



eCGAP Focus Group

Date: Tuesday, June 7, 2005
Time: 9:45 a.m. to 11 a.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, Room 2198
Advocate: Jennifer Flach

Next Meeting: Monday, June 20, 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., Rockledge 1, Room 2198

Action items

1. (Jennifer Flach) Find out from Service Providers why no detailed budgets were submitted for the June 1 receipt date.
2. (All) Recommend to policy that since budgets are capped at five years, applicants be required to resubmit for further funding.
3. (All) Get feedback from ICs on the five year budget limit
4. (All) Try to obtain statistics on applications granted funding exceeding five years.
5. (Jennifer Flach) Take the issue of piloting SBIRs/STTRs and R13s through Grants.gov to 424RR Transition Working Group on Thursday (June 9)
6. (Jennifer Flach) Arrange for applicant community to be notified once a decision has been reached to pilot SBIR/STTRs and R13s.
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.
8. (Jennifer Flach) Place a note in the Grants.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."

Status from June 1 Receipt Date

Jennifer Flach

Jennifer reported that 24 applications were received electronically for the June 1 receipt date, with all the applications having modular budgets. She said she would find out from Service Providers at the next conference call as to why no detailed budget applications were submitted.

Handling Human Subjects— Jennifer noted that the main issue that arose during this receipt date was in connection with applications that came in with no human subjects. The instructions for the new 398 specify that all applications are supposed to have a human subjects page that says "No human subjects" if there are no human subjects. Due to an oversight, that functionality was not included for eCGAP applications. For these applications, the Service Providers were instructed to include a Protection of Human Subjects attachment, containing the title "Section E. Human Subjects Research," followed by "No human subjects research." However, the eCGAP software inadvertently prevented the Human Subjects attachment from being included in the grant image. Service Providers were then given the option of including the words "Section E. Human Subjects Research. No human subjects research," at the end of the PDF for Section D or adding those

words at the beginning of Section G. The Service Providers were informed that neither of these workarounds will generate a table of contents or bookmark entry for human subjects, but all reviewers will be alerted to the fact there will be no such entry.

Jennifer said the eCGAP team is going to look at whether they can fix this issue for the July 1 date. If a quick turnaround is not possible given the resources, the team will continue communications on the issue with Service Providers. Suzanne Fisher will help convey the nuances to reviewers. Mike Goodman noted that until the instructions have been properly amended and the datastream structured to accommodate the new approach, applicants may use their discretion in determining where to submit the inclusion report. He noted that most will probably opt to include these reports in section E, to avoid having them counted in the page limit which CGAP automatically enforces via its validations.

***Update:** This issue will not be fixed for the July 1 receipt date, given resources and the short time left until the next receipt date. The plan is to modify eCGAP's handling of human subjects for the October/November receipt cycle.*

Suzanne noted that an issue that reviewers are also facing with paper applications is that for Type 2 applications, if an applicant puts the inclusion report in with the Progress Report, the inclusion report will be counted against the 25-page limit for sections A-D. The solution that is being proposed is to exclude the inclusion report from the 25-page limit.

Budget Numbers wrapping around—An issue that the eCGAP team does plan to fix for the July 1 receipt date is decimal numbers wrapping around to the next line. Budget figures on form pages 4 and 5 of the grant image, as well as on the modular budget justification page, are coming in with decimal precision to two places. As a result, on the modular budget pages, the numbers are wrapping so that part of the number appears on the next line.

For instance, the number \$200,000.00 will appear as:

\$200,000.0

0

The issue is being fixed by eliminating the decimal numbers. Jennifer noted that it was more a formatting issue than a content one.

Business Rules Issues

Five budget periods versus six or seven—Mike Goodman noted that the eCGAP team is wrestling with the issue of how to take in more than five budget periods on a grant application. With paper applications, applicants sometimes take the budget format page and add a column for the sixth year. Mike asked the group whether that practice should be sustained in the electronic model or is it something that happens only on occasion. Suzanne noted that the issue comes up rarely, probably once a year. Some ICs put out a Request for Application (RFA) requesting a seven year budget. The other example is that of an F30 (an MD/PhD Fellowship award), where it may take the applicant more than five years to complete both MD and PhD degrees. In such instances, a waiver is usually granted. JJ Maurer noted that it may not be cost-effective to make substantial changes to the electronic model to accommodate just a handful of applications. Suzanne noted that the 398 form states as a policy that the request for funding should not be for more than five years. The group agreed that they would recommend to policy that since budget periods are capped at five years for 398s, applicants should be required to resubmit when seeking further funding. The group also agreed that they would seek feedback from ICs on whether they can live with the five year limit on budgets. The group suggested that getting more statistics on applications seeking funding that exceeded five years would be helpful.

Action: (All) Recommend to policy that since 398 budgets are capped at five years, applicants be required to resubmit for further funding.

Action: (All) Get feedback from ICs on the five year budget limit

Action: (All) Try to obtain statistics on applications granted funding exceeding five years.

Update on Grants.gov and 424RR Transition

Jennifer Flach

Jennifer noted that the 424RR Transition Group has discussed, but not made any final recommendations on:

- Whether to accept 424RR on paper
- Whether to fix Receipt and Referral to allow data entry for 424RR
- Identifying the first types of NIH grant opportunities to roll out for applicants to submit through Grants.gov.

