eCGAP Focus Group

Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2005
Time: 9 a.m. –11 a.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, Room 2198
Advocate: Jennifer Flach

Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 1, 9 a.m. to 11 a.m., Rockledge 1, Room 8111

Action Items

1. (Jennifer Flach) Check on timing of new fellowship grant form.
2. (Sara Silver) Work with Suzanne Fisher over the long-term on business rules for assorted R grant mechanisms that can be rolled in to eCGAP.

3. (Sara Silver) Print copies of 424 R&R and PHS 398 forms and bring to next eCGAP Focus Group meeting.

Discussion on eCGAP Priorities

Following the Jan. 12 meeting with the Commons Working Group in Las Vegas and a follow-up with the Service Providers Jan. 13, Jennifer Flach stated there was consensus among them on developing the following eCGAP priorities in the near term:
- o Continue with e-Corrections
- o Continue with electronic Notice of Grant Award (eNGA) – already developed requirements; getting it to developers and ready for testing
- o Develop ability to handle Consortia and subcontracts in budget
- o Expand appendix capabilities

However, the two groups did not reach consensus on the following:
- o Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR)
- o Fellowships
- o electronic Streamlined Non-Competing Award Process (eSNAP)
- o Target and actual enrollment as structured data in e-applications
- o Enrollment transaction—Developing a transaction that would allow a Service Provider or Principal Investigator to update their enrollment figures for their clinical trial outside of an application.

SBIRs—Jennifer noted that some of the Service Providers target smaller institutions and are in favor of developing SBIR grant mechanisms as a priority. However, the Commons Working Group members—representing large institutions—did not see the need for SBIRs. She needed feedback from this group on identifying priorities where there was no clear agreement. A member noted that a government-wide SBIR form is being considered. Sara Silver said that if Grants.gov does not have SBIRs built in form sets yet, it does not make sense to move forward on that.

eSNAP—David Wright suggested that getting digital signatures embedded in the SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol) message was key to getting global acceptance of electronic submission. He said that unless the digital signature is achieved, one should put off incorporating eSNAP (eSNAP is an NIH eRA Commons module that allows principal investigators (PIs) to prepare and administrative officials (AOs) from grantee organizations to electronically approve and submit information consistent with an Application for Continuation of a Public Health Service Grant, PHS Form 2590).

Target and actual enrollment data—Jennifer said that moving on 'Target and actual enrollment data' made sense because right now the data comes in a PDF image that cannot be parsed out and users want it as structured data. David Wright said the eCGAP team should move on getting the target and actual enrollment on the 2590 (Non-Competing Grant Progress Report) and 398 (Public Health Service Grant Application) forms as structured data.

Fellowships—Jennifer reported that the CWG was also pushing Fellowships (Individual National Research Service Award). Suzanne Fisher stated that the current fellowship form (PHS 416-1) was expiring and it would be an opportune time to include this grant mechanism when the new form comes in. Jennifer said she would check on the timing of the new form. She noted that the fellowship form would have to be developed with Grants.gov because it cannot fit in the SF 424 RR form. Sara Silver said that accepting fellowships would be a fairly complex change for CGAP-RR, with screens and business rules being very different.

Misc.—David Wright suggested incorporating mechanisms that require little additional work such as assorted Rs. Sara said she would work with Suzanne on business rules involved. A member suggested including K awards (Career Awards for individuals with a research or health-professional doctorate).

On the items where there was no consensus from CWG and SPs, the group agreed on these priorities:

- o Look at targeted and actual enrollment
- o Push for digital signature
- o Roll in additional Rs
- o Add K awards

Action: (Jennifer Flach) Check on timing of new Fellowships grant form.

Action: (Sara Silver) Work with Suzanne Fisher over the long-term on business rules for assorted R grant mechanisms that can be rolled into eCGAP.

Grants.gov and forms update

Jennifer Flach

Grants.gov has been developing NIH specific forms to go along with the standard federal grant application form, SF 424 (Research and Related) R&R form. The NIH specific forms will now be called PHS 398 forms and will not be specific to NIH only but include OPDIVs as well, with full budgets included in the form. The PHS 398 forms should be ready in the first week of February. In order to roll out working with Grants.gov, eRA plans to conduct a test using CWG members and "dead" data. The CWG members will submit dead data in Pure Edge forms via Grants.gov.

