product to be peer reviewed? How? When? (Describe):    Yes            No

Will the agency provide significant and relevant public comments to the peer reviewers before they conduct their review?    Yes            No

Give succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed in the review:

**Document links:**

*Either provide links to the documents, or list file names and provide the files separately.*

***All links must point to specific documents, rather than to a general site.***

The charge statement to the peer reviewers (required).

The final peer review report (required)

Agency response to the peer review report (required for HISA)

Draft Report or Assessment.

Final Publication or information product (required)

**Annual Reporting Requirements (for completed peer reviews):**

Date on which peer review report was completed.

Date that peer reviewed information product was made available.

Was the peer review panel conducted in public?    Yes            No

Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the information product?    Yes            No

Did the agency receive written comments *on the adequacy of the peer review plan*? Yes            No

How many were received?

Were any of the peer reviewers recommended by a professional society or the public? Yes            No

Was the peer reviewed information used by NOAA to support a regulatory action? Yes            No

If yes, did the agency include a certification of compliance with Peer Review Bulletin and IQA requirements and relevant materials (e.g., the peer review report) in the administrative record for the regulatory action? Yes            No

# INSTRUCTIONS: Peer Review Data Call

## General Information:

A "peer review plan" must be submitted for any influential scientific information that is in process. A template is provided.

All submissions must come from the Line Office Contact person named by your AA. Submissions will not be accepted from other sources unless specific prior arrangement has been made.

## What Must Be Submitted?

For each new item, and each changed item, a template should be submitted.

- **New Entries:** For new entries, submit a complete new plan, using the template. Submit copies of, or links to, documents that have been made public pursuant to the Peer Review Bulletin (PRB) (*see* Document Links, starting at bottom of page 2). All links should point directly to specific documents and not to general Web sites with collections of documents. OMB has specifically directed us not to use general links. Any documents submitted with your templates should be separate documents, and should NOT be included in the body of the template.
- **Existing entries:** Review your existing posted items. (For a list of currently posted plans, see [http://www.cio.noaa.gov/services\\_programs/prplans/PRsummaries.html](http://www.cio.noaa.gov/services_programs/prplans/PRsummaries.html))
- Use yellow highlighting to indicate what elements are changed. If any hyperlinks are incorrect or if linked documents have been moved, include these as changes on your update template. Submit any new documents with the template (not embedded in it).
- If you are submitting a peer review plan High Influential Scientific Assessment (HISA), contact our line office 515 Working Group Representative to be sure that the plan meets the specific requirements for HISA

## General Information about the Template:

The template is designed to help you provide the required information. The items in the template match the items listed by OMB in the Peer Review Bulletin, and space is provided on the template for either names of included documents or for links to required documents posted elsewhere (e.g., charge statements, peer review reports). **Do not include any documents within this template.** Either provide **current** links in the template, or list file names in the template and provide the files separately. **All links must point to specific documents, rather than to a general site.** Follow the naming conventions below for files to be linked. Finally, for completed peer reviews, the template includes a series of questions to assist with preparing the agency's annual report to OMB.

**Naming conventions for attached files:** Any file provided (e.g., charge statement, peer review report) must have a file name with **no spaces**. The underscore character or hyphen should be used instead of spaces. The file name should make clear what the document is in terms that can be

understood by someone not involved with the science. File names to be added as links from existing entries should begin with the **ID number** of the item. For example,

Wrong:	Peer Review Report for Coral Reef Study.doc
Right:	ID99_Peer_Review_Report_for_Coral_Reef_Study.doc
Right:	ID99-Peer-Review-Report-for-Coral-Reef-Study.doc

**Specific Dates:** Where dates are called for, you must give specific dates (month, day, year). It is understood that these dates are estimates. NOTE: the ESTIMATED DISSEMINATION DATE refers to dissemination of the FINAL PEER REVIEW REPORT.

**Items Posted to Web:** Not all the information provided by you in the template will be posted on the Web.

The names of the "Contact Person" and "Back-up Contact Person" requested below are for internal use only. The "Contact Person" name posted to the Web will always be the name of the 515 Working Group Representative for your Line or Staff Office.

## Summary of what you must submit

By the date specified in the data call email, the following must be submitted to your line office contact in electronic form:

1. Completed peer review templates for all new ISI and HISAs.
2. Completed revision/update templates for any earlier posted peer review plans that have changed. **Use highlighting to indicate which information has been changed.**
3. For any documents required to be posted with your plans (e.g., charge statements, final peer review reports<sup>1</sup>), include electronic copies in accessible formats (i.e., 508 compliant), or links to same. Do NOT imbed these documents in your templates.
4. For completed peer reviews, the information requested in the "Annual Reporting Requirements" section of the template must be completed.

The **APPENDIX** at the end of this document summarizes information from the OMB Peer Review Bulletin, including definitions of Influential Scientific Information (ISI) – *with added text including current ISI examples* - and Highly Influential Scientific Assessments (HISA). Review it if you need more information or a refresher.

