



## eCGAP Focus Group

---

**Date:** Monday, June 20, 2005  
**Time:** 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.  
**Location:** Rockledge 1, Room 2198  
**Advocate:** Jennifer Flach

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, July 5, 9 a.m. to 11 a.m., Rockledge 1, Room 2198

---

### Action items

1. (Jennifer Flach) Find out Grant.gov's deadline for electronic submission.
2. (Sara Silver) Send out high level overview of consortia requirements for detailed budget to group this week for feedback
3. (Sara Silver) Discuss with Suzanne Fisher the changes needed to eCGAP to accommodate the SBIR/STTR applications.
4. (Jennifer Flach) Find out from Grants.gov whether Phase I and Phase 11 Fast Track SBIRs can be submitted as two applications but tied together in the system.

### June 1 Receipt Date

*Jennifer Flach*

**Receipt and Referral performance**—Jennifer asked about the performance of the Receipt and Referral module with regard to grant applications received on June 1. Suzanne Fisher noted that the module worked well overall and definitely worked better than it did during the February 1 and March 1 receipt dates. She noted that there were a few suggestions for improvement that she planned to send out. Jennifer said that another release of eCGAP-RR will be scheduled to fix the defects in time for the October/November receipt dates.

**Application from India**—NIH received 25 applications electronically for the June 1 receipt date. Of those, one application was submitted from India. Sara Silver noted that the DUNS (Data Universal Numbering System) number and the time difference were the only two issues that arose with that application. A DUNS number is a nine-digit number provided by Dun & Bradstreet that uniquely identifies a business.

### Service Provider issues

*Jennifer Flach*

**Receipt deadline of 5 p.m. in the submitter's time zone**—Jennifer noted that one issue a Service Provider raised at the last conference call with the eCGAP Team was that applicants who submit electronically have less time to prepare and submit their application than those who submit on paper. The deadline for electronic submission is 5 p.m. in the submitter's time zone on the receipt date whereas with paper, the application has to be postmarked/courier-dated on that receipt date. Thus, a paper application can be shipped via FedEx well beyond 5 p.m. on the receipt date. Jennifer asked the group for its thoughts on the issue. Group members noted that a 5 p.m. deadline is standard for federal agencies like the National Science Foundation that also deal with

electronic submission. It is also a matter of keeping to office hours, so that resources are available on that day. The consensus of the group was that the 5 p.m. deadline should not be changed for electronic submission.

Jennifer said that she would find out Grants.gov's deadline for electronic submission.

**Action: (Jennifer Flach) Find out Grant.gov's deadline for electronic submission.**

**Consortia for detailed budget**—Jennifer noted that Sara Silver is working on requirements for adding the consortia component to detailed budgets. She plans to send out for feedback this week a high-level overview on what will be needed in the grant image for receiving and validating consortia. Consortia for detailed budgets will be implemented in fall of 2005.

**Action: (Sara Silver) Send out high level overview of consortia requirements for detailed budget to group this week for feedback**

## Update on Grants.gov and 424RR Transition

*Jennifer Flach*

**Grants.gov**—Jennifer noted that the development team is working on the first iteration of a Grants.gov release, which should be out next week.

**SBIR/STTR**—Jennifer noted that the 424RR Transition Group has identified the Small Business Innovation Research/Small Business Technology Transfer (SBIRs/STTRs) as the first type of NIH grant opportunity to roll out for applicants to submit through Grants.gov using the 424RR agency specific form. The plan is to mandate that all SBIRs/STTRs for the application deadline of December 1, 2005 come in electronically.

This will not be formally announced through a NIH Guide notice until after August 1, 2005, so as not to confuse SBIR/STTR applicants submitting for that deadline. Suzanne Fisher noted that NIH would typically receive about 2500 applications for that receipt date.

Sara noted that she needed to discuss with Suzanne the changes needed to CGAP to accommodate SBIR/STTR applications. Suzanne noted that:

- Phase I SBIRs are not allowed to have an appendix; Phase I SBIRs far outnumber Phase II SBIRs.
- With Fast Track SBIRs, both Phase I and Phase II applications come in as a bundle, although each application has to be complete in itself.

JJ Maurer wondered if there were difficulties in implementing the Fast Track bundle coming in via Grants.gov, could the Fast Track application be submitted as two applications, but tied together in the system? Suzanne noted that they are given only one assignment number. Jennifer said she will follow up with Grants.gov on the issue.

