

FTS-OD-OAM

December 16, 2005
12:00 p.m. CST

Dr. M. Jackson Hello. This is Morgan Jackson. I'm at the Center for Complementary Alternative Medicine, the host for the conference call and also the contact for the program announcement (PA).

I'd first like to do a destination check. This is the telephone conference call and application information meeting for PAR-06-075, [Collaborative CAM Research Development Capability Enhancement Grant at Minority-Serving Institutions \(R03\)](#). Despite the name, it provides funds to plan future complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) research projects.

At this site, the staff include myself, Dr. Peter Kozel, a Program Analyst; Dr. Marty Goldrosen, NCCAM's Director of Scientific Review; Dr. Dale Birkle, a Scientific Review Administrator; Dr. Sheila Caldwell, a Program

Analyst; and Ms. Anita Green, NCCAM's Outreach Coordinator. Dr. Lori Donze, also a Scientific Review Administrator is on the call as well.

As you know, eligibility for this PAR is limited to minority serving institutions (MSIs) defined as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), and Alaskan Native- or Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions, either in the United States or in territories under U.S. jurisdiction.

We have scheduled the conference call for approximately one hour. The purpose is to provide general background information and answer questions about the PAR and CAM research, as well as NIH and NCCAM policies. A transcript of the call will be posted to the supplemental information Web page associated with this PAR (<http://nccam.nih.gov/announcements/planning-grant.htm>). After this introduction and a bit of background, the agenda will continue with general grantsmanship pointers and grantsmanship resources on the Web, some of which will be available on the supplemental information page to the PAR; special considerations for this PAR and CAM research; , I'll talk a little bit about NCCAM policies, although won't go into great detail

because the policies regarding the conduct of CAM research at NCCAM will be more appropriate to subsequent conversations; we'll close with a question and answer period. I'm re-emphasizing that a transcript will be available because I tend to talk fast and will apologize in advance, but I think that the more useful part of the call will be to answer questions you might have, so I'm intending to limit my remarks to 20 minutes. The transcript should be available in about two weeks and will be posted on the Web. For people who do not have Web access, we will provide a hard copy.

That being said, I wanted to go over some general grantsmanship resources that currently are available on NCCAM's Web site (under additional information for PAR05-152,, and in the future will be linked to the site for this with this program announcement. You currently can find these resources is on the "More Information" link on NCCAM's Web site associated with PAR-05152 (<http://nccam.nih.gov/announcements/disparitiesPAR.htm>); scroll to the bottom of the page and you'll see an area called "Resources for Applicants."

First I'd like to review the list of grantsmanship resources and sample applications on NCCAM's Web site. A document from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease (NIAID) called All About Grants (<http://www.niaid.nih.gov/ncn/grants/default.htm>) has extensive information on a range of activities associated with grant applications. There are several resources there, including information on basics of NIH grant application (<http://www.niaid.nih.gov/ncn/grants/basics/index.htm>), how to plan a grant application (<http://www.niaid.nih.gov/ncn/grants/plan/index.htm>), how to write a grant application (<http://www.niaid.nih.gov/ncn/grants/write/index.htm>), checklists for applicants and grantees (<http://www.niaid.nih.gov/ncn/grants/charts/checklists.htm>), as well as extensive supplemental materials to the tutorials (<http://www.niaid.nih.gov/ncn/grants/charts/default.htm>).

There are two other documents that are slightly shorter and will provide an easier way of getting a handle on the grant review process. One is the NCCAM Tips for New NIH Research Grant Applicants (<http://nccam.nih.gov/research/tips.htm>), which is on the NCCAM Web site. Another one with a broad overview is from the National Institute of

Diabetes, Digestive and Kidney Disease, called Writing a Grant
(http://www.niddk.nih.gov/fund/grants_process/grantwriting.htm) .

There is also a technical checklist from the National Institute of
Neurologic Disorders and Stroke, NINDS, called Writing a Grant
Application
(http://www.ninds.nih.gov/funding/grantsmanship_checklist.htm).

