Comments for
Program and Grants Management Staff

B4b   Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants

- Streamlining the grants process

- It appears to have been an administrative exercise in response to a small focus groups comments but it does not fit the realities of the NIH institutes and research community practices presently in place

- To enable the processing of more grants with less specialists.

- Reduce review committee time on budget considerations.

- The modular grant process has reduced the time and concerns that reviewers have over budgets during the review meetings.

- Make more money available to new starts in the out years by eliminating cost of living escalations.

- SLOTH ON THE PART OF CSR

- Eliminates "nit-picking" of budget by reviewers, which was often interminable during the review process for grants that were well outside the pay line before 1999.

- Removed Other Support Information from reviewers. However, in my view this was a mistake. Now they just guess. Remove budget detail from the reviewers. This was also a mistake.

- Reduces the burden on study sections so that they don't have to review detailed budgets for appropriateness

- Facilitation of the peer-review process. Restores focus on scientific merit.

- To create the appearance of cutting red tape.

- Saves study section members time in evaluate if the budget is appropriate

- In effect, acts as a ceiling on cost increases

- Places more budget accountability on institutions.

- In response to streamlining initiatives and to accelerate   electronic grants administration, to centralize services. Shorten application to award timeline

- To reduce the focus of some study sections on the minutiae of budgets instead of on scientific worthiness.

- To ease grantee burden in developing application. If fundable they still have to do the extra budget work.

- Although not a consideration when initially implemented, the Modular process should greatly ease the electronic Research Administration (eRA) process for eventual electronic submission of competitive grants.

B4b   Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants

- create incentive for fewer large budget research applications

- Ask of reviewers to concentrate on the science and not in the budget.

- It facilitates PI's preparation of grant applications. It simplifies grantee institutions' grants management.

- In general, modular grants keep the outyear commitments flat, which should, in theory, allow more funds to be available for new awards.

- save investigator's time in preparing detailed budget if not funded.

- Reduce reviewers' evaluation of budget detail

- To eliminate paperwork that is required for a detailed budget. To allow PIs to concentrate on the science rather than the budget.

- To let study section reviewers spend more time evaluating the science and less time on budget matters.

- To facilitate the NIH budget planning process

- To reduce burden on the reviewers' part.

- Easier calculation of out year commitment base

- To accommodate the increased number of grants and the decreased number of personnel staff

- Reduce administrative burden on the applicant (not NIH staff as your questions state). Also, many local institutions still require a detailed budget, so not sure the goal of reducing burden on applicant at local level is accomplished.

- Reduce time spent by reviewers in assessing appropriateness of budget request

- To streamline the process and make it easier on grantee staff.

- Reduce burden on PIs in the budget preparation process

- Reduce burden of preparing applications for P.I.

- They usually simplify budget cut recommendations during the review.

- SAVE ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN FOR APPLICANT INSTITUTION AND PI (FOR GRANTS NOT IN FUNDABLE RANGE)

- Save PI time

- Dispense a significant portion of the increased grant money that came with the doubling of the NIH budget without having to fund much further down (lower percentiles).

- simplicity, flexibility

- FACILITATE REVIEW--THE PRIMARY REASON

- The belief that budgets that were previously submitted were not based in "reality" anyway.

B4b   Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants

- supposedly, it reduced the effort of the PI at the outset

- To reduce the administrative burden on the grantee.

- Yes, by designating a cost level ($250K)that encompasses a large amount of the grants NIH awards, PO & GMS have less information to evaluate on a grant by grant basis. I recall; the time saved by less evaluation on Modular grants was supposed to be applied to Non-modular grants.

- To save time during peer review, and focus reviewers time on scientific content. To save applicants time preparing their application. To reduce the average cost of grants.

- Avoid audits of broken out costs; make applications more compatible with electronic records and submissions; reduce study section comment on budgets and Other Support.

- Down sizing the amount of grants management staff due to changes in responsibility and adding a great deal of responsibility on the grantee

- Reduce reviewers unproductive time reviewing budget line items.

- To reduce the administrative burden on the grantee organization.

- Reduces the burden/staff time for grantees, in preparing the application.

- Focus the attention of reviewers on technical issues rather than budgetary issues.

- Eliminated budgetary negotiations between PIs and NIH Grants Management staff, not program staff. GM staff negotiates awards program staff generally does not negotiate awards.

- Relieve administrative burden on grantee. Inadequate NIH staffing to complete proper analysis.

- makes it easier for the organization

- It was hoped that the study section will focus on the science and not spend time with the details of the budget.

- Institute-specific processing procedure: Programmatic Reduction

- To simplify the budget process, that is more round numbers in NGA.

- To facilitate the budget planning process by having flat outyears

E2b   Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond $250K

E2b   Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond $250K

- Less labor intensive

- Few grants come across my desk that have DC under $250K. Increasing the limit would allow easier processing for grants which are fairly uncomplicated (few to no subs, etc).

- Most of the research grants in our area that come in at the $250K maximum should really be $300-$350K, but a detailed budget is not really needed.

- There seems to be little value added by the extra work and documentation required to process a non-modular R01 award, esp. if it's only minimally over the 250k limit.

- Grants involving single purchase of high cost equipment can be included.

- everyone just puts in budgets of $250,000 under this system

- Due to increases in salaries, costs of equipment, supplies, animals etc. in research I think the limit should be raised to $350,000 - $400,000

- My program involves clinical research. This limit is not sufficient for many clinical research proposals.

- I think it should go to $500.

- 1. RISE IN THE COSYT OF DOING RESEARCH. 2. INFLATION.

- The cost of doing basic research has risen significantly since the implementation of the modular grant process. It is now feasible to imagine a modular scenario up to $500K or $750K. I think the module levels should also be increased to $50 in lieu of $25 to accommodate current scientific cost trends.

- If we are supportive of the modular concept, why limit it to 250K. It either works or it doesn't.

- So more applications can become modular grants.

- $250K doesn't go as far these days as it used to and the $250K limit re-enforces the perception that a typical R01 should cost less than $250 in total costs. Thus if an R01 comes in over $250K, the reviewers feel compelled to cut the budget, even though the total costs may be justified and legitimate.

- $500,000 seems more appropriate.

- Because behavioral research with human subjects is expensive and those types of studies typically cannot take advantage of modular funding

- to keep up with the increase in cost of living and help eliminate administrative time.

- It should be increased to accommodate third party F&A, which often requires a requested budget above the current $250K.

- Raise to $300,000 or $250,000 because of the rising costs of research and health resources.

E2b   Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond $250K

- NIH is funding more grants, for more money, than ever before, but with the same amount or fewer personnel to manage them. Even though future appropriations for NIH may not approach the recent 'doubling' of the NIH budget, it is, and will be, a severe challenge for NIH to continue extending its research objectives while maintaining its fiduciary responsibilities.

- If the limit were increased to $300,000, even fewer non-modular applications would be submitted. Recently, we have received several non-modular applications that barely exceed the $250,000 cap which could be submitted as modular if the cap were increased.

- I feel that since the modular process was developed several years ago, we should take into account inflation and the rising costs of doing research and raise the modular cap (perhaps to $350,000).

- If there a consortium, the F&A for the sub should be excluded from inclusion in the direct costs. $250,000 is not adequate for such an award.

- Increase the cap to $300,000 to $350,000

- It seems too low. I would set the cut-off for modular at about the 75th percentile for the medium R01 award. Then you could really see an impact of modular awards.

- Research costs are going up. The average grant direct cost is 275,000 or so. Investigators and their institutions are responsible. Let's increase to 300,000.

- The rising cost of research is going to make the current maximum level less useful in the next couple of years and we are going to see more non-modular grants. Also, the modular grant process has been so successful, I think increasing the limit to $500k would be reasonable. We have defined $500k as the minimum limit for seeking institute approval before submission of an application, detailed budgets starting at this level would be more reasonable.

- Most R01 applications are requesting more than $250,000

- Because $250,000 is an arbitrary number anyway and costs due to inflation are rising.

- $300,000

- allow for simplicity for larger grants and clinical trials which are more expensive

- should go up to 500k.

- $SUGGEST THAT IT GO TO $300,000 OR MAYBE 325,000 TO BETTER ALLOW FOR MULTI-SITE OR MULTIDISICPLINARY PROJECTS.

- to a maximum of $500K because any dollar amount higher should be more closely monitored.

- If we intend to keep it, let's raise limit to promote uniformity in applications procedures.

- Many grants are in the 250-300k DC range.

- To make it simpler and easy to make an award.

- Science projects more expensive

- They are still grants-in-aid. They are not contracts.

E2b   Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond $250K

- Epidemiology studies usually require increased funds so the modular mechanism is seldom used.

- The "average" R01 budget appears to be closer to $300,000 than $250,000. I recommend changing the modular cutoff to $300k.

- because the average cost of doing research as gone up and more and more grants don't meet the $250K cut off

- This would provide more grants to be eligible for the modular budget format. As the grant application budgets grow, and the amount of grants funded grow annually, we need a streamlined process to allow staff to handle the increased workload. Increasing the modular threshold to $300,000 would aid in this.

- The admin burden is lighter

- we've been working with 250k for years, time to increase

- In some ICs, the average size for a grant is above $250,000 so most of their grants are nonmodular. To gain the benefits in workload, the limit should be raised.

- Personnel costs are now higher and cuts are deeper across the board

- Inflation has driven up costs, so while $250,000 was reasonable several years ago, it no longer is.

- larger grants need to provide detailed budgets for us to provide better oversight and stewardship needs.

- grant in aid mentality

- Given the rise in costs of doing science, a slightly higher limit might be appropriate. I don't think that the detailed budgets are particularly helpful for grants at about $275,000.

