

Identifier: **SOP-4005**
(formerly EP-ERSS-SOP-4005, R0)

Revision: 0



Effective Date: 1/16/2009

Next Review Date: October 15, 2013

Environmental Programs

Standard Operating Procedure

for **PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

Subject Matter Expert:	Organization	Signature	Date
Sandra Martinez	WES-RS	Signature on File	11/4/2008
Quality Assurance Specialist:	Organization	Signature	Date
Laura Ortega	QA-IQ	Signature on File	12/11/2008
Responsible Line Manager:	Organization	Signature	Date
Dwain Farley	WES-RS	Signature on File	11/18/2008

Title: Peer Review Process	No.: SOP-4005	Page 2 of 11
	Revision: 0	Effective Date: 1/16/2009

1.0 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This process guides staff in conducting peer reviews and identifying review requirements and reviewer responsibilities. The peer review process also ensures that management is in alignment with key decisions, such as readiness for work or submittal of critical documents.

Peer reviews are performed by qualified technical personnel with sufficient independence to ensure that criteria, assumptions, methodology, and conclusions are appropriate for a given document.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND PRECAUTIONS

2.1 Background

There are **four** types of peer reviews:

Decision—A review that occurs before document writing has begun, or at the key decision phase, and that focuses on the appropriateness of the stated objectives for the identified problem, adequacy of the proposed approach to address the objectives, and identification of concerns and necessary contingencies. This review occurs as a panel review only.

Document—A review of a completed draft of a document that focuses on clarity of presentation and approach and on consistent, appropriate format and content. This review may be in the form of a panel review or a read review.

Panel—A review that includes a meeting with the author and the reviewers to discuss issues (may be a decision or document peer review). A document will not be provided for a decision review. Comments from the meeting must be recorded.

Read—A review of the written document that each reviewer conducts individually without meeting as a group.

The peer review draft is a version of a document that has received a quality pre-peer-review edit and composite with comments provided to and incorporated by the author. This draft is considered the “best available draft,” includes all pertinent sections for a thorough review, and shows “Peer Review Draft, date” in the header of the document.

2.2 Precautions

The following procedure is the responsibility of the project leader and/or author and peer reviewers.

Provide at least seven (7) working days for review and comment for documents that are less than 50 pages and provide at least three (3) weeks for review and comment on documents longer than 50 pages. Specify the date that comments must be received by the project leader/author. Documents going through peer review under an accelerated schedule may require a modified peer review (shorter review time and fewer reviewers).

Reviewers should not be directly involved in the specific work that produced the document being reviewed. It may be necessary to include a technical reviewer on the team who is familiar with the project so an independent technical review can be performed.

Comments provided after the required review date will not be considered part of the formal peer review process without prior notification to the project leader/author. If the schedule permits, the project leader/author will be encouraged to incorporate late comments where appropriate, but these comments will be outside of the formal process and will not require documentation of comment/resolution.

Peer review is complete only when all required comments from peer reviewers have been resolved and incorporated, where applicable, into the Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form. Electronic submittals for peer

reviews are preferable. However, the subcontractor must print and provide the appropriate number of paper copies to the document manager if the project leader opts for a hard copy distribution peer review. The document manager will send a peer review notification request to reviewers via email and include the comment form. The reviewer must use this form for all reviews. The author must respond to all reviewer comments, meet with the reviewers to obtain their signatures, and return the completed forms to the document manager.

3.0 EQUIPMENT AND TOOLS

None

4.0 STEP BY STEP PROCESS DESCRIPTION

The following process is used for **all types** of peer reviews.

4.1 Request Peer Review

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Project Leader/Author | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request the appropriate peer review (refer to section 2.1, Background) by completing and electronically submitting the Document Services Request Form to the document manager via the submittal button on the form.

(Note: Obtain the form at http://int.lanl.gov/orgs/wes/docs/internal/editor_compositor.pdf or refer to Attachment 1 of this procedure. Refer to the online document review, approval, and signature matrix [http://int.lanl.gov/orgs/wes/docs/writing/doc_matrix.pdf] to determine who must be included in the peer review.) <hr/> 2. Designate a peer review chairperson and/or technical reviewer.

