Electronic ARA/901 Working Group Minutes

Date:	Tuesday, Jan. 6, 2004
Time:	1:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m.
Location:	Rockledge 2, Room 3087
Chair:	Ellen Liberman

Action Items

1. (Sara Silver) Review minutes from the last two ARA-901 Focus Group meetings and email comments to the group distribution list.

2. (Sara Silver) Discuss internal process for Dual IC Changes at next ARA-901 Focus Group meeting.

3. (Sara Silver) Talk with the Grants Management Analyst to determine the way Withdraws are handled in the system.

4. (Sara Silver, Suzanne Fisher) Meet to discuss the business rules for 901s.

5. (Chris Melchior) Confirm if IRG Chiefs need to approve grant # (mechanism) changes.

Minutes

Sara Silver asked the group to review the minutes from the last two ARA-901 Focus Group meetings. The minutes are posted on the eRA Web site: December 9 meeting (http://era.nih.gov/Docs/ARA_901s_Meeting_Minutes_12-09-03.pdf) and December 16 meeting (http://era.nih.gov/Docs/ARA_901s_Meeting_Minutes_12-16-03.pdf). Sara asked that the group email comments to the ARA-901 distribution list.

Action: **(Sara Silver, All) Receive comments on minutes from the last two ARA-901 Focus Group meetings and email comments to the group distribution list.**

901s and Workflow

Sara asked the group to finish discussing the list of 901s generated and processed last year in the IMPAC II database. She reminded the group to define each type of 901, review/suggest a workflow and chain of approval for each 901 in the electronic 901 system, and identify any additional requirements. The group began by reviewing Council Change, an item that was discussed at the last meeting. It was decided that Council Change should remain a 901 type in the electronic system, even though IC Review users can use the Review module to change the council date. CSR Review users do not have this capability in the Review module. The group proceeded to discuss the remaining 901 types:

1. **Council and Dual IC Change**

    - *Definition*—A Council and Dual IC Change is a change in council date as well as an addition or deletion of an IC.

- *Current Chain of Approval*—A 901 is not required for a Dual IC Change. The group explained that when a 901 is submitted for a Dual IC Change, it may be submitted for internal tracking purposes by the IC or in response to a PI request by the Division of Receipt and Referral (DRR). When an IC adds or subtracts an IC, DRR approval is not required. Similarly, when DRR adds or subtracts an IC, IC approval is not required. However, DRR should notify the IC. Finally, several group members explained that their ICs have a designated individual who is responsible for adding/subtracting ICs.

- *Suggested Chain of Approval*—If an IC adds/subtracts a Council and Dual IC Change, the 901 should remain internal to that IC. An internal process for 901s within an IC needs to be developed. Also, the Electronic 901 system should allow users to configure who in the IC can add or subtract an IC. Finally, if DRR submits a 901 requesting a Council and Dual IC Change, the 901 should be sent to the IC Referral Liaison.

2. **Council and Grant # Change**

   - *Definition*—A Council and Grant # Change can either be a change to the council and the mechanism, a change to the council date and the primary IC, or a change to the council date, mechanism, and primary IC.

   - *Suggested Chain of Approval*—

     a. *Council and Grant # (mechanism) Change*—A 901 requesting a change to Council and Grant # (mechanism) should be sent (for approval) from the requestor to the IC Referral Liaison. The Referral Liaison will then send the 901 to DRR for final approval/disapproval.

     b. *Council and Grant # (primary IC) Change*—A 901 requesting a change to Council and Grant # (primary IC) should be sent (for approval) from the requestor to the IC Referral Liaison of the requesting IC. The Referral Liaison will then send the 901 to the Referral Liaison of the receiving IC who will then obtain the required signatures. The Referral Liaison of the receiving institute will send the 901 to DRR for final approval/disapproval.

     c. *Council and Grant # (mechanism and primary IC) Change*—A 901 requesting a change to council, mechanism, and primary IC would follow the flow for the 901 for a change to council and primary IC.

3. **Council, Dual IC, and Grant # Change**

   - *Suggested Chain of Approval*—The workflow/chain of approval for a 901 requiring both a Council, Dual IC, and Grant # Change should follow a combined workflow/chain of approval previously suggested for Council and Dual IC Changes and Council and Grant # Changes.

4. **Dual IC Change**

   - *Suggested Chain of Approval*—The workflow/chain of approval should be internal to the IC since a Dual IC Change does not require approval outside the IC. This will ultimately relieve the burden on CSR.

5. **Dual IC and Grant # Change**

- *Suggested Workflow/Chain of Approval—*The workflow/chain of approval for a 901 requiring a Dual IC and Grant # Change should follow the workflow/chain of approval suggested previously for both the Council and Grant # Change as well as the internal process for Dual ICs (this internal process still needs to be determined).