---

<sup>1</sup> The **final peer review report** is a summary of peer review comments, with comments organized by sections of the draft work product, NOT by reviewer responses ( \_ 's comments, followed by 's comments). Here is a link to an example -

[http://www.cio.noaa.gov/services\\_programs/prplans/pdfs/ID239\\_Dwarf\\_Seahorse\\_Peer\\_Review\\_Report.pdf](http://www.cio.noaa.gov/services_programs/prplans/pdfs/ID239_Dwarf_Seahorse_Peer_Review_Report.pdf)

Note: this is actually the agency response to the peer review report, but it contains the peer review report.

# Appendix

## How do I determine if my information is "influential scientific information"?

The term "**scientific information**" means factual inputs, data, models, analyses, technical information, or scientific assessments based on the behavioral and social sciences, public health and medical sciences, life and earth sciences, engineering, or physical sciences. As with the Information Quality Guidelines, this includes any communication or representation of knowledge such as facts or data, in any medium or form, including textual, numerical, graphic, cartographic, narrative, or audiovisual forms. Also as previously mentioned, this definition includes information that an agency disseminates from a Web page, but does not include hyperlinks to information that others disseminate, and does not include information which does not represent the agency's views.

**"Influential scientific information (ISI)"** means scientific information the agency reasonably can determine will have or does have a clear and substantial impact on important public policies or private sector decisions. Below is some draft additional guidance to help in determining if your research might fall in this classification:

To decide if an information product qualifies as ISI the agency must determine if the information will have a "clear and substantial impact on important public policies or private sector decision making." The NOAA Information Quality Guidelines note that this impact must have a high probability of occurring. If the impact is arguable or a judgment call then it is likely not clear and substantial, and not influential. Additionally NOAA Information Quality Group has informally noted that "public policies or private sector decision-making" can include "strategic management processes"

Examples of existing peer review plans and their influence on public policies or public sector decision-making:

**National Coastal Condition Reports:** This report is written for the informed public, coastal managers, scientists, members of Congress, and other elected officials. It serves as a report card on the status of our Nation's coastal waters, a benchmark for assessing future change, and a tool for identifying current data gaps, emerging issues for coastal managers, and the potential future direction of coastal monitoring efforts.

**National Marine Sanctuary Condition Reports** (developed every five years): Trends in the status of resources are also reported, and are generally based on observed changes in status, generally over the past five years, and are assessments and observations of scientists, managers and users. Therefore, ratings reflect the collective level of concern among participants based on their knowledge and perceptions of local problems. This information is intended to help set the stage for management plan reviews.

**State of the Climate reports** place today's climate in historical context and provides perspectives on the extent to which the climate system varies and changes as well as the effect that climate is having on societies and the environment. (from Climate.gov: temperature, CO<sub>2</sub>, ocean heat content, sea level, arctic sea ice, sun's energy trends are monitored). All of these changes may affect availability of a variety of resources, e.g. fish stocks, fresh water supplies, as well as contribute to

public health issues, e.g. prevalence of certain diseases/disease vectors, and human safety. Areas in which decision-making would be impacted would include: Federal fishery management, public health policy and planning and public safety policy and planning.

**Arctic Report Cards:** Issued annually, the Arctic Report Card is a timely source for clear, reliable and concise environmental information on the state of the Arctic, relative to historical time series records. Material is prepared by an international team of scientists. The audience for the Arctic Report Card is wide, including scientists, students, teachers, decision makers and the general public interested in Arctic environment and science. The Report Card is cited on a wide range of websites. Example of use for decision-making: reductions in sea ice mean that Arctic shipping routes become more feasible. Also, the Arctic Report Card is closely tied to climate change issues, which affect (see State of the Climate reports).

**Stock assessments and other reports on the prevalence of a species/the impact of certain actions taken on its prevalence** contain information that would impact decisions for industry and sectors that would be affected by classification of a species as threatened or endangered.

**How do I determine if my information is a "highly influential scientific assessment"?**

The term "**scientific assessment**" means an evaluation of a body of scientific or technical knowledge, which typically synthesizes multiple factual inputs, data, models, assumptions, and/or applies best professional judgment to bridge uncertainties in the available information. These assessments include, but are not limited to, state-of-science reports; technology assessments; weight-of-evidence analyses; meta-analyses; health, safety, or ecological risk assessments; toxicological characterizations of substances; integrated assessment models; hazard determinations; or exposure assessments.

To be a "**highly influential scientific assessment**," a scientific assessment must meet one of the following conditions, as determined by the agency or OMB:

Have potential impact of more than \$500 million in any one year on either the public or private sector [Economic test]	<b>OR</b>	The dissemination must be novel, controversial, or precedent-setting, or have significant interagency interest. [Narrative test]
--	-----------	---

Please note that the threshold for HISA is set fairly high, and it is expected that NOAA will produce few, if any, HISA each year.