



eCGAP Focus Group

Date: Tuesday, May 3, 2005
Time: 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, Room 8111
Advocate: Jennifer Flach

Next Meeting: Thursday, May 26, 2:15 p.m. to 4 p.m., Rockledge 1, Room 8111

Action items

1. (Sara Silver) Find out if ICs can designate a person and a back-up who will receive email notifications after applications have been assigned to an IC, instead of having the email go to both DEAS staff and SRAs.
2. (Sara Silver) Craft sample subject lines and email it to the group for feedback.
3. (Suzanne Fisher) Add a line in the memo that accompanies printed paper applications to reviewers, urging them to check the grant folder for appendices.
4. (Sara Silver) Suggest to Tracy Soto and Daniel Fox that they include a link to the appendices in the Internet Assisted Review module.

Update on next eCGAP Release and Application Receipt Cycle

Jennifer Flach

The next software release of eCGAP, slated to be deployed May 6, incorporates changes to accommodate the new 398 form. Jennifer noted that the mandated date for use of the new 398 form is May 10, although as a practical measure, the Service Providers are not likely to use the new form before June 1.

Sara Silver noted that for the eCGAP team, the effort mainly involved generating a new XML stream and generating a grant image to look like the new 398. Richard Panniers asked how long it would take the Service Providers to conform to the new 398. JJ Maurer noted that each Service Provider has built his or her own system in a unique way and therefore it is difficult to gauge how long they will take. However, JJ noted that the changes are technically not hard and involve few fields. Sara noted that the biggest changes are to the budget, but those are self explanatory.

Suzanne Fisher noted that the paper form of the new 398 has been in use since December and a number of applicants are using it.

Jennifer outlined the new receipt and verification dates for the June/July round.

	June 1, 2005	July 1, 2005
Ticket Request	June 1	July 1
Verify	June 3	July 6

If applicants do not approve of the online image and want to send paper	June 9	July 8
---	--------	--------

The receipt and verification deadlines will be posted on the eRA website soon. Jennifer noted that that a number of steps are being taken by eRA’s Communications branch to publicize electronic submission, from submitting an article for the April/May issue of the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) to submitting another article for the May issue of CSR’s Peer Review Notes.

Grants.gov progress and plans

Jennifer Flach

Jennifer noted that the development team is working on a system-to-system interface with Grants.gov and plans to test the system on May 25. Four members of the Commons Working Group, in town for their triannual meeting May 22, will participate in the testing. The four will use the eCGAP test environment to submit old applications to Grants.gov, using 424RR and PureEdge forms. Any errors and the application itself will appear in Commons. Jennifer said the team wants to use this opportunity to locate snags and get feedback on the process. She noted that Skip Moyer will also be at the test. At the same time, the software will be undergoing testing for defects. Both efforts will culminate in a live pilot with Grants.gov sometime in July. Jennifer noted that the team has not yet identified a grant opportunity for the live pilot. The team is considering two options:

- o Target a Request For Applications (RFA)
- o Set up a hidden opportunity for a receipt date and have select volunteers work with the eCGAP team.

Jennifer said that eRA Communications had developed a NIH-Grants.gov Frequently Asked Questions paper that both NIH and Grants.gov staffers could use.

Funding—Jennifer said that a task order was initiated last April to carry out eCGAP work. That task order expires in mid-July but will be replaced with another contract almost immediately. That contract will take care of work associated with expanding grant mechanisms, improving eCGAP functionality and in integrating eCGAP with Grants.gov. eRA has a standing relationship with three vendors. Chunks of work are identified and task orders put out for defined work. Right now, a statement of work and a smaller task order is being put together for eCGAP Receipt and Referral. That task order will include a few tasks associated with eCGAP, so that there is a safety net if there is a time lag between the eCGAP contract expiring in mid-July and the new one.

Ending the paper option?

Jennifer noted that currently applicants have the option of submitting their grants on paper if they are not satisfied with the way their grant application looks online. She asked the group if eCGAP should retain the paper option or phase it out. Suzanne noted that very few applicants had used the option, probably two out of 20 applicants. Melissa Stick said that she would be reluctant to phase out the paper option until applicants got more comfortable with submitting grants electronically; David George suggested it be done down the line, not now.

Sara raised the issue of whether a paper option should exist when applications are submitted to NIH via Grants.gov. Jennifer noted that eCGAP is not funded to offer the option of 424RR on

paper. Sara noted that a decision in this regard needs to be made soon, given that eCGAP is planning a live pilot with Grants.gov in July.

