

SAB CHEMICAL ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 3, 2013
Robert Fensterheim

IRIS Forum

Previous Comments to SAB

- *Development of Charge Questions*
- *Making the Process More Interactive*
- *Composition of CAAC Review Committees*
- *SAB Involvement in All Phases of the IRIS Development Process*
- *SAB Oversight on the Overall Quality of IRIS Assessments*
 - *As we anticipate that non-FACA ad hoc, independent panels will continue to review some of the IRIS assessments, we believe that general oversight of that process by the new SAB committee could ensure more uniformity in quality and nature of all of the peer reviews of IRIS assessments.*
 - *Committee should seek to provide oversight/guidance for the overall IRIS program, both in terms of how peer reviews are conducted as well as to enhance the quality of the scientific assessments themselves.*

Steps to Develop Assessment and Charge

NCEA

1. Circulate draft IRIS assessment for comment
Circulate draft Charge Questions (CQ)
2. Organize Stakeholder Engagement Session
(A few Lead reviewers for CAAC selected; may want to start paying attention)
3. Comments received from stakeholders
4. Revise draft IRIS and CQ; provide to SAB for Peer Review

SAB/CAAC

5. *Announce peer review; circulate draft IRIS and CQ for short (e.g., 30-60 day) public comments*
6. *Prior to Peer Review, revise CQ to ensure key science issues raised and augment Panel so that key science issues adequately represented*
7. ***Peer Review draft/Submit Peer Review report to NCEA and public***
8. NCEA provide “Response to Comments/Path Forward” to CAAC
9. CAAC (and Stakeholders) review “Path Forward” and provide supplemental feedback (if warranted) focused on the Peer Review
10. NCEA revise/finalize IRIS Assessment

Augmented Chemical Specific Peer Review Panels

CAAC should think creatively about ways to increase throughout

- Goal: All IRIS assessments are of comparable quality
- If CAAC does not review draft, peer review will be done by “ad hoc” non-FACA, contractor led (typically ~6 people) and of varying quality

Recommendation:

- Involving ALL (most) CAAC members in first few reviews makes lots of sense to lay the foundation for subsequent reviews
- Robust Panels will likely be needed for most chemicals “stuck” in the Middle of IRIS Pipeline. Robust Panel likely not needed for all
- Tailor size of Panel to needs of the assessment
 - Decide on number and expertise based on areas of controversy
- Develop guidance (and oversight) for all draft IRIS peer reviews, including non-CAAC peer reviews



STAY ENGAGED!