



Electronic 901 Working Group Minutes

Date: January 11, 2005, Tuesday

Time: 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Location: Rockledge 1, 5th Floor Conference Room

Advocate: Ellen Liberman

Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 25, 2005. RKL 1 – 5th Floor Conference Room.

Action Items

1. (Lana Diggs) Update “As Is” list by rearranging illustrated representations of the 901 initiating procedure.
2. (Lana Diggs) Facilitate a discussion on the pros and cons of PIs initiating the 901 process at the next 901 Focus Group meeting; add topic to meeting agenda
3. (Lana Diggs) Update Feature List with the following:
 - (a.) **Ability to Enter Justification**
 - (b.) **Ability to Attach Documents**
4. (Ellen Liberman) Compile a list of suggested ICs to be included in future meetings in order to broaden representation.
5. (Daniel Fox) Brief the 901 Focus Group at the next meeting on whether it is better to submit 901 requests separately or in bundles.
6. (Lana Diggs) Include an organizational hierarchy to the Features List.

Handouts

“As Is” Business Process Model Handout http://era.nih.gov/docs/901_FG_Models_FINAL.pdf

“To Be” Business Process Model Handout http://era.nih.gov/docs/901_FG_Models_FINAL.pdf

Features List http://era.nih.gov/docs/901_FG_Models_FINAL.pdf

Status

Group Chair, Lana Diggs, went over the previous meeting and reminded focus group members that the role of these meetings is to update the 901 process to an electronic medium. So far, the group has updated the models based on comments from the group presented at the last meeting.

“As Is” Business Process Model

Lana presented the updated “As Is” 901 Business Process Model document, noting changes she made based on suggestions from last month’s meeting:

http://era.nih.gov/docs/901_minutes_12-09-04_final.pdf.

Suggested “minor” update points from the group were the following:

- Rearrange symbols of Principal Investigator, IC, Scientific Review Administrator, and the Division of Receipt and Referral to properly illustrate that each initiates the 901 process independently and is not solely motivated by the PI.
- Add clearer representation to the 901 process by showing more interactions between initiating bodies such as the PI, IC, SRA and DRR and other authorizing officials.

Action: (Lana Diggs) Update “As Is” list by rearranging illustrated representations and processes of the 901 initiating procedure.

If PIs were allowed to submit 901 requests in the Commons, the group was concerned that the following issues would arise:

- An increase in volume of 901 requests (approved and not approved) in the system
- Sharply reduced personal interaction between group members and extramural representatives.

Lana thanked group members for their suggestions and agreed to update the “As Is” model to accurately show that the PI has the ability to initiate a change within the 901 process. The group will discuss those different types of changes as well as the pros and cons of the PI’s involvement in the initiation process at later point in time.

Action: (Lana Diggs) Facilitate a discussion on the pros and cons of PIs initiating the 901 process at the next 901 Focus Group meeting; add topic to meeting agenda..

“To Be” Assignment Change Request Business Process Model

Lana also presented a document illustrating the “To Be” assignment change request business process model: (http://era.nih.gov/docs/901_FG_Models_FINAL.pdf). This model represents what the 901 process will be in its updated form. It represents way eRequest will be processed in the future. This effort is in the initial stages.

Group members reviewed the handout and posed the following questions:

Q: What happens if the 901 is rejected?

A: The form goes back to the initiator.

Q: Is there a clerk still processing this?

A: No, the processing clerk has been eliminated.

There were some questions raised about tracking from the initiator throughout the entire process, but the tracking will be controlled, as is currently done, in the Referral Audit process.

Feature List

Lana presented the proposed list of features for the 901 system: (http://era.nih.gov/docs/901_FG_Models_FINAL.pdf).

The group reviewed the features and suggested the following:

- For feature F1 (initiating a request), there should be some sort of acknowledgement of a change or an inappropriate request. There should be a rationale or justification for why an applicant's request moves, changes or is deemed unsuitable. There should be a way to attach this acknowledgement electronically.

Action: (Lana Diggs) Update Feature List with the following: (a.) Ability to Enter Justification and (b.) Ability to Attach Documents.

The group asked whether the “Delete” component would be used? Lana said that this question was raised at the last meeting, and it was decided that while “Delete” would not be used, a “Withdrawal” would. Group members also asked whether the “Duals” option would be used. Lana said that a Program Official may be able to request Duals, but not without approval.

Ellen Liberman suggested that the group be expanded to ensure that the needs of all ICs were taken into consideration regarding the 901 system. The group decided to compile a list of suggested ICs to be included in future meetings in order to broaden representation and discuss the potential roles of extramural parties.

Action: (Ellen Liberman) Compile list of suggested ICs to be included in future meetings in order to broaden representation.

Finally, the group discussed an e-mail sent by Daniel Fox concerning the pros and cons of submitting the 901 form separately for each transaction, or bundled. This issue will be discussed next week as Daniel Fox will be in then.

Action: (Daniel Fox) Brief the 901 Focus Group at the next meeting on whether it is better to submit 901 requests separately or in bundles.

- For the F10 feature (the ability to track a request), tracking will indicate where the initiation process of the 901 form begins and where it ends.
- For the F13 feature (the ability to delegate approving authority to a request), there should be an organizational hierarchy throughout all of the features in this list.

Action: (Lana Diggs) Include an organizational hierarchy to the Features List.

Finally, group members asked about the timeline for delivering a usable 901 system. Lana said that “something usable” would mostly likely be available within six months. 10 to 11 months would yield something with a larger functionality.

Attendees

Armistead, Allyson
(PCOB/LTS)

Jerry Colderone
(CSR/BBBP)

Diggs, Lana (OD)

Faenson, Inna (OD)

Hagan, Ann (NIGMS)

Lieberman, Ellen (NEI)

Melchior, Christine (CSR)

Noronha, Jean (NIMH)

Paugh, Steve (OD/LTS)

Roberts, Luci (NIH/CSR)

Silver, Sara (OD)

Stesney, Jo Ann (NIAID)