eCGAP Focus Group

Date: Tuesday, Sept. 6, 2005
Time: 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, Room 2198
Moderator: Jennifer Flach

Next Meeting: Monday, Sept. 19, 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., Rockledge 1, Room 2198

Action items

1. (Sara Silver) Follow up with JoAnne Goodnight on arranging meeting to discuss Fast Track applications. Include Marian Wachtel in the meeting.

2. (Sara Silver) Use narrative attachment to include relevance statement, not include relevance statement in the abstract.

3. (S Fisher) Check Manual to see for rules on NIH Intramural Scientists not signing if they submit a grant application on behalf of a university they plan to join. (DONE.)

4. (S Silver) Follow up with Marcia about policy on NIH Intramural Scientists signing issue.

5. (All) Send names of volunteers interested in participating in 424RR testing exercise to Manju Subramanya

6. (Michael Goodman) Send Richard Panniers a copy of the 424 (R&R) instructions.

7. (Jennifer Flach) Follow up with Amy Swain on where Service Providers are in Phase II.

8. (Richard Panniers) Take up issue with Walter Goldschmidts of changing confidential letters of recommendation accompanying Fellowship applications to non-confidential letters of support.

Handout
[Electronic Receipt Timeline](#)

Electronic Receipt Timeline
Jennifer Flach distributed a handout showing the NIH timeline for electronic receipt of grant applications through Grants.gov. Since most members were familiar with the timeline, it was not discussed in detail.

Changes to SBIR/STTR Requirements
Sara Silver
Sara Silver said that the structure of Grants.gov and some of the limitations of the SF 424 (R&R) form had forced her to change some of the requirements discussed at the last eCGAP Focus Group meeting. She discussed the changes:

- **Fast Track**—At the last meeting, some group members had suggested that Fast Track applications should be consolidated and not be two separate pieces. Review members had

expressed concern that if this is done, they will not be able to decouple Phase I from Phase II. Sara noted that the 424RR form will not allow separate forms for Phase I and Phase II because it assumes there is one of everything. The group had agreed that Suzanne Fisher and Tom Tatham should discuss the matter with JoAnne Goodnight. Sara said she will follow-up with JoAnne on the meeting. Suzanne also suggested including Marian Wachtel, the Small Business point person at the Center for Scientific Review, in the meeting.

Action: (Sara Silver) Follow up with JoAnne Goodnight on arranging meeting to discuss decoupling of Fast Track applications. Include Marian Wachtel in the meeting.

- **Fast Track budget**—Sara noted that with Grants.gov, they would be unable to distinguish between the primary Research Institution budget, the Secondary Research Institution budget and the non-Research Institution consortium budget. The group previously thought that NIH might be able to distinguish the budgets by assuming that the first budget entered on the PureEdge form will be the research budget. Sara noted that Grants.gov does not support this action and that there is no way to determine the order of things coming in to Grants.gov.

  Sara noted that if an SBIR/STTR application comes in with a primary budget and only one subaward budget, they can assume that it is the latter is the budget of the research institution and may run the validation, noting it on the grant image as such. However, if there is more than one subaward budget, they cannot run the validations. JoAnne Goodnight and Kathleen Shino had decided that it would be best in the instructions to urge applicants to identify the Primary Research Institution in the budget justification.

- **Signature**—Sara noted that NIH will not be getting the signature of the Business Official of the Research Institution through Commons; instead, the signature will come on paper as a Just-in-time submission. In the future, NIH plans to get the signature through Commons, but since that involves structural changes to Commons, it is not imminent.

- **Address of Research Institution**—The address of the research institution was supposed to be on the budget page; however, the 424RR form does not support that. Therefore, the address will be collected on paper at the time of the grant award. Eventually, it will be collected as Just-in-time.

- **PI on both budgets**— Sara noted that the PI cannot be listed on the budgets for both the Research Institution and small business; if the PI is listed on both, it will generate a warning or rejection. A validation cannot be run if the PI on the Research Institution cannot be identified. She noted that Grants.gov, on the primary budget, automatically pulls the PI name in from key personnel onto the Project budget; even if the PI is from the Research Institution, it is automatically assumed that he or she is the PI. As a result, any validation for a STTR application will fail if the PI is from the Research Institution. Therefore, the validation preventing a PI from being listed on both budgets will not be included in the software. As a workaround, the Institution will be instructed to indicate that there are zero dollars associated with the PI on the applicant organization budget.

- **Verification of PI and SO for Commons**— Sara noted that if the PI is associated with the Research Institution, he or she may not be able to verify the application in Commons, because the Commons account is associated with the small business and not the PI. In such cases, small business will have to create a Commons account for the PI from the research

institution, who will then be able to go in to Commons and verify. If the PI already has a Commons account, it must be affiliated with the small business.

