

# IAR Requirements

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
1	<p>IAR Demo:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General Requirement that all items in current production release must also be in IAR Demo facility.</li> <li>2. Add ability to view Grant Images. This can already be done via Commons Demo, so IAR Demo must just mimic production IAR in terms of viewing Grant Images.</li> </ol> <p>NOTE: Create bogus Grant Image for all applications.</p>	Commons Expansion	Added to Commons Expansion Task
2	Commons IAR reviewers with foreign telephone numbers have a problem entering the foreign phone number.		Added to Maintenance Task for Commons
3	Under Investigation - I have heard from several reviewers that they are unable to see the scores that have been submitted for applications on which they are discussant. When IAR first came out and Discussants were blocked from reading other critiques unless they submitted something, we all agreed that was in error and the programming was fixed to correct that. It seems however, that they continue to be blocked from seeing the scores.	Maintenance Defect:CQ15285	Add to Maintenance
4	Need a Score Matrix Report in Excel.	Maintenance CQ15355	Added to Maintenance TO
5	SYSTEM GENERATED E-MAIL TO REVIEWERS: The e-mail asks the reviewers to activate their accounts at least a week before the meeting. Should be changed to at least 2 weeks before the meeting.	Maintenance	Added to Commons Maintenance TO
6	<p>When enabling, if reviewer has commons username but account is NOT active and request_status_code is V (status in control center is pending NIH) send a new email that you have an username and as soon as NIH data quality approves your account you'll get an email with your username and confirming that your account is active. (right now we send them their username and assume their account is active).</p> <p>When enabling, if reviewer has commons username but account is NOT active and request_status_code is I (status in control center is pending reviewrr) resend the registration url so the user will be prompted to complete what they missed (right now we send them their username and assume their account is active).</p> <p>-----</p> <p>If a user tries to login with a commons account that is in V status, not active yet - the error should tell them that their account isn't active yet and they'll get an email when it becomes active but until then they can't login. Right now the error they get is that account is locked and that's not correct.</p> <p>If a user tries to login with a commons account that is in I status, they should get an error that tells them they need to complete their account registration request before they can proceed and we should take them to the registration url or verify NIH support so they can complete the request.</p>	Commons Expansion	<p>Added to Commons Expansion Task</p> <p>Note: Both Commons and IAR Use Cases will be modified</p>
7	<p>The old active accounts created before recent modifications to Commons to store account statuses in person_Assoc_fields_t table do not show as active on Control Center.</p> <p>Need to modify IAR to make sure that if account is active regardless of table entry in person_assoc_fields_t (use old</p>	Maintenance 15286	Add to Maintenance

# IAR Requirements

	accounts_t.status_code) then show 'Active' in the account status column on the Control Center.		
8	For column headings, add the word "Preliminary" on score matrix and anywhere the "Score" column is shown so it says "Preliminary Score" instead of just "Score".	Maintenance CQ15283	Add to Maintenance Task
9	<p>Search Meeting Capabilities for SRA/GTA and NCAA:</p> <p>For SRAs, in addition to search capabilities, show list of all meetings they normally see. When searching, only show meetings to which SRA/GTA has IRG Cluster access. This alleviates the need for SRA or GTA to be on meeting roster, any SRA or GTA in IRG cluster can see the meeting (same security used by Peer Review).</p> <p>If NCAA on List of Meetings screen then show Search screen and nothing else when first on the screen. Search Fields will be Meeting Identifiers and SRA Name. Once search button is pressed, list of meetings will be displayed and Search Option will remain on the top of the screen. Remove Restriction to show meetings only when meeting phase dates is set.</p> <p>Show Display All (or Reset) Button to reset the list of meetings after the search back to the original state.</p> <p>Allow meeting sorting: By Council, SRG/Flex, SRA/Flex.</p>	Commons Expansion	Added to Commons Expansion Task
10	Filter old meetings from list of meetings. Meetings older than 6 months should not appear...or if meeting start date has passed and no phases were setup, meeting shouldn't show.	Maintenance CQ15282	Add to Maintenance Task
11	When Prelim. Summary Statement is created, subproject critiques are pulled into the preliminary summary statement for the parent application. If subproject application is not in the same meeting as a parent application, then critiques for these subprojects are not pulled into the preliminary summary statement for parent application. This is a defect. The system must pull critiques for subprojects into a parent application prelim. Summary statements even if subprojects are in different meeting than the parent.	Maintenance Defect:CQ15287	Add to Maintenance
12	<p>Roberta Binder (SRA) reported that several of her reviewers submitted critiques during the Read phase (they were blocked and had not submitted previously) and when she viewed their critiques (through the view link for the application or View PDF or View Meeting Critiques) the reviewer showed as Unassigned in the critique header.</p> <p>The pre-ss correctly showed reviewer role instead of unassigned but the other viewable critique options must be corrected.</p> <p>The requirement is that whenever a reviewer submits a critique it should show their correct role in the header.</p>	Maintenance Defect: CQ6014	Add to Maintenance
13	<p>Add a meeting-wide option for including or not including discussant and reader critiques in the pre-summary statement bodies.</p> <p><u>DFOX Note:</u> If changing this option in post Submit phase, all pre-sses in the meeting will have to be deleted and regenerated.</p>	Maintenance CQ15352	Added to Maintenance
14	Add a sort on Avg Score on the List of Applications for SRA/GTA (by Application). A sort by Average Score should have a secondary sort on PI name.	Maintenance CQ15281	Added to Maintenance Task

