

2025 Current Fiscal Year Report: Office of Research Infrastructure Programs Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 04/24/2026 09:07:07 PM

1. Department or Agency Department of Health and Human Services **2. Fiscal Year** 2025

3. Committee or Subcommittee Office of Research Infrastructure Programs Special Emphasis Panel **3b. GSA Committee No.** 875

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year? No **5. Current Charter** 09/29/1995 **6. Expected Renewal Date** **7. Expected Term Date**

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year? No **8b. Specific Termination Authority** **8c. Actual Term Date**

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** 2 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total** 2

Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End
To review grant applications	11/26/2024	- 11/26/2024
To review grant applications	06/17/2025	- 06/17/2025

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 2

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$8,735.00	\$8,735.00
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	\$11,535.00	\$11,535.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.10	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 grant and cooperative applications and contract proposals for research projects and for research and training activities in the areas relevant 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. The committee reviewed 3 grants requesting \$16,252,717.00.

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?

The Office of Research Infrastructure Programs Special Emphasis Panel held 2 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/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 grant and cooperative agreement applications and contract proposals for research projects and for research and training activities in the areas relevant 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.

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

This committee did not produce any public reports during the fiscal year. This committee does not have a website. There was a change in the decision-maker during the fiscal 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

Jonathan Ivins Branch Chief

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Aguirre, Jose	11/26/2024	11/26/2024	Associate Professor, University of Florida	Peer Review Consultant Member

Akkina, Ramesh	11/26/2024	11/26/2024	Professor, Colorado State University	Peer Review Consultant Member
Amos, Brent	06/17/2025	06/17/2025	Principal, Cooper Carry Architects	Peer Review Consultant Member
Anastasiadis, Panagiotis	11/26/2024	11/26/2024	Professor, Mayo Clinic Cancer Center	Peer Review Consultant Member
BANKS, RALPH	06/17/2025	06/17/2025	MANAGER OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	Peer Review Consultant Member
Carias, Ann	11/26/2024	11/26/2024	Research Associate Professor, Northwestern University	Peer Review Consultant Member
DELL'ACQUA, MARK	06/17/2025	06/17/2025	Professor, University of Colorado	Peer Review Consultant Member
Devanathan, Aaron	11/26/2024	11/26/2024	Assistant Professor, University of Pittsburgh	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lewis, Anne	06/17/2025	06/17/2025	Professor, Oregon Health and Science University	Peer Review Consultant Member
PATTERSON, EDWARD	11/26/2024	11/26/2024	Professor, University of Minnesota	Peer Review Consultant Member
Price, Robert	06/17/2025	06/17/2025	Professor, University of South Carolina	Peer Review Consultant Member
Sherwood, Leslie	06/17/2025	06/17/2025	Professor and Director, University of Louisville	Peer Review Consultant Member
Varela-Stokes, Andrea	11/26/2024	11/26/2024	Professor and Chair, Tufts University	Peer Review Consultant Member
Veazey, Ronald	06/17/2025	06/17/2025	Professor, Tulane University	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 14

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 checked="" 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

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input checked="" 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 Other	<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?

1,304

Number of Recommendations Comments

This committee reviewed for applications for support of scientific conferences.

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 3

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 3

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$16,252,717

Grant Review Comments

NA

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

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.