

## ***Instructions for FY'12 Report pursuant to the Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review***

As you prepare your report, please ensure that your agency's Peer Review Agenda (the Agenda) includes agency plans for the foreseeable future<sup>1</sup> and that each Agenda entry is up to date regarding both the timing of the review and whether the review has been completed. Agenda entries should be updated whenever new information becomes available; every six months is the **minimum** for updating the Agenda.

Once a peer review has been completed (that is, the final product has been edited to reflect the reviewers' comments), the Agenda entry should be updated to include a link to the peer review charge, the reviewers' names, and the peer reviewers' comments, as well as the final version of the product. For highly influential scientific assessments, the agency's responses also should be posted. An example of good practice is the Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service<sup>2</sup> agenda.

Please use the attached template to record peer reviews conducted pursuant to the Bulletin between October 1, 2011 and September 30, 2012. This form has two parts: 1) A "department-level summary," which should aggregate information across all of the agencies/bureaus/offices in the department and 2) an "agency report" that should be completed by each agency within a department. A separate "agency report" should be completed for each agency that produces information subject to the Bulletin. Please make sure to report to us the **current URLs for your peer review agenda** – some agencies continue to submit URLs that no longer work. Also take this opportunity to ensure that your agency's peer review agenda is up to date and all of the links on your agency's peer review home page are working.

For those agencies that do not have any peer reviews to report for this fiscal year, it is necessary to complete only the General Information component of the "agency report." Agencies that are not part of departments do not have to complete the summary page; they should type "Not Applicable" on the "Department" line.

To ensure consistency across agencies, please use the guidance below to determine which peer reviews were "conducted" during the last fiscal year, and thus should be reported.

- Include peer reviews for which the peers have provided the agency with their (final) comments, *regardless* of whether the agency has:
  - completed its response to the reviewers, or
  - made the peer review comments public.
- Exclude peer reviews:
  - for which the reviewers are still considering the information,
  - that are planned for the future, or
  - that were planned for the current fiscal year, but were not conducted.

---

<sup>1</sup> As stated in the November 28, 2005, memo from the Deputy Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, the Agenda is not a six month forecast (i.e., it should not be limited to information (documents) that the agency plans to disseminate (or peer review) in the next six months).

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.aphis.usda.gov/peer\\_review/peer\\_review\\_agenda.shtml](http://www.aphis.usda.gov/peer_review/peer_review_agenda.shtml).

Agencies that reported last year that they *do not* produce information subject to the Bulletin do not need to fill out a report this year unless the disclaimer no longer applies **OR** the link to your disclaimer has changed. Rather, those agencies should send an email to [OMB\\_peer\\_review@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OMB_peer_review@omb.eop.gov) with the agency's current point of contact for the Bulletin and the current URL to the disclaimer. The agencies to which this applies are listed in Appendix K, part C of OMB's Draft 2012 Report to Congress on the Costs and Benefits of Federal Regulations.<sup>3</sup> The template for the appropriate disclaimer is shown below:

“based on the review it has conducted, the [AGENCY] believes that it does not currently produce or sponsor the distribution of influential scientific information (including highly influential scientific assessments) within the definitions promulgated by OMB. As a result, at this time the [AGENCY] has no agenda of forthcoming influential scientific disseminations to post on its website in accordance with OMB's Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review.”

Agencies not listed in Appendix K, part C should submit a report this year. Please send your *draft* Peer Review Bulletin Annual Report (**Due January 18, 2013**) to [OMB\\_peer\\_review@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OMB_peer_review@omb.eop.gov). Please do not post your draft report on your web-page until OMB review is complete. Should you have any questions related to the Peer Review report, please contact Margo Schwab (202 395-5647) [mschwab@omb.eop.gov](mailto:mschwab@omb.eop.gov) or James Kim (202 395-3085) [james\\_h\\_kim@omb.eop.gov](mailto:james_h_kim@omb.eop.gov).

---

<sup>3</sup>[http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/oira/draft\\_2012\\_cost\\_benefit\\_report.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/oira/draft_2012_cost_benefit_report.pdf) (page 155).