[NOTE: The project leader/author should not serve as the chairperson or technical reviewer.] <hr/> 3. Prepare a statement of the issues, including pertinent supporting information, to be addressed. Include this information on the Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form. This information instructs reviewers participating in any type of peer review. <hr/> 4. List appropriate personnel on the form: geographic information systems team leader, data steward, ENV-RCRA, legal counsel, quality assurance, U.S. Department of Energy, Authorized Derivative Classifier, SAFE-1, and/or other subject matter experts. <hr/> 5. Indicate which section(s) reviewers should review and comment on, if not the entire document. <hr/> 6. If distribution for peer review is done via hard copy, ensure the subcontractor provides enough documents and coordinate with the document manager to distribute hard copy to reviewers.

(Note: The reviewers will receive the Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form when they receive the peer review email notification from the document manager.) |
|-----------------------|--|

Project Leader/Author (continued) 7. Provide an electronic version of a complete and final peer review draft of the document, including appendixes and attachments, table of contents, and cover page complete with document catalog number (this number is assigned by the document manager) to the document manager.

4.2 Schedule

- Document Manager
1. Receive electronic Document Services Request Form.

 2. Set up the electronic folder that includes the peer review request, draft peer review document, and Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form.

 3. Include the review time frame and the reviewers for the peer review in the document schedule.

 4. Have documents intended for external distribution reviewed by an ADC before it is sent to the Laboratory's classification group.

 5. Draft the e-mail to the reviewers indicating the draft document and comment form are attached.

 6. Include the following information in the e-mail:
 - A brief description of the item/issue to be reviewed or discussed
 - The person receiving and reconciling comments
 - The due date for comments to be received
 - Any special review requirements provided by the project leader/author (refer to the Document Services Request Form)

 7. Allow at least one (1) week for the review unless the accelerated approach has been authorized for use.
 [NOTE: Refer to SOP-4006, Attachment 1, Using the Accelerated Approach.]

 8. E-mail the peer review notification to reviewers (including items mentioned above).

 9. Send a reminder at least two (2) days before comments are due.

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| Project
Leader/
Author | 10. | <p>For decision and panel reviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • coordinate the meeting time and location and e-mail participants, including the document manager; • distribute the information regarding any pertinent issues to reviewers at least three (3) working days before the scheduled review; • prepare a summary documenting the decisions and recommendations within two (2) working days after the meeting and distribute the summary to the reviewers and document manager; • request concurrence of the summary within three (3) working days; • work with the reviewers to address and resolve all concerns and revise the summary as necessary; and • transmit the final summary to the Records Processing Facility (RPF). |
|------------------------------|-----|---|

4.3 Review Proceedings

- | | | |
|----------|----|--|
| Reviewer | 1. | Follow the guidance in the document manager's e-mail peer review notification. |
| | 2. | Read the original document in its entirety (unless otherwise instructed) to ensure technical accuracy and consistency with previous approaches and document types. |
| | 3. | Concentrate on the technical content of the document, focusing on area of expertise. |
| | 4. | Contact the project leader/author with a request for a panel review if a panel review is more appropriate. |
| | 5. | Record all comments on the Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form. Include entries that are informative and that address the issues completely to encourage an effective response to comment(s). |
| | 6. | <p>Ensure comments are incorporated and/or addressed.</p> <p>(Note: Comments not entered on the Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form are not considered mandatory; therefore, the author is not required to address them. Tracked changes in documents reviewed electronically are also acceptable. Editorial comments may be recorded in the margins of the document and returned, along with the form, to the project leader/author.)</p> |
| | 7. | Submit the Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form to the project leader/author. |

4.4 Comment Resolution

- | | | |
|------------------------|----|---|
| Project Leader/ Author | 1. | Resolve all comments as indicated on the Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form.

(Note: Comments require resolution acceptable to the reviewer. Recommendations as they appear on the Peer Review Comment/Resolution, Peer Review Summary Report, or document margins are incorporated as appropriate. The Peer Review Summary Report is the product of the decision peer review [see section 4.2, step 10].) |
| | 2. | Direct any questions concerning issues or comments to reviewer(s). |
| Reviewer | 3. | Concur with the project leader's/author's responses by signing the Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form. |
| Project Leader/ Author | 4. | Concur with the project leader's/author's responses by signing the Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form. |
| | 5. | Submit a copy of the revised document and the completed, signed Peer Review Comment/Resolution Forms to the document manager after all comments have been resolved. |
| Editor | 6. | Provide the edited version to the compositor for final compositing and a quality check. |

4.5 Conflict Resolution Process

- | | | |
|---|----|--|
| Technical Reviewer | 1. | Contact the project leader/author regarding comments that were rejected. |
| Peer Review Chairperson/ Technical Reviewer | 2. | If an issue cannot be resolved directly with the project leader/author, bring the issue to the peer review chairperson/technical reviewer. |
| Division Leader | 3. | Meet with the division leader and the project leader/author, if appropriate. |
| Division Leader and Project Leader/ Author | 4. | Document the decision on the Peer Review Comment/Resolution Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form and return the form to the document manager. |
| | 5. | Continue to complete the peer review process. |

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----|---|
| Project Leader/Author | 6. | Continue comment resolution (section 4.4 of this procedure). |
| | 7. | Transmit the completed Peer Review Comment/Resolution Forms and/or the decision review summary report to the document manager.