## IAR Requirements

15	<p>IAR Control Center must allow SRA/GTA to send custom batch emails to selected (including Select ALL option) reviewers in the meeting.</p> <p><u>Details:</u></p> <p>(Reviewers' email addresses should be BCC so Reviewers cannot see other recipients).</p> <p>IAR Control Center must allow SRA/GTA to specify the "From" addressee in the custom batch email to all Reviewers. IAR Control Center must send the Carbon Copy emails to SRA/GTA when batch emails are sent to all Reviewers.</p> <p>IAR Control Center must return undeliverable emails to the SRA/GTA when batch emails are sent to Reviewers.</p>	Commons Expansion	Added to Commons Expansion Task
16	The system must provide the ability for SRA/GTAs to submit unassigned critiques for Reviewers.	Maintenance CQ15353	Added to Maintenance TO
17	<p>The IAR should include the ability for the SRA/GTA to identify hyperlinks to documents for display within their meeting in IAR.</p> <p>For documents not available on the Web, the IAR Control Center should allow the SRA/GTA to upload documents for display within IAR.</p> <p>This could meet needs previously voiced for a reviewer folder.</p> <p><i>The system could allow the SRAs/GTAs to post the application abstract themselves (for reviewers to read or that can be used to auto assemble the summary statement). Could be done manually by SRA/GTA with new feature for uploading documents/urls.</i></p>	Commons Expansion	<p>Meeting Materials</p> <p>Added to Commons Expansion Task</p>
18	3/4/2003 suggestion. It would be very helpful to see Lower Half data reflected on the List of Applications screen. It could go somewhere on the same line as the Average. That is, the label "Lower Half" could appear just to the left of Average with an X appearing for those so designated.	Maintenance CQ15279	Add to Maintenance Task
19	List of Applications screen should indicate the date and time of Pre-Summary Statement creation.	Maintenance CQ15354	Added to Maintenance TO
20	The List of Applications screen for Reviewer's should allow reviewer to sort their list of applications by these column headings: <del>application number (activity code/IC/serial), PI name (secondary sort on application number)</del> , assignment role (secondary sort on PI name), score (ascending 1-5), and critique submitted date (show blanks on top and do secondary sort on application number, sort most recent date first).	Maintenance CQ15280	<p>Add to Maintenance Task</p> <p>Crossed over items already implemented in production.</p> <p>Clarify that this is for Submit Phase only.</p>
21	Add meeting wide option to toggle the ability to submit non-numeric scores. Default is Allow.	Maintenance CQ 15637	Added to Maintenance task
22	Modify the boilerplate on the Critique/Score confirmation screen to remind reviewers about score entry and provide instructions on how they can enter score later.	Maintenance CQ 15638	Added to Maintenance task
23	The system should provide virus protection from any viruses that may exist in critique files. (10/16/02 This is dependent on Framework and may or may not be completed for version 1, phase 1.)		Short-term solution in place.
24			Delete
25	<p>Unlike Regular Reviewers who have not submitted their critiques in SUBMIT phase and are blocked, Discussants cannot upload their critiques.</p> <p>This is due to the rule that allows Discussant to view other critiques in READ phase even if they did not submit their own.</p>		Priority: Medium/High
26			Delete
27	Request for chairman of the meeting/committee to have additional privileges in IAR. What privileges are needed?		Priority: Low

