

2025 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 07/06/2025 08:15:32 AM

1. Department or Agency	2. Fiscal Year
Department of Health and Human Services	2025
3. Committee or Subcommittee	3b. GSA Committee No.

National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering Special Emphasis Panel	16637
--	-------

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	09/17/2003		

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

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?
Continue	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority	Authorized by Law
------------------------------------	-------------------

12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Committee Type	14c. Presidential?
42 USC 282(b)(16)	11/20/1985	Continuing	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 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
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	\$0.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

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 highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals in the fields of biomedical imaging and

bioengineering research. Operation of this committee is accomplished using 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 and/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. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 191 grant and cooperative agreement applications requesting \$239,546,112 in direct costs.

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 provide advice and recommendations on 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 the broad areas of information science, physics, chemistry, mathematics, material science, engineering, and computer sciences. 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 NIBIB Special Emphasis Panel held 16 meetings during this period. The flexibility in

review allowed by this committee structure has proven both efficient and effective.

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 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 16 meetings of the NIBIB Special Emphasis Panel 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 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 reports during this reporting period. This committee does not have a website. Since NIBIB is a small institute, the Director, Office of Scientific Review, serves as both the DFO and the Decision

Maker. 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/>. The DFO and Decision Maker does not have a FAX number.

Designated Federal Officer

MANANA SUKHAREVA DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF
SCIENTIFIC REVIEW

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 conducting research in its own laboratories. The mission of the Board of Scientific Counselors is to assess the quality of the Institute's intramural research programs and to evaluate the productivity and performance of intramural scientists in accordance with Section 492(b) of the PHS Act, as amended and shall also, as requested by the Director, NIH, undertake peer review of extramural funding applications as required by section 492(a) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended.

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?

5,223

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

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 191

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 191

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$239,546,112

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

N/A