(Note: Completed forms include reviewer comments, the project leader/author's resolutions to the comments, and the signature of each reviewer.) |
| Document Manager | 8. | Scan the completed Peer Review Comment/Resolution Forms (all pages) and save each reviewer's comment form as a portable document file (pdf) in the electronic folder.

(Note: The Document Services Request Form and the completed Peer Review Comment/Resolution Forms are included as part of the document package and are part of the submittal to the RPF during final distribution.) |

4.6 Records Management

- | | | |
|------------------|----|--|
| Document Manager | 1. | Submit the following records generated by this procedure to the RPF:

[NOTE: Refer to SOP-4006, Attachment 3, Document Distribution, for administrative authority/regulator document deliverables.] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer Review Comment/Resolution Forms — Project leader/author obtains signatures. Final approved copy of the document is in the publications folder. |
|------------------|----|--|

5.0 PROCESS FLOW CHART

Refer to SOP-4006 for a detailed document development and peer review chart.

6.0 ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: 4005-1 Document Services Request Form (1 page)
Attachment 2: 4005-2 Document Review, Approval, and Signature Matrix (1 page)
Attachment 3: 4005-3 Sample Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form (1 page)

7.0 REVISION HISTORY

Revision No. <i>[Enter current revision number, beginning with Rev.0]</i>	Effective Date <i>[DCC inserts effective date for revision]</i>	Description of Changes <i>[List specific changes made since the previous revision]</i>	Type of Change <i>[Technical (T) or Editorial (E)]</i>
0.0	3/23/07	Major rewrite formerly QP 3.5	T/E
0		New procedure. Supersedes EP-ERSS-SOP-4005, R0.	E

[Using a CRYPTOCard, click here for "Required Read" credit.](#)

If you do not possess a CRYPTOCard or encounter problems, contact the EP training specialist.

ATTACHMENT 1

SOP-4005-1

DOCUMENT SERVICES REQUEST FORM

Records Use only



Document Services Request Form

Submit Form

Request Date: Project Leader:

Author:

Document Title:

Cost Codes: Document Due to NMED/DOE/EPA:

Service(s) Requested:

- Peer Review
- Writer/Editor Proofread Full Edit Hard Copy Edit Online
- Compositor
- Illustrator
- Production Distribution beyond standard

Date to be submitted to peer review: Comments Due:

Peer Reviewers:

S-7 Review: Yes No Legal Review: Yes No DOE Review: Yes No
 GIS Review: Yes No Data Review: Yes No

Document Page Count (text only): **Figures/Maps/Appendixes:**
 No. of pages: _____ No. of Figures: _____ No. of Tables: _____ No. of Appendixes: _____

Distribution Requirements: (specify distribution requirements in comment box below)

Brief summary of request (include request for extra copies):

To be filled out by Document Manager only

Editor: _____	PR Request: Y/N	Draft Letter: Y/N
Compositor: _____	PR Resolution forms: Y/N	Controlled Document: Y/N
QA: _____	ADC Review: Y/N	OOU: Y/N
Doc sig Form: _____	LA-UR #: _____	ERID # (RPF closeout): _____
Doc sig Form: _____	LA-UR #: _____	