- Research is expensive. Inflation will necessitate a new ceiling.

E2c   Keep Modular Grant Limit at $250K

E2c   Keep Modular Grant Limit at $250K

- I am already uncomfortable with modular grants under $250K. A higher ceiling would only make a bad situation worse. I deal mainly with grants > $500K. Modular budgets at that level would be disastrous. Program and Grants Management would be unable to do our jobs properly.

- I am not comfortable with the lack of accountability for budget requests and funding level decisions under the modular grant format, and I would be even more uncomfortable if the modular grant limit were increased. I hear general agreement among NIH staff and members of the scientific community that modular grant budgets have led to rapid inflation of budget requests; this would only get worse if we increase the limit.

- The average costs of our grants increased by $50,000, as our initial policy was not to cut them. The carryovers are huge. And the reviewers rarely consider the proposed budget in terms of what the research might cost. I believe that most institutions have just programmed the maximum into their word processors. I do not think that equipment is taken out of the equation, so we are paying indirects on equipment, too. No, this was not a particularly good idea.

- DON'T LIKE THE WHOLE PROCESS, NOR DO REVIEWERS...THE ONLY GOOD THING BY THEIR LIGHTS IS THAT THEY DON'T HAVE TO PROVIDE THE OTHER SUPPORT PAGES

- This seems like a good upper limit for the size of an AVERAGE NIH grant. Moreover, this administrative limit provides a small incentive to keep budgets at or below this level.

- Modular grants have converted grant budget review into a completely NIH budget driven exercise. It has decreased careful thought about how the dollars are spent. This will only be worse for very large grants. Will the rounding limits increase to the nearest $100K without any clear purpose to the next $100K increment.

- I think this amount is fine. Our program office usually makes a cut from that amount anyway.

- The average cost per grant is already much higher than before the doubling. Wherever the modular cap is set will become the new, higher, modal value requested.

- I think most grantee organizations make investigators work-up a detailed budget anyway so this is not saving them time. I think reviewer's and my jobs are more difficult not having detailed information on the budget.

- $250,000 is a reasonable maximum amount to spend on a discreet project. Larger projects need more scrutiny to see if the higher costs are warranted.

- Higher cost programs require added scrutiny to safeguard against bloated and unreasonable funding requests.

- prefer it not be used

E2c   Keep Modular Grant Limit at $250K

- The modular concept makes sense when the "grant in aid" concept holds true, which is more likely for smaller awards. It would make sense for grant awards less than $100k/year and becomes problematic as the size of the award increases. Increasing the limit will take a concept that can be useful and put it in practice in situations that seems to beg for misuse and misunderstandings. Everyone benefits from justifying costs contained in budgets greater that $250k.

- the PI's see this as a ceiling and they apply for the max - without regard to the science proposed - because their administration tells them too.

- Seems like $250,000 is a reasonable threshold for not requesting the detailed budget information. As stewards of Federal funds I think it in our interest to get detailed information on more expensive grants.

- Seems to become a de facto threshold. I wouldn't like to see average requests increase.

- Most PI's have to do a detailed budget for their institution anyway. Modular grants are not a great idea. Should just make all budgets the same, with detailed budget pages. Good training for PI's.

- Need to review a detailed budget for applications requesting more than $250K direct cost.

- I DO NOT LIKE IT SO WHY WOULD I RAISE THE LEVEL?

- The more detailed budgets at lower levels--the better.

- I believe that this process in raising the cost of grants so do not want it expanded

- A detailed budget requirement forces applicants to think carefully about resources required for their proposal.

- I believe that a higher budget would warrant detailed budget information. The institution would have to come up with this budget regardless so it is appropriate to have them submit for awards >$250,000.

- LARGER PROJECTS ARE MORE COMPLICATED AND NEED MORE FISCAL REVIEW. I DO NOT BELEIVE THAT MODULAR GRANTS HAVE BEEN EFFECTIVE AS IS AND THEREFORE EXPANDING THEM WILL NOT BE EFFECTIVE. THEY HAVE BEEN ONE FACTOR IN DRIVING UP THE MODAL COSTS OF GRANTS.

- In my program, less than 2% request more than $250K so a higher limit would only encourage inflated cost estimates.

- Prefer to see detailed budget.

- To provide stewardship of larger grants, cost analysis is required.

- I don't think modular grants are good. All PIs should submit detailed budgets.

- It's a reasonable amount of money for a project.

- Funding is very limited now, and the cap at $250K helps to reduce requested budget increases.

- Large budgets should provide details

E2c   Keep Modular Grant Limit at $250K

- higher $ require more detail monitoring

- Would want a more detailed budget and other support for larger sized awards.

- PI have choices as to modular or nonmodular grant proposal

- HIGHER BUDGETS NEED MORE SCRUTINY

- Modular grants may be helpful to beginners to save time. However, larger projects would benefit from detailed budget.

- Since the Grantee Institution's routinely shoot for the higher grant module (for example - $201,000 would be $225,000), I think that for anything higher than $250,000 needs to include detailed budgets - and justification. Modular grants routinely detail the consortium costs (total costs for each year) - although the instructions state that, and many times only key personnel are included on the modular budget page with justification (not all personnel as per the instructions).

- Need more detailed information for large grants

- Grantees will request more if the cap goes up and we will have less ability to verify the costs.

- I believe applicants are asking for the maximum amount to begin with and now reviewers have to evaluate if that is justified from the research application without any detailed budgets provided.

- average grant costs will increase which will affect the success rate for funding

- $25K is an adequate budget for majority of basic science projects. Because clinical or clinical/basic projects are usually expensive, budget should be given in detail.

- I feel if the limit is raised the PI will request up to the limit and increase average costs of a grant.

- Applicants will go for whatever the NIH gives as the top figure, irrespective of real needs (I can, therefore I will philosophy)

- This amount seems reasonable since documentation is limited.

- Some PI's seem to be taking the limit as what they should ask for, which sometimes seems more than necessary; raising the limit would encourage even higher requests. Program officers need to see the detailed budget on the larger requests, since usually these are for more complex projects and budgets need to be better justified.

- Because I wish to have better insight into where the $ go when the investment is higher.

- Investigators have the option of sending in a regular grant application.

- Now that the indirect cost is an additional cost to the 250K cap, PI's have more flexibility. Anything higher than 300K without budget justification could get out of control.

- NIH has a responsibility to make sure tax payer dollars are accounted for and modular grants make this a challenge

E2c   Keep Modular Grant Limit at $250K

- Already, the average budget in my portfolio has increased from ~150K to around ~225K. PIs should have to justify budget requests higher than that.

- By in large, applicants will ask for the maximum allowable amount.

- because all of the negative features toggled above would ripple through still more applications and result in higher average award costs and, with shrinking NIH allocations, fewer awards or greater across-the-board reductions

- I would not be comfortable approving budgets that are not detailed at higher award amounts.

- This is a reasonable cap for most research projects. For projects requiring in excess of $250K, I would prefer to see a detailed budget.

- I disagree with the use of modular grants with any budgets.

- $250k Is fine for investigator initiated as long as F&A on subcontracts is not included. I raise the limit on select RFAs where there is no advantage to having categorical budgets.

- Scrap modular grants.   Detailed budgets provide for accountability and, in fact, help evaluate the PI's science and ability to carry out the proposed research.

- I believe that the modular process should be abandoned completely.

- Once the funding levels reach a certain level, I believe more oversight by NIH in the review process is necessary.

- I think it is important the NIH admin staff know how the funds are being used..not for oversight purposes, but to be aware and informed.

- increasing the limit will allow for more inflated cost.

- I believe it would encourage an increase of inflated budgets.

- The limit becomes the ceiling.   Researchers will always ask for the limit.

- Budgets are already inflated. They are inflated due to rounding which is usually up to the next module level and in anticipation of IRG or Council cuts. Increasing the dollar amount will only add to the current dynamic.

- With flattening budgets, we need to control the overall size of awards. PIs tend to bump their budget up to the modular limit, *or* trim a somewhat bigger budget to reach the $250K limit. A higher modular limit would thus encourage higher budgets.

- This is a good cut off--I'd like to see a complete budget for larger projects.

- It will increase cost of grants at time when budgets are tight. PIs will make requested amount the new amount, or a dollar below that.

- It is too difficult to assess the actual cost of the research with the modular budget.

- This would lend further flexibility and a higher level of funding that is not delineated thus, even more is not known about what costs are involved in a particular award.

E2c   Keep Modular Grant Limit at $250K

- I think it would hard to keep track of the amounts requested vs. what was committed and funded.

- At higher levels the budget needs more scrutiny and a scientific evaluation

- The 250K is a good baseline for small, limited grant projects. It has been my experience that PI's (mostly new to NIH) who apply for modular grants have a misconception when they try to apply for larger grants with multiple consortium & have to put a non-modular application together.

- $250,000 seems to be a reasonable threshold.

- The budget is sufficient for vast majority of applications

- The higher the limit, the greater chance there is for fiscal irresponsibility, both by the grantee and NIH staff.

- Modular grants make the budget a "black box." I don't like not knowing what is happening. Raising the limit would make things worse. PIs should be accountable - not given a "pass."

- I think a dollar limit of $250,000 is reasonable. With F&A rates topping 71% at some institutions the total cost of the award can exceed $427,000.

- Would prefer that it be lower.

- When requesting government money, any applicant should have to provide a budget showing how it will be used.

- I don't care of the modular grant process anyway so I would not support an increase in the threshold. I do not feel the benefits are worth what we have to give up in the end.

- The larger the award the more difficult it is for the reviewers to judge the reasonableness of the request; this affects program judgment as well. However, the level should be adjusted periodically for inflation.

