Environmental Protection Agency
Annual Report on Peer Review (DRAFT)
Fiscal Year 2019 (October 1, 2018 – September 30, 2019)

Purpose

This annual report is a requirement under the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review. The report provides information for peer reviews that EPA conducted in Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 that were subject to reporting under the Bulletin. This report contains up-to-date information as of the date of the report.

Background

On December 16, 2004, OMB issued its Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review. This Bulletin asks all federal agencies to submit an annual report to OMB's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs providing information on peer reviews that were subject to the Bulletin and conducted during the previous fiscal year. The Bulletin establishes minimum peer review provisions for all non-exempt "influential scientific information" and "highly influential scientific assessments." The Bulletin defines "influential scientific information" as "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." A scientific assessment is an evaluation of a body of scientific or technical knowledge that typically synthesizes multiple factual inputs, data, models, assumptions, and/or applies best professional judgment to bridge uncertainties in the available information. The Bulletin considers a "scientific assessment" to be "highly influential" if the agency or OMB determines that the dissemination could have a potential impact of more than $500 million in any one year on either the public or private sector, or that the dissemination is novel, controversial, precedent-setting, or has significant interagency interest.

For the purposes of this annual report, a peer review was considered completed if the peer reviewers' final comments were received during FY2019, regardless of whether the Agency has completed the response to the comments or incorporated revisions based on the comments into the final product. This annual report includes the peer reviews identified by the EPA offices as having met the Bulletin's definitions for "influential scientific information" and "highly influential scientific assessments".

More information on the Bulletin can be found in the EPA's *Peer Review Handbook, 4th Edition* at https://www.epa.gov/osa/peer-review-handbook-4th-edition-2015.

I. Summary Page for Department (if Applicable)

Section I is not applicable.

II. Agency Report

GENERAL INFORMATION

Agency U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Agency Contact for Implementation of the Peer Review Bulletin

Name and title: Maria Doa, Director, Science Policy Division, Office of Science Advisor, Policy and Engagement, Office of Research and Development

Email address: doa.maria@epa.gov

Phone number: 202-566-0718

URL for Agency's Peer Review Agenda http://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_pr_agenda.cfm

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 – No
- Link from Information Quality home page – Yes
  http://www.epa.gov/quality/epa-information-quality-guidelines
- Link from science, research, or regulatory pages – Yes
  - Science Inventory Home Page http://cfpub.epa.gov/si/
- Other (please describe) _____

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

INFORMATION ABOUT REVIEWS CONDUCTED

Number of peer reviews conducted subject to the Bulletin in FY 2019: 8

Number of influential scientific information peer reviews (ISI) (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 7

List the title of each ISI. Indicate whether the Agency's response to the peer reviewer's final comments has been completed (Y/N)

Office	Title	Agency response to peer review comments Completed
OAR/OTAQ	EPA Technical Report on Aircraft Inventory and Stringency Analysis	Y
OCSPP/OPPT	EPA Draft Risk Evaluation of Colour Index (C.I.) Pigment Violet 29 (PV29)	N
OCSPP/OPP	Evaluation of a Proposed Approach to Refine the Inhalation Risk Assessment for Point of Contact Toxicity: A Case Study Using a New Approach Methodology (NAM)	N
OCSPP/OPP	Proposed Guidelines for Efficacy Testing of Topically Applied Pesticides Used Against Certain Ectoparasitic Pests on Pets	N
OP/NCEE	Concentration-Response Functions for Lead and Cardiovascular Mortality	Y
ORD/NCEA	IRIS Toxicological Review of Tert-Butyl Alcohol (tBA) (External Review Draft, 2017)	Y
ORD/NCEA	IRIS Toxicological Review of Ethyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (Etbe) (External Review Draft)	Y

Number of highly influential scientific assessments (HISA): 1

List the title of each HISA. Indicate whether the Agency response to the Peer Review Report has been Completed (Y/N)

Office	Title	Agency response to peer review comments Completed
ORD/NCEA	Integrated Science Assessment (ISA) for Particulate Matter (External Review Draft)	Y

1. Provide the titles of ISIs and HISAs 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.*
Not Applicable.

2. 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)? 0

3. Number of peer review panels that held public meetings:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 5
Number of HISAs: 1

4. Number of peer review panels that allowed public comment:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments): 5
Number of HISAs: 1

5. Number of public comments provided on the agency's peer review plans during FY 2019, regardless of whether the peer review was actually completed during FY 2019: 0

6. Number of times agency specifically solicited peer reviewer nominations from professional societies: 1

If such nominations were solicited, were any recommendations provided? Yes