



**Date:** Tuesday, January 4, 2005  
**Time:** 9 a.m. –11 a.m.  
**Location:** Rockledge 1, Room 2198  
**Advocate:** Jennifer Flach

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, January 18, 9 a.m. to 11 a.m., Rockledge 1, Room 2198

---

### Action Items

1. (Sara Silver) Include receipt date, PI name, institution, title, review assignment, grant number, accession number, Program Announcement/Request For Applications (PA/RFA) number and Program Class Code as data fields in Cool Tool report for running a query on e-applications that are in a three-day lag period as well as Cool Tool report designed to list e-applications assigned to a specific IC or IRG/SRG. Have the Cool Tool query by grant mechanism or by PA/RFA. Include start date of three-day lag period in Cool Tool report.
2. (Lana Diggs) Incorporate notification to PI/SO that NIH received their attachment; burden is on applicants to make sure it is correct in Commons.
3. (Jennifer Flach) Follow up with Scarlett Gibb on including eCGAP information on the NIH Office of Extramural website as well as publishing NIH Guide Notice in March for June/July receipt dates.

### Cool Tool reports

Sara Silver discussed the data fields to be included in the Cool Tool report that would provide users with the ability to query e-applications in the 3-day lag period between assignment to an Integrated Review Group and actual release from Receipt & Referral, and applications that have been assigned to an IC or IRG/SRG. The Cool Tool would be an interim solution until eRA develops the infrastructure for e-notification, and therefore would be a relatively simple kind of report. It would include data fields such as PI, Institution, Project Title, Grant Number, Review Assignment and maybe an abstract.

Janna Wehrle suggested including Program Class Codes. Suzanne Fisher proposed adding the PA/RFA number. The group agreed that the query to get a report should be by IC/Integrated Review Group or Council date. A query by Receipt Date may also be helpful. Melissa Stick suggested that the Cool Tool query by grant mechanism as well as by PA/RFA. Richard Panniers proposed including the start date of the three-day lag period and the accession number.

**Action:** (Sara Silver) **Include receipt date, PI name, institution, title, review assignment, grant number, accession number, PA/RFA number and Program Class Code in Cool Tool report for running a query on e-applications that are in a three-day lag period as well as Cool Tool report designed to list e-applications assigned to a specific IC. Have the Cool Tool query by grant mechanism, not query by PA/RFA.**

**Include start date of three-day lag period in Cool Tool report and the accession number of grant.**

## **Electronic Corrections Feature List**

During the eCGAP pilots conducted so far, applicants have been able to submit corrections to their electronic grant application up to the point that the Principal Investigator/Signing Official verifies the application in NIH Commons. Now eCGAP is preparing business rules and the approval process for allowing corrections after the verification process; such changes are currently permitted post-receipt for paper grant applications. The group reviewed the Electronic Corrections feature list and offered suggestions.

***Corrections under Grants.gov***—Tom Tatham asked how applicants would submit corrections under Grants.gov since the federal one-stop Internet portal for grant information and submission does not accept corrections once the application has been accepted. Jennifer stated that one loophole is that before verification, applicants can resubmit through Grants.gov. However, mechanisms like adding a replacement page or providing additional information are not going to be available in Grants.gov anytime soon. Jennifer stated some potential solutions would be to submit through Service Providers or allow applicants to upload information to Commons, similar to Just-in-Time uploads. Tom stated that it is very important to create a solution for applicants not using Service Providers to submit corrections electronically. Skip Moyer asked how the signatures of applicants submitting to Grants.gov would be handled. Jennifer stated that when they use Grants.gov, they will still use Commons to verify applications, which serves as a signature.

***Reverify after submitting attachments?***—Everett Sinnett asked if applicants need to reverify after they submit addenda and other PDF attachments or make a structured data correction. The group discussed that requiring verification may not be necessary unless the grant image was being regenerated. The eCGAP team could send a notification to the Principal Investigator/Signing Official that the attachment has been received, but the burden would be on the applicants to look at the image if they desired. Tom asked what happens if the PI views the attachment and says it is garbled. Some group members suggested that the SRA be given the option of reversing their acceptance or deleting the attachment. David George noted that during a time of transition, giving applicants the opportunity to verify what they have sent is extremely important. Once eCGAP proceeds for a considerable period of time without a hitch, verification will be less of an issue.

***SRA discretion vs. set deadlines***—The group discussed at length whether there should be a set deadline for accepting corrections after verification or should acceptance or rejection of additional material be left to the discretion of the Scientific Review Administrator (SRA). The practice varies among different SRAs. The group agreed that corrections should be allowed and that the SRA should decide whether to accept it or not. If the application has not been released from the Division of Receipt and Referral, DRR will judge whether to accept the corrections or not. JJ Maurer asked if the eCGAP system should include options for the SRA to delete material that has been rejected or set it aside to a place where it is not visible. The group noted that there are legal and policy issues involved—documents need to be retained in case rejection of the application is appealed; on the other hand, lawyers urge people to keep fewer documents, not more. JJ noted that they could design a generic corrections system that SRAs will use as they

will. The group agreed that the policy issues should be examined in detail before any decision is made in the matter.

