

SWFSC Fundamental Research Communication Review and Approval Form

Use this form to clear all NMFS-authored including previously un-reviewed fundamental research communication (FRC) products that will be disseminated to the public. This form replaces NOAA 25-700.

Fundamental Research Communication Description

Required for all documents. *To be completed by senior/sole/corresponding NMFS author* regardless of whether or not author is the primary/lead author. Fill out, obtain supervisor signature and submit form to Division Director or designee.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Manuscript (e.g. journal or report) | <input type="radio"/> Book |
| <input type="radio"/> Presentation/poster abstract | <input type="radio"/> Book Section or Chapter |
| <input type="radio"/> Webpage (new data/research content) | <input type="radio"/> Other (list) _____ |

Author(s):

Affiliation(s):

Title:

Abstract:

Target Audience/Intended outlet:

Submission deadline¹:



Senior/sole/corresponding **NMFS author's signature**: _____ Date: _____
email:

I have read this manuscript, the reviewers' comments, and am satisfied that the current version is ready for submission for publication.



Supervisor's signature: _____ Date: _____

¹ Review of manuscripts intended for peer-reviewed journals must be initiated 30 days prior to submission for publication. Author also to notify Division Director when manuscript is accepted for publication.

Technical Review:

To be filled out by Division Director or designee. Place a check beside appropriate action(s).

- ☐ No additional review needed (Technical review completed by Division Director or designee)
- ☐ Additional review needed (Technical review requires additional expertise)

Reviewers: A minimum of one reviewer is required. If needed, additional reviewers may be consulted.

1. Reviewer's name and title:

Affiliation and email:

2. Reviewer's name and title:

Affiliation and email:

3. Reviewer's name and title:

Affiliation and email:

Division Approval:

- ☐ Not suitable for publication/presentation/display/posting (type explanation below)
- ☐ Suitable for publication/presentation/display/posting:
 - ☐ As is
 - ☐ With corrections as indicated (does not need my further review)
 - ☐ Suitable with rewrite as indicated (does need my further review)

If rewrite with review was required, indicate which of the following applies:

- ☐ Rewrite approved: as is/with corrections as indicated/with further rewrite as indicated (circle one)
- ☐ Rewrite not approved (type explanation below)

☐ Information Quality Act review is not required. Will submit to peer-review journal that meets IQA requirements.

Comments from Division Director:

Division Director (or designee) signature:



Date: _____

Information Quality Act Compliance:

Required for all documents. *To be filled out by Division Director or designee.*

Is this Influential Scientific Information (ISI) or a Highly Influential Scientific Assessment as defined by the Office of Management and Budget Peer-Review Bulletin? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If yes, has this been posted on the NOAA Peer Review Agenda? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Information Product Category: Place a check mark by appropriate category or categories.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Original Data | <input type="radio"/> Experimental Product |
| <input type="radio"/> Synthesized Product | <input type="radio"/> Corporate and General Information |
| <input type="radio"/> Interpreted Product | <input type="radio"/> Natural Resource Plan |

Product Standards Certification: Each standard below (utility, integrity and objectivity) must be checked in order for the work to be cleared for dissemination. Provide any and all necessary descriptions, explanations, etc., in the “comments” sections provided below for each standard.

Utility Standard: Is the information product, helpful, beneficial and serviceable to the intended user? Is the information product an improvement over previously available information? Is the product made available in a standard data format? Describe below.

Integrity Standard: How does the information product meet the standards for integrity? Check one:

- A) ☐ All electronic information disseminated by NOAA adheres to the standards set out in the Appendix III, Security of Automated Information Resources, OMB Circular A-130; the Computer Security Act; and the Government Information Security Reform Act.
- B) ☐ If information is confidential, it is safeguarded pursuant to the Privacy Act and Titles 13, 15, and 22 of the U.S. Code (confidentiality of census, business and financial information).
- C) ☐ Other/Discussion (e.g.) Confidentiality of Statistics of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; NOAA Administrative Order 216-100 – Protection of Confidential Fisheries Statistics; 50 CFR 229.11,(confidentiality of information collected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act.) Provide comments below.

Objectivity Standard: Describe how this information product meets the applicable objectivity standards. E.g., is the Information presented in an accurate, clear, complete, and unbiased manner, and in proper context? Is the substance of the information accurate, reliable, and unbiased? Are original and supporting data generated, and the analytical results developed, using sound, commonly accepted scientific and research methods? (See NMFS IQA for guidance.)

Division Director (or designee) signature: _____  Date: _____

Policy and Disclaimer Review:

Required for all documents. Review the work product for statements or findings with policy implications relevant to a Science Center or Office, NMFS, or NOAA, and for determination of disclaimer requirement. *To be filled out by Science Center Director or designee.* Place a check beside appropriate action(s).

- Has a NMFS/NOAA policy statement? ☐ Yes ☐ No (Director must determine if disclaimer required)
Disclaimer Required? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Has NMFS/NOAA policy implication? ☐ Yes ☐ No (If yes, requires leadership notification)

Science Center Director Approval:

- ☐ Not suitable for external peer review/publication/presentation/display/posting (type explanation below)
☐ Suitable for external peer review/publication/presentation/display/posting:
☐ As is
☐ With corrections as indicated (does not need my further review)
☐ Suitable with rewrite as indicated (does need my further review)

If rewrite with review was required, indicate which of the following applies:

- ☐ Rewrite approved: as is/with corrections as indicated/with further rewrite as indicated (circle one)
☐ Rewrite not approved (type explanation below)



Science Director (or designee) signature: _____ **Date:** _____

High Profile or Controversy Review:

Required for all documents. The purpose of this review is to identify content that relates to sensitive, controversial, and high profile topics so that NMFS/NOAA leadership can be notified prior to release of such content in a timely manner. *To be filled out by Science Director or designee.* Place a check beside appropriate action(s).

Topic is likely to be high profile or controversial ☐ No ☐ Yes (If yes, notify NMFS leadership)

Comments from Science Center Director:



Science Director (or designee) signature: _____ **Date:** _____