

## 2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Library of Medicine Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 04/18/2024 01:05:12 AM

### 1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human  
Services

### 2. Fiscal Year

2024

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

National Library of Medicine Special  
Emphasis Panel

### 3b. GSA

### Committee No.

2081

### 4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

### 5. Current Charter

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

### 7. Expected Term Date

No

09/29/1995

### 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 USC 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

0

17c. Partially Closed

0

Other Activities

0

17d. Total

0

### Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

Current Next  
FY FY

<b>18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18d. Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00

**20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?**

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/or contract proposals) in the fields of medical library services, health science publications, integrated biotechnology information, databases, resources, and educational technology. During this reporting period, 7 special emphasis panels met and reviewed a total of 74 applications recommending \$36,840,191.

**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 in medical library services, health science publications, integrated biotechnology information, databases, resources and educational technology. 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 Library of Medicine Special Emphasis Panel held 7 meetings during this reporting period. The flexibility in review allowed by this committee structure has been proven 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 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 Library of Medicine 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**

This committee did not produce any reports during this reporting period. This committee does not have a dedicated website. Committee Decision Maker and Designated Federal Official are the same individual based on assigned duties within NLM. Dr. Wanda Whitney is a federal employee; however, does not have federal costs associated with her as she signed a waiver that she will not receive reimbursement from her federal agency while serving. Dr. Frederick Davis served as Chair for two of the Special Emphasis Panel meetings on July 19, 2023 and September 7, 2023. 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**

ZOE HUANG CHIEF SCIENTIFIC REVIEW  
OFFICER

**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...The Special Emphasis Panels are established to provide grant review for a variety of grant or contract applications for which specialized reviews are required. The NLM SEP peer reviews include Publications, Research, and Training Grants.

**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

N/A

## 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 disease.

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

2,632

## Number of Recommendations Comments

A total of 74 grant applications were reviewed in FY 2023.

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

20%

## % 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 or review performed by the 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 or review performed by the 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 74

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 74

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$36,840,191

### Grant Review Comments

### 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Access Comments

Contact the National Library of Medicine Committee Management Office.