One item to which I want to call your attention in particular is an archived
document that is Video of Dr. Anthony Coelho that are recorded
presentations that he's given regarding Scientific Peer Review and also
Grant Writing for Success, each of which is about one and a half to two
hours (http://ora.stanford.edu/ora/ratd/nih_04.asp). These are on the
Stanford University Web site, but Dr. Coelho is with the Office of
Scientific Review at NIH. In addition to the videos there are PDF files for
his handouts (http://ora.stanford.edu/supporting_files/peer_review.pdf;
http://ora.stanford.edu/supporting_files/grant_writing.pdf), both of which
are excellent. I will mention parenthetically that before coming to NIH,
Dr. Coelho had a remarkable record of success in submitting grant
applications to NIH. As you know, the best way of learning how to do
things is to listen to people who've done them well. I encourage you
strongly to view his videos and learn from them.

The Office of Extramural Research also has grant writing tip sheets (http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/grant_tips.htm) and the Center for Scientific Review has the video of a mock peer review meeting to give you a sense of what the application review process will be like once the application comes to NIH (<http://cms.csr.nih.gov/ResourcesforApplicants/InsidetheNIHGrantReviewProcessVideo.htm>).

That was a bit skeletal. Are there any questions at this point before I go forward to the special considerations for this PAR? If not, what I now want to do is to call your attention to the special considerations for this PAR. This PA is different from others that NIH has issued and most of the other PAs that NCCAM publishes in particular because it is a planning grant. It is not a research grant. As such, there are several specific components that are articulated in the program announcement to which I would like to call your attention.

This program announcement is for small grant applications. The purpose of these applications is to assist investigators of minority serving institutions (MSIs) in collaborating with investigators at research

experience institutions (REIs) to develop research capability and undertake focused collaborations in complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) research. The goals of the PA are to increase the CAM research capability at MSIs; assist investigators at MSIs in preparing CAM research project grant applications; stimulate research on CAM and health disparities; establish productive research collaborations between investigators at MSIs and investigators at research experience institutions; as well as diversify the CAM research community. This mechanism provides support for up to two years and up to \$50,000 in direct costs per year to encourage and foster research collaborations that will lead to the submission of a competitive R21 or R01 grant application for collaborative CAM research within one year of completion of the planning grant.

There are several requirements for this particular planning grant application. The applications are required to include letters from one or more potential collaborating investigators at REIs with whom the subsequent R21 or R01 CAM related research project grant will be submitted as a result of the collaboration and also identify potential projects to be under taken with the collaborators. Successful applications

may lead to joint CAM research projects in any area of basic clinical, behavioral, translational, or health services research.

The \$50,000 direct cost limit requires use of a modular budget.

MSIs which are eligible are Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), and Native Hawaiian – and Alaska Native-Serving Institutions. Eligibility for this program announcement is limited to those institutions. I checked the list of registrants on this conference call and to my knowledge all of the people who registered are at minority serving institutions, but I need to caution individuals with whom you might share the information about this program announcement that we do need to be clear about the eligibility criteria and application from an ineligible institution will be returned without review.

REIs (REIs), as articulated in the program announcement, are defined as those institutions in the top 100 on the list of institutions all receiving research from NIH

(<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/award/trends/rnk04all1to500.htm>). If an applicant institution – the MSI -- identifies an institution that is not in the top 100 please contact us to get permission to submit an application for

collaboration with that institution. What I will say is that we used that list as a proxy for institutions that had received in 2004 approximately 100 NIH grants and so you can use that as a metric for the amount of experience that an institution has had in identifying collaborators.

M Is NIH itself included on those 100 institutions?

Dr. M. Jackson NIH is the awarding component and so, no, it is not.

M Okay. So I should look for somebody outside. It cannot be from NIH.

Dr. M. Jackson Correct. NIH is a component of the Department of Health and Human Services in the federal government that arguably is the largest biomedical research organization in the world. The budget is about \$27 billion and it awards about 85% of those monies to institutions around the world to conduct biomedical research.

There is a URL embedded in the program announcement that will take you to a list of institutions receiving grant funds from NIH. Because we're attempting to encourage the development of research capability at

minority serving institutions we've limited the pool of collaborating REIs to the top 100.

Is that clear?

M Yes.

Dr. M. Jackson There are several special components of this program announcement to which I'd like to draw your attention. The following information is found in Section Three: Eligibility Information, Item Three: Other Special Eligibility Criteria.

There must be letters of commitment from the MSI leadership and the collaborating REI leadership that are fully supportive of this collaboration. Those letters need to detail or include a specific statement detailing the percent effort of release or protected time that the principle investigator at the MSI will receive. In addition, the principle investigator at the MSI has to provide a minimum of 15% effort on the project.

