



## eRA Project Team Meeting Minutes

---

**Date:** Tuesday, April 12, 2005  
**Time:** 9:00–10:10 a.m.  
**Location:** Rockledge 1, 5<sup>th</sup> floor conference room  
**Chair:** Izja Lederhendler, Jim Cain

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, April 26, 9:00 a.m., Rockledge 1, 5<sup>th</sup> floor conference room

---

### Action item

1. (Scarlett Gibb, Izja Lederhendler) List priorities that would be considered for funding in FY2006 if surplus money becomes available during the year.

### Presentation of eRA FY2006 Budget Request

*Izja Lederhendler*

Izja presented eRA's budget request of \$45.87 million for FY2006 to the Project Team, noting that it would be presented for approval to eRA's governance body, the Information Technology Working Group (ITWG) the next day, April 13. The budget calls for no major new initiatives, given that this is a tight budget period. Izja noted that the cost drivers for this budget include user expectations, priorities of the federal government (OPDIV integration, Grants.gov) and needs within NIH such as reorganization (Division of Extramural Activities Support, DEAS) or major initiatives (Roadmap, Disease Coding).

He noted that planning for this budget had moved speedily, at least five months ahead of where eRA was in the budget process at the same time last year. Once this budget is approved, it will allow the eRA team to move ahead with its projects for FY2006. Izja thanked the many people who contributed to the intense planning process over the past few months.

**Overall budget request**—Izja said eRA's initial budget request for FY2006 came in at \$53.53 million, significantly higher than the FY2005 base figure of \$41.73 million. As has been typically done in years past, Izja said he is presenting three different budget scenarios:

- Using his professional judgment, Izja said he reduced the initial budget request to \$45.87 million.
- Assuming flat funding for FY2006, the budget request was further reduced to \$41.73 million under a second scenario.
- Assuming a two percent cut below flat funding is required, the budget request was whittled down to \$40.93 million.

Izja noted that the proposed cuts represent difficult decisions that had to be made in many areas.

**Framework for budget**—The proposed budget request spans seven broad areas:

- Operations and Maintenance
- Systems Enhancements
- Electronic Receipt
- Enterprise Grants System

- ❑ Reporting
- ❑ Knowledge Management Disease Coding
- ❑ External Drivers

Izja noted that this budget request represents eRA’s move away from a framework of a large array of individual projects to a set of services that it is providing. This move will enable eRA to clearly spell out to its clients the services it provides and the cost of those services. This framework will also enable eRA to internally distinguish services that it is providing from new development.

### Summary –FY2006 Funding Request (in millions)

	PROJECTED IN FY2005	PLANNED IN FY2006
Operations & Maintenance	\$22.14	\$23.70
Systems Enhancements	\$ 4.31	\$ 2.95
Electronic Receipt	\$ 2.07	\$ 9.19
Enterprise Grants System	\$10.80	\$ 3.29
Reporting	\$ 0.74	\$ 1.42
Knowledge Management Disease Coding	\$ 3.30	\$ 5.32
<b>Total Budget Request</b>	<b>\$41.73</b>	<b>\$45.87</b>

- ❑ **Operations and Maintenance**—Budget is proposed to increase from \$22.14 million projected in FY2005 to \$23.70 million in FY2006. Among the categories, Federal Personnel expenses are slated to rise while the money allotted for Data Quality will remain level.

**Discussion:** Jim Tucker wondered whether the budget for System Maintenance should be increased if the amount for Data Quality is to remain flat for FY2006. Izja replied that the budget for System Maintenance has been reduced on the assumption that once eRA software modules are converted from client-server modules to web-based J2EE versions, maintenance needs and costs are going to substantially decrease.

Tom Tatham asked if the data quality budget includes correcting duplicate Commons profiles. Izja noted that eRA plans to wage a war on duplicate profiles.

- ❑ **Systems Enhancements**—Budget is proposed to be reduced from \$4.31 million projected in FY2005 to \$2.95 million in FY2006. Izja noted that the budget was going down because of rising costs.
- ❑ **Electronic Receipt**—Budget is slated to climb from \$2.07 million in FY 2005 to \$9.19 million in FY2006. Izja noted that the budget for electronic receipt is substantially higher than other programs because a number of eRA’s endeavors are heavily dependent on getting grants in electronically. Electronic Receipt covers the gamut from electronic submission of grant applications by a Principal Investigator to Receipt and Referral. The projects within electronic receipt that are proposed to be funded for FY2006 are:
  - eCorrections Phase II
  - System to System eSNAP

- eReceipt (SBIR/STTR)
- eReceipt (Pioneer Awards)
- eReceipt (Fellowships)
- eReceipt (Complex Program Grants)
- eXchange Transactions (FSR and IPF)
- eXchange Transactions (Grant Data Retrieval by Grantee)
- Receipt and Referral Changes for New Transactions
- Digital Signatures
- Rules Engine

