

2025 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 08/27/2025 07:09:19 PM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

2. Fiscal Year

2025

3. Committee or Subcommittee

National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute
Special Emphasis Panel

3b. GSA

Committee
No.

898

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

02/18/1994

6. Expected Renewal Date

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

Yes

8b. Specific Termination Authority

2025 Secretary
Directive

8c. Actual Term Date

06/30/2025

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority

Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16)

13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

Special Emphasis Panel

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for
this Fiscal Year

17a. Open

0

17b. Closed 35

17c. Partially Closed 0

Other Activities 0

17d. Total 35

Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End
NIH Peer Review	10/04/2024	- 10/04/2024
NIH Peer Review	11/04/2024	- 11/04/2024
NIH Peer Review	11/06/2024	- 11/06/2024

NIH Peer Review	11/07/2024	- 11/07/2024
NIH Peer Review	11/08/2024	- 11/08/2024
NIH Peer Review	11/08/2024	- 11/08/2024
NIH Peer Review	11/12/2024	- 11/12/2024
NIH Peer Review	11/14/2024	- 11/14/2024
NIH Peer Review	11/20/2024	- 11/20/2024
NIH Peer Review	12/04/2024	- 12/04/2024
NIH Peer Review	12/05/2024	- 12/05/2024
NIH Peer Review	12/06/2024	- 12/06/2024
NIH Peer Review	12/09/2024	- 12/09/2024
NIH Peer Review	02/18/2025	- 02/18/2025
NIH Peer Review	02/25/2025	- 02/25/2025
NIH Peer Review	02/26/2025	- 02/26/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/01/2025	- 04/01/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/03/2025	- 04/03/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/04/2025	- 04/04/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/07/2025	- 04/08/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/10/2025	- 04/11/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/14/2025	- 04/14/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/14/2025	- 04/15/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/18/2025	- 04/18/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/22/2025	- 04/22/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/22/2025	- 04/22/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/23/2025	- 04/23/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/23/2025	- 04/23/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/23/2025	- 04/23/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/23/2025	- 04/23/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/28/2025	- 04/28/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/28/2025	- 04/28/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/28/2025	- 04/28/2025
NIH Peer Review	04/28/2025	- 04/28/2025
NIH Peer Review	05/12/2025	- 05/12/2025

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 35

	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?

The SEP provided 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 cardiovascular, pulmonary, and blood diseases and blood resources research. Operations of this committee were 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 a group of panels reviewed a total of 628 applications requesting \$987,884,292.00 in direct costs, while other panels reviewed 6 contract proposal requesting \$229,590,732.00.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

This committee had 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 were selected to evaluate grant and cooperative agreement applications and contract proposals, for research projects and for research and training activities for a specific, perhaps narrow, expertise area. Members were selected from authorities who are knowledgeable in the various disciplines and fields relating to cardiovascular, pulmonary, and blood diseases and blood resources research. 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 Panel held 35 meetings during this reporting period.

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

Per "2025 Secretary Directive" this FACA Committee has been terminated.

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

Meetings of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Special Emphasis Panels were closed to the public for the review of grant applications and contract proposals. 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. Website: This committee does not have a website. Reports: This committee did not produce any reports during this fiscal year. The DFO and the Committee Decision Maker positions are held by the same individual based on the assignment of duties in this Institute. Chairpersons: There were 35 meetings, but only 36 Chairpersons listed in Member section. There were 7 Chairpersons who served as Chair for more than one meeting (Drs. Geraci, Atkinson, Sweitzer, Castro, Pinsky, and Luepker). 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

Charles Joyce Director, Office of Scientific Review

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...

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

Not Applicable

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>



Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments 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?

24,376

Number of Recommendations Comments

During FY25, a group of panels reviewed a total of 628 grant applications.

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 628

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 628

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$987,884,292

Grant Review Comments

During FY25, a group of panels reviewed a total of 628 applications requesting \$987,884,292.00

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

Access Comments

NA