The letter also needs to provide information on the activities from which each faculty member involved in the project is being released. It also

needs to assure the provision of space and facilities for the new project. Each application must evidence a partnership between the MSI and the REI.

The application should describe how the activities of the MSI and REI both differ, as well as complement each other in achieving the common objective. We conceptualize two components of the project; an initial research development stage and a priority setting stage for selecting the areas of greatest promise. Additional information about these is contained in the program announcement.

If the application includes participation of American Indian, Alaskan Native, or similar populations, a formal letter of support for the study is required from the Tribal nation leader or equivalent authority.

The application receipt date is February 14, 2006, which means that the application has to be received by NIH by that date. There are circumstances under which the application only has to be postmarked by that date, but these applications have to be received by that date.

There are some components of review that I think it's useful for people to be aware of: If you have experience with NIH's usual review process, in addition to the usual criteria regarding significance, reviewers will be asked to consider the merit of a proposed project as it relates to the goals and priorities of the partnership.

Regarding the approach: In addition to the usual criteria, reviewers will be asked to look at the strength of evidence at the researchers and faculty at the MSI and the REI are working closely; that there are provisions made for day-to-day oversight, coordination, and support, as well as logistical services. They will look for documentation of the process used in identifying areas ready for prioritization, as well as the adequacy and duration of the initial research development stage needed to identify areas of potential collaboration.

In terms of innovation, reviewers will be asked to consider the objectives, design, and the direction of the project.

In terms of investigators, in addition to the usual criteria, reviewers will be asked to consider the appropriateness and adequacy of the principle investigator, faculty, and scientists identified from the MSI and the REI, as

well as CAM practitioners, if included, that contribute effectively to each aspect of the project.

In terms of environment, the reviewers will be asked to consider the degree to which the letters of support from senior faculty or institutional leaders evidence institutional commitments to assure the success of the collaboration. Please note: If the principle investigator from the MSI is considered a junior faculty member, then it will be necessary for the application to include letters from senior leadership at the MSI indicating a mentoring plan for the junior faculty member to assist him or her in developing their capability to conduct this type of a search.

Those are the major points that I had wanted to cover. Please take a look at the list of NCCAM's priorities that are on our Web site (<http://nccam.nih.gov/research/priorities/index.htm#5>). Of the priorities you'll notice that several areas are mentioned as priorities and some areas are mentioned as those for which we are entertaining a short "pause." A short pause is being entertained for a variety of reasons, mostly that substantial investments already have been made in those areas and we are waiting for the results of those research investments to determine whether or not it's appropriate to move forward. So, the absence of an item from

the list does not mean that it is not a priority; the ones that are mentioned are higher priority than others.

Now I did receive some questions that I'll answer before opening up to other questions you might have.

Q1: I have reviewed the list of projects funded for 2004 and 2003 from the NCCAM Web site. Is this list the list to be used identification of a potential REI selection or could an REI from another NIH institute be considered?

A1: There is a specific link that identifies the rank ordering of institutions in terms of the dollar figure of funding they receive from NIH (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/award/trends/rnk04all1to500.htm>). That is the list that we used to identify a research experience institution. Those institutions have received funding from across NIH, not necessarily from NCCAM and not necessarily in CAM research. The inclusion of an institution in the top 100 institutions on that list means that an individual from that institution who is interested in CAM research would be an appropriate partner.

NCCAM's Web site lists projects funded for 2004 (<http://nccam.nih.gov/research/extramural/awards/2004/index.htm>). This is a useful list from which to determine NCCAM areas of interest in general. There is a database called CRISP, Computer Retrieval of Information on Scientific Projects (<http://crisp.cit.nih.gov/>), that is a searchable database of all the projects funded by NIH from which you can get abstracts on projects on NCCAM's list. NCCAM's list unfortunately is not searchable.

Q2: Is the application for PAR06075 expected to be a research grant, a planning grant or some combination of the two?

A2: Applications for PAR06075 are exclusively planning grant. It is important, however, that information about an intended research project be described in good detail in that application, but funds will not be allocated for the conduct of research in this planning grant.

Q3: Realizing that the budget depends on the uniqueness of each grant application, is there a suggested monetary ratio in the budget consideration and/or recommendation for the REI contribution?