6. **Grant # Change**

- *Suggested Chain of Approval—*

    a. *Grant # Change (mechanism)—*A 901 requesting a change in Grant # mechanism) should be sent from the requestor to the IC Referral Liaison. The Referral Liaison will then send the 901 to DRR for final approval/disapproval.

    b. *Grant # Change (primary IC)—*A 901 requesting a change to Council and Grant # (primary IC) should be sent (for approval) from the requestor to the IC Referral Liaison of the requesting IC. The Referral Liaison will then send the 901 to the Referral Liaison of the receiving IC who will then obtain the required signatures. The Referral Liaison of the receiving institute will send the 901 to Receipt and Referral for final approval/disapproval. However, many ICs have an additional liaison who receives and approves these kind of changes; the electronic 901 process needs to accommodate these ICs. The group decided that the workflow/chain of approval should be configurable.

7. **Withdrawal**

- *Definition—*A Withdrawal is a 901 requesting the removal of a grant from consideration. A Withdrawal does not mean that a grant has been deleted from the system. Withdrawals can be requested both internally and externally by the PI. Withdrawals can occur for many reasons (the Principal Investigator (PI) asks that the grant be removed, the PI dies and a new PI is not been instated, an application is non-responsive to an RFA/PA and the IC chooses to withdraw it). The group recommended that Sara talk to Grants Management to better understand how Withdrawals are handled in the system.

- *Current Chain of Approval—*Usually, a Withdrawal is requested by a PI who sends a signed letter to the NIH. The appropriate IC Official (sometimes an official in Referral, sometimes in Review) creates a 901, signs it, and attaches the letter from the PI. The IC Official then sends the signed 901 (the signature of the PI and the IC Official are required) and the attached letter to DRR for final approval/disapproval. In addition to PIs, ICs and CSR can also request a Withdrawal; these are usually for administrative reasons. If the IC requests a 901, the 901 follows the same workflow/chain of approval as if a PI requested the 901. If CSR requests the 901, it is created, approved and a notification is sent to all involved parties (including the PI) that the application has been withdrawn.

- *Suggested Chain of Approval—*
    a. *If Requested by Principal Investigator—*Once the letter from the PI is received (most often either by Review or Referral), the IC Official should scan the letter, create and electronically sign a 901, attach the letter from the PI to the 901 and send to Program (the group emphasized the importance of keeping Program in the loop on Withdrawals). Program should send the 901 to the Referral Liaison and the Referral Liaison should then send the 901 to DRR for final approval/disapproval. All parties should then be notified on CSR's final decision via email or some other notification means. It was unresolved whether the system will allow an attachment directly or another means of sending the attachment, e.g. e-mail.

    b. *If Requested by IC—*The 901 should be sent from the IC Official to Program, from Program to the Referral Liaison, and from the Referral Liaison to DRR. All parties (including the PI) should then be notified of DRR's final decision.

    c. *If Requested by CSR—* The Review staff or DRR staff should create the 901 and DRR should approve it. CSR should then notify Review, Referral, Program, and the PI that the application has been withdrawn. The group asked if it was possible to display a Withdrawn status in the Review module. Sara said that she would speak with the Review Analyst on this matter.

8. **Reinstatement**

   - *Definition—*A Reinstatement is a 901 requesting that an application be reinstated after it has been accidentally withdrawn.

   - *Suggested Chain of Approval—* The workflow/chain of approval for a 901 requiring a Reinstatement should follow the same workflow/chain of approval that was previously suggested for a 901 requesting a Withdrawal. All involved parties along the chain of approval should be notified when DRR takes action.

9. **Deletion**

   - *Definition—*A Deletion is a 901 requesting that an application be purged from the system. Deletions are usually required when there are applications that have been mistakenly been entered twice or when a revision has been withdrawn before review (deleting it will mean the PI hasn't "used up" one of their three allowed revisions). PIs, ICs, or CSR (Review or DRR) can request deletions.

   - *Suggested Chain of Approval—*The workflow/chain of approval for Deletions should follow the same workflow/chain of approval previously suggested for 901s requesting Withdrawals and Reinstatements. All involved parties along the chain of approval should be notified when DRR takes action.

Action: **(Sara Silver) Discuss internal process for Dual IC Changes at next ARA-901 Focus Group meeting.**

Action: **(Sara Silver) Talk to the Grants Management Analyst to determine the way Withdrawals are handled in the system.**

Action: **(Chris Melchior) Confirm if IRG Chiefs need to approve grant # (mechanism) changes.**

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held January 20, from 1-3 p.m. This meeting will focus on the internal processes for 901s and how to build this workflow into the electronic request system, the final requirements for the Electronic 901s, and the business rules for 901s. Sara explained that she will present the business rules for 901s for confirmation and discussion. She intends to meet with Suzanne Fisher to discuss the rules in depth.

Action: **(Sara Silver, Suzanne Fisher) Meet to discuss the business rules for 901s.**

Attendees

Armistead, Allyson (LTS)

Calderone, Gerald (AHRQ)

Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)

Goodman, Michael (OD)

Hagan, Ann (NIGMS)

Liberman, Ellen (NEI)

Melchior, Christine (CSR)

Noronha, Jean (NIMH)

Ratnanather, Chanath (OD)

Silver, Sara (OD)

Stesney, JoAnn (NIAID)

Vann, Cecelia (NIH/OD)