## IAR Requirements

			<p>Want chair to be able to read all critiques and to send the entire assignment list.</p> <p>It was noted that chair, if enabled as a reviewer, can read all critiques in Read Phase.</p>
28	SUMMARY STATEMENTS OF MULTI-PROJECT APPLICATIONS: Need capability to create preliminary SS of subprojects. This may also be a requirement for Peer Review application.		Priority: Medium/High
29	<p>Creating Pre-SS for multiproject applications</p> <p>There does not need to be a separate SS for a subproject, but the problem is that IAR doesn't create a preliminary summary statement for the parent grant unless the parent grant has critiques.</p> <p>We usually do not have a critique for the parent project since the overall opinion on the application cannot be written until all of the subprojects are discussed at the meeting. There are always a number of different expertise areas that need to be heard from for a program project. The final "resume" or opinion is then written from the notes of the discussion at the meeting and the SRA is the one that does that.</p>	<p>Maintenance</p> <p>CQ17472</p>	Added to Maintenance Release
30	SRA or Reviewer needs ability to post multiple critiques/scores for a reviewer.		Priority: Medium
31	<p>Brian Wojcik NCI</p> <p>7) I would like to the double appearance of the screen from Adobe asking if I want to open or save the critique, when I click on view, to go away. It should just open the critique, then the SRA/GTA can go to file/save if they want to save it elsewhere.</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete</li> <li>2. Reviewers must be on the list of Reviewers in Asgn Reviewers Screen.</li> <li>3. Delete</li> <li>4. Delete</li> <li>5. Delete</li> <li>6. Delete</li> <li>7. Will investigate further. (Low Priority).</li> </ol>
32			Delete
33			<p>Delete</p> <p>Can't treat Telephone Reviewers as Different types of Reviewers.</p>
34			Delete
35	<p>The IAR Control Center should allow SRA/GTA to toggle show/hide preliminary scores from all (meeting wide option) Reviewers in IAR. If Scores are hidden, Reviewer would only see scores they've entered.</p> <p>If scores are not visible (as designated by SRA/GTA in Control Center) Reviewer will not see score portion of score matrix—they will only see lower half.</p>		Low
36	The system could include online, personalized, completely electronic, conflict of interest forms.		<p>Priority: Low</p> <p>Will be useful when we go completely electronic without paper signatures and conflict of interest forms.</p>