ATTACHMENT 2

SOP-4005-2

DOCUMENT SERVICES REQUEST FORM

Records Use only



DOCUMENT TYPES	EDITING COMPOSITION PROCESS	PEER REVIEW PROCESS	Data Steward	Geographic Information System Team Leader	Peer Review Chair/ Technical Reviewer	Quality Program Project Leader	ENV-RCRA ^a	Laboratory Legal Counsel	U.S. Department of Energy Reviewer ^b	Project Leader	Program Manager/ Group Leader ^c	Unreviewed Safety Question Reviewer	Classification	Program Manager DOE	Project Director Environmental Programs (Responsible Line Manager)	Owner/ Operator ^d and Engineering Certification	Associate Director Environmental Programs
Access Agreement	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	X	X	X	X	—	X	X	X	—	—
Administrative Authority—Negotiated Document (Regulatory Deliverable to NMED, DOE, EPA)	X	X	X	X	X	—	X	X	X	X	X	—	X	X	X	—	X
Communication Record (Phone, Email, Meeting)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	X	—	—	—	—	—	—
Correspondence (Internal/External; Notification; Memo)	X	X	—	—	—	—	X	X	X	X	X	—	X ^e	X	X	—	X
Digital Data (Map, Drawing, Photo, Chart)	—	X	X	X	X	—	—	—	—	X	—	—	X	—	—	—	—
Fieldwork Document (FTA, FIP, IWD, SSHASP, WCSF WPF)	—	X	—	—	—	—	X ^{f,g}	—	—	X	—	X	—	—	X	—	—
Financial Document (e.g., Baseline)	—	X	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	X	X	—	—	X	X	—	X
Memorandum of Understanding	—	X	—	—	X	X	X	X	—	X	X	—	X	—	—	—	—
Public Relations Document (Poster, Technical Paper, Press Release)	—	X	—	—	X	X	X	—	—	X	X	—	X	—	X	—	X
Quality Documents (Report/Plan/Assessment/Corrective Action)	—	—	—	—	X	X	X	—	X	X	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Remedy Completion or Closure Plan/Report	X	X	X	X	X	—	X	X	X	X	X	—	X	X	X	X	X
Safety and Security Plan/Report	—	X	—	—	X	X	X	—	X	X	—	—	X	—	—	—	—
Standard Operating Procedure ^h	—	X	—	—	X	X	—	—	—	X	X	X	—	—	—	—	—
Statement of Work/Task Order ⁱ	—	X	—	—	X	X	—	—	—	—	X	—	—	—	—	—	—
Viewgraph	—	X	—	—	X	—	—	—	—	X	X	—	X	—	X	—	—
Waste Document (IWD/SSHASP/WCSF/WPF)	—	X	—	—	X	—	X	—	—	X	X	—	—	—	—	—	—

Notes: X = required; — = not required. Some authorizations do not appear on the document catalog signature form. Author review and approval are required for all documents. All documents to NMED require a Laboratory edit/composite. All final and original documents should be submitted to the RPF.

^a ENV-RCRA review is required only if document (1) is a requirement of the Compliance Order on Consent or the Hazardous Waste Facility Permit or if it includes related compliance information, (2) is a submittal to the administrative authority, and/or (3) includes information concerning solid, hazardous, radioactive, or toxic waste management.

^b DOE review cannot precede internal or (Laboratory) legal review and approval. Obtain an ADC review before documents are distributed to DOE.

^c Signature is required for program manager.

^d Owner/operator certification pursuant to 20.4.1.900 New Mexico Administrative Code, 270.11(b–d) is required for final remedy completion reports and closure plans/reports. An engineering certification is also required.

^e Correspondence with new attachments requires SAFE-1 review for an LA-UR number.

^f Technical reviewers for waste characterization strategy forms/amendments are also the waste management coordinators and EP-Waste Services representatives.

^g Technical reviewer for waste profile forms is the waste management coordinator.

^h Procedures relating to nuclear environmental sites must also be approved by the responsible division leader and the responsible line manager and require an unreviewed safety question (USQ) analysis.

ⁱ Acquisition Services Management (Procurement) is responsible for SAFE-1 review of statements of work and/or task orders

ATTACHMENT 3: PEER REVIEW COMMENT/RESOLUTION FORM

SOP-4005-3

Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form



Part 1

Today's date:

Title of document:	EP Document Catalog #:	Rev. #:
Reviewer's name:	Phone:	Comments due date: (mandatory)
Author's name:	Phone:	Fax:

Return completed and signed forms to the document manager

Part 2 (to be completed by the reviewer and PL/author as appropriate)

Received on (date):			Review completed on:	Signature of reviewer (<i>sign after verifying final resolution</i>):	
Comment #	Location ¹	M/R ²	Reviewer's Comments	A/R ³	Author's Proposed Revision/Resolution

¹ page, paragraph, line

² M = mandatory / R = recommended

³ A = accept / R = reject

ATTACHMENT 3: PEER REVIEW COMMENT/RESOLUTION FORM

4005-3

Peer Review Comment/Resolution Form



Comment #	Location ¹	M/R ²	Reviewer's Comments	A/R ³	Author's Proposed Revision/Resolution

¹ page, paragraph, line

² M = mandatory / R = recommended

³ A = accept / R = reject