Suzanne noted that in rare situations, if an NIH Intramural Research scientist, while still working at NIH, submits a grant application as a PI on behalf of the university he or she plans to join he or she is forbidden from signing the grant application. The rules are listed in the NIH Policy Manual (http://www3.od.nih.gov/oma/manualchapters/contracts/6003-1/) Sara wondered if the Commons provided the capability for the PI to delegate his or her responsibility to sign the application. Suzanne noted that intramural scientists should be alerted to this issue. She suggested sending an alert with the manual chapter as an addendum via Mike Gottesman, Deputy Director of Intramural Research, in her name.

Action: (S Fisher) Check Manual to see for rules on NIH Intramural Scientists not signing if they submit a grant application on behalf of a university they plan to join. (DONE.)

Action: (S Silver) Follow up with Marcia about policy on NIH Intramural Scientists signing issue.

- **Narrative—**Sara said that NIH had been under the impression that the attachment upload for the Project Narrative in the 424 was optional. However, the upload is mandatory. This issue needs to be resolved. The group suggested separating the abstract into two parts — the description and the relevance. The relevance statement could then be included in the narrative attachment. Suzanne Fisher also suggested adding a line stating that, "This narrative is anticipated to be one to three sentences." The group also recommended a separate bookmark for the narrative attachment and adding it as a Table of Contents entry. The recommendation was to locate the attachment on the page directly after the abstract.

Action: (Sara Silver) Separate the abstract into two parts — the description and the relevance. Include the relevance in the narrative attachment. Locate the attachment directly after the abstract and have a separate bookmark and Table of Contents entry for the narrative attachment.

Changes to eCGAP Development plans
Jennifer Flach
Due to resource issues, eCGAP is not going to support consortium in full budgets for the October and November receipt dates and thereafter. Jennifer noted that the focus is shifting to the Dec. 1 deadline for SBIR/STTR submissions electronically via Grants.gov and therefore most resources are being directed towards that effort. She noted that the electronic receipt timeline had been approved and publicized and therefore NIH will not put any more resources into the 398 form except for making fixes as needed. However, other eCGAP changes planned for the October/November receipt dates will continue as planned, including a title page for human subjects and adding a list of publications.

Tom Tatham asked if any of the Service Providers will be ready for the Dec. 1 date. Jennifer said that information is not known at this time.

Acceptance Testing
Jennifer Flach
Jennifer noted that she will be looking for volunteers to participate in testing of the SF 424 (R&R) once the developed SBIR/STTR form set is available on NIH's testing site. The testing is

likely to take place in late September or early October. Participants will be urged to provide feedback on the process as a dry run for the Dec. 1 date. Jennifer requested anyone from the group who is interested in participating or knows anyone who would like to participate to send those names to Manju Subramanya. A member asked if the SBIR/STTR instructions were complete. Mike Goodman noted that the general instructions were fairly close to being completed. Richard Panniers requested that Mike send him a copy.

Action: (All) Send names of volunteers interested in participating in 424RR testing exercise to Manju Subramanya

Action: (Michael Goodman) Send Richard Panniers a copy of the 424 (R&R) instructions.

Table Talk

Communications— Jennifer noted that Sheri Cummins, eRA Project analyst and Izja Lederhendler's executive assistant, has been named Communications lead on Electronic Receipt. With electronic receipt elevated to a high level within the Office of Extramural Research, the goal is to give more prominence to electronic grants submission to NIH via Grants.gov. Jennifer said she would request Sheri to attend a future meeting and brief the group. Janna Wehrle asked where Service Providers are in the process, since NIH has changed gears completely. Jennifer noted that the Service Providers are in Phase II but she did not know at what stage in Phase II. She said she would follow up with Amy Swain.

Action: (Jennifer Flach) Follow up with Amy Swain on where Service Providers are in Phase II.

Recommendation letters for fellowship grant applications— Richard Panniers suggested that as Fellowships move to electronic receipt, it may be an opportune time to have the confidential letters of recommendation in sealed envelopes that accompany the application changed to letters of support that are non-confidential. Suzanne suggested Richard take up the issue with Walter Goldschmidts. Janna Wehrle noted that if the letters are non-confidential, they will contain only positive comments about the applicant and therefore have no value. Sara Silver noted that this is a policy issue that needs to be determined. For now, the plan is to have the confidential letters submitted via Commons.

Action: (Richard Panniers) Take up issue with Walter Goldschmidts of changing confidential letters of recommendation accompanying Fellowship applications to non-confidential letters of support.

Attendees

Carr, Faizah (AHRQ)

Dixon, Diana (OD)

Fisher, Suzanne (CSR)

Flach, Jennifer (OD)

George, David (NIBIB)

Goodman, Michael (OD)

Liberman, Ellen (NEI)

Maurer, JJ (IBM/Ekagra/OD)

Moyer, George (Skip) (AHRQ)

Panniers, Richard (CSR)

Silver, Sara (IBM/Z-Tech Corp./OD)

Sinnett, Everett (CSR)

Stallone, Don (RSIS/OD)

Subramanya, Manju (LTS/OD)

Tatham, Tom (CSR)

Wehrle, Janna (NIGMS)