- I think $250k is more than sufficient for grantees to manage without seeing a detailed budget.

- This would only result in PIs bumping up their requested $s, further inflating research costs.

- IT SHOULD BE CLEAR FROM MY ANSWERS THAT I SEE VERY LITTLE MERIT IN MODULAR GRANTS.

- THE GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO BE INVOLVED IN BUDGETARY NEGOTIATIONS AT SOME LEVEL. $250k IS A GENEROUS CEILING ENOUGH.

- It would depend on the research study being proposed for investigation.

- I have had very few modular grants (only 1 in recent years) and therefore leave blank those items about which I just don't have the experience to justify a response. I checked "No" here just to have chance to inform you about my lack of experience in this area.

- Amounts higher than the current limit warrant increased scrutiny.

- It could result in grants being even MORE inflated than they are now.

E2c   Keep Modular Grant Limit at $250K

- It's important to see specifically for what the money is being requested.

- I am comfortable with whatever decision is made.

- PIs will ask for more money. The process needs more oversight. If there was more justification required then an increase to 300K would be reasonable.

- $250,000 seems to be an adequate figure

- keep it at 8 modules

- We are already providing $250K without any "real" budgetary information. To go higher would only increase our inability to provide fiscal responsibility/oversight. I still believe it is our fiscal responsibility as Federal employees to provide oversight.

- The modular grant process was a bad idea from day 1, and has produced more bad than good results. It should be eliminated, not expanded.

- This works fine fro small basic grant. Any grant with animals and human subjects should provide a detailed budget.

- The current limit is fine. Actually it should be lower.

- If you go any higher, I think it decreases the financial management.

- Itemized budget for larger amounts would be helpful

- It is a reasonable amount for an average R01. If a PI need to, there is the option to request a higher amount.

- The grantees are not following the modular grant guidelines in providing the minimal amount of information. Grantees of an award of $250,000 can not follow the guidelines, I would hate to jeopardize a larger amount of funds due to their continued lack of adherence to the modular process and possibility lack of institutional controls of federal funds.

- For higher award amounts, I think it is important to review a categorical budget to ensure appropriate designation of funds.

- I think the level is good. It is good "average" figure of most RPGs.

- The line between a 'modular' and a 'non-modular' budget is totally arbitrary. There's no reason for it to be at $250k, but there's no reason to move it either. Moving it would suggest that the limit is associated with some actual grant feature.

- Most clinical research requires greater scrutiny than basic research, and usually costs more than $250,000.

- High budgets should be justified

- need to know budgetary items in greater detail for large grants

- Does not allow proper stewardship of Federal funds. Would not be able to explain these grants to auditors. Grantees seem unable to handle routine administration of grants.

E2c   Keep Modular Grant Limit at $250K

- Cost is not the issue. The PI should show the reviewers what the costs are for the project, regardless of the size of the project.

- As an individual taxpayer, I believe in monitoring and stewardship of Federal funds; however, I recognize that micromanagement is not efficient nor effective.

- To ensure proper stewardship of federal funds I think the modular level of $250,000 is reasonable.

- I think detailed budgets are good for higher DC requested applications.

- Larger grants usually require more oversight to make sure the funds are used appropriately by the grantee to address the research objectives.

E3   **Reasons for Liking Modular Grants**

E3   Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Simplified budget

- Since there are such a large number of these, it simplifies processing and allows getting these out to investigators faster.

- Far easier to award in competing year

- It clearly makes everyone's job easier, albeit less careful. Reviewers blow off the budget discussion, program makes easy decisions based on cost management guidelines, grants management is saved the trouble of doing spreadsheets. However, oversight is lost at each level.

- Slightly reduced administrative oversight.

- Correctly indicates that budget proposals are only rough estimates of research costs. Also keeps reviewers from getting involved with fiscal issues that are sometimes inappropriate in the context of a scientific peer-review (e.g., avoids nit-picking).

- In most cases, grants mgmt reviews are much more streamlined and award processing is simplified.

- nothing in particular. The PI still needs to prepare detailed budgets for his/her own institution, so it is not time-saving for the applicant either.

- Saves "nittering" at the review meeting.

- Less time burden for applicant.

- NON-DETAILED BUDGET

- The easy flow without trying to figure out what's going on with the budget when there is a 1% increase rather than 3% and another category with 2%.

- The ease of the budget analysis.

- Simplified budget preparation on the part of the grantee and no need to have GM and program go over the budget in gory detail before an award is made.

- Its simplicity.

- For the most part, preparing the applications for award is fairly quick.

- It enables speedier processing of awards

- The small amount of paper (size of application) since modular budget page is usually just 1 page).

- simplicity

- Its simplicity, its flexibility.

- VIRTUALLY NONE!

- Simpler, more flexibility

E3   **Reasons for Liking Modular Grants**

- Prior to implementation, the process had already gravitated towards a modular model, i.e., the average cost requested was around $225,000. Reviewers spent their time nit-picking $1,000 requests for travel, for example (rather than $800). Program staff were/are ill-suited to undertake cost accounting practices. In these days of 'big science', why spend time anybody's time this way? Modular awards simplify planning and cost accounting practices at the NIA.

- Ease of review and award.

- Study sections focus on the science and cuts are usually based on deleting aims/experiments rather than "it shouldn't cost that much to do this work"

- Less work for PIs.

- The modular grant application process is terrific!

- The modular grant application process saves time and effort for NIH Staff but probably not for applicants who must still prepare a detailed budget to use if they are funded.

- Easier to review budget.

- Simplicity

- There is not a lot of time wasted by reviewers, program staff, SRAs, and grants management staff evaluating detailed budgets. These people have good ideas of the general cost of the research involved.

- Using the modular grant process does cut down on the amount of processing time, but it doesn't necessarily decrease the grants specialists workload. I think that the use of modules allows for the researcher to provide better estimates of cost.

- simple

- Streamlined.

- Everything. The process decreases my workload considerably while allowing me to focus on other grants management issues.

- Less reviewer and grants management micromanagement. Admission that expenditures in research are unpredictable.

- I was a PI when modular grants were introduced and they are easier for PIs.

- I do like that we do not get bogged down in dollar levels for each person supported by the grant or even for specific categories of cost and that we look at the project and costs as a whole - especially since these are grants in aid and are not intended to fully fund these proposed project.

- Not having the detailed budgets makes review of an application much quicker.

- Not having to complete a cost analysis and handle cost variances in out years makes issuing a competing award very easy.

- Study section recommended reduction by modules saves a bit of time in evaluating and approving the final budget in making an award.

E3   **Reasons for Liking Modular Grants**

- less paper

- not having budgets etc. for all applications. Just in time aspects are good.

- Easier to work up when there are no cuts.

- Simplicity

- places more responsibility for the administration of the grant on the institution.

- I liked the initial concept that modular budgets would be funded at the level that study section approved.

- not having to review a budget

- I like that reviewers know it is ok not to make budget cuts. Some feel that they have to make cuts to show that they have done their job. But when they do make cuts it is much harder because they have to make them in $25K blocks and they usually can't justify the cuts at that level.

- The lack of focus on minutiae

- Suppresses reviewer micro-budgeting of a project.

- Not much. It saves a slight bit of time in making downward budget adjustments

- It seems easier for the applicant.

- With EA and carryover authorities, the modular budget process leaves the onus of budget management with the PI/grantee. We can monitor progress by annual reports, and viewing the PMS drawdowns.

- I can focus on the science. Also, the study section focuses its discussion on the science and this is helpful to me. It avoids lengthy penny cutting discussions and disagreements that occurred in the past at study section. Most important, study section often used to play trade-offs where reviewers with a criticism would vote better score as a compromise and then reduce the budget.

- Ease of processing the grant application for award

- Simple process for PI

- Less emphasis on budget, more emphasis on proposed science.

- It's easier to make recommendations for budget cuts without dealing with all the details.

- It does simplify the entire grant award process.

- When it works, it does save NIH valuable staff time, and it refocuses the review and administration process to the science by eliminating undue scrutiny on budget details.

- PIs are able to focus more on the scientific aspects of their grant application. Particularly helpful to junior PIs conducting secondary analyses and/or post-pilot studies.

- No detailed budget to review

E3   **Reasons for Liking Modular Grants**

- Quick to review and award, it saves valuable time. As a Grants Management Specialist for NCI this factor is very important since we handle a lot of grant in a year.

- Simplify submission of proposal and should help expedite the review process

- Requires less focus on the actual details of the budget but still provides for monitoring appropriateness of budgets for the work to be done.

- Formulaic budget reductions based upon Institute specific financial management goals are easy.

- In theory it removes burden of detailed financial monitoring

- The grants are easier/quicker to award/manage.

- I like the streamlined review process.

- Can reduce burden for grant writer, and can reduce nitpicky disputes about the budget

- Reduces the time spend in micro-analyzing budgets and making small, targeted cuts; reduces a lot of the time spend going over PIs' budgets. A real time-saver.

- Since working here the modular grant process has been in place so I have nothing to compare it to.

- Less budget review.

- Simplicity.

- puts more burden on the grantee organization.

- easy arithmetic

- Ease of preparation for PI. Simple in concept.

- No detailed budget

- In principal seemingly constructive approach; however I am unfamiliar with other approaches taken in the past since I am fairly new (roughly 1 year).

- 'Chunks' of dollars (modules)

- -Simplicity for review
  -No detailed budgets

- I do not like the modular budget

- They are analyzed and released quicker.

- Simplification of the process.

- It does reduce some of the administrative burden.

- Reduced staff time on budgets.

- It saves us time that would normally be spent analyzing the budget.