## IAR Requirements

37	<p>When changes occur (i.e., any change in the assignment matrix, COI, application added, withdrawn, or deferred), Reviewers and Discussants associated with the affected application (EXCLUDING those in conflict and mail reviewers) should receive email notification of the changes. This requirement may be met by another upcoming eRA system - Notification.</p> <p>When an application is deferred (901 change)/moved to another meeting, if critiques were already submitted the SRA/GTA should have the option of whether to keep or delete the critiques.</p> <p>When changes in conflicts are added or deleted, the affected reviewer should receive email notification of the changes. This requirement may be met by another upcoming eRA system - Notification. This requirement needs more discussion because "On the one hand, it is important that a reviewer be notified when a conflict has been removed, so (s)he will know of the need to be prepared for discussion of the application. On the other hand, if an SRA "enables" the meeting in IAR and THEN does a conflict check on all reviewers, there could be multiple messages about conflicts that were already known to the reviewer as well as both the addition and the "ignoring" of non-conflicts. Reviewers would NOT want that kind of bombardment."</p>		<p>Priority: Low</p> <p>The e-notification system (under development) will address this issue. When the new system is operational, the analysts will bring the issue back to the team to reconsider.</p> <p>One issue with this is that SRA/GTA would need the ability to turn off this feature while meeting is being finalized.</p>
38	<p>Some SRA/GTAs read critiques as they are added to the ER Web site allowing them to be better prepared for meeting and to spot potential problems. A useful feature would be the ability to mark an application as read and approved by the SRA/GTA to help streamline the assembly of triaged summary statements in particular. If a critique is updated then the check mark will be removed automatically.</p>		<p>Priority: Low</p>
39	<p>Allow users to choose certain applications to merge associated critiques into a PDF file.</p>		<p>Priority: Low</p>
40			<p>Delete See #21.</p>
41			<p>Delete See #30</p>
42	<p>Streamline voting: The SRA/GTA needs to define ineligible reviewers—Mail Reviewers are generally not eligible to vote for streamlining an application; however, others on the committee may wish to see the opinion of the Mail Reviewer. Thus, a screen with the list of reviewers and three columns is needed so as to exclude access, include but display only (i.e., don't count toward the criteria of two UN votes), or include fully. All regular reviewers should default to "include fully" while Mail Reviewers should default to "display only."</p>		
43	<p>The SRA/GTA needs to monitor votes—A display building on the 1500–50 (Tally) screen would be useful, with the number of UN votes (or scores) displaying next to that utilizing the same set of columns headings. This would allow the SRA/GTA to know who hasn't voted at all, who might have forgotten to vote on discussant assignments, or who has such a light load that the lack of UN votes may not be a concern.</p>		
44	<p>The SRA/GTA needs to be able to exclude applications from streamlining based on activity code criteria. Basically, the system must allow SRA to tell system: "Do not allow fellowship to be unscored".</p>		<p>Medium Related to 50</p>

## IAR Requirements

	Together with 50.		
45	There should be a separate date for streamlining to be set and for display. A bold display of the Deadline for Posting (set by the SRA/GTA) information should appear when reviewers logon to the web. Any UN votes submitted after the deadline would register as "late votes" and would not count toward preliminary streamlining. They need to be confirmed at the meeting.		Delete Related to 50
46	Export to Order of Review—Some SRA/GTAs like to manipulate the Order of Review so as to push all the UN applications to the bottom of the list. Such an Export button would transfer the existing streamlining information to the Order of Review screen, causing all UN applications to migrate down (but keeping the same order while doing so) and then be Resequenced.		Defer until Peer Review Redesign.
47	Update & Transfer to Score Entry screen—After the meeting, the SRA/GTA or GTA could update UN results (add UN's or change to D), then transfer these results to the Master Sheet for score entry.		Defer until Peer Review Redesign
48			Delete
49	Using scores, the system should determine which applications have two votes of 3.0 or worse.		Delete Related to 50.
50	<p>SRA/GTA needs the ability to establish "Floating Cutoff"— If scores or percentile votes are registered, pushing the Floating Cutoff button would perform an iterative procedure whereby a score or percentile is found for which at least 50% of the applications have two or more scores as bad or worse than the cutoff. A window should open indicating, for instance, "A cutoff of 2.6 resulted in 55 percent of the applications falling into the "floating lower half" (two or more votes of 2.6 or worse)." An "Accept" button would establish that as the cutoff, while "Step Back" and "Step Forward" buttons would move the floating cutoff to worse or better scores. SRA/GTA should have Cancel button to abort.</p> <p>Together with 44</p> <p>Lower Half label on the List of Applications will have number in parenthesis indicating number of streamlined scores under the "cut off point".</p> <p>Floating cutoff for streamlining to &gt;&gt; % "UN" - While an averaged score could be used to determine the "true lower half" (to include all with two UN votes plus enough scores to reach half the total # at the meeting), a floating cutoff would more closely follow the spirit of streamlining by looking for applications with two scores at or worse than a specified level. For example, input "2.5" and the program would identify all applications with two prelim scores of 2.5 or worse. If that did not net enough applications, let the cutoff float to a better score, maybe 2.3, etc.</p>		Medium
51			