A3: The answer is no.

Q4: Is the application for PAR06075 required to be submitted electronically?

A4: It is not required to be submitted electronically this round, however, electronic submission is possible. There is an entire domain of information inferred in that question which I'll only touch on: NIH is in the process of converting to exclusive electronic submission of grant applications. For this round of this PA, paper or electronic applications are acceptable, using the PHS form 398.

This program announcement will be reissued as a new program announcement sometime in the spring. It is intended to have three annual receipt dates, the first of which is February 14, 2006, the second two are February 14, 2007 and 2008. For the two subsequent receipt dates in 2007 and 2008 electronic applications be required. Only electronic applications will be accepted and they must use the new SF standard form 424. With this conversion to electronic submission there hopefully will be considerable technical assistance to assist institutions in understanding the new process for applying for NIH grants.

Q5: In as much as there is a short turnaround for PAR06075 grant submission, what level of communication is suggested between the grant applicant and the NCCAM office?

A5: NCCAM is available to provide technical assistance, but that necessarily is limited. So, for example, we do not engage in recommendations regarding potential collaborators for a variety of reasons. I also recognize that with the short turnaround it's entirely possible that institutions will have more options available for the second and third receipt dates than for this first receipt date. NCCAM staff can discuss the applicability of projects intended as outcomes for the planning grant and where they fit in NCCAM's priorities. Staff also can discuss the structure of the planning grant in general. We're not in a position to review or to take a look at a draft application because that gets involved in second guessing the review committee which is not a useful undertaking.

There are some parameters of an R03 that I should mention that differ from the R01 or R21 applications. The R03 application has a ten-page limit for what is usually called the research plan, but for the purposes of this program announcement we are calling it the "Development Capability Enhancement and Collaboration Plan," under section four, item six, the detail is given about the component of the application for this program

announcement that are different from the standard research plan of the PHS398 and the components that need to be included there. I had mentioned the two-year limit, \$50,000 direct cost per year and the modular budget.

Those are the points that I wanted to share. So that we don't have another government talking head experience, we're open to questions that potential investigators might have.

J. Falco This is Jim Falco. How many awards do you expect compared to previous years?

Dr. M. Jackson Well, we haven't done this before and so it's hard to say. Because this is a program announcement and not a request for application, funds have not been set aside for awards through this program announcement. The mantra that NIH uses is that the amount of funding available will depend upon the number of meritorious applications received.

M What, who would be the program officer to contact in the making of the proposal?

Dr. M. Jackson I'd be the person to contact for that, Morgan Jackson. My phone number is (301)-402-1278, Morgan Jackson. My e-mail is mj145m@nih.gov. I need to mention that I will not be in the office between December 25th and January 2nd, otherwise I will be in the office and will try to get back to you as quickly as possible. I prefer to use e-mail to answer simple questions and to set up appointments for telephone conversations because I find e-mail failingly linear and it's frequently more useful discuss anything more than a simple yes/no question.

Dr. Birkle (NCCAM) I have a question: As an applicant I would be a little confused about this research project part of this application because it appears this is a planning grant and a major part of it is priority setting, yet the instructions talk about outlining a research project and you mentioned that as well. So, can you tell them what level of detail you would expect in the outline of a research project or are you thinking more of just identifying an area that they might focus in?

Dr. M. Jackson I hear the question and part of it will be determined by the review committee in terms of looking at the applications. I think it will be important that there be sufficient detail about the project for the reviewers to determine that the people who are identified as collaborators on the

project have the necessary skills to undertake the work. I would say that it does not need to have great detail, but the application does need to identify a process for identifying those projects and some information about what will be undertaken in the project. I don't know if that answers your question.

Dr. Goldrosen (NCCAM) When Dr. Jackson and I were actually working through this initiative, we had the idea that applicant organizations would be at different levels of ability. There would be people starting off with very, very little research experience. There would be people who could come in with an idea that has, for lack a better term, body to it. So, a lot depends on where you are as applicants in terms of how much detail you should provide.

The bottom line is that everyone should be able to paint a global picture of the area in which you propose to work. Then, depending on the degree of collaboration you have, you may be able to give more detail, but we don't expect you to provide, say, specific aims of the proposed research project. That goes beyond the context of this PA. We are more interested in you telling us in what area you want to work and what are the resources you need to undertake competitive work in this area.

