

CPHEA Peer Review Decision Summary & Work Product Categorization

To be completed by Principal Investigator, Assessment Manager or Project Lead— **Approval Required on Page 2**

- 1) **TITLE OF WORK PRODUCT (Product/Sub-Product(s) listed for Clearance):**

- 2) **Project Lead/Principal Investigator:** _____

Contact if different from Project Lead: _____

- 3) **RAPID Sub-Product Title(s) & ID#(s):** (Bundle related & similar sub-products on one form)

- 4) **Intended Audience:** _____

- 5) **AA-Ship/Office/Division:** _____

- 6) **What Decision/Rule/Regulation/Action/Activity does this Work Product Support?**

- 7) **Categorization of Work Product and Rationale for Peer Review Mechanism**

See page 3 for category explanation and rationale. If work product is designated as ISI or HISA, Center Director approval of the decision summary form is required; external peer review is required. For other scientific or technical work products that will be public, external peer review is required. For products not for public release, external peer review can be conducted if the Decision Maker determines it is worthwhile. **Check all that apply.**

Categorization of Work Product

Rationale:

☐ Influential Scientific Information (**ISI**)

☐ Highly Influential Scientific Assessment (**HISA**)

☐ **Other** Scientific or Technical Work Product (not influential, **may be high profile**)

Peer Review Mechanism (check all that apply)

☐ Internal - EPA Review

☐ External- by Journal/Editor/Publisher

☐ External- Letter Review by Contractor

☐ External- Letter Review by EPA

☐ Usability Review (internal or external)

☐ External- Panel Review by Contractor

☐ External- Panel Review by Federal Advisory Committee (e.g., SAB or CASAC)

☐ External- Panel Review by National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM) or other

☐ No external peer review (document rationale on pg 3)

- 8) **Will the public, including scientific or professional societies, be asked to nominate peer reviewers?** ☐ Yes ☐ No

- 9) **Number of External Peer Reviewers:**

☐ 3 or fewer

☐ 4 to 10

☐ More than 10

- 10) **Primary Disciplines Needed in the Peer Review:**

11) **Will there be opportunities for public participation?** (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comment on Charge | <input type="checkbox"/> Comment on Draft Work Product |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nominate Potential Peer Reviewers | <input type="checkbox"/> Comment on Peer Review Mechanism |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comment on Potential Peer Reviewers | <input type="checkbox"/> Oral Presentation to Reviewers |

12) **External Review (FY/QTR)** **(drafts must be cleared in STICS prior to ext peer review)**

Route this form via email and follow the sequence provided for approvals. Lead should enter names

Approvals: Center Director must approve HISA/ISI. Division Directors can approve non-HISA/non-ISI.

Principal Investigator/Project Lead (Recommendation) _____

(Sign and Email to Peer Review Coordinator)

Peer Review Coordinator (Concurrence) _____

(Sign and Email to Branch Chief)

Branch Chief (Concurrence) _____

(Sign and Email to Division Director)

Division Director (Concurrence for HISA/ISI; Approval for non-HISA/ISI)

If HISA/ISI, Sign and Email to the Center Director, Subject line "For Signature" _____

If non-HISA/ISI, Division Director should sign as approver, do not send to the Center Director, and return signed form to Project lead and Peer Review Coordinator.

Center Director, (Approval for HISA/ISI only) _____

(Final Disposition - Sign and Email to Project Lead and Peer Review Coordinator)

NOTE: This form is consistent with the EPA Science and Technology Policy Council *Peer Review Handbook* (4th Edition, EPA/100/B15/001, 2015).

Post Peer Review Addendum Section - Only needed when additional analysis is added to a Work Product After External Peer Review

(If more than one additional analysis, list each analysis in responses below)

Description of Additional Analysis:

Categorization of Additional Analysis: _____

Is peer review of the Analysis needed? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, which Peer Review Mechanism is chosen? (If more than one additional analysis, list each analysis and the peer review mechanism chosen for the analysis.) _____

Approvals

Peer Review Leader/Project Lead (Recommendation) _____

Peer Review Coordinator (Concurrence) _____

Branch Chief (Concurrence) _____

Division Director (Concurrence) _____

Center IO (Approval) _____

Work Product Category Explanation and Rationale (OMB Defined)

Influential Scientific Information (ISI) <i>Peer Review Handbook Section 2.2.3</i>	Highly Influential Scientific Assessment (HISA) <i>Peer Review Handbook Section 2.2.4</i>
<p>Meets one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishes a significant precedent, model, or methodology • Likely to have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, Tribal, or Local governments or communities • Addresses significant controversial issues • Focuses on significant emerging issues • Has significant cross-Agency/interagency implications • Involves a significant investment of Agency resources • Considers an innovative approach for a previously defined problem/process/ methodology • Satisfies a statutory or other legal mandate for peer review 	<p>Meets the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment that, in addition to meeting the criteria for ISI, could have a potential impact of more than \$500 million in any year, or • is novel, controversial, or precedent-setting or has significant interagency interest.

Document rationale for NOT doing external Peer Review: