eCGAP Focus Group

Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2004
Time: 9:00 –11:00 p.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, Room 2198
Moderator: Jennifer Flach

Next Meeting: Monday, December 20, 1:30 p.m.–3:30 pm., Rockledge 1, RM 2198

Action Items

1. (Jennifer Flach) Take discussion about how to integrate OPDIVs' workflow with NIH workflow format to outside group and share outcome with the eCGAP Focus Group.

2. (eCGAP team) Work on accomplishing some type of notification by the February/March timeframe so ICs and Review Groups have sense of workflow coming their way. Work on long-term plans for integrating workflow plan for OPDIVs.

3. (Sara Silver) Check on how Receipt & Referral staffers know that they are in the three-day lag period.

4. (Jennifer Flach) Follow up with Commons staffers to see why AHRQ (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality) information cannot be viewed in Commons.

5. (All) Review revised electronic corrections feature list and send comments back via email.

6. (All) Review group purpose statement and roster and send comments/changes back via email.

Workflow in the absence of paper

Jennifer Flach asked how people will be notified (now that more and more electronic applications are being submitted) of the workflow when there is no paper to trigger various steps. The group also raised several additional questions:

- o Will there be e-notifications to the mailbox of the Grants Management Officer (GMO) like those received for electronic Streamlined Non-Competing Award Process (eSNAP) T5s? Will there be such notifications for the ICs that are just secondary?

- o Is there a flag in IMPAC II designating an application as electronic, as is the case with eSNAP T5s? If so, will there be a reporting tool that can list the electronic Competitive Grant Applications for an IC? Should eRA be urged to develop one, like the T5 image report (a cool tool developed by Tim Twomey that lists all Type 5 applications received, whether images are in and whether they are available in the grants folder)?

Janna Wehrle stated that when an application comes in, especially a new one, it has to be coded with Program Class Codes. She asked how ICs would be notified that these applications exist and that they need to be coded. Sara Silver noted that it could be done through e-notification at the

time of release of application by Receipt and Referral. This feature is not presently available but is clearly needed.

Sandy Karen stated that HRSA (Health Resources and Service Administration) already has a built-in system of e-notification. When an application comes in, it is housed in a central place and people get notified based on the activity code that particular application falls under. Ellen Liberman noted that at their institute, they have a referral officer who gets the initial notification; he makes the first cut and decides to which program director the application goes. He emails the program director, who then codes the grant image.

Richard Panniers suggested that when an application goes to Receipt and Referral, an e-notification is needed for Integrated Review Groups (IRGs) so that they know what to expect from R & R. He noted that IRGs have two days to respond to R&R. In addition, Scientific Review Administrators also need to be notified; otherwise they will be running around trying to find paper copies. Ellen Liberman stated that this was a transitional problem; a permanent fix would be some type of system that would generate a list of applications coming in.

Sara Silver said that the eCGAP team would work on accomplishing some type of notification for the February/March timeframe so that ICs and Review Groups have a sense of the workflow coming their way. Jennifer stated that they could look at different options and if e-notification is not possible in the short-term, they could look at making reports available.

Sara stated that eRA does have a flag in the database to indicate e-applications, but the flag is not in the right place. She also noted that there is a three-day lag period built into the system after the referral officer refers an application, to allow for R & R staffers to correct any mistakes before the application is formally released from R & R. Suzanne Fisher asked how would a R & R staffer know that they are in that three-day period. Sara stated that she would check on that.

In response to a question about whether eRA had selected a workflow engine, Sara noted that eRA was considering a prototype Oracle Workflow Tool. George "Skip" Moyer asked if the workflow system would be able to accommodate other OPDIVs who do not follow the NIH workflow format. He noted that AHRQ followed the same workflow model as NIH but OPDIVs like SAMHSA (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration) and HRSA processed grants differently. The question is whether NIH has to change drastically or OPDIVs have to become compatible. Jennifer noted that NIH could work with the OPDIVs, instead of just doing it the NIH way, by getting an idea early on as to where the differences lie and trying to fill the gaps. She stated that she would take this discussion about integrating OPDIVs in the NIH workflow system to an outside group and share the outcome with the group.

Action: **(Sara Silver) Check on how R & R staffers know that they are in the three-day lag period.**

Action: **(eCGAP team) Work on accomplishing some type of notification by the February/March timeframe so ICs and Review Groups have sense of workflow coming their way. Work on long-term plans for integrating workflow plan for OPDIVs.**

Action: **(Jennifer Flach) Take discussion about how to integrate OPDIVs' workflow with NIH workflow format to outside group and then return to share outcome with the eCGAP Focus Group.**

eCGAP priorities

The group resumed their discussion from the Nov. 16 meeting on ranking eCGAP priorities. Sara distributed a handout (view Type of application/volume) indicating volume of applications received for each grant type to enable the group to use it as a guide for determining priorities. Jennifer noted that the group had already listed appendix and consortia and subcontracts as high priorities.

o Sara noted that eCGAP would accept one simple appendix PDF per application. The appendix is not part of the verification process because it is not part of the grant image; it is a separate object in the grant folder. A few group members indicated that when an appendix comes in electronically, they would like the ability to pull out portions of the appendix and toss irrelevant pieces away before sending the appendix to review. Tom Tatham noted that given the potentially large size of appendices, even CDs would become unwieldy. Edward Myrbeck suggested having the appendix on the Web as a download. Suzanne said there is a reluctance to shift the burden of printing copies or CD burning to reviewers.