The group is leaning towards:

- accepting small business grant applications, both Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) grant applications via Grants.gov for the application deadline of December 1, 2005.
- In addition, OPDIVs like AHRQ are looking at the possibility of accepting R13 (conference grants) via Grants.gov for the deadline of December 15, 2005. The group suggested that NIH ICs also look at accepting R13s via Grants.gov.

Conference Grants—The advantage of R13s is that it is centrally solicited and applicants are also required to get the prior approval of an IC before submitting an application for a conference grant. Ellen Liberman said the pilot should be widely advertised through ICs so that applicants are made aware of it. While ICs can publicize this information on their websites, Suzanne said a line could be added to the IC-issued approval letter stating that, “This application can only be submitted through Grants.gov.” Jennifer noted that she will take the issue of piloting these two types of applications to the 424RR Transition Working Group at its June 9 meeting.

SBIR subcontracts—Tom Tatham asked if the agency specific forms will handle subcontracts on SBIR. David Wright noted that the group that put together the 424RR dataset is now working on the SBIR form. In the event that they cannot get it to Grants.gov on time, the fallback option is to quickly develop a single form that can be processed fairly quickly. One issue with the Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) grant applications is that a certification – basically a signature – is needed from the collaborating institution. David noted that could be accomplished by adding a third validation, the signature of the third party’s Signing Official, in addition to the signatures required from the applicant institution’s Principal Investigator and Signing Official.

Grants.gov online demo—Richard Panniers noted that the Grants.gov website had an online demonstration on how to send in a grant application, but it was not specific to a grant mechanism. He suggested that a demo outlining the submission of a specific grant mechanism would be extremely useful and wondered if eRA could recommend that to the Grants.gov team. Jennifer said she would do so.

Grants.gov emails—Sandy Karen noted that Grants.gov sent an email to an applicant that the application had been successfully submitted but followed it up with an email three days later stating that the application was invalid. She noted that if a grantee submitted an application and went on vacation, he or she might miss the application deadline. JJ Maurer noted that the first email was probably stating that the application had been successfully downloaded; the second

was probably sent after the application went through the validations. Suzanne noted that the issue could be resolved by changing the wording of the first email to indicate that the application has been received and is now going through validations.

Action: (Jennifer Flach) Take the issue of piloting SBIRs and R13s through Grants.gov to 424RR Transition Working Group on Thursday (June 9)

Action: (Jennifer Flach) Arrange for applicant community to be widely notified once a decision has been reached to pilot SBIRs and R13s through Grants.gov

Action: (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

Action: (Jennifer Flach) Place a note in the Grants.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.”

Review Action Items from May 26 meeting

1. (Jennifer Flach) Inform Service Providers that the Inclusion Enrollment Report should be placed in Section E. *Done*
2. (Sara Silver) Update requirements to change the wording of bookmark to state: “Inclusion Enrollment Report and/or Targeted Enrollment Table” and schedule the change in time for the October 1 receipt date. *This will not be done if the solution is to include the report in the research plan and exclude it from the 25-page limit.*
3. (Suzanne Fisher) Add this note to printed copies of eCGAP applications sent to reviewers: “If there is an Inclusion Enrollment Report, it will be found with the Targeted Planned Enrollment Report due to the way the data is structured.” *Done. This is being done for July but if the solution mentioned in action item 2 above is implemented for October, Suzanne need not add this “inclusion report” caveat to the printed copies of eCGAP applications going to reviewers in October.*
4. (Manju Subramanya) Inform Service Providers that for applications that come in with no human subjects, Service Providers should include a Protection of Human Subjects attachment, containing the title “Section E. Human Subjects Research,” followed by “No human subjects research.” *Done*
5. (Sara Silver) Compile number of eCGAP applications received to date that involved human subjects and send to group. *Done*
6. (Manju Subramanya) Send out Commons Working Group meeting slides with these minutes. *Done*
7. (Sara Silver) Craft sample subject lines for notification and email it to the group for feedback. *To be done.*
8. (Sara Silver) Incorporate appendix discussion items in future requirements. *To be done.*
9. (Tom Tatham) Recommend to Scarlett Gibb that the following sentence be added to the Submitting Grants Electronically webpage (http://era.nih.gov/Projectmgmt/SBIR/sbir_grants.htm) to clarify the “select grant applications” sentence: “Applicants will be able to submit applications for those grant

opportunities that are posted by NIH on the Grants.gov website as packages for Apply.” ***To be done.***

- 10.** (Jennifer Flach) Inform Service Providers that the certification chart will be posted on a specified date and they have to complete their recertification by that date. ***Jennifer said she will inform them at next week’s (the June 15) conference call.***

Attendees

Dixon, Diana (OD)	Maurer, JJ (OD)	Swain, Amy (NCRR)
Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)	Moyer, George (Skip)(AHRQ)	Subramanya, Manju (LTS/OD)
Flach, Jennifer (OER)	Myrbeck, Edward (NINDS)	Tatham, Tom (CSR)
George, David (NIBIB)	Panniers, Richard (CSR)	Wright, David (OD)
Goodman, Michael (OD)	Silver, Sara (OER)	
Liberman, Ellen (NEI)	Stallone, Don (OD)	
Karen, Sandy (HRSA)		