

## 2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Biology of Development and Aging Integrated Review Group

Report Run Date: 04/28/2021 08:36:20 PM

### 1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

### 2. Fiscal Year

2021

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Biology of Development and Aging Integrated Review  
Group

### 3b. GSA Committee No.

1863

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

No

### 5. Current Charter

01/03/1994

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

### 7. Expected Term Date

### 8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?

No

### 8b. Specific Termination Authority

### 8c. Actual Term Date

### 9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear

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  
FiscalYear

### 17a. Open 0 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 0 Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

	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

<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 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 development and aging sciences. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 57 applications requesting \$29,165,206.

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

This committee is composed of authorities knowledgeable in the disciplines and fields relation to morphogenesis and pattern formation; gastrulation; cell fate, lineage and differentiation; organogenesis; gametogenesis; pre- and post-implementation development; regeneration; evolutionary aspects of development; and the molecular basis of primordial birth defects; chromosome dynamics; cell cycle control; cell death; responses to stress; cellular signaling; the biology and applications of stem cells; tissue repair; determinants of longevity; age-related changes in physiological functions; geriatric syndromes and diseases; animal models of aging; predictive markers of biological health and aging; and mechanisms of exceptional aging.

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

The committee 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 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?**

Meetings 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 discussions 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. Due to the assignment of responsibilities within the Center, the roles of committee designated federal officer and committee decision maker are filled by the same individual. Dr. Martha Sajatovic's role changed to chairperson during the fiscal year. Her term will end on 6/30/2022. Current individual meeting rosters, including zip codes are available online at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

## Designated Federal Officer

BRUCE REED Chief, Biology of Development and Aging IRG

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Aliyu, Muktar	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	Associate Professor, Vanderbilt University Medical Center	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bass, Judith	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor, Johns Hopkins University	Peer Review Consultant Member
Chi, Benjamin	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	Peer Review Consultant Member
Cohen, Theodore	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor, Yale School of Public Health	Peer Review Consultant Member
METCALFE, JOHN	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	Associate Professor, University of California, San Francisco	Peer Review Consultant Member
Peek-Asa, Corinne	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor and Associate Dean for Research, University of Iowa	Peer Review Consultant Member
Sajatovic, Martha	07/01/2020	06/30/2022	Professor, Case Western Reserve University	Peer Review Consultant Member
VEDANTHAN, RAJESH	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	Associate Professor, New York University	Peer Review Consultant Member
VERGHESE, JOE	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	Professor, Albert Einstein College of Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member
White, Laura	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	Associate Professor, Boston University	Peer Review Consultant Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 10**

## 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 institutes throughout the country

and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS 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
- 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 Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?**

7,602

## **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**

Institute Program Staff provides the committee with data pertaining to funding actions taken.

**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 <b>Number</b> of grants reviewed for approval	57
What is the estimated <b>Number</b> of grants recommended for approval	57
What is the estimated <b>Dollar Value</b> of grants recommended for approval	\$29,165,206

**Grant Review Comments**

Grant Review

**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**

N/A