E3   **Reasons for Liking Modular Grants**

- It has ended the nickel-and-dime discussions of small budget items in study section.

- Facilitate program focus on scientific issues

- SIMPLICITY

- More time can be spent on more complex grant mechanisms, rather than rushing through volume in a given portfolio.

- As program staff in our institute we don't have much of a role in assessing budgets.

- simplicity

- easy to review no problems with grantee rebudgeting

- It reduces the time it takes to review the budgets, the consortium details, and the overall grant in general.

- Appropriate to spend less time reviewing budgets for project unlikely to be funded.

- I like everything about the process

- the SNAP process, where the grant is easy to award on a succeeding year without going into the process of creating another spreadsheet before awarding a grant.

- The budget spreadsheets for the type 1s are certainly easier to do although not interesting. If an eSNAP application is complete and all the snap questions are answered no an award can take just minutes to review. I often do snaps as a way to relax on b

- review process much easier, quicker.

- Time saved in not reviewing a categorical budget. Not escalating is also a time saver.

- The modular grant application process eliminates micromanagement of pending applications and facilities expedited awards, assuming supporting documentation is provided in a timely manner.

- For awards less than $100,000/year, it relieves the burden of budgetary details that are not necessary.

- Easier.

- Overall it is fairly simple and straight forward

- simplicity,

- I like not having a detailed budget. Many times the Grantees' staff do not know how to complete the budget break-downs. Specifically the personnel and Institutional Base salary calculations

- Makes reviewers time more productive.

- Relative to a non-modular, they are easy and quick to complete.

- Less to review and less paper

E3   **Reasons for Liking Modular Grants**

- I like the emphasis on science rather than dollars

- 1) They are less burdensome for the reviewers. 2) It emphasized the fact that budget estimates - no matter how detailed they are - are still just estimates.

- The ease of reviewing and processing the award.

- Reduces reviewers control over research budget

- It seems to be a smooth process for transferring the funds to PI

- The modular grant process allows the submission of very simple grant applications that could expedite the award if the grantee followed up with the IRB approval date, consortium cost breakdown on the checklist, etc.

- The fact I do not have to analyze the detailed budget, it leaves me more time to pay attention to science.

- Processing Progress Reports are faster

- I like the time-saving aspect for both NIH staff and the grantee. The modular mechanism is closer to 'a true grant' then a contract.

- Reviewers seem to spend less time quibbling over trivia such as $1 or 2K for travel.

- Saves time - can get awards out on time.

- Modular grants are normally easier to review and award, etc.

- It is simpler than looking at a detailed budget. It does simplify the review process by not distracting the reviewers. It is simpler to cut the budget; one doesn't have to manipulate numbers to get to the desired total cost.

- Much quicker time to award a grant than with a detailed budget that requires more in-depth analysis.

- less administration prior to award

- The ease and speed with which the award can be made.

- Easy calculation of future year costs.

- It is usually easier to issue a modular grant in a more timely manner which allows the science to start sooner. The spreadsheet takes less time to create as well.

- Saves PI's time

- easier to compute direct cost amounts

- Don't have to second guess budgetary expenditures

- It is simple

E4   Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

E4   Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- In order to do my job well, I have to spend more time/grant to get the details I need to make a decision.

- Grants have to be cut in $25k modules.   Cutting grants may be faster, but inaccurate or inappropriate.

- APPEARS TO COST MORE DOLLARS FOR THE SAME THING SINCE BUDGET REQUESTS MIGHT BE INFLATED.

- PI's calling & saying that they still have to submit a line item budget to their research office so NIH's modular grant concept didn't help them at all....

- that the exclusions from the base on the checklist page is not documented in the application

- Difficulty in discerning how costs were projected

-   HAVE HEARD FROM PIs that they need to do the full budgets in advance anyway. My greatest objection is that Study Sections are not consistent in scoring and can easily delete a module based on incomplete information.

- If an IC has many of these, specialists have little opportunity to truly analyze grants. TRUE Grants Management is lost.

- Not seeing the budget or budget justification and knowing that most of the grantee institutions prepare budgets anyway, even though they are not required. It then seems that the only reason is for the review process. A solution to this would be to separate the budget and budget justification and not provide these pieces of the application to reviewers.

- Lack of detailed budget.

- problems in procedures and differences with non modular, cuts of one module can be scientifically significant

- I don't like reconciling the checklist page with the listed base. You can't always tell what the grantee has excluded from the base.

- Waiting for the JIT information.

- As above, applicants for gov't money should detail how it will be spent. It is not possible for either reviewers or NIH staff to do any better than roughly guess if the amount requested is appropriate. It has overall driven up the per-grant cost. It makes it harder to defend supplement requests, because there is much more room for opinion, rather than facts on the page, to be used to approve or deny these requests. It does not save applicants any time or effort, because they must prepare detailed budgets for their universities anyway.

- Cuts in budget by IRG not adequately justified

- The biographical sketch does not substitute for other support information that is badly needed in review, and by program in preparing for council. Also, the costs should be broken out in major categories so that review can more easily judge the appropriateness of the overall budget. We should not, however, go back to detailed costs.

E4 **Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants**

- Inability to see the estimated costs for various items in the project. This makes it very difficult for reviewers and NIH staff to determine whether the PI is requesting adequate funds for the project components.

- In general, the grantees' and NIH's lack of understanding of the whole process.

- Not knowing how to cut the grant. The grantee not supplying all the needed information.

- No detailed budget

- No clear instruction for how to include additional information for justification of budget items.

- Do not always know how grantees have arrived at F&A base and do not always know if salary funds are included for each individual.

- Would prefer to see other support in the modular grant application.

- Without formal declaration of other support, it makes it harder to check for potential overlap. If the application goes to award, I get that information in follow-up communications but the peer-reviewers may not have access to this more detailed information. Nonetheless, my personal opinion is that cases of true overlap are rare.

- 1. Sometimes grantees do not correctly present costs/information in the modular format. 2. Some grantees complain when proportional adjustments to DC and F&A are made, esp. when consortiums are involved, since those affect F&A calculation. NIH is not consistent in handling these situations but, in the spirit of the modular format this IC handles costs as lump sum and adjusts DC and F&A proportionally. 3. Program staff that try to treat budgets as categorical to maximize F&A calculations, Total Costs and future year costs. 4. Staff adjustments that must be made after an award is issued because the original award level was not carefully considered/negotiated w/ the grantee.

- The lack of a detailed budget and budget justification.

- lack of transparency - who is doing what for how much effort? Why are some activities costing so much?

- We should require the applicant detail what costs are being excluded from the F&A calculation - items outside of subs are excluded.

- Decreased information necessary for the proper oversight of grants.

- SOMETIMES CALCULATING THE F&A EXCLUSIONS CAN POSE A PROBLEM

- abuse of funds by the applicant

- Lack of budget details

E4   **Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants**

- Oversight is being lost at every level. PIs are devoting less thought to what is really needed to do the work proposed. Reviewers blow off the budget discussions at study section. Program makes decisions based on cost management guidelines, rather than scientific needs. Grants management has abdicated most of its oversight role to the institution. If asked by congress, we would be hard pressed to say what exactly how the funds were used by our grantees. It is very difficult to know what resources are applied to which science. There is little basis for deciding whether an administrative supplement is needed or not. It is difficult to determine institutional support for a project.

- The lack of accounting of research costs has led to inflated awards and wasting of research $s.

- Sometimes there is a need to see more information in order to better understand why an amount has been requested.

- gathering information

- The JIT materials often do not come in all at one time and have to be requested again and again.

- Lack of other support pages, lack of detail.

- I don't feel that grants management staff are effective stewards of the Government' money.

- The guess work that goes into the budget analysis.

- it has caused budget inflation

- I believe that detailed budget plan/justification helps not only program staff for management purpose, but also reviewers with information they need to judge the scientific scopes, as well as investigators to plan/operate the logistics of a grant award.

- A grantee's misunderstanding of how to use modular grants; for example, not calculating total or annual budget in 50% or 25% increments of $25K if the full module is not needed. This can cause a real mess in program budgeting, especially when annual cuts are being made.

- Unable to easily track changes in "Other Support." Funding overlap assessments are difficult to perform, and in fact, the importance of this stewardship function seems to have been de-emphasized, at least in my perception. Program staff is uncertain to what extent they should rigorously undertake an assessment of 'duplicate funding.'

- VIRTUALLY ALL. A MISBEGOTTEN IDEA FROM THE BEGINNING.

- When study sections make cuts without a good scientific rationale, there are more steps involved in determining the true costs and the basis for suggested reductions.

- Unfortunately if you are new to grants management you do not get the benefit of learning about complex cost analysis until you are higher up in grade. The modular is like training wheels - ok for a short period of time but if you are going to go anywhere fast they need to come off. The same in grants management, a specialist needs to either have a compliment of complex awards to balance the modular or move from modular to non modular before GS-12.

- I would like to see justifications for animals and supplies etc.

- CAN NOT TELL WHAT IS GETTING THE MONEY

E4   **Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants**

- When there are problems with the grant, it's nearly impossible to determine what sorts of budgetary changes should be made to help.

- Trying to cut a budget when I don't know what's in the budget.

- Results in higher costs per grant and provides no detail on budgets which are directly related to the science.

- Modules should be in $20,000 amounts instead of $25,000.

- Not quite sure if the appropriate Indirect Cost Rates are applied and what the specific dollars will be used for.

- Upper limit is too low.