The following two projects were requested but deferred:

- Expanded Appendix Capabilities
- Support for Paper 424 RR applications in Receipt and Referral

**Discussion:** Given the increase in the budget for electronic receipt, a member asked how many grant applications eRA expected to receive electronically by the end of FY 2006. Jennifer Flach noted that the numbers would rise as eRA added more types of grant mechanisms that could be submitted electronically and began receiving applications electronically through Grants.gov, but it was hard to estimate. Izja noted that eRA had opened up unrestricted submission of select grants electronically as recently as in January 2005 and there had been only one round of electronic submissions since then; therefore it was too early to judge electronic receipt by numbers alone. A member asked if eRA had the technical capacity to handle higher volumes. Tim Twomey responded that eRA had sufficient capacity and that was not an issue at all. David Wright noted that major institutions are waiting to submit electronically to NIH through Grants.gov using the 424R&R form and are unwilling to submit now using the 398 form if they have to retool their systems down the road for the 424 R&R. Given that rationale, eRA's development of the 424R&R with Grants.gov is key and in the works.

- ❑ **Enterprise Grants System**—This area, formerly called End-to-End Processing, refers to the management of grants from review through closeout. The ultimate goal is to go paperless. Budget is proposed to be cut substantially from \$10.80 million in FY2005 to \$3.29 million in FY2006. Migration of client-server modules to the web-based J2EE platform is expected to be completed in FY 2005.

The projects proposed to be funded in FY2006 are:

- Public Access Phase III – prepopulation of eSNAP reports. [Public Access is a mandated cost. Phase 1 is set for deployment on May 2, 2005, while Phase II is slated for deployment Oct. 1, 2005)
- Virtual Organizational Layers
- Multi-PI support

Funding for the following six projects was requested but deferred:

- eNotification Phase II
  - eRequests
  - Flexible Document Generation
  - Council Operations/Paylist
  - GM Redesign Phase II [FY2006 will mark a skip year for GM redesign; it will be picked up again in FY2007]
  - eFile Folder
- ❑ **Reporting**— This program refers to internal and external reporting needs, including support of Knowledge Management for Disease Coding. This is an important program, representing the merger of the Office of Reports & Analysis into the Office of Electronic Research and Reports Management (OERRM). The budget is proposed to rise from \$0.74 million to \$1.42 million in FY2006.

The following projects are proposed to be funded in FY2006:

- Knowledge Management Disease Coding and CRISP on the Web Analysis
- QVR
- DCIS Phase II (Departmental Contracts Information System —the federal repository of all NIH contracting information – required for adequate population tracking)

Funding for the following projects was requested but deferred:

- Portfolio Analysis
  - Reviewer/Advisor Selection
  - Person Profile Resolution (Text Mining)
  - Crisp on the Web Redesign (Implementation)
  - Automated Referral in Receipt and Referral
- ❑ **Knowledge Management Disease Coding**—Budget is slated to increase from \$3.30 million in FY2005 to \$5.32 million in FY2006. Of the \$3.30 million, \$1.8 million has been received from ITWG and \$1.5 million applied from eRA’s Operations and Maintenance budget.
- ❑ **External Drivers**—These are the departmental and federal programs and mandates affecting eRA priorities, such as OPDIV integration, OPDIV grantee access to eRA Commons, Grants.gov for the non-NIH OPDIVs and Grants Management Line of Business. The proposed budget for this area is slated to increase from \$3.3 million to \$5.32 million. It is anticipated that OPDIV integration expenditures will be funded through contributions by OPDIVs and possibly funds from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), along with eRA resources from Operations and Maintenance to support the OPDIV integration. Izja noted that while External Drivers is not a program, it needs to be carved out separately because it is a distinct operation with a distinct budget requirement —integrating both department and federal programs into eRA.

## Proposed cuts: three budget scenarios

Izja outlined three different versions of the budget, dependent on whether eRA's budget is substantially higher than FY2005's; there is no change from FY2005; and there is a 2 percent decrease from FY2005 numbers.

PLANNING PROCESS	PLANNING REQUEST	PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT	FLAT FUNDING	2 % CUT
Request	\$53.53 million	\$45.87 million	\$41.73 million	\$40.91 million

- **To reduce the budget from \$53.53 million to \$45.87 million, the following projects will be deferred:**
  - Grants Management Redesign Phase II
  - Electronic Receipt of non-SNAP Progress Reports of Complex Mechanisms
  - Financial Status Reports via NIH eXchange
  - eFile Folder Phase II
  - Portfolio Management
  - Review/Advisors Selection
  - Receipt and Referral Selection
- **To reduce the budget from \$45.87 million to \$41.73 million, the following projects will be deferred to FY2007**
  - eReceipt of Ks and Fs
  - eReceipt complex program grants
  - Public Access Phase III
- **To reduce the budget further to \$40.91 million to accommodate a two percent cut, the following projects will be trimmed:**
  - QVR
  - DCIS
  - Multiple-PI support

Izja noted that a reduction in QVR's budget will inhibit the development of new features for this popular program but will not affect QVR's existing functionality. As for DCIS, any cut will postpone its delivery date from September 2006 to May 2007. Reducing the budget for Multiple-PI support will postpone eRA's ability to electronically receive applications with multiple PIs listed from December 2006 to June 2007.