The applications will be processed through eRA grants.gov validations and eRA will generate grant images that look like 424 specific forms, followed by PHS 398 forms. eRA is unlikely to process live applications through Grants.gov until mid-summer or the fall of 2005.

The 424 R&R forms consist of five or six forms. For modular budgets, eCGAP is not using the 424 R&R budget page, but its own modular budget page. For full budgets, eCGAP is using 424 R&R forms, rather than developing its own full budget page.

While initially the eCGAP team thought that they should generate the image to look like a 398, even though it is a 424 R&R, they have now moved away from the idea because the 398 is going to go away in the future. The question that arises is whether the 424 forms should be in front and the PHS 398 forms behind on the grant image or should the two be meshed together.

The CWG preferred the 424 R& R image upfront with the PHS 398 image behind it, saying that would make it easier for Principal Investigators and Signing Officials to recognize the forms as being NIH specific. Jennifer asked the group if they had a preference. Sara said she will bring the forms to the group's next meeting to enable them to take a look and decide.

Skip Moyer asked if Commons would be able to handle the growth that comes with the influx of several agencies. David said that Commons will be able to handle the growth, but that eRA will have to work on expanding communications, outreach and user support.

Action: (Sara Silver) Print copies of 424 R&R and PHS 398 forms and bring to next eCGAP Focus Group meeting.

Feedback from Commons Working Group

Jennifer noted that the Commons Working Group expressed concerns that the verification deadlines have been tightened since the pilot. She said that the eCGAP team explained that now that Service Providers are no longer testing the process, they should not be given leeway. The CWG felt that applicants needed to be given an incentive to go electronic, especially because some are not familiar with the electronic format.

Jennifer said that the CWG also thought that verification by the Principal Investigator should be made optional, i.e. PIs should be allowed to choose whether or not to view the application image, CWG members thought that verification is a big burden on the PI, who often moves on to other issues after submitting an application. Tom Tatham noted that the philosophical argument against PI verification is that by asking PIs to verify, the eCGAP team is expressing lack of confidence in their own ability to generate an electronic image. David Wright suggested that perhaps PIs should be allowed to sign without looking up the image and they should be given 48 hours to pull the application back if they want to. The digital signature would go in with the submission and the application would move forward in the process after 48 hours.

He noted that the National Science Foundation does not require the PI to sign. The Office of Policy for Extramural Research is currently discussing with its general counsel what can and cannot be done in this regard.

Open Discussion

Change of Institution—Sara Silver said that a request for 'Change of Institution' is sent to the Division of Receipt & Referral (DRR) when sending in a Type 2 or revision or when applications have been reviewed and not yet funded. The plan is to have the Type 2 Change of Institution

request come in through eCGAP and still be processed through DRR. For the Change of Institution request for the applications reviewed and not yet funded, the plan is to have it processed through the Commons interface without having it go through DRR. The question is, where should the requests come if not through DRR? One member suggested that it could come to a central point, where it would be scanned and passed around electronically.

Two monitors—Suzanne Fisher noted that the Center for Scientific Review is looking at buying two monitors instead of one big screen for reviewers. The downside of having one big screen is that the size of two programs on one screen cannot be controlled individually. Two separate monitors would offer more flexibility.

Review of Action Items from Jan. 4 Meeting

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. ***Tim Twomey is working on developing the Cool Tool. Sara said that one Cool Tool report will be developed for use by both R&R and SRA/IRG chiefs.***

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. ***Done.***

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. ***Working on including eCGAP information on the OER website.***

Attendees

Dixon, Diana (OD)	Maurer, JJ (OD)	Stallone, Don (OD)
Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)	Moyer, George (Skip) (AHRQ)	Swain, Amy (NCRR)
Flach, Jennifer (OER)		Subramanya, Manju (LTS/OD)
Goodman, Michael (OD)	Prenger, Valerie (NHLBI)	
Long, Kelly (HRSA)	Silver, Sara (OER)	Tatham, Thomas (CSR)
	Sinnett, Everett (CSR)	Wright, David (OD)