- Not having detailed budget information

- we do not have the "other support" pages so we have to call every applicant going to council to obtain them/meet required mandates for council and paylist meetings. the budgets don't fit the science now because investigators are pushed by their institutes to go for the max we make administrative cuts to all grants and without detailed budgets we are just shooting in the dark as too how these cuts should be tempered for each applicant lack of other support in the application and detail in the budget results in erroneous assumptions being made by reviewers that often hurt the applicant It's not one size fits all, but the modular grant pushes the applicant pool to act that way - resulting in differences in cost of labor which are significant between institutions/parts of the country severely benefiting or disadvantaging applicants based on where they are applying from.   the applicants have to provide their own institutions with detailed budgets so they are saving little in the way of time. While review and program staff are hampered by lack of information

- I dislike not having the full budgetary information and being able to check out salaries and the IDC exclusions. Grantees often make mistakes in different areas of the applications and modular budgets make them difficult to find.

- A lot of guess work and spent time for personnel salaries, supplies, animal costs, and other categories. A real concern is budget adjustment needed to account for reduced efforts by key personnel.

- Occasionally, more details are needed.

- Cap of $250,000

- Other support info not available in time for Council-mandated analysis and reporting.

- 1. It can be difficult to evaluate the budget in relation to proposed research. 2. Boilerplate language is used and but is not sufficient for instructing applicants. Some costs, e.g., grantees' meetings, can be overlooked.

- As a grants specialist, I do not feel confidant with recommending reductions in cost b/c I do not know average costs for doing this type of research. Also, I would like to see the cap of $250K raised.

- When you are not sure what is excluded from the F&A base calculation.

E4   **Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants**

- The limitations on reviewers to only recommend budget cuts in a modular fashion. The modules are too large (25K) and cuts are often made arbitrarily without taking into consideration costs of research in different parts of the country and at different institutions.

- Difficult to make budget reductions without a detailed budget. Unclear what the NIH policy is on making reductions: by modules or less/more than a module?

- hard to connect with someone to guide you through the process

- not having an itemized final budget for the award so program staff can perform cost analyses (i.e. determine cost to accrue one patient to a clinical trial).

- Can't tell where cuts need to be made; budget sometimes inflated to fit modules; difficult to evaluate whether budget is justified

- I don't see why research during the last 3 years should be included on the biosketch. This does not replace the updated other support that is requested for JIT. Also, the grantee does not include a lot of the required information to be in compliance for the modular format, and many times I have to email them the correct format to follow.

- Cuts are awkward because we do not have details of budget

- The lack of an other support section.

- lack of detail. PIs have to prepare detailed budget anyway so doesn't save them time. Reviewers complain about not having necessary detail. Doesn't seem to help anyone.

- It does not give us information that we may need to do our job properly. My understanding is that the PIs still have to prepare budgets at their institutions, so it doesn't save them time at all.

- Based on my discussions with grantee business officials, they ask their PIs for categorical budgets and turn them into modular for submission. Most of their accounting systems use budget categories. It does not save them any time and may create more work. Specialists spend time trying to turn modular budgets into categorical so that they can check calculations, do spreadsheets and monitor costs.

- lack of detailed personnel costs

- lack of detailed budgets

- There is NOT sufficient information in the PHS 398 instruction manual about the process. Additionally, there is NOT sufficient information to reviewers about the process. Applicants need more guidance on how to put together a modular budget under special circumstances (foreign subcomponents, high-cost animal studies, consortia, etc.).

- Please see my answer to E2. The time savings (see answer E3) comes at a cost, since there is no sound basis for making these adjustments, and therefore no satisfaction in making arbitrary adjustments. The arbitrary nature of budget adjustments is inherently unfair to some applicants, since some applicants try hard to be realistic in their budget requests, while others will take advantage of the system. Modular budgets give cover to the latter group, and without the least bit of budgetary detail it is nearly impossible for program staff to tell who's trying to milk the system.

E4   Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- I am not sure it is really easier for the applicant, because I always wonder how they arrive at the budget request. It seems a detailed budget must exist somewhere anyway, so why not submit it in the application.   It seems counter to our responsibility to properly manage tax dollars to use modular budgets. It is extremely hard to justify cuts without details available. It is hard to know whether budgets are appropriate. My experience with modular budgets is very narrow, however. Only two or three per year. Perhaps those with more exposure to modular grants find ways to deal with them more effectively. The majority of my portfolio is $500K.

- Grantees fail to follow the instructions for the few elements that ARE required-- for example, F&A basis, third party costs, T&E for personnel, and the JIT information is hit & miss interims of timeliness

- No idea of the cost involved in actually doing the research

- administrative supplements, consortium agreements

- No detailed budget for review

- Reviewers may not really be examining requested budgets carefully. Most grantees still must prepare detailed budgets for their institution.

- Study sections are very inconsistent in whether they even discuss the budgets, let alone make recommendations about cuts.

- Can't confirm the F&A exclusions. Have to trust the grantee is excluding/including allowable charges in accordance w/ the rate agreement and OFM cost principle guidelines. In addition, it seems inconsistent that we review the graduate student compensation in a detailed budget, but don't review the same costs in modular applications.

- The mistaken belief among some study section members that since a budget is modular, the budget should not be evaluated as a function of the 'value' of the science.

- It is more difficult to feel confident that the awarded modular funds will be used for the indicated purpose even though the PI has always had the right to rebudget.

- Still too much ambiguity among applicant and NIH staff in terms of instructions and monitoring. Plus, grantee/applicant staff do not realize any of the benefits since most grantee do (and should) require detailed budget pages back home.

- difficult to judge whether requested budgets can actually absorb cuts applied by ICs

- Applicant's often don't include the required information for consortiums.

- Often times the grantee's don't specify what are their exclusions to the base (DC). The business office many times need to go back to the PI in order to find out what the exclusions which delays the entire process of the modular grant.

- Worry that the budget are overestimated

- just about everything -from review to programmatic stewardship - and I am no control freak

E4   **Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants**

- Asking for other support info including percentages of time and effort commitments. I feel that this should be included in the application though I do understand why it is not requested until probably funding. Suggest automatic submission requirement if score is better than a certain cut-off.

- not enough information is provided by some institutions on the budget justification to not have to go back to them for additional information.

- It has not simplified the peer review process. It provides incomplete admin information. The applicant has to generate a detailed budget for own institutional use.

- Making arbitrary cuts in modules or fractions thereof to satisfy an institute-mandated targeted budget reduction.

- It can be difficult to understand where the requested number comes from. For example, how much does the use of animals increase the cost of the research. There is not sufficient information for the reviewers to comment on the budget. Study section members don't know what to do with the modular budget so they often ignore the budget. Program staff would like some opinion from the reviewers.

- I don't feel like I am providing a good stewardship of Federal funds, since I don't know "exactly" what the funds are going to be spent on. We are getting further and further away from doing a cost analysis.

- Program staff does not understand making cuts on modular budgets and still tries to cut specific categories (i.e.. equipment).

- Less information is available.

- vague budgets submitted by institutions

- not enough justification

- I don't like lack of detail in a budget, plus universities and research centers require internally detailed budgets for the most part.

- lack of other support feature

- I dislike have to dig for the information. For example, I don't assume that the Grantee has requested equipment. I look at the check-list and hope that the Grantee reflects any exclusions on the checklist pg.

- The inability to determine costs using a detailed budget.

- In the absence of understandable information review panels take an agnostic view of the budget. Too often, knowledgeable recommendations on budget are lost.

- -Checklist page that does not provide space for exclusions.

- Lack of budget which interestingly the universities require that PIs prepare so no time saved at the local level.

- updated other support is not required at the time of receipt of application.

E4   **Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants**

- No information on how funds will be expended.

- loop hole for inflated cost.

- In Practice there is little difference

- I dislike the modular budget

- Budgets are inflated. There is no stewardship of the funds at any time during the grant's project period. We have no idea about any rebudgeting which may provide insight into a possible change in scope. When running PMA or DW reports, the unobligated balances are typically in excess of 50% of TC of the current year.

- Overall, it appears to have had the (possibly) unintended consequence of raising the average budget, which has hurt our ability to award more grants.

- Policy needs a lower bound. For grants under $100,000 the $25,000 steps are awkward.

- ALL BUT THE OTHER SUPPORT PAGE SUBMISSION

- I disagree with the argument that says that we are not responsible for funding the entire project. Additionally, it's illogical to provide all projects with an estimate of their required costs. Sometimes we're providing less than needed and sometimes it's more than needed. That is, for applications that propose to perform 'A', 'B' and 'C', we sometimes provide enough funds to do 'A' and 'B', and we sometimes provide enough funds to do A, b, C and D.

- May not save any grantee time or trouble.

- asking separately for other support percentages, should be in the application.

- Limited budget cap that could be raised to $300,000-$350,000/year

- Just in Time information

- Lack of written budgetary justifications for all categories

- reviewers are not able to rationally identify cuts

- I strongly dislike the lack of Other Support pages.   It's more difficult to adjudicate restoration requests because neither peer reviewers nor program staff have detailed info.

- Sometimes cutting an entire module is not appropriate, but that is the only thing a study section can recommend. On top of that, an administrative cut by the IC just can cut the budget so much that I am left discussing a reduction of scope with the PI or fighting for an administrative supplement.

- Not good financial management.

- Not knowing the specifics of how much is spent for certain key items.

- The modular grant application process requires additional time and effort when supporting documentation is not provided in a timely manner.

- Lack of specific information regarding items in the budget

E4   **Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants**

- Having to follow up for all of the JIT information. In some cases, it is difficult to get.

- Incremental budgets

- Administrative rules not clearly understood by grantees and Program staff.

- Too small to be useful to most investigators.

- Not a lot of details/explanations for budgets.

- Lack of detailed budget. Reduces the flexibility of the applicants.

