

Charge to STAC regarding review of substantive changes to WTC Health Program *Policy and Procedures for Adding Non-Cancer Health Conditions to the List of WTC-Related Health Conditions*

Background: At the direction of the Administrator, the WTC Health Program Science Team evaluates the scientific evidence for or against adding a condition to the List of WTC-Related Health Conditions (the List) pursuant to the criteria described in the *Policy and Procedures for Adding Non-Cancer Health Conditions to the List of WTC-Related Health Conditions (Non-Cancer P&P)*. The Administrator may take a range of actions as a result of the Science Team’s evaluation of the evidence. In general, such actions depend on the weight of evidence supporting a causal association between the health condition in question and exposures to 9/11 Agents. In preparing their evaluation of the evidence for the Administrator, the Science Team characterizes the weight of evidence as establishing one of five evidentiary categories:

1. The evidence supports that the causal association is substantially likely;
2. The evidence supports a high likelihood of a causal association;
3. There is limited evidence of a causal association;
4. The evidence is inadequate to draw any conclusion on a causal association; or
5. There is substantial evidence against a causal association.

Statement of the problem: The WTC Health Program has revised the *Non-Cancer P&P* to more clearly define the five evidentiary categories. An expanding research agenda has resulted in significant gains in the available scientific information and epidemiologic studies of 9/11-exposed populations and, as a result, a more rigorous description of the evidence supporting causal inference is needed in the *Non-Cancer P&P*. The revisions to the *Non-Cancer P&P* to clarify the weight of evidence categories and thresholds for Administrator actions are considered substantive and therefore are being brought to the STAC for input.

Revision Purpose: To clarify the weight of evidence categories used in the Science Team evaluation as described in the *Non-Cancer P&P*.

Charge to the STAC:

1. Does the revised language under Section IV.B. adequately clarify the five weight-of-evidence categories used for grading a causal association by the Science Team: (i.e., substantial likelihood, high likelihood, limited or inadequate likelihood; and no likelihood)?
2. Are the evaluation criteria established for each weight-of-evidence category clearly defined, reasonable, and appropriately linked to an action?