**Discussion:** Marcia Hahn noted that by deferring development of electronic receipt of the Fellowship grant mechanism, eRA would be losing a good opportunity to get its numbers up for grants submitted electronically. She said that the Fellowship community has been hungering for electronic receipt and is a community that embraces electronic submission

because they have grown up with computers. Izja responded that while he considered Fellowships a priority, it simply lost out to competing priorities.

Jim Seach asked if pushing DCIS out will have an impact on Knowledge Management. Izja replied that KM's plan is to incorporate contracts in FY2007.

Tracy Soto asked if there was a process to bring back deferred priorities if funds were available. Both Izja and Scarlett Gibb said they would list priorities that would be considered for funding if more money becomes available during the year.

**Action: (Scarlett Gibb, Izja Lederhendler) List priorities that will be funded if surplus money becomes available during the year.**

***Other points of note in the budget:***

Izja noted that QVR and DCIS have been moved out of Operations and Maintenance, where they were located last year, to Reporting.

## **eRA's List of Accomplishments**

### *Izja Lederhendler*

Izja noted that eNotification was moving into pilot mode and commended Inna Faenson and her team for finishing the project ahead of time and under budget. eNotification is an important part of the OneView, a standardized look and feel for all transactions in a grant's lifecycle, that eRA is implementing in FY2005.

In addition, he highlighted an array of eRA's accomplishments in FY2005:

- ❑ Produced a successful Disease Coding prototype using Collexis software
- ❑ Received approximately 100 electronically submitted grants. Received 3,500 eSNAPs over the last six months (since October 2004), a jump over the 2,854 received in FY2004.
- ❑ Scanned 15,000 paper Type 5s received centrally.
- ❑ Doubled the use of the Internet Assisted Review module between January 2004 and January 2005:
  - Approximately 84,000 preliminary summary statements created
  - More than 210,000 critiques submitted electronically
  - More than 1,500 meetings used IAR
  - During a peak period in early March, more than 12,000 logons per day were recorded on Commons.
- ❑ Recorded more than 640,000 logons on Commons in the past six months, a marked increase over the 565,000 Commons logons in all of FY2003 and FY2004.
- ❑ Deployment of X-Train in June/July 2005 will create 10,000 new Commons accounts every year.
- ❑ Deployed a DataMart pilot for IMPAC II that is designed to enhance performance of reporting functions as well as transactions. The DataMart design is based on that of the National Cancer Institute DataMart.

## Attendees

Avashia, Kashyap (IBM/OERRM)	Faenson, Inna (OER/OERRM)	Milner, Tina (OER/OERRM)
Bradley, Eileen (CSR)	Finch, Dorrette (ORA)	Moyer, Skip (AHRQ)
Bukowski, Maria (OER/OERRM)	Flach, Jennifer (OER/OERRM)	Piquet, Barbara (IBM/OERRM)
Burns, Amy (LTS/PCOB)	Frahm, Donna J. (OER/OERRM)	Seach, James (NCI)
Clevenger, Gail (IBM)	Goodman, Mike (OER/OERRM)	Simms, Sophonia (OER/OERRM)
Connelly, Vance (Blueprint Technologies/OERRM)	Hahn, Marcia (OER/OPERA)	Snouffer, Anna (OD/OFACP)
Copeland, Zoe-Ann (OER/OERRM)	Hays, Timothy	Subramanya, Manju (LTS/OERRM)
Cox, Michael (OER/OERRM )	Horton, Marcia (HRSA)	Tatham, Tom (CSR)
Cummins, Sheri (LTS/OERRM)	Jordan, Craig (NIH/NIDCD)	Tucker, Jim (OER/OERRM)
Diggs, Lana (OER/OERRM)	Kinley, Teresa (CDC)	Twomey, Tim (OER/OERRM)
Dutcher, Sylvia (Mitretek/OERRM)	Lagas, Robert (Lagas Associates/OERRM)	Wehrle, Janna (NIGMS)
Fadeley, Vickie (OER/OERRM)	Lederhändler, Israel (OER/OERRM)	Wright, David (OER/OERRM)
	Liberman, Ellen (NEI)	Zhen, Changqing (IBM)
	Lynch, Peggy (IBM/OERRM)	