- do not like the concept

- Encourages rounding up! Makes small grants larger in terms of budget. Always nice to know details of budgets

- Sometimes it's harder to compute indirect costs because they don't provide all the info needed. Also, they don't always follow instructions, and submit irregular figures (not $25,000 increments). Grantees often say that they must create itemized budgets anyway for internal accounting reasons, so they have to create two budget versions - itemized and modular, which doesn't save them time in that regard. One grantee submitted a modular budget with the first few years under $250,000 and the last years over $250,000. When asked to submit a non-modular budget, it was clear they had no idea where to put the costs (hadn't thought about it) because they made up ridiculous figures to match the totals previously provided. When asked to explain the figures, they opted to accept lower modular amounts in the later years rather than have to analyze/justify the budget. Some grantees say that the just-in-time saves in some ways but puts more pressure on at the last minute to get the material in quickly, especially at the end of the fiscal year.

- Rounding off costs is fiscally irrational and lacks full fiscal accountability. Science should drive and specify in a well-justified manner exactly which personnel, equipment, resources, and other expenses, etc. are needed to accomplish stated goals and specific aims of research, training, and other related projects. as opposed to irresponsibly allotted large, unjustified pools of monies to drive the science and means to accomplish it.

- For budgets in the $150,000 - $250,000 range, it has not been uncommon to have to refer back to the detailed budget of the first year.   This requires program staff requesting a copy from the grants management staff.

F8   Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

F8   Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- Most applications pulled are nearly complete so awards go out faster

- Current information has to be submitted.

- I like the fact that we are not overburdening our clients, the grant applicants with unnecessary work.

- Applicants and their organizations seem to be well informed about JIT procedures and their implications. With only about 15-20% of applications getting funded, JIT saves the applicants time and significantly reduces administrative burden for officials and committees. Moreover, request for JIT updates lets the applicant know that a potential award is in the works. Peer reviewers do not seem to have a problem with the reduced applicant information.

- The concept is quite good, if implementation can be improved.

- When information is submitted, it is more timely.

- Were it limited to some reasonable % in the current state of funding, it is usually great.

- When completed properly - it is very efficient.

- That the information is there when I need it be it right or wrong.

- UPDATED/CURRENT INFORMATION THAT IS PROVIDED

- Other support information is sent to the program officials for review for scientific overlap before it comes to the grants specialist for processing.

- get this type of info only from PI's who are likely to be funded.

- I like receiving info without having to ask for it.

- In genera, the program is fine with me.

- the decrease in the burden on the grantee institutions

- The flexibility of the program

- When the information has already been submitted once I get ready to review the grant for award.

- Only requesting necessary info for to be awarded grants.

- have all the requested information ready

- The information is usually received prior to funding and thus reducing the time and effort to obtain the information.

- Having updated information.

- I like the JIT feature of the NIH Commons so that grantees can submit information using the Commons.

F8   **Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time**

- It allows you to begin your evaluation earlier and keeps the PI notified that this is a very important process

- These materials don't have to be sent with every application, only those that may be considered for funding. Also, some just in time components are not available at the time of grant submission.

- LESS PAPERWORK.

- Eases time burden for applicants requiring institutional approvals.

- So far none. JIT has not been very helpful.

- Not needing IRB prior to submission.

- CURRENT INFO

- The information received is current.

- PIs not having to get IRB approval unless the application will be funded.

- JIT promotes efficiency when processing grants

- It's just one way of accomplishing a necessary administrative requirement.

- Less time required for NIH staff and unfunded applicants.

- Up-to-date data. Reduction of paper.

- automatic notification of PIs that they must submit the materials--otherwise, our business office handles everything else.

- Facilitates PIs getting the applications in.

- Our Grants Management staff take care of JIT procedures. I have almost nothing to do with these types of procedures since JIT went into effect. So it's great for me but don't know how it is for GM staff. I may be called on by GM staff at times to help out in getting JIT info (e.g., can't find a relocated grantee) but that is rare. This is why I responded "somewhat of a problem" in F4-F6; but N/A would have been a more accurate representation.

- I have no real problems with any of it.

- less paperwork for applicants that are ultimately successful

- I like that when we get the information, it is much more current and relevant than if it had been included when the original application was submitted.

- JIT eliminates our handling information that we don't need for unfundable applications.

- Very limited experience with procedure.

- Updated information

- Most of my grants use animal subjects. I think it's reasonable that IACUC approvals are now JIT.

F8   **Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time**

- Helps investigators in simplifying submission of proposals

- Is more now part of the grant procedure for grantees. The information is receive more and more earlier than later.

- I like the original premise of JIT, in that it was to be used for the most simple of grant applications. The expansion to all applications was not helpful for us or the grantees.

- in theory, we do not collect unnecessary paperwork and the PIs do not gather it

- The most up-to-date information is available at the time an award is being prepared.

- When it works, JIT is a worthwhile endeavor, and should lend itself to shortening the review and award process, especially when the electronic submission issues mature.

- When it works as intended it is great.

- when the grantee follows the instructions for submitting the Just in time, it's one less action I have to follow up on.

- receiving the most current information since it's several month between application submission and potential funding

- It may be a bit easier overall for applicants.

- it must make it easier for the PI at a very stressing time

- If items are received and are not outdated by the time the grant is funded then it's great

- Information is timely. Useful. Up to date. Prevents the grantee from clogging committees with paperwork for non-meritorious applications.

- IACUC/IRB approval and other support pages are requested only for those applications that have a good chance of being funded.

- It is current.

- I can award grants on time when the pay plan comes through and the Just in Time information is complete.

- The information is up-to-date.

- updated other support

- The information is current.

- Reduces program administrative efforts for large number of applications that will ultimately NOT be funded. Reduces administrative burden on applicant institutes.

- It's helpful that the JIT info is up to date (though it's often incomplete, since most PIs conveniently overlook the fact that we need total support, not just Federal or NIH support).

- It provides timely information on relevant grant applications, but also relieves administrative burdens on applicants and NIH staff. It is a good balance.

F8   **Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time**

- The information is generally current. The automated mailer gets the grantee to sent it in...usually. When the grantees send it electronically to the file through the COMMONS it's much faster!

- That the information is current when you get ready to fund an application.

- The information obtained at the time of award, is up to date. Previously, you would have to call the PI to find out how other support had changed since time of submission.

- Saves some time for scientists at applicant institutions.

- Receiving current information.

- CURRENT IRB

- I only request JIT documents for those applications that I know will be funded.

- Updated info

- That when it comes into our Branch, it gets filed in the grant proposal file. Most items are included.

- eliminate paper and unnecessary information

- I like having current information.

- I usually request this information from the PI once I know the grant is fundable.

- The level of effort to accomplish is only increased for those who are funded. We have up to date information. Reduces amount of paperwork received by us (rather than receive the information from all applicants).

- Avoid wasting time for PI and program staff budget prep/budget reviews, especially for unfundable projects.

- Current information

- I like the idea that grantees don't need to do certain steps prior to submission.

- It gives PI's a heads up that their grant may be funded and to compile needed documents.

- It saves the PIs time by not requiring the information until it's needed, and ensures that program staff have current IRB approvals, Other Support, etc.

- It reduces burden on PIs who have no chance of getting funded.

- Saves time for institutions and P.I.s

- Not everyone has to submit materials that take a lot of time to assemble.

- This allows for the most current information from grantees.

- Knowing that updated information is being received.

- That only the PIs likely to be funded need provide the detailed information, thus eliminating work and paper for unsuccessful applicants.

F8   **Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time**

- getting the requested material on time to fund the award

- Some information is clearly not needed until time of award

- Receiving current and update information at the time of award.

- There are times when you have received the information in a timely fashion.

- not a duplication of a request (for example, by the time a grant is funded certain info is outdated anyway. Getting this info JIT makes the most sense)

- easier for applicant

- Provides most recent assurances.

- Previously stated, i.e., focus on science

- Easier for the PIs who don't get fundable scores. Easier in the short run for PIs who do get fundable scores.

- Getting current info; sparing the PI the need to rush to get IRB/IACUC in if it is not going to be needed.

- the only aspect that is positive is that the information is sought only from people likely to be considered for funding.

- a simplified way of requesting all the information needed at the same time.

- Reduced application size. Information is more up to date.

- The fact that the information is current at the time it is received.

- reduces workload to enable GMS to concentrate on grants that are likely to be funded

- Flexibility allows new investigators more time to get IRB and other assurances.

- Up to date information.

- obtaining current information

- Don't have to focus on costs

- Is efficient for the applicant (if they will not be funded) to have not wasted time procuring documents that will not be used.

- The information is current.

- Information available to begin award processing

- The information is very current.

- I like the aspect of asking for it only if there is a strong possibility of funding.

- Knowing that other support is timely and no new awards have been made that should be incorporated on the other support page. After all, grant applications are months old before they are awarded and information can be outdated.

F8   Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- I like the fact that the information is more current than what used to be included in the application. We had to seek updated information prior to award so now we don't need to do that with JIT procedures.

- Up-to-date information is nice to have

- timeliness of information

- current and updated information

- Saves time for all involved

- Just-in-Time procedures are great when supporting documentation is provided in a timely manner, and I applaud the effort to reduce the administrative burden on the grantee organization.

- Automatic requests

- receiving information only for application that will be funded; getting updated and current information; can get clarification on IRG concerns or questions; sometimes the information comes in without even being requested.

- -When the grantees submit properly just-in-time, there is less chance of a delay due to animal or human subject research.

- I like having the information available early. This allows a little time for corrections before funding.

- I like that we get up-to-date information and therefore more accurate information.

- I like having up-to-date Other Support info available, as well as not having to call every grantee to request this info.

- We get the most current information.

