NIH eRA Commons Working Group (CWG)

Date/Time:	Sunday, September 18, 2005, 9:00 a.m.–2:00 p.m.
Location:	The National Academy of Sciences Building, 2100 C St. N.W., Washington, D.C.
Chair:	David Wright
Next Meeting:	TBD

Action Items

1. (Scarlett Gibb) Send the URL for the Grants.gov training site to the Commons distribution list.

2. (Peter Brunner) Make sure that the Grants.gov notification sent to the Signing Official (SO) that the application has been downloaded to the NIH includes the title of the application and the name of the PI as well as the tracking number to expedite the matching of the notification with the application at the institution.

3. (David Wright) Send an email to institutions asking what information they would want in the Grants.gov confirmation notification.

4. (David Wright) Add "Hide" feature for faculty lists to priority list.

5. (Megan Columbus) Follow up to find out why NIH is requiring validation after submission.

Presentations

- Electronic Receipt Timeline: http://era.nih.gov/Docs/Electronic_Receipt_Columbus_09-18-05.pdf

- Toward Eliminating NIH Mail Notifications: http://era.nih.gov/Docs/Eliminating_mail_Fisher_09-18-05.pdf

- Commons Update: http://era.nih.gov/Docs/Commons_Update_09-18-05.pdf

Welcome

David Wright welcomed CWG members to the meeting. He announced that Jane Fant has taken a new post as Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Research Administration at the University of Alabama in Birmingham. Formerly, she was at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey. Her new university has agreed to support her participation on the CWG.

David also announced that Ellen Beck, who is at UCLA, is retiring in December, and she will be missed by the CWG.

Electronic Receipt Timeline

Megan Columbus

Megan, who used to be part of the eRA project a few years ago, is now in a newly created position designed to coordinate a number of concurrent projects. She is the NIH Program Manager for Electronic Receipt of Grant Applications, and she reports directly to the Office of Extramural Research Director Dr. Norka Ruiz Bravo. In this position, she will coordinate all areas addressing electronic receipt, including policy, technical and contingency planning among others, and guide the project along its very aggressive timeline.

Electronic receipt has become the top priority for eRA and the Office of Extramural Research (OER) because of directives from Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and upper management at NIH and DHHS. To comply with this, NIH plans to require electronic submission through Grants.gov for all NIH grant applications by May 2007. This also means transitioning from the current PHS 398 application form to the SF424 family of forms data set:

- SF424 Research and Research-Related—SF424 (R&R)
- SF424 Discretionary (of limited use for NIH)

This was announced in the NIH Guide on August, 19, 2005: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-05-067.html.

Obviously, the simultaneous transition to electronic application submission AND a new set of application forms is a huge initiative for NIH, particularly under such an aggressive timetable. It involves numerous funding mechanisms and thousands of applications ranging widely in size and complexity. This transition depends on many things for its success, including:

- Technical development of the eRA and Grants.gov systems
- Trans-agency resolution of policy and operational issues
- Lots of communication, training and outreach
- Acceptance of change by NIH staff (the changes aren't optional but want to help them along)
- Acceptance of change by research partners in the extramural community

The benefits to electronic submission include:

- Resulting efficiencies may allow NIH to shorten the cycle from application receipt to award
- Electronic validations improve data quality
- Reduction in scanning, printing, and data-entry costs
- Grant image is clearer and in color
- NIH repository of data will be improved and will be available to be mined by knowledge management and other tools

Suzanne Fisher said that NIH already is looking for ways to reduce the application cycle. They also are looking at Knowledge Management and portfolio planning possibilities with the information resulting from electronic submission.

SF424 Forms—NIH is transitioning to the SF424 form data set because it also will be used by all federal grant-making agencies. Applicants can use these standard forms regardless of the program or agency to which they are applying. It also will reduce the administrative burden on the federal grants community. The new SF424 (R&R) is the government-wide data set for research grant applications.

Why the transition?

Public Law (PL) 106–107, called the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999, mandated that government improve the effectiveness and performance of federal financial assistance programs; simplify federal financial assistance application and reporting requirements; and improve the delivery of services to the public. In 2002, the President's Management Agenda stated that "Agencies must allow applicants for federal grants to apply for, and ultimately manage, grant funds online through a common Web site, simplifying grants management and eliminating redundancies…"

In addition, OMB has set this goal for agencies to achieve in FY 2005: Post 75 percent of funding opportunities in "Find" on Grants.gov "Apply." As eRA places all mechanisms on the timeline, we have to be sure we meet this goal. Also, the PHS 398 OMB clearance expires in September 2007, making sense not to continue with it and to transition to the SF424.

Transition Strategy

NIH will transition to electronic receipt by individual research program or funding mechanism. All applications in response to announcements with transitioned mechanisms will require electronic submission through Grants.gov using the SF424 form data set. Mechanisms not yet transitioned will continue to require submission on PHS forms on paper or through service providers.

NIH will announce its plan to transition mechanisms in the *NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts* about six months in advance. Funding opportunity announcements will be posted in Grants.gov "Apply" about two months before the submission date.

SF424 (R&R) Package—The package includes these standard components:

- R&R application/cover
- R&R project/performance site location(s)
- R&R other project information
- R&R senior/key person
- R&R budget
- R&R personal data (NIH will not use this because the information is part of the Professional Profile in the eRA Commons)
- R&R sub-award budget attachment

In addition to the standard components, NIH will require these agency-specific ones:

- PHS 398 cover letter file. This is optional and will be a PDF upload.
- PHS 398 cover page supplement. This will be a PDF upload.
- PHS 398 research plan. This will be a PDF upload.

- PHS 398 modular budget. This will be in an electronic form with data elements.
- PHS 398 checklist. This will be in an electronic form with data elements.

All of the forms are in the Grant.gov library. NIH-specific forms listed under PHS 398 forms.

- For all NIH forms: https://apply.grants.gov/FormsMenu
- For the PHS Checklist and Research Plan: http://apply.grants.gov/FormLinks?category=7

There can be up to ten PDF uploads and it was noted that there would be an upload for each section of the plan. This allows the computer to validate each one and to be sure that all sections are included in the application.

Applicants/institutions will need to be able to download the PureEdge™ forms from Grants.gov and to convert their files to be submitted in Adobe PDF format.

In summary, NIH's application package includes the agency-wide SF424 (R&R) components and the PHS 398 components.

Timeline

Currently, there is a partial timeline. Other mechanisms will be posted by November 15. The key dates so far are:

- October 15: Post Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR)/Small Business Technology Transfer Program (STTR) and R13/U13 announcements on Grants.gov
- November 15: Post the full schedule with all remaining mechanisms
- December 1: Submit SBIR/STTR via Grants.gov
- December 15: Post R15 announcements on Grants.gov
- December 15: Submit R13 & U13 via Grants.gov
- February 25, 2006: Submit R15 via Grants.gov
- June 6: Submit R03 & R21 via Grants.gov
- August 1: Post R01 announcements on Grants.gov
- October 1: Submit R01 via Grants.gov
- January 2007: Post National Research Service Award (NRSA—training and fellowships), careers & complex grants announcements on Grants.gov
- **May 31: Submit all mechanisms via Grants.gov**
- September 1: OMB clearance for PHS 398 from expires

We are expecting about 2,500 applications for the SBIR/STTR and R13 submissions. A question was raised about how people would apply through Grants.gov for unsolicited applications if Grants.gov required the application to be in response to a funding opportunity announcement. NIH will post blanket funding opportunity announcements for the unsolicited applications.

One of the CWG members observed that there was nothing in the schedule for pilot testing. The group agreed that pilots are extremely important for ensuring that the system works correctly for every

mechanism. If it is expected that R01s will be submitted by October 2006, then pilots and subsequent training are extremely important. Also, training for the October 2006 submission date needs to be done within a few weeks of the submission date and not many months before.

NIH has two dates in the fall. The CSR director is very keen to shorten the cycle. One option under consideration is to have more submission dates. For example, they are investigating changing submission dates for recompetes or revised applications but in ways to benefit the PI. There will be more on this next year.

2590s still will be submitted directly to the NIH. A common data set for Progress Reports for all agencies is being discussed. Once the application data set is done and released, attention will turn to the data set for Progress Reports and to post-award Commons registration.

Implications for HHS OPDIVs

Several operational divisions of DHHS already are working with eRA, but are at different stages. The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) will transition at the same time as the NIH. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and Health Resources & Services Administration (HRSA) are working with NIH to integrate into the eRA systems but may not be ready at the same time as the NIH. If a lot of technical changes are required for their integration, it may take longer because eRA resources have to be allocated primarily to eRA electronic submission.

NIH Preparations

The NIH is very busy with planning and preparing for this transition, including:

- Coordinating closely with Grants.gov. We are working a lot on communications.
- Technical development. We are talking with the Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) and other agencies about lessons learned from their similar transition.
- Infrastructure planning.
- Coordination with service providers.
- Interagency forms development and developing ways to handle complex mechanisms.
- Coordination of forms development with the Grants.gov forms factory.
- Application guide development, which will be different for the one that now is being developed for the SBIR service providers.
- Planning for transitioning mechanisms and posting of funding announcements.
- Increasing staffing for the help desks and coordinating their activities.
- Providing Grants.gov with a Citrix "workaround" for PC emulation for Macintosh users.
- Developing communication plans to manage the change internally and externally.
- Lots of contingency planning.

Regarding the experience of HUD, Peter Brunner, representative of Grants.gov, said that there was a very large instruction set that changed often. Consequently, users weren't sure which version was the most

current. In addition, there was an inexperienced user base, which caused other inefficiencies. The lesson that they learned was to make the instruction set very clear, geared to the most inexperienced user.

David Wright said that his experience of working with a group of people who have varying degrees of computer experience to use the SF424 instruction guide showed that the instruction guide needed a lot more work to make it usable for everyone. The users also said that they would want training. David said that NIH has increased the number of people on the Helpdesk.

Megan asked the group about training. Although it is not possible for eRA trainers to come to each institution to conduct training, she asked if their institutions would be willing to send a representative here for a "train the trainer" class. The group seemed positive about the idea but preferred to wait until a firm agenda for this class was available to make a commitment.

Macintosh Support—There was much disappointment in the NIH and Grants.gov for not providing support for Macintosh users. Currently, 25 percent of PIs have Macs. Mac users are very displeased and a few have written letters to their senators to have this rectified.

Although Grants.gov does not provide support for Macintosh users, the products and services developed by the service providers are platform independent. Additionally, institutions can develop their own systems to accommodate Macintosh users.

However, one member observed that the eCGAP project has been an excellent experience and that the process couldn't be where it is without it. Subsequently, working with Grants.gov has been very frustrating for users and institutions.

Training & Test Site—Grants.gov does not provide a test site, which is crucial for training purposes. Peter Brunner said that a training site was not a priority and that there were limited resources to develop one. However, the group agreed that without a test site, it was very difficult to train people on the application process.

It was suggested that Grants.gov set up a dummy site for people to practice submissions. Dummy numbers could be deleted daily. The eRA Commons test site is a good example of how it should be done.

Three suggestions were made for training:

- Train the trainer classes

- Video site

- Test site

Scarlett Gibb noted that Grants.gov has an excellent training site, which includes how to fill out a budget.

Action: **(Scarlett Gibb) Send the URL for the Grants.gov training site to the Commons distribution list.**

Contingency Planning—The NIH has been mandated to get the applications in electronically. Clearly, there has to be contingency plans, particularly should Grants.gov break or other technical problems occur. NIH is making plans to address this. However, NIH is going to a hard line on electronic submission in that if all electronic systems are working, applications must be submitted using them, no exceptions. This is why it is very important for institutions to stress to their staffs and PIs that the earlier the PI applies, the easier it will be for the applicant. Also, in the past, those agencies that have made using electronic submission an option have had a very low number of electronic submissions. This is not acceptable at this point.

It was noted that 80 percent of FastLane applications are uploaded within two hours of deadline. However, deadlines are spread out so there aren't too many at a time. With the NIH deadlines, there could be as many as 100 uploads for a single deadline at some of the larger institutions. It is important for PIs to understand that this is no longer "business as usual" and that it is to their great advantage to work with the new system and get in their applications prior to the deadline. At one institution, a director sent a memo stating that he wouldn't approve any applications that aren't in his office three days before the submission date. All agreed that this was a good idea.

Registration

Grants.gov and eRA Commons registration are required for electronic grant submission.

- Grants.gov registration is required *for institutions only,* and is a one-time only registration good for electronic submission to all federal agencies. Megan reiterated that it is critical for institutions to begin the registration process at least four weeks before applications are due. (See http://grants.gov/GetStarted)

- eRA Commons registration is required for institutions and PIs, and is a one-time only registration. This registration allows the NIH to receive applications electronically from Grants.gov and to validate them against NIH business rules. It also provides a way for the NIH and registered users to communicate electronically after submission. (See https://commons.era.nih.gov/commons/)

A CWG member said that it was crucial for NIH to tell faculty not to register with Grants.gov. It is not currently clear in the instructions or on Grants.gov. This is a problem on Grants.gov because for some agencies—non-profits, for example—individuals do register. Sheri Cummins, communications coordinator for electronic submission, will be sure that the information about the registration process, including the caveat about individuals not registering in Grants.gov, will be prominently placed in FAQs, instructions and other communication.

Options for Submission—There are two options for submitting electronic applications:

- Submit directly through Grants.gov using the PureEdge Forms Viewer, which can be downloaded from the Grants.gov Web site.

- Establish an electronic system that allows the institution to submit to Grants.gov using system-to-system (XML) data stream. It can be created by the institution or the institution can establish an agreement with a commercial service provider.

Error Checking—Grants.gov checks the schema and provides basic validation. PureEdge can check business rules as defined by NIH. This will be built into the processing workflow. The NIH then provides enhanced error checking upon receipt. Initially, any errors NIH finds will be posted on the Commons. Applicants and institutions will have to go to the Commons Web site to track their applications and check for errors. In later releases, NIH will notify applicants and institutions when errors are encountered.

When NIH downloads an application, Grants.gov will notify the Signing Official (SO), who, in turn, notifies the Principal Investigator (PI). This is the "heads up" for the applicant to start checking the Commons for the status of the application.

Currently, Grants.gov and NIH assign different numbers to track applications. Exploration is underway for the NIH to adopt the Grants.gov tracking number or for Grants.gov to adopt the process and tracking number that NIH uses.

Additionally, the group said that the notification includes the tracking number but without a title or PI name, it is very difficult to link the notification with the application. This is especially difficult when many notifications arrive at the same time and there are only two days in which they must be matched up and the applications reviewed and approved on the eRA Commons.

Action: **(Peter Brunner) Make sure that the Grants.gov notification sent to the SO notifying them that the application has been downloaded to the NIH includes the title of the application and the name of the PI as well as the tracking number to expedite the matching of the notification with the application at the institution.**

It was further suggested that the PI's name be in the subject field for the notification. In Grants.gov, there is a data field that could be used for an ID. However, some institutions use this field for their own, internal tracking number, which links the application to their system.

Action: **(David Wright) Send an email to institutions asking what information they would want in the Grants.gov confirmation notification.**

David will route all responses to the email to Peter Brunner.

It was suggested that Grants.gov adopt the NIH notification system that is already built into eCGAP. Peter Brunner agreed to consider but said that it could not, at this point, be ready for the December submission. However, notifications should all be in place by June 2006.

The SO or PI must go to the Commons and verify that the application is okay. If either one indicates that there is an error, the process stops and the application has to be resubmitted through Grants.gov (using the same tracking number).

Currently, the SO has to sign off on the application for Grants.gov submission and again for the NIH receipt. The question was asked as to why this redundancy when most institutions have applied for and received digital signature certification.

The SO has two days from the notification from Grants.gov that NIH has downloaded the application to sign off on the application. Why not let faculty submit the application to Grants.gov without SO signoff, and then have the SO sign off on it when it gets to the eRA Commons? Faculty is certainly used to tracking their applications when it is sent by paper and will continue to do so when it is electronic.

Action: **(Megan Columbus) Follow up to find out why NIH is requiring validation after submission.**

The group noted that while they will submit applications through Grants.gov, they will receive responses and confirmations in varying formats from the many agencies using Grants.gov. This makes it more difficult for the institutions to sort out.

Unregistering PIs—Many institutions want their PIs to route all of their applications and correspondence through a central office. Some wondered if it were possible to unregister PIs. However, although this issue may need more attention, at the present time it is not possible to unregister PIs. It is up to the institution itself to manage this process.

Information about Electronic Receipt

The NIH is disseminating information about electronic receipt through several avenues. Currently, you'll information is available at:

- NIH eRA' Electronic Receipt Web site: http://era.nih.gov/ElectronicReceipt/
- NIH Guide Notices: http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/guide/index.html
- Professional society meetings
- Booths at major scientific meetings

Changes in Mailers & Summary Statements

Suzanne Fisher

Suzanne recalled the days when each PI would send four self-addressed postcards with their applications, one of which would be mailed back to them at each stage of the application process. After that there were green and white SNAP mailers, and then the current paper letters for notification. And, there were always some problems with the mail. With this in mind, NIH has made the decision to go out of the paper notification business and put electronic notifications in its place.

Paper notification elimination will be done in three phases:

- Phase I: January 2006 Council Round. Summary Statements will not be mailed.
- Phase II: May 2006 Council Round. Review Outcome letters will not be mailed.
- Phase III: Timing to be determined. Other notification mailings will be eliminated once eNotification is fully implemented.

The announcement for eliminating paper review outcome letters and summary statements was posted in an NIH Guide Notice on September 8, 2005 (http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-05-075.html)

There will be a notice in the Review Outcome letters for the January 2006 Council Round stating that Summary Statements will not be mailed and providing a link for registering in the Commons. This again will be done in the Assignment letters for the May 2006 Council Round to alert applicants that the Review Outcome letters and Summary Statements will not be sent. Assignment letters and Change of Assignment letters will continue to be sent until eNotification is implemented.

The eventual cost savings for the mailings is enormous. For each application, there were three regular postage (37 cents each) and one heavier mailing. NIH expects more than 78,000 applications this year.

Multiple PIs—When multiple PIs are incorporated into the eRA system, they all will receive eNotifications. However, Suzanne noted that there also are plans to have one of the PIs designated as the corresponding contact so that for questions, all the PIs would not have to be contacted.

Additionally, parsing the Summary Statement into sections so that the administrative portion could be seen by institutional officials is under consideration. The concept still needs approval from the legal staff.

Scarlett Gibb, interim Helpdesk manager, said that she would like to post a contact list for each institution on the Commons. There already is one posted on the Grants.gov Web site. This posting would eliminate a large number of unnecessary phone calls to the Helpdesk. Currently, Helpdesk staff provides a list of all the Signing Officials at an institution when a PI inquires, and the PI has to figure out the appropriate contact.

There was much discussion about the most appropriate way to provide contact information for an institution in that many want the PI to contact the Office of Sponsored Projects (or equivalent), others

want to direct them to their own Web site for information, others have more than one phone number in the central office and etc. The group agreed that in the future, they would like to see a blank field in the Institutional Profile that would allow the institution to enter contact information in the form of a phone number or URL. Eventually, there should be a Point of Contact (POC) in the Profile.

It was suggested that, for the short term, the OER Web team develop a form that could be linked to the eRA Commons saying "contact your sponsored program office" giving a phone number or URL. One would be needed for each institution.

Fellows—The issue of Fellows having Commons' accounts was raised. Some schools do not allow Fellows to have an account while others allow it. From the NIH's view, Fellows and PIs are all researchers and there is no difference in the system. The PI designation in the Commons is a role and not a title—so Fellows and PIs with that role have the same authority. There was some discussion to change the role name to "researcher" but the expense of changing the system and all documentation was not deemed worth it.

Internet Assisted Review (IAR) Reviewers—Reviewers who participate in the IAR only will need to have their accounts affiliated with their institution to be able to submit applications electronically. eRA is going to contact them and remind them to register.

Dual Paper and Electronic—The group agreed that it would be unwise to issue paper and electronic notifications simultaneously for a period of time. They agreed that the switch should just be made directly to electronic notifications as discussed.

Group Emails—Institutions can set up a group email for eNotifications from the Commons. Before doing so, the group should be sure that all members of the group have permissions to see any information that might be contained in the eNotifications. However, no sensitive data would be mailed via the automatic Commons eNotifications.

Outreach

The plan for notifying applicants and institutions, besides including the information in the aforementioned letters, include the following:

- Broad dissemination of the plan to all extramural staff.

- Announcement banners on the OER, Commons and CSR Web sites.

- SRAs will add information about this change to any "welcome applicant" email/letter they send to applicants.

- ICs will be encouraged to send emails notifying PIs that their Summary Statements have been released and are available on the eRA Commons.

Commons Update

David Wright

A new Commons Task Order, with more than 100 enhancements, has been approved. It will be based on the new One View infrastructure. However, it won't be started until Commons 3.0 is released, which will be in December or January. Other items included in this task order are:

- Upload of Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW) documents

- Enhanced version of Just In Time (JIT)
- eSNAP enhancements:
    - Helpdesk able to "Reset" eSNAP.
    - AO/SO to upload files (not Progress Report). This is a safeguard to be sure that the PI is involved. However, the group suggested that this issue should be revisited. If the PI is delegated by the SO, the PI can upload.
    - Additional upload files (if needed).
    - Add "Save & Designate as Complete" button.
- Expand data in the Demo facility: Closeout, verification of electronic submission, request change in PI, etc.
- New administrative transactions (non-XML).
- More IAR enhancements.

Releases

2.7.3—November 1. This release will include bug fixes, Public Access integration, other OPDIVs in Commons and the Assurances. In 2.7.4, OPDIV grant information will be integrated.

For the Public Access integration, the NIHMS will automatically update a PI's Profile when the PI's publication is uploaded to the National Library of Medicine (NLM). It will be listed in the Profile under Publications/Citations. Citations will be listed separately: citations that the PI enters and citations that are automatically posted.

3.0—December/January. Included in this release will be the following:

- **X-Train:** training grants, reappointment and termination. Payback will remain in paper for the time being.
- **Organizational Hierarchies:** this was trickier to implement than anticipated.

For organizational hierarchies, we will move the current structure and assign grants to the nodes. After the conversion, all users will be at the root level. It will be the institution's responsibility to move the users to the correct place in the hierarchy.

Length of Department Names—The issue of department names was raised. Many of them are extremely long and the fields in the forms aren't long enough to accommodate them.

Varying Department Names—Often PIs do not enter the official name for their department on the face page. Consequently, there often are numerous names for one department. This will get ported over to the new organizational hierarchy. Since current grants are in the system with whatever department name they used, it will not work to change them now. It would be best to work with the PIs beforehand to be sure they use the right terminology.

Inactive Departments—It was agreed to port all departments to the new hierarchy but to provide a means for institutions to designate which ones are inactive. Ideally, they would then go to one node for inactive departments. Sometimes, grants are still attached to inactive departments so the departments cannot be deleted.

It was suggested that the NIH produce an Excel file with grants and departments for each institution, which would be very helpful to the institutions when they clean up their organization hierarchy.

Reporting Function—Web QT has been integrated into the eRA for internal staff but has not, as yet, been available on the Commons as promised. The Status module has limited query ability. The group agreed that they would like it higher on the priority list. It is not planned for the Commons for at least a year. David volunteered to provide a list of all priorities to the CWG so the group could decide what could be dropped so that the Web QT could take higher priority.

However, David said that resources are extremely limited and all focus is on electronic receipt. This means that any changes that are requested require a justification and assurances that it won't impede or take away resources from electronic receipt.

Hiding Names—It was suggested that there be a way to "Hide" faculty names, yet keep them on the list. This would be very useful because often people who have died or have moved are left on the list and it makes it more cumbersome to find current faculty.

Action: **(David Wright) Add "Hide" feature for faculty lists to priority list.**

IRB Spreadsheet—This has been pulled from the priority list because of competing resources. Marcia Hahn will investigate.

Misc. Items

David Wright

The question was posed to the group as to whether or not they thought a Commons users' listserv would be a good idea. Its purpose would be to communicate Commons information to all people registered in the Commons. If this would not be acceptable, what other means of communication would they suggest? The responses are as follows:

- Would rather have the information go to the Office of Sponsored Grants or other designated point of contact.

- Post changes in the NIH Guide as primary method of communication.

- Newsletter—most people did not want it sent out automatically. However, it was agreed that that people are reluctant to go to a site and sign up for something like a newsletter.

- Send to one point of contact in the internal communications group at the university and let them decide how to pass along the information.

- Urge people to sign up for the newsletter with instructions for doing so in the message when people change their passwords.

- Many universities are setting up systems that will filter unauthenticated emails, requiring all emails to be SMTP authenticated. This should be addressed by the NIH for all planned emails.

Next Meeting

Since the next meeting in January was scheduled for New Orleans in conjunction with the FDP meeting, the meeting location will be changed. A new location as yet has not been determined.

Attendees

CWG Members

Beck, Ellen (UCLA)
Custer, Tammy (Cornell Univ.)
Fant, Jane (Univ. of Alabama at Birmingham)
McKinney, Tolliver (St. Jude Children's
  Research Hospital)
Randolph, James (Univ. of Mich.)
Robins, Sandi (Univ. of Wisc. Medical School)
Sweet, Mark A. (Univ of Wisc., Madison)

Other Institutional Representatives

Drinane, Tom (Dartmouth Coll.)
Kirk, Graydon (Emory Univ.)
Lee, Linda (UCLA)
Marcussen, Tom (Oregon Health and Sci Univ.)
Marshall, Sue (Univ. of Minn.)
McNulty, Patricia (UMass Medical School)
Roadfeldt, Susan (Columbia Univ.)
Ross, Susan (Northwestern Univ.)
Stewart, Darin (Oregon Health and Sci Univ.)
Swavely, Todd (Univ. of Pennsylvania)
Valenzuela, Richard (UCLA)
Wilson, Thomas (City of Hope)

Service Providers

Bozler, Dianne (ERA Software Systems)
Harker, Chris (Cayuse)
Hennessey, Dan (ERA Software Systems)
Hullette, Forrest (ERA Software Systems)
Vargas, Deanna (ERA Software Systems)

NIH Staff/Contractors

Brunner, Peter (DHHS/Grants.gov)
Columbus, Megan (OER)
Cummins, Sheri (LTS/OERRM)
Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)
Fox, Daniel (OERRM)
Gardner, George (OPERA)
Gibb, Scarlett (OD/OERRM)
Hahn, Marcia (OPERA)
Seppala, Sandy (LTS/OERRM)
Sukhenko, Mikhail (OERRM)
Wright, David (OD/OERRM)