eRA Program Official Users Group (ePUG)

Date:	February 9, 2005, Wednesday
Time:	1:00–3:00 p.m.
Location:	Rockledge 2, Room 9104
Advocates:	Carlos Caban, Janna Wehrle

Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 13, 2005, Rockledge 2, Room 9100

Action Items

1. (Chanath Ratnanather) Develop a proposal for a Public Access framework and present it at the next meeting.

2. (All) Solicit feedback from colleagues on accessibility and send notes to Janna.

Handouts

- Organizational Hierarchies and OneView for ePUG:
  http://era.nih.gov/docs/ONEVIEW Dan Hall feb 9.ppt

- Retrieving and Analyzing Data Using the QVR System:

  http://era.nih.gov/docs/ePUG Proposal-TAF-02-09-05.ppt

- eRA Program Module (PGM) ePUG Meeting:

  http://era.nih.gov/docs/Public Access.ppt

Introduction

Chanath Ratnanather introduced two new team members:

- Vickie Fadeley – Business Analyst and Task Order Analyst

- Sachin Shah – Note taker.

Organizational Hierarchies and One View
Dan Hall

Dan Hall delivered a presentation on the use of Organizational Hierarchies as a "method to define system privileges based upon a hierarchical structure" and on OneView, "an integrated approach to initiate and process all eRA and Commons transactions electronically."
http://era.nih.gov/docs/ONEVIEW Dan Hall feb 9.ppt
After the presentation, he opened the floor to questions:

- *Are notifications linked to the hierarchy?* — In the first release, notifications would go to the Program Official.

- *How will the system accommodate other people getting involved before Program Officials?*—. The workflow tool is going be able to handle different processes within the ICs. ICs will need to identify the individuals and the process for approvals. This process will get more refined with the second release.

- *Will the system handle foreign project approvals?*—This feature is scheduled for a later phase and will first be built into the Grants Management Task List.

Retrieving and Analyzing Data Using the QVR System

Thor Fjellstedt

Thor Fjellstedt delivered a presentation about using the QVR system to retrieve and analyze data. **http://era.nih.gov/docs/ePUG Proposal-TAF-02-09-05.ppt** After the presentation, he opened the floor for questions:

- *Will QVR be able to sort output through the hitlist?* Users are able to select output sorting options though the hitlist via a wide variety of parameters.

- *Is there a way to remove undesired results from the hitlist?* – Future iterations of QVR will have iterative hitlists, where users can select certain items for further study and remove unselected items.

- There also is a new Abstract Report in QVR. As soon as an application image is available in IMPAC II, QVR will extract the first three pages of the application and turn them into a text file using Optical Character Recognition, a technique of extracting text from scanned applications. Users are advised to check the OCR version against the original, because of the inherent limitations of OCR.

Access to Draft/Pre-Journal PI Manuscripts

Chanath Ratnanather

Chanath delivered a presentation on the NIH "Public Access" initiative: **http://era.nih.gov/docs/Public Access.ppt** The NIH "Public Access: initiative involves establishing at the National Library of Medicine a searchable electronic resource of NIH-funded research results and archives of scientific literature, and providing access to appropriate persons. eRA is allowing the NLM system to use Commons User IDs to authenticate Principal Investigators' uploading of documents. After the presentation, Chanath opened the floor for questions and feedback:

- *Would Program Class Codes (PCC) be a useful way of sorting manuscripts?*—The group felt PCC codes may be useful as most PGM (Program Management) portfolios are in PCC codes. However, not everyone uses PCC codes strictly for scientific coding only.

- *General security issues discussion* – Chanath pointed out that any manuscript in the Grant Folder would be available to anyone with IMPAC II access. Manuscripts could be available within NIH for months before publication, depending on the journal's publication schedule, which could lead to confidentiality issues.

- *Enforcing embargoes* – If a manuscript is accepted for publications, there is question of enforcing embargoes, to ensure that information is not released to the public before publication. The group suggested one potential solution would be digitally watermarking manuscripts as embargoed until they are published.

- *Does Open Access apply to applications as well as funded projects?* – Submission for Open Access is only requested for funded projects.

- *Which view of the manuscript is the most important: Current Science; Grant; or PI?* – The group agreed that a Current Science view is a Knowledge Management issue. Manuscripts should be attributed to specific grants but also should be part of a PI's personal profile.

- The group came to a consensus that all Program Officials, not just the PO assigned to a particular application, would need access to all manuscripts, to facilitate collaboration and limit grant overlap.

Action: **(Chanath Ratnanather) Develop a proposal for a Public Access framework and present it at the next meeting.**

Action: **(All) Solicit feedback from colleagues on accessibility and send notes to Janna.**

Attendees

Asanumna, Chiiko	Finklestein, David	Koepke, Kathy Mann
Bean, Carol	Fjellstedt, Thorsten	Lerchen, Mary
Caban, Carlos	Goldman, Stephen	Ratnanather, Chanath
Chen, Daofen	Good, Peter	Shah, Sachin
Delcore, Sandy	Hall, Dan	Tiedemann, Don
Duncan, Rory	Heath, Anne	Walker, Cathy
Evans, Frank	Hilton, Thomas	Wehrle, Janna
Fadeley, Vickie	Kinley, Teresa	Wong, Shan