## IAR Requirements

52	<p>The Critique Upload screen should allow SRA/GTA to submit user-defined alphanumeric preliminary scores.</p> <p>If an SRA/GTA submits an alphanumeric score, the Critique Upload screen should limit the entry to 3 characters.</p> <p>The Critique Upload Screen should verify that the alphanumeric score submitted by the SRA/GTA exists on the score list of values (acceptable values need to be determined by group).</p>		Medium
53	<p>This and other Summary Statement Related Requirements should be:</p> <p>a) When producing Preliminary Summary Statements, use RPC developed guidelines to plug in Headings of each section right inside the document. Fully format per ss needs (caps, bold) Insert New, Foreign... Flag human subj</p> <p>1. Once done – do the following:</p> <p>If Read phase ended (or Edit Phase if specified) and meeting is released, automatically submit preliminary ss as a draft summary statement. This will later be available on Prepare SS Screen In Peer Review. If meeting was NOT release by the time the phase ended, use meeting release to trigger the automatic submission of the SS draft</p> <p>Prep for electronic abstracts - the ability to automatically pull electronic abstracts (from electronically submitted applications) should be planned for.</p>		High
54			Delete See 53
55			Delete
56			Delete
57			
58	<p>The summary statement contains a “Description” submitted on the grant application. Since applications are scanned and bookmarked, this “Description” section should be evaluated for feasibility of automatically incorporating it into the summary statement during generation/combination of critiques.</p>		High if we can do it.
59			Delete See 53
60	<p>System should allow the ability to create a streamlining report to include PI name, application number, LH (lower half, no objection), D (Discuss-Objection), single votes, late votes. This report can be distributed to Reviewers at the start of the meeting. It can also be adapted as, or used to guide setting up, the actual order of review.</p>		Medium Related to 50
61	<p>System should allow the ability to create a significant difference report. Identification of significant difference could be by SRA scanning the list of scores and checking to indicate applications with major differences of opinions</p> <p>Add Significant Differences Check Box to the Designate Lower Half – the flag should work just like for Lower Half for</p>		Medium

## IAR Requirements

	SRA/GTA. Show Significant Differences label on List of Applications, just like for Lower half to SRA/GTA		
62	Allow Reviewers to see List of Assigned Reviewers in all Phases (should be a pop up window off of application record in the list of applications) – except COI.		High
63			Delete
64	SRA/GTA will need a printable report of a list of applications that have been nominated by one reviewer for streamlining.		Medium Related to 50.
65			Delete Just like 61.
66	When meeting is released or assignments are purged manually, the Peer Review system should check that the assignment purge date is on or later than the Edit Phase End Date. If this is not the case—the user of the system should get an error message preventing them from doing the task and instructing them to change the Edit Phase end date if there is a need to release a meeting or purge assignments.		low
67	One suggestion was to allow "percentile voting." This may be a method peculiar to my group, but I find it works for us. That is, instead of voting 1.6 or 2.4, which are rather arbitrary numbers, my group votes 15% or 25% to indicate that an application is in the top 15 or 25% of applications that they are used to seeing. Then, when we get to the meeting, I give them the raw score equivalent to write on their score sheet.  Whether I've made that clear or not, the request would be for a second score box to allow that kind of voting (0 - 100%). I don't really expect the idea to fly unless there are others who make a similar request, but you never know unless you ask, right?		Low
68	My personal preference would be to have the ability to have the Word document with all of the reviews in there just like the PDF one. DFOX Note: This requirement will add a toll on the system to now to create word documents (with all the maintenance, such as deleting later, etc.).		low
69			delete
70	THE SRA-GTA SHOULD BE CCD on the system-generated e-mail. This should be an option, decided by each SRA, GTA and met by the eNotification system.  An alternative way to meet this requirement would be to provide in the control center a method for the SRA, GTA, RTA to see "who got what and when" (reviewer, date/time enabled, and which email they received (new account, existing account) and provide current sample of the email text they received.		Medium/high
71	HELPDESK INFO: Help Desk contact information should be displayed more prominently and clearly. It is currently found in the footer for commons under a Contact Us link.		high
72			delete
73	Multiproject applications - 1. The Word document that is generated for the entire summary statement does not separate the projects and cores. The GTA has to go through the document and figure out where one project ends and the next begins. It would help in managing the Preliminary Summary Statements if each subproject critique is marked with the Header of the Subproject in the Preliminary		High



