

2025 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute of General Medical Sciences Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 08/15/2025 07:31:47 AM

1. Department or Agency		2. Fiscal Year	
Department of Health and Human Services		2025	
3. Committee or Subcommittee		3b. GSA Committee No.	
National Institute of General Medical Sciences Special Emphasis Panel		1962	
4. Is this New Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	09/30/1994		
8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date	
Yes	2025 Secretary Directive	06/30/2025	
9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?	
Continue	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	
11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law			
12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Committee Type	14c. Presidential?
42 USC 282(b)(16)	11/20/1985	Continuing	No
15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel			
16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports for this Fiscal Year		
17a. Open	17b. Closed	17c. Partially Closed	17d. Total
0	0	0	0
Meetings and Dates			
No Meetings			

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Administrative Costs (FRNs, contractor support, In-person/hybrid/virtual meetings)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Other (all other funds not captured by any other cost category)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18e. Total Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts... This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who

represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant and cooperative applications and contract proposals for research projects and training activities in the broad areas of biomedical research and the behavioral sciences, such as genetics, developmental biology, cell biology, molecular biology, biophysics, chemistry, biochemistry, physiology and pharmacological sciences. Operation of this committee is accomplished using a fluid membership, with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 585 applications requesting \$927,326,617.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

This committee has a fluid membership, with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. The reviewers for each meeting are selected to provide advice and recommendations on funding applications and proposals, including but not limited to grant and cooperative agreement applications and contract proposals, for research projects and for research and training activities in the broad areas of biomedical research and the behavioral sciences, such as genetics, developmental biology, cell biology, molecular biology, biophysics, chemistry, biochemistry, physiology and pharmacological sciences. Participants for each meeting are assembled to most efficiently and effectively cover the number and breadth of applications or contracts requiring review.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The National Institute of General Medical Sciences Special Emphasis Panel held 23 meetings during this reporting period. The flexibility in review allowed by this committee structure has proved both efficient and effective.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant and cooperative applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meetings of the National Institute of General Medical Sciences Special Emphasis Panel were closed to the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

Per "2025 Secretary Directive " this FACA Committee has been terminated. Reports: This Committee did not produce any public reports. Chairs: The 3/11-12/2025 and 4/3-4/2025 meetings had a co-chair. Designated Federal Officer (DFO): The DFO for the NIGMS SEP changed in FY24 and has been reflected in the ACR. The Decision Maker of the Committee also functions as DFO, based on delegations of authority and assigned duties in this Institute. The 2023 report inadvertently coded the Appointment Term as "No Fixed Term" instead of "Less Than 1 Year". The members of this Special Emphasis Panel (SEP) do not have standing appointments and serve on an as needed basis for meetings throughout the fiscal year. Therefore, the members list does not reflect appointment start and end dates. As often as possible, instead of appointment start and end dates, each meeting date on which the SEP member served is identified on the Members list. When necessary to protect peer review integrity, a fiscal year start and end date is used as the alternative to appointment start and end dates for some SEP members. As a result the Members list, including the number of chairs, may not align or directly match to specific meeting dates. Meeting rosters, including members' affiliations and zip codes are available online at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

Designated Federal Officer

Gregory B. Bissonette Chief Scientific Review
Branch

Narrative Description

NIH's mission is to seek fundamental knowledge about the nature and behavior of living systems and the application of that

knowledge to enhance health, lengthen life, and reduce illness and disability. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-Federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts. This committee will be composed of recognized biomedical and behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant and cooperative agreement applications and contract proposals that focus on scientific areas relevant to broad areas of biomedical research and the behavioral sciences, such as genetics, developmental biology, cell biology, molecular biology, biophysics, chemistry, biochemistry, physiology and pharmacological sciences. Operations of this committee are accomplished using a fluid membership with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. During this reporting period, the committee provided state-of-the-art scientific peer review in support of research supported by the Institute insuring that the momentum of scientific research in the biomedical and behavioral fields remains strong so that innovations and advances may be developed to benefit the health and well-being of the public.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if
Applies

Improvements to health or safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>

Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements



Other



Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None



Unable to Determine



Under \$100,000



\$100,000 - \$500,000



\$500,001 - \$1,000,000



\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000



\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000



Over \$10,000,000



Cost Savings Other



Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments which often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

27,608

Number of Recommendations Comments

Grant review

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine

scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

Information resulting from closed initial peer review meetings is subject to the Freedom of Information Act. The public can view information on research projects funded by NIH on the RePORT (Research Portfolio Online Reporting Tool) website located at <http://report.nih.gov>.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>

Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

An action of approved or recommended for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH's funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant's management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval 585

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 585

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$927,326,617

Grant Review Comments

NA

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Access Comments

N/A