

2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute of General Medical Sciences Initial Review Group

Report Run Date: 05/04/2021 12:05:47 PM

1. Department or Agency				2. Fiscal Year
Department of Health and Human Services				2021
3. Committee or Subcommittee				3b. GSA Committee No.
National Institute of General Medical Sciences Initial Review Group				820
4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date	
No	12/01/1987			
8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date		
No				
9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear	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 U.S.C. 282(b)(16)	11/20/1985	Continuing	No	
15. Description of Committee	Grant Review Committee			
16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports for this FiscalYear			
17a. Open Meetings and Dates	17b. Closed	17c. Partially Closed	Other Activities	17d. Total
No Meetings	0	0	0	0

	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. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$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 applications in the fields of cellular, molecular, and developmental biology; biochemistry, biophysics, microbiology, neurobiology, pathology, physiology, and genetics. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 216 applications requesting \$663,629,021.00.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in the fields of cellular, molecular, and developmental biology; the disciplines of biochemistry, biophysics, microbiology, neurobiology, pathology, physiology, and genetics.

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

This Committee held 12 meetings during this reporting period. Members also participated in other committee activities, such as working group meetings, throughout the fiscal year.

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 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 which is not available on the NIH staff or from other established resources.

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

The meetings of this Committee 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

This committee did not produce any public reports. The DFO and the Committee Decision Maker positions are held by the same individual because of delegations of authority and assignments in this Institute. Members: Change in end term due to reappointment for Drs. Bigio, Dermody, Godfrey, Goldberg, Komives, Shimizu, Fox, Hu, Kerwyn Huang, Koh, Meyers, Roman, Sekelsky, Brown, Colley, Frantz, Kin, Raabe, Skvirsky, Vasquez-Vivar, Canavan, De Lacalle, Linda Huang, Morris, Schwiebert, and Street. Occupation/Affiliation: Due to the large number of members serving on this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide additional information on Occupation or Affiliation. Additional information on an individual's affiliation may be obtained by contacting the designated federal officer listed in this report.

Designated Federal Officer

Sally Lee EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
BENSON, GARY	07/15/2020	06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, BOSTON UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
BIGIO, IRVING	08/29/2018	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, BOSTON UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
BOGENMANN, EMIL	07/01/2018	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL LOS ANGELES	Peer Review Consultant Member
BROWN-BORG, HOLLY	03/20/2020	06/30/2021	UND Chester Fritz Distinguished Professor, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA	Peer Review Consultant Member
BROWN, LISA	03/20/2020	06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE CHAIR AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
CANAVAN, HEATHER	03/20/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO	Peer Review Consultant Member
CASPARY, TAMARA	12/16/2019	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, EMORY UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
COLLEY, KAREN	07/15/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR AND DEAN, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS	Peer Review Consultant Member
DE LACALLE, SONSOLES	06/04/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
DERMODY, TERENCE	07/29/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR, CHILDRENS HOSPITAL OF PITTSBURGH	Peer Review Consultant Member
DORRANCE, ANNE	07/29/2020	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
FOX, BRIAN	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN	Peer Review Consultant Member
FRANCIS, CAROLEE	01/04/2020	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN	Peer Review Consultant Member
FRANTZ, KYLE	07/01/2016	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
GEYER, PAMELA	12/13/2019	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA	Peer Review Consultant Member
GIMOTTY, PHYLLIS	12/17/2019	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA	Peer Review Consultant Member

GLICK, BENJAMIN	07/01/2018	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO	Peer Review Consultant Member
GODFREY, MAURICE	07/29/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA	Peer Review Consultant Member
GOINS, GREGORY	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR OF BIOLOGY, NC STATE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
GOLDBERG, BENNETT	07/29/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
GOMES, ALDRIN	07/29/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	Peer Review Consultant Member
GREEN, RACHEL	07/29/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR, JOHNS HOPKINS	Peer Review Consultant Member
HERNANDEZ-SERRANO, JULIAN	07/15/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO	Peer Review Consultant Member
HORWITZ, MARSHALL	12/13/2019	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON	Peer Review Consultant Member
HUANG, KERWYN	07/01/2017	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR & DIRECTOR, STANFORD UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
HU, WEI-SHOU	10/28/2019	10/29/2021	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA	Peer Review Consultant Member
JULIAN, DAVID	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA	Peer Review Consultant Member
KIN, NICHOLAS	07/05/2016	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE DEAN, JEFFERSON STATE COLLEGE	Peer Review Consultant Member
KOH, JOHN	06/29/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE	Peer Review Consultant Member
KOMIVES, ELIZABETH	06/29/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR, UC, SAN DIEGO	Peer Review Consultant Member
KORZICK, DONNA	01/07/2020	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, PENN STATE	Peer Review Consultant Member
KOS, LIDIA	02/01/2020	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE DEAN, FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
MEYERS, FREDERICK	10/24/2019	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	Peer Review Consultant Member
MORRIS, ANDREA	10/24/2019	06/30/2022	DIRECTOR, ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
PATEL, RAKESH	12/12/2019	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA	Peer Review Consultant Member
RAABE, TIMOTHY	06/04/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS	Peer Review Consultant Member
RICKS-SANTI, LUISEL	02/01/2020	06/30/2021	DIRECTOR, HAMPTON UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
ROTHMAN-DENES, LUCIA	07/15/2020	06/30/2022	A.J. CARLSON PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHIMMENTI, LISA	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR OF PEDIATRICS, MAYO CLINIC	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHWIEBERT, LISA	08/31/2016	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA	Peer Review Consultant Member
SEKELSKY, JEFF	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR OF BIOLOGY AND OF GENETICS, UNC CHAPEL HILL	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHIMIZU, YOJI	08/30/2018	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA	Peer Review Consultant Member
SKVIRSKY, RACHEL	03/09/2020	06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS	Peer Review Consultant Member
STOCK, ANN	07/15/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
STREET, NANCY	08/17/2016	06/30/2021	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN, UT SOUTHWESTERN MEDICAL CENTER	Peer Review Consultant Member

THOMAS, SHEILA	05/14/2020	06/30/2021	DEAN FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND DIVERSITY, HARVARD MEDICAL CENTER	Peer Review Consultant Member
VASQUEZ-VIVAR, JEANNETTE	10/28/2019	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, MEDICAL COLLEGE OF WISCONSIN	Peer Review Consultant Member
WATKINS, ELIZABETH	07/15/2020	06/30/2022	DEAN AND PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	Peer Review Consultant Member
WRIGHT, CYNTHIA	07/29/2020	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 49

Narrative Description

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. 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 applications and/or contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations can not 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.

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

Checked if Applies

- Improvements to health or safety
- Trust in government
- Major policy changes
- Advance in scientific research
- Effective grant making
- Improved service delivery
- Increased customer satisfaction
- 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?

3,312

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

NA

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 <u>Number</u> of grants reviewed for approval	216
What is the estimated <u>Number</u> of grants recommended for approval	216
What is the estimated <u>Dollar Value</u> of grants recommended for approval	\$663,629,021

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