o A member noted that Academic Research Enhancement Award (AREA) grants constitute a small number and come from institutions that probably have one every five years and should not be a high priority.

o Suzanne stated that Fellowships and Career Awards are NIH's future applicants and should be roped in early. Sara noted that eCGAP cannot do fellowships presently because the PHS 416 form is not in place.

o The group noted that some other Rs could be included such as R34s (clinical planning grants) and R18s without much difficulty. Suzanne noted that because R18s are Research Demonstration and Dissemination projects, one would not get many until eCGAP develops the consortium feature.

o Suzanne said that U01s would catch a lot of RFAs. However, they would not be modular, but full budgets.

o As for G07s and G08s, only the Library of Medicine uses them. Structurally, these applications are like R01s. However, these applications form a very small pool.

Skip said that he received a call from a person who stated that he could not see AHRQ information in Commons. Jennifer stated that she would follow up on the issue with the Commons people.

Action: (Jennifer Flach) Follow up with Commons staffers to see why AHRQ information cannot be viewed in Commons.

Miscellaneous

Follow up on corrections—Jennifer stated that the revised feature list of electronic corrections will be sent out to the group. She urged them to review the list and send back any comments via email so the feature could be considered finalized.

Discuss format of minutes— Jennifer asked if the group was comfortable with the current format of minutes. David George asked if names of members had to be used. Jennifer stated that it is very helpful to the eCGAP team to know where comments and suggestions are coming from. Suzanne stated that she wanted more thorough editing of the minutes to make the discussion seem more neutral. Jennifer stated that they would continue with the same style of minutes but also send it out to members for review so they feel comfortable before the minutes are posted on eRA's website.

Future topics

- o **Workflow**

- o **Reports**—Suzanne stated that she would like to see applications tracked on screen from first contact to breakout to referral and onwards. Jennifer said that suggestions for types of reports that people would like to see would be beneficial to eCGAP so they could customize reports.

- o **Outreach**—Edward Myrbeck suggested a Frequently Asked Questions page on what is happening with the eCGAP mission. Suzanne also suggested that eCGAP hold a demonstration at a retreat for SRAs.

Finalize group purpose statement and roster—Jennifer requested the group to review the group purpose statement and roster and send their feedback via email.

Action: (All) Review electronic features correction list and send comments back via email.

Action: (All) Review group purpose statement and roster and send comments/changes back via email.

Review of action items from Nov. 16 meeting

1. (eCGAP Team, Communications branch) Develop a single sheet of frequently asked questions about electronic submission of grants that NIH staff can refer to or distribute. *Will follow up with Planning, Communications and Outreach Branch chief.*

2. (eCGAP Team) Follow up with the Service Providers to find out why some applications were rejected by the PI/SO in the October/November pilot. *Waiting for information from the Service Providers.*

3. (eCGAP Team) Give applicants for Feb. 1 receipt date until Feb. 4 to verify. For those who revert to paper, their applications need to be received by NIH by Feb. 9. Give applicants for Mar. 1 receipt date until Mar. 4 to verify. For those who revert to paper, their applications need to be received by NIH by Wednesday, Mar. 9. *This plan was presented to the service providers and will be posted on the eRA website.*

4. *(eCGAP Team)* Term the process of opening up eCGAP for submission of simple modular R01, R03 and R21 grant applications in January as "open submission" rather than "production." ***Done.***

5. *(Sara Silver)* Compile list of application volume received for each grant type, so group can use it as a guide for determining priorities. ***Done.***

6. *(eCGAP Team)* Compile a list of priorities for eCGAP and the eRA eXchange based on this discussion. Solicit input from Commons Working Group and Service Providers and incorporate into a running list of priorities. ***Discussed this with Service Providers who will send us their rankings. Emails have been received from some service providers. Will be getting the list out to the Commons Working Group soon before the CWG meeting in January.***

7. *(Sara Silver)* Compile a list of institutions that submit grant applications, so the group can prioritize based on what would be helpful to those applicants. ***(Sara Silver, Jennifer Flach) There are about 30-31 institutions. Will follow up on getting that list to group. This list is going to be posted on the eRA website.***

8. *(All)* Review draft purpose statement for eCGAP Focus Group and suggest changes, if any. ***Review via email.***

9. *(All)* Send availability for regular eCGAP Focus Group meetings to Manju Subramanya ***Done. Two eCGAP meetings will be held every month. First meeting will be held from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. on the first Tuesday of the month; second meeting will be held from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. on the third Monday of every month.***

Attendees

Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)

Flach, Jennifer (OER)

George, David (NIBIB)

Goodman, Michael (OD)

Liberman, Ellen (NEI)

Karen, Sandy (HRSA)

Maurer, JJ (OD)

Moyer, George (Skip) (AHRQ)

Myrbeck, Edward (NIAMS)

Panniers, Richard (CSR)

Silver, Sara (OER)

Sinnett, Everett (CSR)

Swain, Amy (NCRR)

Subramanya, Manju (LTS/OD)

Tatham, Thomas (CSR)

Wehrle, Janna (NIGMS)