eSubmission Update
March 2007
February 05, 2007 R01

- (57) R01 applications were accepted at NIH
- (49) went PDS, 8 went PureEdge
- (29) applications were successful on the 1st submission -- 49%
- January 31, 2007 was the peak day with (11) successful applications

February 16, 2007 R21

- (32) R21 applications were accepted at NIH
- 1st time successful submissions improved
- February 14, 2007 was the peak day with (6) successful applications
Common eSubmission Problems

Missing Required Fields;
- Missing Ggov role for Senior/Key individuals
- Missing organization name for Senior/Key individuals
- Area impacted on 424 D
- View forms looking for fields marked with an asterisk (*) to determine required fields.

Missing / Corrupt Attachments;
- Although rare, any attachment can become corrupt
- Biosketch attachment missing
- Cover letter attachment missing.
- If you reply “Yes” to the human subjects question on the Compliance Tab, the attachments associated with humans in the Research Plan (e.g. Protection Of Human Subjects, Inclusion Of Women And Minorities, Targeted Planned Enrollment Table, & Inclusion Of Children) must be included unless exempt, which is indicated by the exemption flags on the Compliance Tab.
Common eSubmission Problems (cont.)

- Multiple detailed budget justifications being attached – Only (1) budget should be attached
- Modular budget justifications should be attached to the “Proposal ATT” tab, not the “Budget ATT” tab
- All key individuals must have effort
- When submitting a change/corrected application to Grants.gov the PDS Doc must be unlocked and re-approved by Central Administration before re-submitting
- eRA Commons PI affiliation not with Washington University
eSubmission System Issues

- System generated effort values are in calendar months and academic & summer months. NIH is expecting calendar months or academic & summer months. This is not an NIH error but it will give a messy warning list.

- Validation mis-queues;
  - `<ENVIRONMENT IMPACT EXPLANATION>` is blank, `<OUTSIDE COUNTRY(S)>` is blank – Can be ignored.
  - The system is assuming 1st person in key list is PI and messaging accordingly. Shows error messages for both the 424 form & key. Correct the key person errors will also correct the 424 errors.
  - Budget justification message is only a reminder and not an indication the attachment is missing.
  - Unrelated application editing causes AOR data to be erased. AOR data must be re-entered before submission.
eSubmission System Issues (cont.)

- If you delete a person from the Senior Key Tab and that person has a biosketch or supporting document attached, the attachment(s) are not deleted and cause an error when the application is submitted. To correct, add the deleted person back, delete the attachments, then delete the person.
- Occasionally, budget calculations in the PDS system result in rounding errors that cause totals to be 1 dollar under or over the desired figure. (E.g. $249,999 instead of $250,000). This can be corrected by adding or subtracting a dollar in appropriate places.
- NIH distorts scanned attachments when building application. These are usually the letters of support. Replacement letters can be emailed to SRA once the application has been assigned a study group or the PDF can be rebuilt and sent through grants.gov again.
- Grants.gov busy
Before You Submit

- Run the PDS validation & correct any applicable errors
- View all attachments
- Build & preview the forms
- Submit Early!!!
We Welcome your Feedback

We’d love to hear about your electronic application experience. Please send comments or suggestions via email to NIH Electronic Submission at NIHElectronicSubmit@nich.gov.

Remember that there are some things NIH can change, and other things that aren’t under NIH control.

Things under NIH control:
- Application guide instructions
- Content of agency-specific forms (labeled PHS 398)
- Language of eRA Commons errors/warnings
- Support concerns
- NIH requirements
- Overall process
- Opportunity language
We Welcome your Feedback

Things not under NIH control:

• Decision to use Grants.gov
  The Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requires NIH to post opportunities and make available an electronic submission option through Grants.gov. NIH feels strongly that applications that are reviewed together should follow the same process and format; this translates into ALL NIH electronic applications using Grants.gov.

• Look, feel, content and navigation of the SF424 (R&R) forms
  Grants.gov must meet the needs of ALL Federal agencies, not just NIH. So, NIH instructions and requirements that are not needed by other agencies cannot be included in the standard forms (labeled SF424 or R&R).

• Ability to print entire application or check for agency errors before submission

You are welcome to comment on any of the items above. We don’t have authority to implement change in every area, but we can consider changes to areas under NIH control and raise awareness of concerns in areas outside of NIH control.
Grants.gov has brought us new terminology for the Type of Application field of the SF424 (R&R) Cover Component (box #8). NIH is trying to change all of its materials to correctly reflect the new terminology, but it will take some time. Please see chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Grants.gov Term</th>
<th>Old NIH Term</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>An application that is submitted for funding for the first time. Includes multiple submission attempts within the same round. (Type 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Competing Continuation</td>
<td>Previous years of funding for the project have elapsed. Competing for additional years of funding to continue original project. (Type 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Competing Supplement</td>
<td>Request for additional funds for a current award to expand the scope of work. Applicants should contact the awarding agency for advice on submitting any revision/supplement application. (Type 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmission</td>
<td>Revision or Amended Application</td>
<td>Application previously reviewed. A revised or amended application addresses reviewer feedback. (A1/A2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>Progress Report</td>
<td>NIH does not use the SF424 (R&amp;R) for Continuation Applications. (Type 5; Progress Reports are submitted directly to eRA Commons, not through Grants.gov.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Do I Put In the Federal Identifier Field of the SF424 (R&R) Cover Component?

If “Type of Application” is “New”, you can leave the Federal Identifier field blank on the first submission attempt. However, the Federal Identifier field becomes a required field when submitting a Changed/Corrected application to address errors/warnings. When submitting a Changed/Corrected “New” application, enter the Grants.gov tracking number of the previous submission attempt (e.g. GRANT00123456). If you are unable to find the tracking number, enter “N/A”.

If “Type of Application” is “Renewal”, “Revision” or “Resubmission”, enter the IC and serial number of the prior grant number (e.g. CA123456). For these types of applications, there is no need to change the Federal Identifier field when submitting Changed/Corrected applications.

Resist the Temptation to Scan

I know it is a pain to have to turn an application that was originally prepared on a paper PHS 398 into an electronic SF424 (R&R) application, but unfortunately it must be done. If you are making the move from paper to electronic forms, please resist the temptation to scan sections of the paper forms. There are times when scanning simply can’t be avoided, but (when possible) it is best to work from the original documents that can be appropriately edited for the current submission, converted to PDF format and attached to the new application. Additional benefits of working from original documents include clearer images and the ability to extract text from the application image. (PDF Tips)
NIH eSubmission Items of Interest-February 15, 2007 (cont.)

Rejection – It’s All in the Intent

NIH noticed an increase in the number of applications that were “Rejected” prior to the February 5 R01 submission deadline. Some of the “Rejections” were to address identified “Warnings,” a few were to work through confirmed system issues and the rest…well, were not.

When is it OK to use the “Reject” option? It’s all in the intent! The bottom line is applications should not be submitted until there is an expectation that they are ready to go forward barring any unforeseen issues. Since applicants have no way to view the entire application until they submit, it is reasonable that they might want to make adjustments after viewing the assembled application if still before the deadline.

NIH does not condone the submission of "works in progress" or “test” applications. We have pretty strong feelings on this point – just don’t do it!
Questions