## IAR Requirements

	Summary Statement text.		
74			Delete
75	<p>The Critique Upload screen should allow Reviewers to submit user-defined alphanumeric preliminary scores.</p> <p>If a Reviewer submits an alphanumeric score, the Critique Upload screen should limit the entry to 3 characters.</p> <p>The Critique Upload Screen should verify that the alphanumeric score submitted by the Reviewer exists on the score list of values (acceptable values need to be determined by group).</p> <p>Per 6/3/04 meeting, several ICs (NCI, NHLBI, NIAID) would use this for triage. Scores would be defined and maintained at an IC level. This should be discussed at a future RUG meeting.</p>		Medium/high
76	<p>There should be a Control Center option that would allow SRAs to force Discussants to submit a critique in order to view other critiques on that application. While NIH/CSR policy does not require this (and that is why we had you change the programming of the first release), there are some IRG that feel that it is important that Discussants post a review with at least a few bullets before they are allowed to see the other critiques. This forces them to put some independent thought into the applications strengths and weaknesses so that they are not entirely swayed by the opinions of the assigned reviewers. Per 6/2/04 meeting, this should be discussed at a future RUG meeting.</p>		low
77	<p>On list of meeting screen - Two suggestions: First, put the acronym in bold (e.g., <b>ZRG1 RES D (02)</b>). Second, near the Action column, include a narrow column with the # of apps. Most often, SRAs can pick out their meeting based on the number of apps as quickly as by looking for the acronym.</p>		Added to Maintenance task
78	<p>When sorting on Reviewer in the List of Applications screen, there should be an option for a Word download on a critique by critique basis</p>		Low
79	<p>Word versions of individual critiques also be made available on the regular listing. The rationale was based on the fact that summaries are updated at random times, so if a presummary is already downloaded and a new critique appears, it would be more efficient to simply download the single critique and replace it.</p>		Medium/low
80	<p>Periodically email Reviewers when they have started but have not completed their registration</p>		Re-evaluate after July release (improvements to registration process)
81			Delete
82	<p>SRAs need to see Commons User IDs of potential Reviewers - could be an addition to the Person Admin.</p>		Added to Maintenance task for Persons Administration
83			delete

## IAR Requirements

84	<p>System for tracking progress thru the queue - Apparent problems with accounts being in pending NIH status for many days, even weeks, while others move quickly. Should work on a "first in, first out" methodology. Problem Profiles cannot be on hold for so long.</p> <p>If pending NIH for 4 days, alert to QA staff</p> <p>Address problem of new passwords forgotten - Part of the problem may stem from the restrictions on creating passwords. While these almost certainly can't be changed, perhaps the screens could make them more clear, maybe by using examples. Also need to explore other possible causes of problems - use of Netscape? Cookie settings?</p>		Discuss with user support, re-evaluate after new account registration and approval process has been in place for a few months.
85			delete
86			Delete as suggestion but add this text to a FAQ or user guide.
87	Exclude Mail Reviewer score from avg - scores by mail reviewers may be informative to other reviewers and should be allowed. However, those reviewers generally do not take in "the big picture" of the application and therefore, their votes should not be utilized in coming up with the average score.		Daniel&Tracy to investigate. Per guidance from group at 6/3 meeting, Mail reviewers shouldn't be allowed to enter a score.
88	On Control Center, include (Mail) next to mail reviewers (like (Phone))		High
89	<p>Reviewers need access to prior summary statements.</p> <p>There is a suggestion to hide score and % on these prior summaries (DFOX Note: Cannot edit prior Summary Statements).</p> <p>This requirement may also be met by adding grant folder to IAR. Content would need to be defined.</p> <p>Add view Grant Folder capability to IAR for both Internal and External Users. While SRA Grant Folder content will match the content for Grant Folder accessed from Peer Review, Reviewers view of the grant folder should be limited to the following documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. e-Application</li> <li>2. Prior Summary Statements</li> <li>???</li> </ol>		medium
90			delete
91	Reviewers who submit a critique but not a score who look at the submit critique and score screen see an empty field next to "Critique File". Many find this confusing, feeling that they need to resubmit their critique. For those reviewers who HAVE already submitted a critique, it would be helpful to have a prominent flag such as, "Critique submitted February 17, 2004, 6:16 PM." Also a note such as, "You may enter/change your score without resubmitting your (unaltered) critique" would be useful.		Added to Maintenance task
92	Option to force all reviewers to enter (either numeric or alpha) score - for some meetings, streamlining not used; also, pilot being run to provide scores for applications that end up streamlined. Default should be NO – do not force. This should be implemented as a meeting wide option.		Medium/high
93			Delete
94	a)		Delete, move to #53 with other preliminary summary statement redesign suggestions.