The STTR applications:

- Require two signatures because the nonprofit needs to certify that they are on board with the application (An STTR differs from a SBIR in that it requires a formal, collaborative relationship with a university or other non-profit research institution).
- Require two budget pages

**R13s**—The 424RR Transition group is also leaning towards accepting R13s through Grants.gov for the Dec.15 receipt date.

**Action: (Sara Silver) Discuss with Suzanne Fisher the changes needed to CGAP to accommodate the SBIR/STTR applications.**

**Action: (Jennifer Flach) Find out from Grants.gov whether Phase I and Phase II Fast Track SBIRs can be submitted as two applications but tied together in the system.**

*Just-in-time*—Currently, the certification for an STTR comes with the initial submission of applications. JJ Maurer asked when this information is needed and until what point in the cycle it can be deferred. The group agreed that the certification for the STTR can be treated like other just-in-time (JIT) items. Just-in-time information is information sent by applicants to NIH only when they are likely to be awarded the grant. The group noted that the JIT information is only needed once a decision is made by NIH to fund the application, i.e. after review. Tom Tatham asked what happens if the review is favorable for an STTR application, but then the subcontract comes in as a JIT and NIH finds out that the applicant does not have an agreement in place. Amy Swain noted that in such a case, the application goes back to review. Otherwise, the award is not made. The group said the delay was unlikely to lead to an increase in bogus applications.

## **Table Talk**

*System-to-system with Grants.gov*—Jennifer noted that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) deployed its system-to-system interface with Grants.gov to production two weeks ago. The university plans to submit applications live to the National Science Foundation through Grants.gov soon. In addition, some Service Providers have been working to develop a system-to-system interface with Grants.gov. Sara asked if small businesses also have the issue of using Macintosh computers, which are not compatible with Grants.gov's PureEdge system. Janna Wehrle noted that most small businesses are PC-based. Amy Swain noted that most small businesses go through a university's Sponsored Programs office and computers, so that they do not run into the Macintosh issue. Jennifer said that Grants.gov is offering PC emulation software to Macintosh users. For NIH's Pioneer Awards, the Center for Information Technology (CIT) hosted CITRIX servers that allowed applicants to submit via Grants.gov to NIH. However, that is not perceived as a long-term solution. Tom Tatham noted that he asked Tim Twomey for a breakdown by computer platform on visits to the eRA webpages. In November 2004, about 10% of visits to <http://era.nih.gov/> were from Macs and a tiny percentage from Linux/Unix boxes.

## **Review Action Items from June 7 meeting**

1. (Jennifer Flach) Find out from Service Providers why no detailed budgets were submitted for the June 1 receipt date. ***Done. A lack of the ability to support consortia in full budget was noted as the main reason.***
2. (All) Recommend to policy that since budgets are capped at five years, applicants be required to resubmit for further funding. ***Will follow up.***
3. (All) Get feedback from ICs on the five year budget limit. ***Will follow up.***
4. (All) Try to obtain statistics on applications granted funding exceeding five years. ***Will follow up.***
5. (Jennifer Flach) Take the issue of piloting SBIRs/STTRs and R13s through Grants.gov to 424RR Transition Working Group on Thursday (June 9) ***Done.***
6. (Jennifer Flach) Arrange for applicant community to be notified once a decision has been reached to pilot SBIR/STTRs and R13s. ***Jennifer stated that she will talk about this***

*issue at the 7<sup>th</sup> annual NIH SBIR/STTR Conference at NIH in Bethesda on July 28 and 29. A formal announcement will follow only after August 1.*

7. (Jennifer Flach) Recommend to Grants.gov team that a demo on their website outlining the submission of a specific grant mechanism would be extremely useful. ***Jennifer said that she will send an email to Grants.gov.***
8. (Jennifer Flach) Place a note in theGrants.gov suggestion box, that they should change the wording of their first email message to applicants to state: “Your application has been received and is now going through validations.” ***Jennifer said that she will send an email to Grants.gov.***

## **Attendees**

Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)

Flach, Jennifer (OER)

George, David (NIBIB)

Maurer, JJ (OD)

Moyer, George  
(Skip)(AHRQ)

Panniers, Richard (CSR)

Silver, Sara (OER)

Sinnett, Everett (CSR)

Stallone, Don (OD)

Stick, Melissa (NIDCD)

Swain, Amy (NCRR)

Subramanya, Manju  
(LTS/OD)

Tatham, Tom (CSR)

Wehrle, Janna (NIGMS)

Wright, David (OD)