Dr. M. Jackson Also, the planning grant application needs to indicate with whom you plan to work.

Dr. Goldrosen Correct.

Dr. M. Jackson Let me mention, for people who might not be aware of the subtlety of the distinction between the applicant and the investigator, the applicant is the organization -- the institution at which you work. You all would be investigators.

The reason I make that point is this grant is not transferable and this circumstance is slightly different from other grants at NIH. If an investigator were to leave an institution, in this case, the grant could not be transferred with him or her.

J. Miranda I have a question. This is Jorge Miranda from Puerto Rico, the University of Puerto Rico. The deadline for submission I heard was February 14th?

Dr. M. Jackson 2006, correct.

J. Miranda And when would the funds be awarded?

Dr. M. Jackson The earliest anticipated start date would be December 2006. The application receipt date is February 24th. Peer review would occur in June and July 2006. The Council review, which is a secondary level of review for grant applications, would be in September or October of 2006 and the funds would be available in Fiscal year 2007, around December of 2006.

W Hello, I'm trying to understand -- do we have to identify an investigator from an REI?

Dr. M. Jackson I don't intend to be patronizing, but the example I use is that if your child were to come to you and ask you for a couple of dollars, you might be willing to give it to them. But if s/he were to come and ask you for \$150 you would want to know in exquisite detail what they were planning to do with it. The federal government likes to have a turnkey operation where all you have to do is add money and get a result. So, in that regard the applications that will be most successful will be the ones where an investigator at the REI was identified. The application itself needs to evidence the level of collaboration between the investigator at the REI as well the principle investigator at the MSI. That's one level.

At the second level, however, the PA says that there is a requirement for letters of support from the leadership both of the MSI as well as the leadership of the REI assuring that the resources such as space, time and other resources will be available to the investigators for this project should a grant be awarded.

W In terms of the investigators from the MSI, would you prefer junior faculty or more experienced investigators?

Dr. M. Jackson We don't have a preference. It is important to realize that the environment in which we're functioning is extraordinarily competitive. NCCAM funds about 17% of the applications that are received -- that it's somewhere between one in six applications will be successful. So, a well-prepared application from a junior investigator that has very good information in detail about the mentoring plan available at the MSI might do better than a poorly-prepared application from a senior investigator at an MSI, all other things being equal.

W Okay, thank you.

Dr. S. Bannick Sandra Bannick here from Cal State University Fullerton. I have three questions for you. One is, is it possible to use this money to generate preliminary data?

Dr. M. Jackson The relevant section is section four, part five called funding restriction, which identifies the pre-award cost as well as the allowable cost it does not include funding for preliminary data. It includes administrative costs for managing the design and development of collaborative partnership such as salaries, travel for key personnel, equipment and supplies to support an administrative structure, appropriate training costs for research or administrative personnel and developmental costs for both the initial research developmental stage, for workshop seminars, retreats and other forms of communication strategies to explore potential opportunities and research collaborations and the priority setting stage for selecting the areas of greatest promise for implementation as a research project for a subsequent R21 or R01 application.

I'll mention that for R21 applications, preliminary data are not required. If they are available, the reviewers of the subsequent grant will look at them, but generally the R21 applications are considered exploratory

developmental and do not require preliminary data. Did you want to say something?

Dr. Birkle I just wanted to point out also the budget is only \$50,000 a year. So, it doesn't leave very much money when you consider that some of that needs to go for salary support.

Dr. M. Jackson You had two other questions.

Dr. S. Bannick Yes, I was interested to know how many potential investigators you have signed up currently and also about more than one application per institution or per investigator.

Dr. M. Jackson The receipt date for letters of intent is January 16, 2006. Even after that date we're not allowed to tell you how many letters of intent come in or how many applications come in. So, regrettably I can't share that information.

Dr. S. Bannick Are you anticipating a very large number?

Dr. M. Jackson My crystal ball is not working today.

Dr. S. Bannick All right, and about submitting more than one application, is it per institution or is it per investigator.

Dr. M. Jackson As it says in the executive summary of the PA, applicants, and this is where I was making the distinction, the applicant is the institution not the investigator, applicants may submit more than one application provided they are scientifically distinct. In terms an investigator submitting more than one application it doesn't say. But I tell you, this is extraordinarily competitive. We fund 17% of the applications received. I don't know whether you want an investigator should split his/her time by submitting more than one application.

