

Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission

A. Justification

1. The collection of data is necessary to support the process of updating individuals personal information who review applications submitted for grant funds. Experts are used to evaluate the applications and the data collection is done to support the Peer Review System (PRS) database that is queried to identify experts.

There are legal requirements that necessitate this collection. For reviewers used to evaluate applications submitted under Part D. of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, H.R. 1350), the law indicates that "peer review panels" shall include, "to the extent practicable, parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, and persons from diverse backgrounds" (Sect. 682(b)(2)(A)(ii)).

2. The information is used by the peer review contractor to:
 - Identify potential reviewers who would be appropriate to review specific types of grant applications for funding;
 - Provide background information on each potential reviewer; and
 - Provide information on any reasonable accommodations that might be required by the individual.
3. The peer reviewers currently receive the form from the logistics contractor in their competition packet mailed to them before a peer review. Respondents will be able to complete and submit the form on-line or submit to the contractor during the review.
4. The data on this form are not duplicated on other forms. This form replaced four forms previously in use to collect data on potential peer reviewers.
5. This collection of information does not involve small business or entities.
6. If this information is not collected, there will not be a systematic process for updating and recruiting well-qualified reviewers or for identifying them for specific panel reviews. At any time, approximately 30% of the individual files contain data that are out-of-date, such as old addresses, employers and phone numbers. Without a useful database, it would be necessary to contact individual staff members for suggestions. This is both ineffective and inefficient.

The initial data collection was done in October - December 1997. Our experience is that essential contact information needs to be updated at least every two years. Our existing database is to be updated biennially. As soon as this data collection is approved, the plan is to begin the process of asking respondents to update their data.

7. There are no circumstances which would cause information collection to be conducted in any of the manners stipulated.
8. The notice has not been published in the Federal Register yet. This collection will be conducted in a manner consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.5.

9. We pay each reviewer honorarium and cover any travel cost required.
10. There are no statements assuring confidentiality.
11. There are no questions of a sensitive nature.
12. The burden to the respondents annually is 1,250 hours. This estimate is based on each of 2,500 respondents annually spending 30 minutes to complete the form. Since the form will be used biennially to update data in the system, 2,500 is the annual number of respondents (50% of the 5,000 names in the database).
13. None
14. The annualized cost to the Federal government is through payments to the peer review support contractor for the following data collection activities.

Labor		
Data entry	150hrs@\$10.58	1,587.00
Systems adm.	80hrs@\$17.31	1,384.80
Management	40hrs@20.77	830.80
	40hrs@38.46	1,538.40
Fringe and overhead		4,112.20
Subtotal		9,453.20
Materials		5,000.00
G&A and fixed fee		<u>1,846.85</u>
Total		\$25,753.25

15. The results of this data collection will not be published.
16. The expiration date for OMB approval of the data collection is displayed and can continue to be displayed on the form.
17. There are no exceptions noted in the certification statement.

B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods

This collection does not employ statistical methods.