

Instructions for FY'13 Report pursuant to the Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review

As you prepare your report, please ensure that the Peer Review Agenda (the Agenda) includes plans for the foreseeable future¹ 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 bureau/office responses should also be posted. An example of good practice is the Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service² agenda.

Please use the attached template to record peer reviews conducted pursuant to the Bulletin between October 1, 2012 and September 30, 2013 for your bureau/office. Please make sure to report **current URLs for your peer review agenda**. Also, please ensure that your peer review agenda is up to date and all of the links on your bureau/office 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 report.

To ensure consistency across bureaus/offices, 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.

Bureaus/Offices 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. The agencies to which this applies are listed at http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/inforeg_agency_info_quality_links/. The template for the appropriate disclaimer is shown below:

¹ 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).

² http://www.aphis.usda.gov/peer_review/peer_review_agenda.shtml.

“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.”

Please send your *draft* Peer Review Bulletin Annual Report by **COB January 24, 2014** to Vany_Kaiser@ios.doi.gov and Edwin_McCeney@ios.doi.gov. If you have any questions related to the Peer Review report, please contact Vany Kaiser (Vany_Kaiser@ios.doi.gov or 202-208-3387) or Edwin McCeney (Edwin_McCeney@ios.doi.gov or 202-208-3321).

**Template for FY'13 Report pursuant to the
Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review**

I. Agency Report

GENERAL INFORMATION

Agency _Fish and Wildlife Service, DOI_____

Agency Contact for Implementation of the Peer Review Bulletin

Name and title: Richard A. Coleman, Senior Science Advisor

Email address: rick_coleman@fws.gov

Phone number: 3030-236-4443

URL for Agency's Peer Review Agenda

__http://www.fws.gov/informationquality/peer_review/index.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,
- Link from Agency Information Quality home page,
- Link from science, research, or regulatory pages (please specify)
__Science/policy/peer review_____
- Other (please describe) _Agency webpage: Science/policy/peer review
then scroll down to map of regions: peer review agendas
links_____

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

__yes_____

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

Continue to Next Page

INFORMATION ABOUT REVIEWS CONDUCTED

Number of peer reviews conducted subject to the Bulletin in FY'13. (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) 21

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.

- (1) Proposed rule to list Four Subspecies of Mazama Pocket Gopher as Threatened and Propose to Designation of Critical Habitat (Y)
- (2) Proposed rule to List Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly as Endangered and Streaked Horned Lark as threatened and Propose the Designation of Critical Habitat (Y)
- (3) Proposed Designation of Critical Habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl (Y)
- (4) Revised Critical Habitat Determination for the Comal Springs dryopid beetle, Comal Springs riffle beetle, and Peck's Cave amphipod (N)
- (5) Listing Decision for the Rosemont Talussnail (N)
- (6) Listing Decision for the Zuni Bluehead Sucker (*Catostomus discobolus yarrowi*) (N)

- (7) Draft Gulf Coast Jaguarundi (*Puma yagouaroundi cacomitli*) Recovery Plan (N)
- (8) Listing Decision for the Northern Mexican Gartersnake (*Thamnophis eques megalops*) and Narrow-headed Gartersnake (*Thamnophis rufipunctatus*) (N)
- (9) Listing Decisions for the the Sharpnose Shiner (*Notropis oxyrhynchus*) and Smalleye Shiner (*Notropis buccula*) (N)
- (10) Listing Decision for the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse (*Zapus hudsonius luteus*) (N)
- (11) Proposed Revision to the Nonessential Experimental Population of the Mexican Wolf (N)
- (12) Proposed Designation of Terrestrial Critical Habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean Distinct Population Segment of the Loggerhead Sea Turtle (*Caretta caretta*) (Y)
- (13) Proposed Endangered Species Status for *Physaria globosa* (Short's bladderpod), *Helianthus verticillatus* (whorled sunflower), and *Leavenworthia crassa* (fleshy-fruit glaucous) and Designation of Critical Habitat (Y)

(14) Proposed rules to list the Florida leafwing (*Anaea troglodyta floridalis*) and Bartram’s scrub-hairstreak (*Strymon acis bartrami*) butterflies as endangered and to designate critical habitat (Y)

(15)) Proposed rules to list *Brickellia mosieri* (Florida brickell-bush) and *Linum carteri* var. *carteri* (Carter’s small-flowered flax) as endangered and to designate critical habitat (Y)

(16) Endangered Species Act (ESA) Listing Decision for Diamond Darter (N)

(17) Endangered Species Act (ESA) Listing Decision for Red Knot (N)

(18) Proposed Listing of the contiguous United States Distinct Population Segment of the North American Wolverine on Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife with Special Rule And Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of the North American Wolverine in Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico (Y)

(19) Listing evaluation for the Kittlitz’s murrelet – biological section (Y)

(20)) Rapid Screening of Species Risk of Establishment and Impact in the United States (N)

(21) Bayesian Network Model for Invasive and Injurious Species (N)

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>Title of Document</i>	<i>Type of Document</i>	<i>W, D, E, or A</i>
i) Waterfowl Population Status Report 2013	ISI or HISA (HISA)	(and duration) W (annual)
ii) Adaptive Harvest Management 2013 Hunting Season Report (HISA)	(HISA)	W (annual)
iii) American Woodcock Population Status 2013	(ISI)	W (annual)
iv) Mourning Dove, White-winged Dove, and Band-tailed Pigeon Population Status 2013 (HISA)	W (annual)	
v) 2013 Update to the Federal Falconry Regulations (ISI) (E)		

vi) 2013 Status and Harvests of Sandhill Cranes (ISI) W (annual)

vii) Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2013–14; Final rule (ISI) (E)

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) _____

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) _____

Number of HISAs __0__

Number of peer review panels that allowed public comment:

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

Number of HISAs __0__

Number of public comments provided on the agency's peer review plans during FY' 13, regardless of whether the peer review was actually completed during FY' 13 __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 ___