2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: Office of Research Infrastructure Programs Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 04/27/2024 12:29:28 AM

1. Department or Agency 2. Fiscal Year

Department of Health and Human Services 2024

3b. GSA

3. Committee or Subcommittee Committee

No.

Office of Research Infrastructure Programs

Special Emphasis Panel

875

14c.

4. Is this New During 5. Current 6. Expected 7. Expected

Fiscal Year? Charter Renewal Date Term Date

No 09/29/1995

8a. Was Terminated During Termination 8c. Actual

FiscalYear? Term Date

Authority

No

9. Agency 10b.

Recommendation for Next Req to Terminate?

| Continue of the c

Continue Not Applicable Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

12. Specific 13. 14.

Establishment Effective Commitee Presidential?

Authority Date Type

42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16) 11/20/1985 Continuing No

15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel

16a. Total

Number of No Reports for this FiscalYear

Reports

17a.

0 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 0 Open

Shell

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

Current Next

FY 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 and technical authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical applications (and/or contract proposals) that focus on infrastructure support for clinical research centers, research centers for minority institutions, and primate centers and comparative medicine. The committee reviewed 5 grants

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 evaluate grant applications or contract proposals for a specific, perhaps narrow, expertise area. Participants for each meeting are assembled to most efficiently and effectively cover the number and breadth of applications or contracts requiring review. The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in the various disciplines and fields relating to science education projects; research and training activities, and research infrastructure activities across broad areas of biomedical and behavioral research, including comparative medicine, which includes animal models and related research resources, support of primate centers, and laboratory animal medicine and research; and biospecimen repositories and databases; and conference grants and cooperative agreements.

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

This Special Emphasis Panel held 3 meetings during this reporting period.

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

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and behavioral research and from areas related to administrative, scientific, and infrastructural technical expertise 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 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 were closed to the public for the review of grant applications and/or contract proposals. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552(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

Reports: This committee did not produce any public reports during the fiscal year. URL: The committee does not maintain a website. 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 reflects meeting dates, not appointment start and end dates. While only one meeting date is listed as an appointment start and end date, a member may have attended several meetings, either as a chairperson, co-chair, or as a member, throughout the fiscal year. 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

Jonathan Ivins Branch Chief

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	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 often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate <u>Number</u> of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

1,295

Number of Recommendations Comments

This committee reviewed for applications for support of scientific conferences.

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

% 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 <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

% 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.

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

Action Comments

Other

Reorganized Priorities Reallocated resources Issued new regulation

Proposed legislation

Approved grants or other payments

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 5

What is the estimated <u>Number</u> of grants reviewed for approval

Solution of grants reviewed for approval for appr

What is the estimated $\underline{\textbf{Dollar Value}}$ of grants recommended for approval

Grant Review Comments

NA

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

\$8,662,055

	Checked if Applies
Contact DFO	✓
Online Agency Web Site	✓
Online Committee Web Site	
Online GSA FACA Web Site	✓
Publications	
Other	✓

Access Comments

Contact IC Committee Management Officer, Ms. Sharon Sealey, at 301-435-1142.