JJ Maurer noted that Grants.gov has a firm deadline for receiving applications, with a grace period that is recommended by the federal agency receiving the applications through Grants.gov. The group also debated how to set up receipt dates for receiving applications through Grants.gov. While Grants.gov is set up by receipt date, it has no facility to roll over applications received after the submission date to the next receipt date. JJ noted that eCGAP would have to set up rules to accommodate late applications coming through grants.gov. A decision will need to be made whether to reject late applications or to roll them over to the next receipt date.

eNotification for assignment of eCGAP applications

Sara noted that eNotification is ready and the time has come to add enhancements. She noted that the Cool Tool had served as an interim measure, allowing people to query electronic applications that were in a three day lag period after being received by the Division of Receipt and Referral. Now, instead of using the Cool Tool, people could be notified by email of the e-applications. Eventually, eNotification would automatically allow people to view the queue of applications on a screen.

Sara had the following questions:

1. When an assignment for review is made in referral to CSR, who is the email notification sent to? I am assuming it is sent to the Integrated Review Group (IRG) chief, if the assignment is made at the IRG level, and to the Scientific Review Administrator if the assignment is made at the study section level.
Yes. However, some IRGs have deputies who take on that role.
If the deputies have an IRG chief role in IMPAC II, they will automatically get the email. The email will go to everyone with an IRG chief role in IMPAC II.
2. When the email goes to the active SRA, does a copy need to go to the IRG chief too?
Yes, in cases of auto-assignment, it would be good for IRG chief to get a cc on the email.
3. Does DRR need to get a copy of notification?
No.
4. For an Institute review assignment, at the beginning of the three day lag period, it is always assigned to SRC 99. Who at the IC will get the email?
The Referral Liaison or the Review Chief. The Referral Liaison role will have to be created in IMPAC II. David George noted that at his IC, both Division of Extramural Activities Support (DEAS) staff and SRAs have the role of the Referral Liaison. Melissa Stick and David asked if they could step away from the Referral Liaison role and instead have the IC designate a person and back-up so that everyone does not get hit with the email. Sara said she would find out from the eNotification analysts.
5. What happens when the application is released from DRR at the end of the three day lag period? Does CSR need to get notification?
No, except when an assignment referral has been changed within review from SRA to SRA or IRG to SRA (either within the three day period or after the three day period). This second notification should be sent in batch, not the first. For a batch notification, include the date assigned in the subject line.
6. How should ICs be notified of their assignment as a primary IC before the three day lag period?

email notification should be sent to the primary IC only, but there is not a clear role in each IC who should receive the email. Need to find out if email notifications can be sent to individuals, not just to role-based IDs.

7. Do ICs need an email notification after the application has been released from DRR after the three day lag period?

No, except in the case of dual ICs. The email to dual ICs should be sent as a batch.

8. What would be a meaningful subject line for the email, so that people need not open the text of the email to see what it contains?

The subject line should include the following:

- *Grant number (There was some confusion over whether the electronic grant application would have a number at that stage. Sara said she would find out)*
- *Principal Investigator's last name*
- *Review assignment*
- *Primary IC/with duals (Do not name each dual IC as there could be 26; instead, use the text 'duals exist')*
- *Date*
- *Title of grant application at end of subject line (that could run to 200 characters)*

Sara said she would craft sample subject lines and email it to the group for feedback.

Action: (Sara Silver) Find out if ICs can designate a person and a back-up who will receive email notification after applications have been assigned to an IC, instead of having the email go to both DEAS staff and SRAs.

Action: (Sara Silver) Craft sample subject lines and email it to the group for feedback.

Table Talk

HHS Secretary's Award for eCGAP—Suzanne Fisher noted that word had come down today that the eCGAP team will be honored with the prestigious 2005 HHS Secretary's Award for Distinguished Service. She noted that the award went to federal staff, not contractors who work on the team. Suzanne noted that contractors, especially requirements analyst Sara Silver and architect JJ Maurer, need to be commended for their wonderful work on eCGAP.

eCGAP Appendices—Richard Panniers enquired whether reviewers are aware that appendices exist with eCGAP applications and that they should be looking for it. Sara Silver noted that the appendices are in the grants folder. Suzanne suggested that she could add a line in the memo that accompanies the printed paper applications urging reviewers to “please check the grant folder.” Sara said that the body of the email sent to reviewers could also contain a reminder to urge them to look in the grants folder. Sara asked the group if they would like the Internet Assisted Review module to have a link to the appendices; the group agreed it would be a good idea. Sara said she would talk to Daniel Fox and Tracy Soto about it.

Action: (Suzanne Fisher) Add a line in memo that accompanies printed paper applications to reviewers, urging them to check the grant folder for appendices.

Action: (Sara Silver) Suggest to Tracy Soto, Daniel Fox, that they include a link to the appendices in the Internet Assisted Review module.

Attendees

Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)

Flach, Jennifer (OER)

George, David (NIBIB)

Goodman, Michael (OD)

Long, Kelly (HRSA)

Maurer, JJ (OD)

Panniers, Richard (CSR)

Silver, Sara (OER)

Sinnett, Everett (CSR)

Stick, Melissa (NIDCD)

Swain, Amy (NCRR)

Subramanya, Manju
(LTS/OD)

Tatham, Tom (CSR)