## IAR Requirements

95	Improve design of IAR pages - Reviewers should be able to use them without help just like we do for amazon.com. Mostly the pages are intuitive except for a few items like <b>do not use Netscape</b> , locating IAR on the title bar (a big arrow needed - click here), fixing addresses, bigger hints for MAC users with better placement		Low
96			Delete – violates policy for review discussions, may be a relevant tool for other business areas.
97	Score Matrix & Streamlining a) Popup of revr names, assgnmts, scores - by clicking on appl - would allow SRA to assess where the scores came from, who might be missing		a) medium b) delete, move to related item #50 c) delete, already covered in #87 d) Policy discussion needed for releasing pre-ss to program, There are concerns, defer this item. e) delete f) delete g) delete, covered by 68
98	In the Read phase, when a reviewer goes to check out the score matrix, they are given a notice on all their Discussant assignments that "you are blocked from seeing scores." I know this came up earlier, and the workaround is for them to go back to their own assignment list which DOES show the scores, but it is inconvenient when they want to take in "the big picture."		High – bug, discussants shouldn't be blocked on score matrix.
99	Score Matrix SRA-only View on Assignment priority - This would be useful as a one or two page reference to have at the meeting to know who voted what. Since not all the folks assigned to the application submit before the meeting, it would need to be a matrix so you could see missing scores. A typical example would have P1, S1, T, D1, D2, M for column labels (as would appear on an assignment list).		medium
100	Allow sorting of all screens on Review Order.		medium
101	When Reviewer submits scores for the application where he previously submitted critique, right after submission the View link to critique is not available (it appears back when Critique is regenerated in PDF). The system should have the View available all the time, and during the critique regeneration time in PDF, the View should display the original Word File that represents the critique. This is not happening.	Maintenance CQ17621	Added to the Maintenance
102	3.		Delete, merge with #89
103			Delete, combined with #73
104	Is it possible to sort a list of applications in IAR so that applications where Human Subjects are involved sort to the top? (Question from RUG)		low
105	The reviewers of Cancer Research Fellowship Study Section (ZRG1 F09 20L) would like to have a column for the Sponsor's Name on the List of Applications. At present this list contains the columns for Application number, PI Name, Project Title, Institution Name, and RFA/PA. The introduction of Sponsor's Name in the list would greatly help the reviewers in deciding whether they are in conflict with any application		Medium/high Impacts both iar and review
106	When Subproject Number starts with 0, like in 0001, the Sort of Subprojects under the parent application stops working. This needs to be fixed, so that Subprojects always appear under the Parent Grant on the List of Applications screens.		High This is a bug
107	Show/Hide Score Matrix from Reviewer should be a Meeting Wide Option		Low

## IAR Requirements

108	Add a link to ZIP all Preliminary Summary Statements when there is at least one preliminary word summary statement in the meeting to a List of Meetings screen for SRA/GTAs (instead of going to list of applications screen)		High
110	INVITATION LETTER: Should have subject line matching the meeting name in the IMPAC system (because this way reviewers are more likely to identify the e-mail as genuine and important).		Medium high
111	MULTIPLE PROFILES: In the CM module one of the multiple profiles should be identified as the one that is "active" in IAR (does not apply to reviewers who have multiple profiles none of which are active in IAR)		High
112	Some large meetings suffer performance due to a large amount of records to display on one page. Suggestion is to allow users to "paginate" through pages when there are more than 75 applications in the meeting.		Medium high
113	There seem to be a bug where list of subproject critiques within preliminary summary statements is not ordered using the Order of Review order. Also, the ability to specify the order for subproject critiques using Peer Review Order of Review screen is not well known or advertised.		high