Electronic 901 Working Group Minutes

Date: Tuesday, April 19, 2005
Time: 1:00–3:00 p.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, 5th Floor, Room 5147
Advocate: Ellen Liberman

Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 26, 2005. Location RKL 1, Room 2198

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

Action Items

1. (Daniel Fox) Write up a description/definition for the new IRG/Review Chief Role.

2. (Daniel Fox) Create checkbox in User Admin to designate the individual who receives assignment of eRequests by default (as there can be more than one RL or IRG Chief).

3. (Daniel Fox) Make group-suggested changes to the Validation for IRG/SRG/SEP Fields document.

4. (Daniel Fox) Add a message to Council Date change warning users if they enter past council dates.

5. (Daniel Fox) Create a document explaining the routing Approval Chains of all fields discussed by the group.

Documents

1. IRG/SRG/SEP Validation Rules

Review Action Items from Last Meeting

Lana Diggs addressed the main Action Item at the last meeting, which was to update the validation rules, which the group began to discuss at the last meeting. Lana said that she and Daniel Fox met with Suzanne Fisher and defined these rules last week.

Identification of IRG Chief and RL Roles in IMPAC II

Daniel stated that identifying individual Integrated Review Group (IRG) and Referral Liaison (RL) roles within IMPAC II is necessary in order to forward requests to them. The group not only needs to create new roles, but also to define existing ones as they pertain to the Center for Scientific Review (CSR). Tech Reps within CSR and the ICs use a screen within User Administration System that helps them manage IRG clusters and user assignments to them. When there is a meeting change that occurs via a 901 change request through a routing system, an IRG Chief must be identified. The ultimate control over this process is at the institute level, while the

purpose of this identification is simply to create a new role. The group agreed to create a new role tentatively called *IRG/Review Chief*. This role will be assigned to people who will be associated with IRG clusters. The IRG reassignment role will be collapsed into this new role. The group asked Daniel to write up a new role definition.

Action: (Daniel Fox) Write up a description/definition for the new IRG/Review Chief Role.

Daniel asked whether or not the new IRG/Review Chief role should be broken down to include deputies or backups. The group discussed who should be able to receive eRequest assignments. Though members suggested both roles be able to approve requests, Daniel stated that this might cause some confusion. To avoid this, he suggested that while both people have the same role, only one person would be designated in the user admin. as being the default. In essence, one person would receive the events in the queue, while both can receive email. Eventually, Daniel plans to move this function to *My Queue*. The group confirmed with Daniel that these Events will be accessible by multiple people via the Track Requests screen. Daniel assured them that this would not be a hassle.

Daniel then asked the group about RLs, and the definitions of their role. The group agreed that they use the same process for the IRG/Review Chief, where there would be multiple people who can receive notifications, but only one listed as being the default.

Action: (Daniel Fox) Create checkbox in User Admin to designate the individual who receives assignment of eRequests by default (as there can be more than one RL or IRG Chief)

Mass Request Search Screen

Mass Requests are defined as any requests containing more than one application submission. Daniel stated that there was a separate screen for Mass Requests. Users used to do this via a query screen which allowed them to choose and submit multiple requests. However, Daniel would really like to use the search capabilities and wondered if they could simply use the ones already set up in the Web Query Tool (Web QT). Once the list of applications is found, those users who are authorized to submit Mass Requests will use a submission button after selecting desired applications. This would prevent having to use another, separate screen altogether. They will have to define more validations, stating that those applications are within the same council round and IRG cluster. Also, the people accessing these applications must be verified as authorized to do so. The group agreed that there need to be many restrictions on this function, so that unauthorized users do not incorrectly submit information that they are not allowed to manipulate. Currently, these will start with the IRG and in the future, it will allow IC changes.

Validation for IRG/SRG/SEP Fields

Daniel stated that most of the validation rules were completed previously. So far, they have the rules for the following: Grant Number, Generate Grant Number Checkbox, Council, Dual Council, and Dual ICs. The only topics to discuss validation for are the IRG, Scientific Review Group (SRG), and Special Emphasis Panel (SEP) fields. The group went through the list and decided whether or not the conditions that cause the error or warning message and the actual cautionary messages are correctly phrased. They compiled the following list.

1. *Correct*

2. Daniel will change this to include, "SRA Designator*/Flex Combination* is required. If the user enters a SEP meeting that starts with a *Z* and ends in a *1*, then he or she must enter the SRA designator code, while the flex code is optional."

3. *Correct*

4. *Correct*

5. *Correct*

6. *Correct*

7. *Correct*

8. This is just the opposite, so that R37 and Type 4s must be assigned to NSS.

9. *Correct*, but when there is a difference between the Placeholder for one IC and Primary IC, a warning occurs on the Grant Folder. This is unusual, but it does happen.

10. *Correct*

11. *Correct*

12. Should read: *If IRG Code and IRG Flex combination matches one of the Primary Investigator's (PI)* **unwanted** *IRG Code/Flex combinations, then warning*.

13. *Correct*

14. *Correct*

15. *Correct*, but change error message to *The **SEP** you entered is incorrect*.

In the 1.1.2 Validate SRA Designation algorithm, it should read:

*SRA Designation is Valid, if combination of SRA Designator/Flex fields is in the CMTE Federal Staffs table, and federal Staff Code is 'S' and the start date of the federal staff is blank **OR** before the date of the Council of the meeting, or the end date of the federal staff is blank and after the Council of the meeting. Council of the meeting is the Council Date on the Assignment Change request Form.*

Action: (Daniel Fox) Make group-suggested changes to the Validation for IRG/SRG/SEP Fields document.

Routing for Council Date Change

Daniel asked the group to help him figure out the approval chain to change the Council Date. Sometimes, a user might want to change an incorrectly entered date. The group also agreed that problems arise when institutes get a Request for an Application (RFA), receive many applications, review them, and then discover that they need more time. Everybody can submit a Council change, and it has to be active. The gatekeepers of this approval chain are the RL and the Department of Receipt and Review (DRR). Any request goes to the IRG Chief, who can always forward it on. The approval chain when a Council change originates in the CSR looks like this:

Anybody → IRG Chief → DRR Chief

If the approval chain begins in the IC review, then it goes through the RL instead of the IRG Chief. Also, within the institutes, these types of changes might go through a post-review process. When these change, the routing will remain the same since this process is unidirectional. The only change that this process cannot make is from the present to the past. The group suggested that there be a warning that tells users that they are entering a past council date. It will not prevent a user from entering in this information, it simply provides a warning.

Action: (Daniel Fox) Add a message to Council Date change warning users if they enter past council dates.

Daniel asked who can perform the action of changing the Applications Assignment from one IRG to another. The RL is the gatekeeper for "TO" to "FROM" activities. When going from the IC to IRG meeting, then the RL of the "FROM" will go to the "TO" IRG chief of CSR. The SRA is only the last step in the approval chain for DRR notifications. Daniel stated that the RL of the IC, in order to get proof, has to go to the DRR Chief. Most of these will be in conjunction with the primary IC change, but occasionally it will be one IC reviewing another. The "FROM" to "TO" is the acceptable process for this.

Routing Grant Number Change (Excluding IC)

Daniel stated that if there is an incorrectly assigned grant number, there only needs to be a one-step workflow. This change does have to be reviewed, but it can go from the SRA to the DRR or from the RL to the DRR. This does not require the inclusion of an IRG Chief within the routing process.

Routing Combination of Grant Number and Dual IC Change

This change concerns changing a mechanism and adding a dual at the same time. When recognizing an application as an R01 and not an R21 or R03, then GM can be a tool, but it cannot be a tool if it actually is an R03 or R21. The group agreed that this does not need any more approvals, only the mechanism change. It will go through the same routing as a regular Grant Number Change. Daniel explained that any other combination including an IC Change will not generate any extra routing. RLs will receive notifications, as will the PI since many of the duals are included at their request. Summary statements from the PIs will be stored in the Commons.

Routing Grant Number Change (Including IC)

The group stated that anyone may begin this process and that the approval chain will look like this:

$$RL \rightarrow RL \rightarrow DRR$$

If there is a change from an IC to IRG meeting, then an IRG Chief must be within the approval chain. ICs must first agree to the meeting, then there must be the approval of a CSR study section before it goes to an RL and begins the approval chain. Daniel suggested that there needs to be some kind of alert (checkbox) that allows DRR to make a change. Submit requests will be blanked out, which indicates to the user that there is information that still needs to be entered, and

there will be a warning when the IRG field is not properly filled in. There will also be another warning/note that tells the user that there needs to be a CSR review. Daniel informed the group that there will be multiple forms of notifications. One will involve the next step within the workflow assignment; another will inform that user of the actions that he or she performed within the chain, while yet another him or her about the conclusive outcome of the process.

Daniel will compile this information, create a document, and present it at the next meeting. He will also speak to the group at further length about eNotification.

Action: (Daniel Fox) Create a document explaining the routing Approval Chains of all fields discussed by the group.

Attendees

Diggs, Lana	Edwards, Michael	Fisher, Suzanne	Fox, Daniel
Hagan, Ann	Liberman, Ellen	Melchior, Christine	Noronha, Jean
Paugh, Steven	Stesney, Jo Ann		