Electronic 901 Working Group Minutes

Date: Tuesday May 17, 2005
Time: 1:00–3:00 p.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, 5th, Room 5147
Advocate: Ellen Liberman

Next Meeting: ???. Location ???

Change Request Prototype Page: http://erawebdev.od.nih.gov/UI/e901/index.asp

Action Items

1. (Daniel Fox) Email list of Request Types for the First Pilot to the group.
2. (Daniel Fox) Change "View" on the My Notifications page to "Process."
3. (Daniel Fox) Review, write up the process and create mock-ups of the ARA process to go over at the next meeting.

Documents

1. IRG/Review Chief Role Definition
2. eRequest Sub-system Types

Deserts and Refreshments

Lana, who could not make it to today's meeting, made a cake to celebrate the group's completion of the 901 Change Request meetings. The entire group appreciated the sentiment and complimented the chef on her culinary mastery.

Review Action Items from Last Meeting

1. *(Daniel Fox) Add "Delete" action item to the list of actions within Web QT to submit Delete Application requests and move it to the bottom of the list to prevent user errors in accidentally submitting the Delete Requests* - This item is completed. Daniel modified the dropdown menu so that the "Delete" option is at the bottom. Also, the Request History is now a default so that when users select "Go," they will be taken to the list of requests for that application.
2. *(Lana Diggs) Distribute the new IRG/Review Chief role definition* – Lana completed defining this role, sent it out via email and sent a paper copy to the meeting. This item will be discussed later, in the section marked "IRG/Review Chief Role Definition."

3. *(Lana Diggs) Provide a list of all eRequests at the next meeting* - This list was provided to the group at the beginning of the meeting. There will most likely be another meeting, probably sometime next month.
4. *(Daniel Fox) Update the Assignment Change, Withdrawal, Reinstatement, and Deletion Requests Routing Table based on suggested changes by the group.* – This table has been updated and does not need to be sent for review.

IRG/Review Chief Role Definition

The group agreed that the Integrated Review Group (IRG)/Review Chief role definition provided by Lana needed clarifying. While the definition states that, "There can only be one user associated with the IRG Cluster [...]," there actually can be more than one IRG chief. Without creating a deputy role, there needs to be a authorized user and a back-up person associated with the cluster. Daniel stated that user administration needs to be modified to handle the new roles of IRG chief and Referral Liaison (RL).In order to manage these IRG clusters within the user admin, there will be an ability to associate the IRG Chief role with the clusters. From the routing perspective of the request, they need to know which IRG approves the 901. There will be a checkbox in user admin showing the default approver, so as to avoid sending the request to both people. If the IRG Chief is out of town, he or she will contact the IC representative in order to switch the default to another person. This allows that individual to see the notification. If not, then the non-default person can go into Track Request and assign that notification to him or herself. When the request is grabbed by someone, he or she takes responsibility for it.

Grant Folder Link to Event Queue

Daniel stated that the event log of a grant will be shown within the Grant Folder. This event log includes areas outside of the 901, such as changes to the Principal Investigator (PI) name. Daniel showed the group the latest updates to the Grant Folder, which will be available in June. There is a project folder now in the Grant Folder, which shows a browsing tree on the left of the screen. This shows the content of a grant as it relates to the Project Year shown on the top of the Grant Folder page. There is also a link called *Commons PI View*, which shows the user what the PI sees in the eRA Commons. The group applauded this feature, as it will help communication with the PI. If the PI does not have a Commons account, the system will inform the user of this via a message.

There is no firm date for the event log, but Daniel stated that it should be ready sometime in August. All of the events that occur within the eRA can now be viewed, thanks to this system. On the screen in the Grant Folder, users will be able to see the following information about an event: name, Event status, completed date, *who* completed it, actual email text of the notification sent for that event, and the Appl ID. A Help Content will also be included.

Request Types (to be used for Limited Pilot in October)

Daniel said that he would email this list to group members, as he did not have it at the meeting. These will *not* be in the first pilot, but he wants to get something to the group to have hands-on experience with.

Action: (Daniel Fox) Email list of Request Types for the first Pilot to the group.

Actions in "My Events Queue"

As per the suggestion by the group in a previous meeting, Daniel changed the "View" link under the Actions column on the My Notification page to "Review." The group expressed dissatisfaction with this terminology as well and after some discussion, decided on the word "Process."

Action: (Daniel Fox) Change "View" on the My Notifications page to "Process."

ARA Requirements

Daniel suggested that, even in Lana's absence, the group should get started on the discussion about the Awaiting Receipt of Application (ARA) requirements.

The ARA originates from the program / IC staff. The group described the ARA as a way of connecting information to an application before filing a application into the system. It is also an expression of interest on the part of some institute, center or agency in a particular application. It should not be confused with a letter of intent. The ARA can also be used as a means of identifying ownership of an application that might overlap with another institute. Anything can be an ARA, but there is an official form that should be represented electronically.

The first iteration of the electronic ARA should only deal with internal NIH business.

Currently, the paper ARA is matched by Receipt and Referral (RR) by the PI name, rather than an APPL ID or Grant Number. Dr. Fisher suggested that it would be beneficial to match the ARA according to Commons ID numbers as well, if there is a known Commons User ID that user can enter a the time of submitting the ARA. It is coded to type, breaking it up into different categories of ARAs. Initially, they should build those that do not have attachments, and develop attachment capability later. Once the ARA is associated with the corresponding application, it should go into the Grant Folder. There can be varying ARAs; in fact, there can be dueing ARAs.

The ARA represents a one-way transaction to DRR; however, when the application is assigned, there needs to be notification back to the institute. They help to complete the application. There are two states of ARA after its completion: Matched and Denied. SRA, PO, IRG Chief, or RL can submit an ARA, but it must go through the RL as a gatekeeper. There should be an IC field on the form so that the RLs may identify themselves. The ARA approval chain within the IC should just be one step, while in the Center for Scientific Review (CSR) must be initiated by a Chief role. There should be a checkbox marked *Permanent*, which saves an ARA independent of the one attached to the application. This prevents those not authorized from submitting an application and causing mistakes within the system. The *Submit ARA Link* should exist on the main page as an independent option.

In CSR, the following roles can submit an ARA: Scientific Review Administrator (SRA), Program Officer (PO), RL and IRG Chief. The IC approval chain is as follows: SRA → IRG Chief → RL → Department of Receipt and Referral (DRR) Chief.

The group hopes to have fewer mistakes with the electronic version of this process than they do with the paper one. There will be more checks and balances, and fewer incident of human error.. Daniel suggested putting in an *un-match* or *reverse* capability to alleviate errors. Currently, users are forced to re-enter information to accomplish this action. Also, the group suggested that the search capability be enhanced to include a search via Commons ID number. This would be more efficient and allow fewer mistakes than searching by the PI name, for example. Though there are different profiles within the Commons ID, the actual identification always stays the same. Daniel will review the discussion and notes by the group and present initial write ups and mock ups at the next meeting.

Action: (Daniel Fox) Review, write up the process and create mock-ups of the ARA process to go over at the next meeting.

Attendees

Calderone, Gerald	Edwards, Michael	Faenson, Inna
Fisher, Suzanne	Fox, Daniel	Hagan, Ann
Liberman, Ellen	Melchior, Ellen	Noronha, Jean
Paugh, Steve	Roberts, Luci	Stesney, Jo Ann