## Template for FY'12 Report pursuant to the Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review

### I. Summary Page for Department (if Applicable)

Department U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Departmental Contact for Implementation of the Bulletin for Peer Review

Name and title: Tremaine Donnell, Team Leader. Information Collections Team

Email address: Tremaine.Donnell@nrc.gov

Phone number: 301-415-6258

Provide the URL for Department's portal for compliance with the Bulletin

http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/info-quality.html \*\* ensure link is working

Have you checked to make sure all of the information and links on this URL are current? Y/N Y

Is this URL:

A Department-wide Peer Review Agenda (Y/N) or Y

A set of links to each agency (bureau or office's) agenda (Y/N)? N

How would a member of the public locate this peer review portal if she/he did not have this URL? Check all that apply:

A link from Department's home page X

A link from Department's Information Quality home page X

Other means, e.g., a link from a science page (please describe) \_\_\_\_\_

Number of peer reviews conducted subject to the Bulletin in FY'12 (see instructions for what should and should not be included here).

Number of influential scientific information peer reviews (ISI) (not including highly influential scientific assessments) 0

Number of highly influential scientific assessments (HISA) 0

Number of Waivers, Deferrals, Exemptions, or Alternative Procedures used: Total # 0

Number of peer reviews that included at least one peer reviewer appointed pursuant to any exception to the applicable independence or conflict of interest standards of the Bulletin, including determinations by the Secretary or Deputy Secretary pursuant to Section III (3) (c).

Total # 0

Number of peer review panels that held in conjunction with public meetings: Total # 0

Number of public comments provided on the Department's peer review plans during FY'12, regardless of whether the peer review was actually completed during FY'12: Total # 0

**Template for FY'12 Report pursuant to the  
Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review**

II. Agency Report

GENERAL INFORMATION

Agency U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Agency Contact for Implementation of the Peer Review Bulletin

Name and title: Tremaine Donnell, Team Leader, Information Collections Team

Email address: Tremaine.Donnell@nrc.gov

Phone number: 301-415-6258

URL for Agency's Peer Review Agenda

<http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/info-quality.html>

\*\* ensure link is working

What pathway(s) can a member of the public use to find the Agency's peer review agenda if she/he did not have this URL?

- Link from Departmental or Agency home page, X
- Link from Agency Information Quality home page, X
- Link from science, research, or regulatory pages (please specify)
- Other (please describe) \_\_\_\_\_

Does the agenda provide links to peer review reports for all completed peer reviews?

N/A

Have you checked to make sure all of the information and links on the agency's peer review home page to are current? Y/N Y

Continue to Next Page

INFORMATION ABOUT REVIEWS CONDUCTED

Number of peer reviews conducted subject to the Bulletin in FY'12. (see instructions for what should and should not be included here).

Number of influential scientific information peer reviews (ISI) (not including highly influential scientific assessments)   0  

List the title of each ISI. Indicate whether the Peer Review Report has been completed (Y/N) *add more lines as needed* **NOTE:** It is acceptable to provide a screen shot of your peer review agenda as an attachment.

---

---

---

Number of highly influential scientific assessments (HISA)   0  

List the title of each HISA. Indicate whether the Peer Review Report has been Completed (Y/N) *add more lines as needed*

---

---

---

Provide the titles of ISIs and HISIs for which Waivers (W), Deferrals (D), or Exemptions (E) were invoked or Alternative Procedures used (A). *If deferral is marked, please indicate the duration of the deferral.*

<i><b>Title of Document</b></i>	<i><b>Type of Document ISI or HISA</b></i>	<i><b>W, D, E, or A (and duration)</b></i>
---------------------------------	--	--

---

---

---

---

Number of peer reviews that included at least one peer reviewer appointed pursuant to any exception to the applicable independence or conflict of interest standards of the Bulletin, including determinations by the Secretary or Deputy Secretary pursuant to Section III (3) (c)?

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments)   0  

List titles

---

---

---

Number of HISAs   0  

List titles

---

---

---

Number of peer review panels that held public meetings:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments)   0  

Number of HISAs   0  

Number of peer review panels that allowed public comment:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments)   0  

Number of HISAs   0  

Number of public comments provided on the agency's peer review plans during FY'12, regardless of whether the peer review was actually completed during FY'12   0  

Number of times agency specifically solicited peer reviewer nominations from professional societies.   0  

If such nominations were solicited, were any recommendations provided? Yes    No