- Having timely information. Before JIT, we sometimes had to call the PI for updated information, anyway.

- It should come without request by GMS

- For a simple, uncomplicated application, the award may be quickly made.

F9   Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

- 1. Creates trouble collecting and disseminating the often "oops too late" data, making extra work for both applicants and NIH staff. 2. May create an atmosphere negligence at the institution. They need only review animal and human subjects use, if there is a chance of funding. Such review should be part of the intellectual development of the proposal (and it shows in the proposals we receive). The work we support may well be underway at the institution with other funds. Proper review prior to NIH funding helps enforce appropriate institutional review of ALL research. 3. Removal of Other Support information from the reviewers has not improved their focus on science vs. administrative issues, it has merely clouded their ability to exercise judgment concerning the innovation of the project relative to other projects already underway.

- This info is requested from PIs that won't get funded. The request should be linked or roughly linked to each I/Cs payline or under it to be safe

- IRB dates are not on the application face page.

- Having to pursue PIs for the required Just-in-Time documents

- Applicants have expectation of funding when requested for JIT information.

- 1. Sometimes the grantee does not provide information in the proper format (missing data items). 2. Having to follow-up with grantees that did not submit JIT material (esp. when there is pressure to make an award in a short period of time)

- Following up on missing materials.

- I don't see why we go below the 30% when most institutes haven't funded that far in years seems ridiculous to me.

- The biggest problem with JIT is information being directly submitted by the PI without business office concurrence. This then results in delays in awards when we have to go back to the applicant to get the info re-submitted.

- JUST-IN-TIME NEVER SEEMS TIMELY. INITIALLY INFORMATION SUBMITTED IN MOST CASES IS INCOMPLETE AND NOT CURRENT INFORMATION SO WE HAVE TO ASK FOR UPDATES.

- There really is no need to get this info from applicants that are clearly outside of the funding line (above 20% these days).

- problems getting appropriate approvals in a hurry

- Delayed awards if just in time data is delayed.

- MORE RUSHING NEAR AWARD TIME.

- Things like IRB review would be helpful to NIH IRGs

- Initiative should be titled "Just More Time"

- Have information that is nor correct.

F9   **Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time**

- They're never Just-in-time. they are submitted piece meal and sometimes way too early

- When you need to follow-up with the grantee institution to submit the needed information.

- during end of the year funding this is an especially large burden for program staff

- updated other support

- all. See no need for just in time

- The extra paperwork and time that is needed.

- Having program complete their duties with sending out the JIT letters informing the grantees that they are being considered for an award.

- No experience with JIT procedures. See F8 above for clarification.

- lack of other support pages lack of budget

- JIT is usually too premature. By the time the IC is ready to fund the JIT information is outdated.

- It does require a little work contacting the investigators following a review meeting

- The PI's seem unaware that they should at least be "in process" to get IRB certification or their funding will be delayed. Most IRBs take MONTHS to get to an application.

- DELAYS THIGS AND INFO COMES IT AT LAST MINUTE, ESPECIALLY WHEN GRANT IS FUNDED WITH END OF FISCAL YEAR $

- Getting the information requested can be extremely difficult.

- That more people get asked for materials than will ultimately be funded. Timing.

- Reviewers may be concerned about lack of information in application.

- Seems to be a rush on institutions to get this information at the last minute.

- Lack of information necessary for making funding decisions in a timely manner.

- the rush at the end to get this type of information.

- I dislike having to push the grantees to receive the information. By it not being required at the time of application the grantee often delay the submission of protocols to IRB and IACUC until it is too late to make a timely award.

- Other Support information can be important for the review group; without it, reviewers can't fully review an application.

- Raising P.I. expectations of funding when he/she may or may not get funded.

- The percentage used to calculate JIT-eligible grants should be lowered (increased) so that staff do not receive JIT information for grants that will not be funded.

- Some investigators are given a false hope of funding which means more phone calls: 1) asking if the request means they are getting funding, followed by 2) additional phone calls when they don't get funding.

F9   **Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time**

- I dislike having to follow up with grantees to get them to submit the JIT info. I also dislike having to request a business official's signature if the PI directly sent this info via fax or email (The NIH Commons helps here since a business official's countersignature is built into the system).

- JIT letter sent to higher percentile grants than institution is going to fund.

- For anything other than modular or simple application, the grantee/PI is notified several times for additional information. JIT auto-request hits them the first time and then the specialist asks them for protocol or human subjects info, and then program asks them for additional minority/gender information. We can do it all in one request if the IC has control - get rid of JIT for those applications where it was not intended.

- At my IC, program does not routinely see a copy of the other support (even when it has been sent to grants management) before we have to make budget cut recommendations. There is still confusion among PI's about who the JIT information goes to -- they often call program to ask if it has been received, when we have no idea whether grants management has it or not.

- Sometimes when GAB sends out the request to the PI for this information, the Program director is not forwarded this information and can not complete the greensheet.

- Calling the investigators or managers to get the needed information to process awards

- never get a budget broken down by category so rational budget cuts and cost analyses can be performed.

- When the documentation is either sent via fax or mailed, it doesn't get to the appropriate Grants Specialist or file. Then when the grant is ready to be funded, the information needs to be requested again, which makes the PI and Grantee upset. They sometimes submit it 3 different times.

- It takes several phone calls and e-mails for some applicants to respond

- DELAYS ACTIONS AT THE END OF YEAR

- They are not always received JIT.

- Lack of other support information

- It is often a push to get the materials from the investigators.

- Some PIs are unsure where to send JIT material, to program or grants management or to what person in grants management, leading to a bit more workload for program in responding to emails/telephone calls. Increased number and fielding of inquiries from PIs who feel their application is outside the funding range and so they ask "Do I need to send in this information? When? Why?" Also, my perception is that PIs may send in JIT information and then be asked again at the time of the award for updated information.

- Much information is not available when it is needed.

- sometimes both program and grants management contact the PI for the same information; may not be clear what form the information is to be in (i.e., need business official signature?)

F9   **Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time**

- Often, applicants are asked early for JIT information and then are asked again just before award to have the most current information. This is a duplication of effort and penalized applicants that respond rapidly to the first request.

- Completion of Just-In-Time documentation can often take longer than Grants Management-imposed deadlines, particularly for multi-institute and/or foreign-component IRB approvals. GM needs to be more flexible with deadlines. Deadlines force applicant institutes to make decisions on a funding basis, not a science basis. GM reluctance to issue restricted awards is counter-effective.

- JIT has increased the workload immensely for program and grants management staff. Inevitably, a large proportion of my applicants will overlook the need to submit JIT, and this leads to a mad scramble to notify them and get them to submit. When they do submit, as often as not the data will be incomplete, and this leads to further rounds of evaluating, requesting, and prodding. Several times I have been on the verge of notifying a PI (especially a new PI) that s/he is receiving grant funding only to find out at the 11th hour that the PI had submitted an overlapping application to another agency and has already accepted the award. This leads to a great deal of angst and extra work, as we attempt to determine the extent of the overlap and attempt to negotiate the overlap out of existence. If we had the Other Support info much earlier (e.g., with the original grant application), we would be able to see this coming and deal with it much earlier (e.g., in the period between the study section meeting and Council). Under the previous system (Other Support as part of the grant application), the study section would point out potential funding overlap, and this was always very helpful to staff. Scientifically well-informed study section members are much better at spotting overlap issues (or ruling them out) than are program staff, whose level of scientific sophistication usually isn't as great. Finally, and very significantly, requiring Other Support info as part of a grant application presents a negligible burden for the applicant, since this information is almost always available on his/her computer. JIT treatment of Other Support information is highly counterproductive. It costs program and grants management staff enormous amounts of wasted time and angst and saves a few applicants just a little bit of time. Those applicants whose grants get held up because overlap concerns can't be resolved on very short notice are the big losers.

- Sponsored research offices and applicants are not always efficient or responsive in providing information. There is some confusion over what information is necessary in the application, as noted above.

- The information often does not make it to the file, or is sent to the wrong person. Grantees still do not have IRB and IACUC information and we have to wait longer in some cases to get it. Program staff review of other support is often slow...they need training on electronic grants systems!!

- Extremely thoughtless method of asking applicants for JIT materials. While the idea is indeed explained in general, and seasoned applicants generally understand how the system works, the average junior applicant just sees a message saying "your application is being considered for funding, send us the info".... understandably, they believe that their proposal is about to get funded, and get EXTREMELY disappointed when they find out that this is not the case.... very unsettling for your investigators.

- The RUSH

- that some investigators get their hopes raised artifactually

F9   **Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time**

- having to wait to make decisions until information is finally submitted

- Have to request the just-in-time information from the grantee the majority of the time, which defeats the purpose. it's just-in-time at our prompting.

- Lack of a sensible policy to obtain the information. From the perspective of extramural reviewers, all NIH staff are the same. If one office requests JIT materials, and another one requests the same thing later, the NIH looks very bad overall. Because of the lack of a sensible policy, we appear to the extramural community as a disorganized aggregation of incompetents who don't know how to communicate among each other.

- It does not always work as intended and a special effort has to be made to check for the information.

- The quality of JIT submissions is woefully lacking, and requires frequent requests for additional information. To date, the time savings hoped for does not seem to have arrived. More emphasis and training should be provided both NIH and applicants as to submitting and considering JIT concepts.

- CSR send a note to all PI/institutions scoring better than X yet the ICs only want it for a subset Human subject issues should be considered by IRBs before submission

- Sometimes funding decisions are delayed and then you have to hurray and request the information and review it quickly.

- Often times is prepare at the same time the application is submitted and is not updated at the time it is actually needed.