**List appendix content**—A group member asked if there were data fields on the Table of Contents where a PI could list the contents of the appendix. Sara Silver noted that there is an entry on the Table of Contents for an appendix and a check box on the Table of Contents for the appendix, but no place to list contents. Tom noted that on the paper form, there is an opportunity for the PI to enumerate the contents of the appendix. He suggested that a similar feature could be built in for the Service Provider.

**SRA note for reviewer**—Everett Sinnett asked if there could be a way for SRAs to add a memo to the file to reviewers stating for instance that certain items may not be in the application package. Tom agreed, saying it would help tremendously because there are often instances when an applicant refers to an appendix that is not in his package. A note from the SRA would alert the reviewer and save time spent looking for something that is not there. The note could be placed in the grants folder. A group member said that placing the note in the grants folder may not be a good idea because then it would be visible to the PI. The group did not reach a resolution on the issue.

**List of changes**—David George said it would be useful to have the ability to print out for reviewers the list of changes submitted after the original application. Right now, the reviewers do it by hand and it can be quite laborious. JJ Maurer noted that the change history would show the activities and actions since the application was submitted; in addition they would incorporate version control so that the reviewer would know which is the most recent document. Sara said that any printing would be done by CSR. Eventually, CSR's vision is to allow the reviewers to go online, select what they want printed and print up-to-date copies.

**Action: (Lana Diggs) Incorporate notification to PI/SO that NIH received their attachment; burden is on applicants to make sure it is correct in Commons.**

### **Update on eCGAP Release for Open Submission**

Jennifer Flach said that eRA plans to release the latest version of eCGAP software to production on Monday, January 10, and plans to “open access” on Wednesday, Jan. 13, so Service Providers can start submitting applications. The eCGAP team plans to post new information on the eRA website, including the verification deadlines. Once eCGAP opens production, they will not close after the submission date. No new version of eCGAP will be released for the February, March receipt dates. Janna Wehrle suggested that eCGAP include some of their information on the home page of the NIH Office of Extramural Research, where more people may see it. Jennifer said she had mentioned that to Scarlett Gibb and would follow up with her. As for a NIH Guide Notice, the group suggested that such a notice be published in March for the June/July dates. Jennifer said she would follow up on that too with Scarlett.

**Action: (Jennifer Flach) Follow up with Scarlett Gibb on including eCGAP information on the NIH Office of Extramural website as well as publishing NIH Guide Notice in March for June/July receipt dates.**

## Review of Action Items from Dec. 20 Meeting

1. (Sara Silver) Investigate possibility of developing a Cool Tool so that Receipt and Referral staffers and/or Integrated Review Group Chiefs/Scientific Review Administrators can run a query on e-applications that are residing in the “three-day lag period”; update group at the next meeting. **Done.**
2. (Sara Silver) Consult different ICs about the data fields they might require in a report generated by a Cool Tools query designed to list the e-applications assigned to a specific IC. **Done.**
3. (All) Suggest data fields for a report generated by a Cool Tools query designed to list the e-applications assigned to a specific IC for review. **Done.**
4. (All) Review and comment on proposed rules for verification. **Will send out the verification rules by email. Please review and send comments within the next two weeks.**
5. (Jennifer Flach) Assemble or work with Scarlett Gibb to assemble a “canned” set of slides and a script on e-applications for SRAs and/or POs to present at various forums. **Amy Swain is working with Scarlett to come up with set slides and talking points that can be used at any forum to talk about eCGAP.**
6. (Jennifer Flach) Consult Scarlett Gibb about implementing a formal communications/outreach plan for eCGAP initiatives before the system goes “open access;” forward Scarlett the list of communication methods/venues suggested by eCGAP Focus Group. **Jennifer said that Scarlett found all the ideas to be great. Jennifer urged the group to forward any specific questions that people may ask about eCGAP priorities and “open access” to her so they can prioritize based on what people want. The eCGAP priorities will be presented to the Commons Working Group next week for feedback. The priorities will be ranked and presented to the eCGAP group at its next meeting.**

## Review of Outstanding Action Items from Dec. 7 Meeting

7. (Jennifer Flach) Take discussion about how to integrate OPDIVs’ workflow with NIH workflow format to outside group and share outcome with the eCGAP Focus Group. **Trying to set up a meeting with OPDIVs to discuss that.**
8. (eCGAP team) Work on accomplishing some type of notification by the February/March timeframe so ICs and Review Groups have sense of workflow coming their way. Work on long-term plans for integrating workflow plan for OPDIVs. **Start with the Cool Tool reports. Ongoing discussion with eRA on workflow notification; lot of movement in planning toward workflow notification**
9. (Jennifer Flach) Follow up with Commons staffers to see why AHRQ (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality) information cannot be viewed in Commons. **Will touch base again with Commons staffers on the issue.**

## Attendees

Diggs, Svetlana (OER)

Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)

Flach, Jennifer (OER)

George, David (NIBIB)

Goodman, Michael (OD)

Liberman, Ellen (NEI)

Maurer, JJ (OD)

Moyer, George (Skip)  
(AHRQ)

Myers, Chris (NIDCD)

Myrbeck, Edward  
(NINDS)

Panniers, Richard (CSR)

Silver, Sara (OER)

Sinnett, Everett (CSR)

Stick, Melissa (NIDCD)

Subramanya, Manju  
(LTS/OD)

Tatham, Thomas (CSR)

Wehrle, Janna (NIGMS)

Wright, David (OD)