

## 2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: Allergy, Immunology, and Transplantation Research Committee

Report Run Date: 04/25/2024 12:28:25 AM

### 1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

### 2. Fiscal Year

2024

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Allergy, Immunology, and Transplantation  
Research Committee

### 3b. GSA

Committee  
No.

785

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

No

### 5. Current Charter

07/30/1998

### 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 Grant Review Committee

### 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?**

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 entirely 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 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 areas relevant to allergic and immunologic diseases as well as in the areas

of immunobiology, immunogenetics, immunopathology, immunochemistry, and transplantation biology. It also gives advice on policy, planning and program development as well as evaluates programs of institute emphasis in these areas. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 120 grant applications requesting \$116,028,059 in direct costs.

**20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in various disciplines and fields relating to allergy, clinical immunology, immunopathology, immunobiology, immunogenetics, immunochemistry, and transplantation biology.

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

The committee held three FACA meetings during this reporting period.

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

This committee is composed entirely of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge. Their recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the complex nature of research and of research program emphasis and management requires a specialized 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 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 permits 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 have a public website.

Members: Dr. Roberto Adachi was reappointed from 7/1/2023 through 6/30/2025. In general, initial/integrated review group (IRG) members serve up to six years, which is documented in the Members list. The permanent membership of this IRG may be supplemented at any meeting with temporary members who have experience or expertise in the disciplines and fields related to the IRG's function and are appointed to review some or all of the applications considered at that meeting. Therefore, the Members list reflects meeting dates, not appointment start and end dates for these members. While only one meeting date is listed as an appointment start and end date, an IRG temporary member may have attended several meetings throughout the fiscal year. Meeting rosters, including members' affiliations and zip codes are available online at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

## Designated Federal Officer

James Snyder Scientific Review Officer

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
----------------------	-------	-----	------------	-----------------------

Aceves, Seema	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor of Pediatrics and Medicine, University of California, San Diego	Peer Review Consultant Member
Adachi, Roberto	07/01/2019	06/30/2025	Professor, University of Texas	Peer Review Consultant Member
Barrett, Nora	07/01/2021	06/30/2027	Associate Professor, Harvard Medical School	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bishop, Gail	07/01/2021	06/30/2027	Professor, University of Iowa	Peer Review Consultant Member
Boackle, Susan	07/01/2021	06/30/2025	Associate Professor, University of Colorado School of Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member
Burwitz, Benjamin	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Assistant Professor, Oregon Health & Science University	Peer Review Consultant Member
KREISEL, DANIEL	07/01/2018	06/30/2024	PROFESSOR OF SURGERY, PATHOLOGY & IMMUNOLOGY, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
Keet, Corinne	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Professor, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill	Peer Review Consultant Member
Klonowski, Kimberly	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Associate Professor, University Of Georgia	Peer Review Consultant Member
Kono, Dwight	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor, The Scripps Research Institute	Peer Review Consultant Member
Krams, Sheri	07/01/2023	06/29/2029	Proffesor/Senior Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, Stanford School of Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member

MEDINA, KAY	07/01/2018	06/30/2024	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, MAYO CLINIC ROCHESTER	Peer Review Consultant Member
Nowak-Wegrzyn, Anna	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor of Pediatrics, New York University School of Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member
OJO, AKINLOLU	07/01/2018	06/30/2024	PROFESSOR OF MEDICINE & HEALTH PROMOTION SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER	Peer Review Consultant Member
Schroeder, Harry	07/01/2021	06/30/2025	Professor, University of Alabama at Birmingham	Peer Review Consultant Member
Serezani, C. Henrique	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Assistant Professor, Vanderbilt University Medical Center	Peer Review Consultant Member
Shimamura, Masako	07/01/2022	06/29/2024	Associate Professor, Ohio State University	Peer Review Consultant Member
Vartanian, Timothy	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	Professor, Weill Cornell Medical College	Peer Review Consultant Member
Webb, Tonya	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor, University of Maryland School of Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wen, Li	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor of Medicine, Yale University	Peer Review Consultant Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 20**

## 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 the 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**

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?**

1,996

#### **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**

The mission of the Center for Scientific Review is to provide the funding Institutes and Centers of NIH with the scientific and technical merit of research grant applications submitted to the NIH. It is these Institutes or Centers and their advisory councils that make funding decisions. 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 funded.

**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**

The mission of the Center for Scientific Review is to provide the funding Institutes and Centers of NIH with the scientific and technical merit of research grant applications submitted to the NIH. It is these Institutes or Centers and their advisory councils that make funding decisions. 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 funded.

**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 120

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 120

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$116,028,059

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

**Access Comments**

Contact IC Committee Management Officer 240-669-5201