- the information is usually outdated when the grant is funded if any JIT is received at all

- I don't like requesting the information too early and getting the PI's hopes up. I don't like doing extra work when I can focus on other things and move on to other grants that I know will be funded.

- The need for grants management staff to spend large amounts of time tracking down materials is a burden. The DEAS may make this aspect a little easier, but getting documents at the time of submission would be more useful. Once the commons is on line and all grantees are submitting their applications electronically, JIT may work better.

- I believe the Grants Management Specialist handling a particular award, should be the one requesting any JIT information in addition to other questions or documentation he or she may require. The automatic JIT mailer that is sent for application under a certain percentile is sent out much to early, leaving the "other support" outdated. Also, when a PI responds to the auto-mailer, the contact staff listed on the request may or may not be up to date, resulting in lost JIT and duplicate requests.

- some award might not get funding when JIT material is requested.

- The other support pages are not available, and that CV does not require project timelines on the "research projects in the last 3 years section", so you do not know what is active or not.

- Incomplete submission of updated other support which does not include the overlap statement or percent of effort for projects.

F9   **Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time**

- -For other support, there is not a standard form so many grantees submit and forget to put % for their employees.

- Takes time and IRB's may be extremely slow to do their work.

- Need to send requests even though automatic requests have been sent. Lack of follow-up by institutions. Need to send JIT info to program staff for review/little feedback re other support unless asked. Also, I have received IRB approvals which are question-able due to different title from application. Unless caught by me, program is unaware. I feel that program should be asking for IRB and IACUC documents for forwarding to grants mgmt. with their OK as they are the scientists. And they should input the necessary data into IMPAC II. BUT I KNOW THIS WILL NEVER BE DONE OR CHANGED! I feel that there is a lack of accountability/verification for these documents by program staff--i.e. no preaward checklist for competing grants especially.

- Can delay awards, particularly for naive institutions or P.I.s

- needed material not received on time, have to issue restrictions on the award

- Having to request certain things that should already be in the application.

- It doesn't work as advertised. The lateness of the summary statements and the letter requesting the information preclude getting the needed information for council in a timely manner, leading to an administratively poorer end product.

- Having to explain to those near the payline why they aren't getting funded if they got a specific request to send in their info.

- More of a pain for staff and the PIs when it is needed.

- I do not dislike any aspect of the procedures

- Confusing as to what gets sent in when. Easier to have everything in one place at one time. IRB and AUC material can be updated later if necessary, even after the award is made.

- Information is not available in a timely fashion for necessary Council procedures, e.g. NIGMS $750K memoranda.

- delays caused by slow responsiveness

- Having to "harass" PIs to get info

- Increased need for follow-up for missing documents. This has increased the need to go back to some grant files several times. Any time saved by initiatives like modular grants, is lost when excessive follow-up is required due to missing/incomplete documentation. GMS have become overburdened with clerical functions.

- The follow-up and waiting for requested information.

- following up with the PI's and business officials at time of award. They are not very responsive at times of the urgency of this information.

- still have to get this information, even if not JIT

F9   **Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time**

- Not requiring IRB certification for the application to be reviewed. This makes the NIH review group the first line IRB.   IRB actions can and so effect the research plan. This should be taken in to consideration before the application is submitted.   The burden of hassling PIs to get the JIT material in.

- sometimes difficult obtaining info from grantee-multiple requests etc. Also, often times info is not submitted with the appropriate administrative official's signature/approval (especially when requested and received by program staff).

- Falsely excites some PI's that their grant will be funded.

- Review groups seems to find it harder to make budget recommendations -- creates unnecessary work when they recommended reduction of modules, and program needs to bring back to Council or fosgoo

- There is great confusion about who asks for the JIT information (including an automated CSR letter vs. a program letter), who should receive the information (GM vs. program), and who should be responsible for compiling the information. A much better trans-NIH procedure is needed, especially as DEAS takes over.

- they may send the information too early the grant may not necessarily be funded so information is sent that may be later tossed away the PI tries to send the information without signature of their business official to expedite their application process which is not valid

- Confusion by grantees that requests for JIT info. is a promise of funding. Program staff calling PI's to request JIT info. but not all info. so when Grants staff call PI is angry & says they already provided it to Program. Redundant phone calls by PI & grantees to make sure we've received the faxed JIT info. Follow-up phone calls from PI inquiring when the award will be issued.

- As program staff we do not deal with these requests until after they are received, yet our name is listed as the contact and we are constantly referring PIs back to the grants management staff.

- The back and forth communication with the PIs prior to funding. Confusing for the PIs. Does not really save time for program staff.

- The rush of time it takes to retrieve the information and still issue timely awards.

- It can sometimes take a significant amount of time for grantees to submit the IRB and IACUC approval needed prior to award. This causes a delay in the funding of a project; I don't, however, have a solution to this, as it is the responsibility of the grantee to start that approval process. Possibly, we could include a reminder of JIT info needed in a cover letter with the summary statement and note an approximate date that the info would be needed.

- I think it is ridiculous that my institute requests Just-In-Time information when the grant is reviewed. Months may pass before the grant is funded, then we need to request the information again. Sometimes the grantee will send Just-In-Time information and it never makes it to the file. It makes us look disorganized when we request it a second time.

F9   **Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time**

- The information is often incorrect AND there are many times you have to really work to get the information you need. The grantees often react as if this is the first time they have ever heard that they need to submit this and they have NO idea what it is.

- rapid turnaround under certain situations

- The "hurry up and wait" approach: which translates into having to 'chase down' and waste time and effort in awaiting required documentation from applicants post hoc -- as opposed to having all of these as prerequisite documentation either in completed or soon-to-be completed order at the time when grant funding support has been officially committed and ready to be efficiently released.

- Uncertainty about which assurances can be submitted later and when the information has to be submitted.

- Many grantees are uncooperative when asked for JIT material. Some send incomplete or unsigned Other Support pages and seem resentful when asked to resubmit completed pages.

- Just-in-Time procedures are cumbersome when supporting documentation is not provided in a timely manner. The additional time and effort required for follow-up can be distracting and burdensome.

- More often, updated information still required, and some JIT respondents are not fundable.

- If the grantee sends it prior to my request, it is sometimes outdated.

- Indiscriminate cuts in terms of 1 or 2 modules, by zealous reviewers, often comprise a large percentage of the grant

- The grantee is very slow in submitting the requested documentation.

- Having to contact and push a PI to "hurry" and submit the information. In a perfect world, an investigator would submit their JIT information when if they follow the letter from NIH explaining JIT.

- Involves a bit more paperwork (but this has not been a serious problem for me).

- Requiring JIT info from applicants who are not going to be funded. The threshold should be set more realistically.

- Crush of last minute receipt of info.

- our fileroom misfiles info and we have to ask for it again

- the time critical aspects which makes many grantees have to hurry up to give us the information we need for award. And if the information is wrong it causes additional delays

- Need for more oversight by Program Staff

- Grantees constantly fail to include the effort levels, and they identify overlap issues but provide no information on how they will resolve, in the event of an award.

F9   **Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time**

- Reviewers have trouble with concept that IRB approval isn't required for review. It's always better for the PI to have an approved protocol for the review, but because it's not necessary, they don't understand that it is still important. Not having Other Support makes lots of extra work for staff before award.

- Not receiving the info and needing to chase it down

- I think the major burden falls on grants management not program. Given the disproportionate funding at the end of the year, Just-in-Time is a burden on them.

- It is not good use of professional program staff to have to call or e-mail each PI, requesting other support. The electronic system should be able to alert them and cc the program staff. I also think there's a lot of potential for overlap and double-dipping in funds. Again, the electronic data bases should be utilized to help with this issue.

- sometimes it is not routed to the correct GMS and needs to be requested again.

- Information about pending applications is not available, so potential overlap has to be dealt with later.

- Send the information with the application. Chasing grantees for this info and getting it in a timely manner is a real problem.

- Many grantees do not submit JIT info, so I do end up having to call most of them to request it! Also, many grantees do not understand the procedure for submitting JIT info though the Commons.

- We have to disseminate it to all the individuals involved. If the information was just in the application, copies are made (or can view the electronically) you don't have to disseminate them.

- The rush to have to request numerous documents once funding decisions have been approved. The application should be complete before it is review for funding.

- 1. PI's/Organizations are not always responsive in providing the information when it is requested through the mailer. This requires multiple follow-up communications. 2. Many PIs think their application has been approved for funding when they receive the automated request for JIT information. 3. If the information is sent before the application is actually selected for funding, it tends to be misplaced, because it is not urgent.

- Needs to be more computerized - PI's should submit more using the Commons.

- It raises false hopes of an award. Communications with applicants take time. Grants management - program discussions take time.

- Delayed submission

- The need to know other support before JIT other support is received (i.e., with fairly long lead-time before Council).

- more work--not streamlined

F9   **Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time**

- There is a time lag between when the JIT info comes in and funding. NINR needs to get updated Other Support information closer to funding if more than 6 months have passed between submission of JIT and funding decision.

- I dislike receiving information and putting applicants through the process when the grant is not likely to be paid. NIH had the percentile much higher than it should have been but has since moved it to a more reasonable score. P.S. I could not choose an IC in the beginning of the survey since I now work in OD. I used to work at NCI and NICHD in grants management for about 22 years.

- For some clinical studies reviewers want to know if the IRB would approve of the planned human research

- The Just-in-time information does not arrive "in-time" so that we are unable to be fully prepared for our Council or for funding grants. The material is not consistently scanned and put in a location where program staff can find it. The scores for which "just-in-time" information is requested is not appropriate. The cut-off was too high for the past Council round. It might be helpful for the reviewers to have this information if we want them to comment on the budget.