

Peer Review Plan for the Species Status Assessment Reports – Chipola Slabshell (mussel)

About the Document

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service intends to seek peer review of species status assessment reports for the following species:

Title: Draft Species Status Assessment Report for the Chipola slabshell mussel.

Estimated Timeline of Peer Review: 2021

Determination: This report will inform a [5-year status review](#) to ensure that the listing classification of a species as threatened or endangered on the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants (List) (50 CFR 17.11 – 17.12) is accurate. A five-year review does not automatically change a species' protections or status, it only presents recommendations. Any change to a species' federal status requires a separate rulemaking process which is published in the Federal Register, which is open to public comment, and subject to peer review.

About the Peer Review Process

In accordance with our July 1, 1994 peer review policy (59 FR 34270), the Service's August 22, 2016 Director's Memo on the Peer Review Process, and the Office of Management and Budget's December 16, 2004 Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review, we, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) will solicit independent scientific reviews of the information contained in our Species Status Assessment Report for these species. The purpose of seeking independent peer review is to ensure use of the best scientific and commercial information available and to ensure and to maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of the information upon which the report is based, as well as to ensure that reviews by recognized experts are incorporated into the Species Status Assessment process.

The Service will request peer review from three or more independent experts. We will consider the following criteria.

- **Expertise:** The reviewer should have knowledge of or experience with the species biology, habitats in which they occur, and/or threats to the species.
- **Independence:** The reviewer should not be employed by the Service. Academic, consulting, or government scientists should have sufficient independence from the Service if the government supports their work.
- **Objectivity:** The reviewer should be recognized by his or her peers as being objective, open-minded, and thoughtful. In addition, the reviewer should be comfortable sharing his or her knowledge and perspectives and openly identifying his or her knowledge gaps.
- **Conflict of Interest:** The reviewer should not have any financial or other interest that conflicts or that could impair his or her objectivity or create an unfair competitive advantage. If an otherwise qualified reviewer has an unavoidable conflict of interest, the Service may publicly disclose the conflict.

While expertise is the primary consideration, the Service will select peer reviewers (considering, but not limited to, these selections) that add to a diversity of scientific perspectives. We will not be providing financial compensation to peer reviewers. We will solicit reviews from at least three qualified experts.

The Service will provide each peer reviewer with information explaining their role and instructions for fulfilling that role, the Species Status Assessment Report, and a conflict of interest form. Peer reviewers will be asked to comment specifically on the quality of the scientific information and analyses and whether the best available information was used or relied on in the document; identify oversights, omissions, and inconsistencies; provide advice on reasonableness of judgments made from the scientific evidence; help ensure that scientific uncertainties are identified and characterized; provide advice on the overall strengths and limitations of the scientific data used in the document; and inform us of any scientific information that we did not use. Peer reviewers will be advised that they are not to provide advice on policy.

Peer reviewers will provide individual, written responses to the Service. Peer reviewers will be advised that their reviews, including their names and affiliations, will: (1) be included in the administrative record; and, (2) be available to the public upon request once all reviews are completed. We will summarize and respond to the issues raised by the peer reviewers in the final document. The final document is typically expected to be published on the regional website within 1 year of the Federal Register Notice of Initiation of a 5-year status review for the species.

About Public Participation

This peer review plan is made available to allow the public to monitor our compliance with the Office of Management and Budget's Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review. The SSA along with the final document will be made available to the public through a direct email to interested parties and posts on Service websites. If appropriate, the Service will publish a final listing and designation of critical habitat following consideration of all comments received from the public.

Contact

For more information, contact:

Chipola slabshell: Maureen Walsh, Panama City Ecological Services Field Office, telephone 850-769-0552, email: panamacity@fws.gov.