2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 04/20/2024 01:40:23 AM

1. Department or Agency	2. Fiscal
	Year
Department of Health and Human Services	2024

3b. GSA

3. Committee or Subcommittee Committee

No.

National Institute of Neurological Disorders and

Stroke Special Emphasis Panel

111

4. Is this New During 5. Current 6. Expected 7. Expected Fiscal Year? Charter Renewal Date Term Date

No 06/01/1986

8a. Was Terminated During 8b. Specific Termination Authority 8c. Actual Term Date

No

9. Agency 10b. 10a. Legislation

Recommendation for Next Req to Terminate?

FiscalYear Pending?

Continue Not Applicable Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

12. Specific 13. 14.

Establishment Effective Committee Presidential?

Authority Date Type

42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16) 11/20/1985 Continuing No

15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel

16a. Total

No Reports for this FiscalYear

Reports

17a. 0 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 0 Open

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

	Current Next	
	FY	FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to	ቀ ሰ ሰ	ነብ ድብ ብብ
Non-Federal Members	Ф О.С	00\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to	ድስ ሰ	00\$0.00
Federal Members	φυ.υ	ω φυ.υυ
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to	\$0.0	00\$0.00
Federal Staff	ψ0.0	ω ψυ.υυ
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to	\$0.0	00\$0.00
Non-Member Consultants	ψ0.0	/ο ψο.οο
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to	\$0.0	00\$0.00
Non-Federal Members	Ψ0.0	/ο ψο.οο
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to	\$0.0	00\$0.00
Federal Members	ψ0.0	/ο ψο.οο
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to	\$0.0	00\$0.00
Federal Staff	ψ0.0	/ο ψο.οο
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to	\$0.0	00\$0.00
Non-member Consultants	ψ0.0	/ο ψο.οο
18c. Other(rents,user charges,	\$0.0	00\$0.00
graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	ψ0.0	/ο ψο.οο
18d. Total	\$0.0	00\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years	0.0	0.00
(FTE)	0.0	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 contract proposals in the fields of neuroimmunology, neurovirology, academic

medicine, basic research and clinical sciences related to the mission of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (NINDS). 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. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 1,109 applications requesting \$3,748,277,846.00 in total direct costs for all years.

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 and/or contract proposals for a specific, perhaps narrow, expertise area. Participants for each meeting are assembled to most efficiently cover the number and breadth of applications or contracts requiring review.

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

The National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke Special Emphasis Panel held 80 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?

The meetings of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke Special Emphasis Panel were closed to the public for the review of grant applications and contract proposals. 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

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/. This committee did not produce any public reports

during the fiscal year. This committee does not have a public website. The DFO and Committee Decision Maker positions are both held by W. Ernest Lyons, Ph.D. He is the Chief, Scientific Review Branch, Division of Extramural Activities, NINDS. Due to the large number of members associated with this committee. NIH staff are unable to provide individual zip codes for all members. 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

W. ERNEST LYONS CHIEF, SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BRANCH

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. 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.

Operation of this committee is accomplished by using a fluid membership, with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than being formally appointed for fixed terms of service.

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

The recommendations of this committee are a major basis for NINDS decisions about how to select a subset of highly qualified grant applications for funding.

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 be translated into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate <u>Number</u> of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

14,005

Number of Recommendations Comments

This is the approximate number of applications reviewed by this committee from FY 2003 to 2023.

What is the approximate <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Fully</u> 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 <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Partially</u> 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			
mplement recommendations or advice offered?			
'es ✓ No Not Applicable			
Agency Feedback Comments			
nformation resulting from closed initial peer review meetings is subject to the Freedom	of		
nformation Act. The public can view information on research projects funded by NIH on			
ne 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	
Reallocated resources	
Issued new regulation	
Proposed legislation	
Approved grants or other payments	✓
Other	

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?

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for 1,109

approval 1,109

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval

\$3,748,277,846

Grant Review Comments

These numbers reflect the total number of applications considered (both scored and not discussed) and the dollar amount requested. The committee also provides numerical ratings to indicate the relative merit of the applications that are discussed.

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