Dr. Goldrosen The other thing is that these applications will be reviewed by the same study section and effectively you will be competing against yourself by submitting two applications. Generally it works against an applicant if they have two applications under the same review because in part the committee will ask what are they actually interested in doing, if there are two different choices, as opposed to what is their real interest. I wouldn't recommend submitting two applications.

W Is it possible for an applicant to submit an application for REI and also involve, say, an external research center or clinic as part of that application?

Dr. M. Jackson Let me see if I understand the question. You're asking if an MSI could collaborate with both an REI as well as a chiropractic clinic?

W I guess the project, a future project would involve some research with the chiropractic clinic.

Dr. M. Jackson Yes, that is possible. I heard you say one of the projects. With the amount of funds available for the planning, I might be concerned about an attempt to conceptualize more than a single project for an R01 or R21 or attempting to submit multiple applications out of this single planning grant. So, technically it would be possible, but I again would be concerned about an investigator deluding his or her efforts.

W Let me ask another question. As part of that REI contribution, could someone from the REI help and assist in training at the minority institution?

Dr. M. Jackson Yes. There is a section in the PA: Section four, item five, funding restriction says the small grant award will provide support to define the research to be proposed, solidify collaborative relationships and increase understanding between research partners, assess current research needs and develop and initiate plans to address these needs so that the proposed subsequent research project can be successfully and appropriately conducted and identify training and other capacity building activities for both the institutions as well as PIs.

Hello, do the collaborators have to be from the same institution if you have more than one collaborator?

Dr. M. Jackson I would say no.

Dr. Goldrosen The only thing I would add is that you have to be able to demonstrate that there is effective communication if you were working among multiple institutions.

W Okay. Here's another question. Now, you said that the REI has to give 15% commitment, can that come from two different investigators who say they're going to give 7% and 8%?

Dr. M. Jackson Actually, I was not clear. Let me repeat what I thought I said because what I just heard you say is different from what I thought I said. What I was saying and it is in the program announcement -- the MSI must release the principle investigator to provide 15%. In terms of percent effort from the REI, it is my experience that reviewers look at the percent effort of both key personnel and investigators. It is important that the investigators identified as key personnel on the project have appropriate time and effort commitments to the work that they will be contributing to the project. So, it would not be in your interest to have 15 people at a research experience institution each giving one percent.

W Does that have to be the salary commitment also?

Dr. M. Jackson No.

W Okay, because \$50,000 doesn't go far.

R. Sethi How do you characterize an REI? Based on the college type or the general listing? When you go at the link it says NIH medical colleges.

So, should I go to the general list or can I go to the specific list like medical colleges and the top 100 from there?

Dr. M. Jackson Yes, it's the top 100 of all institutions. I see that under the rankings there is a ranking for medical schools, but I was talking about all institutions. So, no, it does not have to be a medical school.

R. Sethi But if my school is in, like the one I want to collaborate with is the list of medical schools, like it's list 96 or something like that, but when I go to the general list they are far below.

R. Sethi I'm looking for the Loyola University ... School of Medicine Illinois and I think that's number 96 in the medical schools.

Dr. Kozel On the main list, Loyola University of Chicago is number 165.

M Yes, but in the other list, in the medical schools, if it's not 96 it might be, it's smaller than 100, it's a better number, it's something like maybe 86 or something. What I'm saying is that which list do I go with. If I go with the general list then they are 165 so they are not considered eligible, right?

Dr. M. Jackson It's number 89. Let me say this, I mentioned at the beginning and it's worth repeating, so I don't mind repeating it, that we use the cutoff as the top 100 as a proxy because we want to define institutions that were experienced. I see that Loyola University of Chicago has 86 grants from NIH. We were using the institutions in the top 100 ranking to identify institutions that had received approximately 100 grants from NIH figuring that institutions that has received 100 grants from NIH had a reasonable research enterprise ongoing and also reasonable amount of experience in managing NIH research grants.

R. Sethi Okay.

Dr. M. Jackson What I would say is that in this case I would need to ask you, because we have specified this in the PA, I need to ask you to send me an e-mail describing the work that you're interested in doing and provide information about the capabilities of Loyola University as a collaborating institution which we could then review and provide a response. I would expect that we would be able to permit it, but I would just need to take a closer look than I can now.

Dr. M. Jackson We intended to use the all institutions ranking, but I did not provide the specific link to the all institutions ranking because that ranking is for the fiscal year 2004 and we were concerned that the link would become outdated after the 2005 or 2006 rankings became available.

What happened here was we provided a link to this page that says awards and in view of the fact that somebody accurately went to the page that we referenced, I feel that we need to give potential applicants the benefit of the doubt and be willing to consider other interpretations to the language we developed than that which we intended.

W If they're choosing something that's in the top 100 of medical school rankings, they may need to get in touch with you.

Dr. M. Jackson They may or may not because in terms of the top 100 I won't be able to immediately foresee how much overlap there is between medical and the all institutions list. But taking a quick look, 100 grants at medical institutions goes down to about number 75 or so, approximately. Other question?

R. Sethi A quick one. I had misinterpreted the time of joining. In regards to what exactly like for the herbs or the alternative medicine are you looking at something which is recent or which is currently being used?

Dr. M. Jackson I'm not sure I understand the question.

W He's asking about our priorities.

Dr. M. Jackson One of the points is that NCCAM does have on its Web site a list of priorities that identifies the areas which we have identified as being ones on which we want to focus. That's the first thing I want to mention. The second thing I'll mention is that in terms of the herbs, I didn't go into the policies regarding conduct of botanical research because it will not directly impact on this grant application although it will be material to the subsequent project. I'll say, yes, NCCAM is interested in identifying mechanisms of action of a range of botanicals. Botanical research is extraordinarily challenging and people need to be very knowledgeable about what they're doing and assemble expert research teams in accomplishing that. I'd be happy to talk with you about that more offline, but that would not be the subject of this particular grant application.

R. Sethi So, I'm missing something here. This application you're looking isn't this CAM?

Dr. M. Jackson It's a planning grant to provide the opportunity for an MSI to develop an application for research in CAM to submit to NIH as the next activity, but the funds for this R03 planning grant are limited to administrative activities associated with developing a collaboration that will undertake the research later on.

R. Sethi So this is just a planning stage.

Dr. M. Jackson That's what it says.

W May I have the name of the individual you were just talking with because we may have some area of interest overlap?

Dr. M. Jackson If he's willing to give it to you.

R. Sethi Who is that?

W Dr.(??) from ...State University in Georgia.

Dr. M. Jackson She was asking, sir, if she could have your name because she might want to be in touch with you.

R. Sethi Yes, my name is Rajat Sethi. Do you need my phone number?

W Yes.

R. Sethi (361) 593-4275.

W What's the institution?

R. Sethi It's Texas A&M.

W Thank you.

R. Sethi Thank you.

Dr. M. Jackson Let me mention that one of the things I want to do and I am aware that collaborations are challenging especially in circumstances where money is tight. I, in a previous position, had the opportunity of experiencing a

process that was undertaken to identify potential collaborating institutions. I will be exploring the possibility of doing that... we might be able to post on our Web site investigators from research experience institutions who would be interested in collaborating with MSI investigators. My initial foray in doing that are preliminary and so I can't assure that. As I said before, I recognize that this is a very short turnaround time for this round, but I'm hoping that by people being aware of it they'll start thinking about exploring the possibilities of collaborations such that they'll be able to have a stronger applications for the subsequent two rounds.

R. Sethi Yes, that will be helpful because I'm from a minority institution and then when you talk about we are finding the top 100 rank, then it might not be somebody in your network. If NIH could give a list then that would help.

Dr. M. Jackson Right. Another question? We're at one hour. If people have any other questions we can answer them, otherwise we probably should close.

R. Sethi Thank you, sir. I will try calling you after giving an e-mail.

Dr. M. Jackson Okay, anybody else with questions?

W Thank you.

Dr. M. Jackson Thank you very much for participating. We'll try to post the transcript to this in about two weeks and we'll do our best to embed the links for all of the URLs that I mentioned in the transcript.

The letter of intent receipt date is January 16th. I will emphasize that letters of intent are optional. They are not required. If you submit a letter or intent you're not required to submit an application and you're not required to submit a letter of intent in order to submit an application. The purpose of the letter of intent is to give us some idea of the number of applications we can expect and the subject of the applications so that we can get some idea of the amount and the types of expertise that will need to be available in order to review.