

2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Human Genome Research Institute Initial Review Group

Report Run Date: 04/26/2024 12:20:53 PM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

2. Fiscal Year

2024

3. Committee or Subcommittee

National Human Genome Research Institute
Initial Review Group

3b. GSA

Committee

No.

881

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

07/01/1990

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

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. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$0.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	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 highly scientific and technical research grant applications (and/or contract proposals) in the areas relevant to genomic research including: construction of genetic maps, development of physical maps, determination of DNA sequences, management and analysis of the

resulting data, development of innovative technologies required to achieve the above, and development of tools and resources supportive of this effort, as well as in areas relevant to the ethical, legal, and social implication of genomic research. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 41 applications in the amount of \$74,993,325.00.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in the various disciplines and fields relating to cytogenetics, human genetics, quantitative genetics, somatic cell genetics, molecular biology, cell biology, chemistry, biochemistry, physical biochemistry, computer science, engineering, bioethics, law, public policy, medical genetics, genetic counseling, nursing, education, and public outreach.

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

The committee conducted three FACA meetings during this reporting period on the following dates: 11/3-4/2022, 3/2/2023, and 6/1/2023.

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 established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meetings of the National Human Genome Research Institute Initial Review Group were closed to the public for the review of grant applications and/or 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

Reports: This committee did not produce any public reports during the fiscal year. The DFO and Decision Maker are the same person, the Co-Chief, Scientific Review Branch due to delegations of authority and assignments in this Institute. Dr. Mark D. Adams was reassigned from Chair to member for two years from 07/01/2023 to 06/30/2025. Dr. Christina Leslie was appointed as Chair for 3 years to serve from 07/01/2023 to 6/30/2026. 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

Rudy O. Pozzatti CO-CHIEF, SCIENTIFIC
REVIEW BRANCH

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Adams, Mark	07/01/2023	06/30/2025	Director, The Jackson Laboratory for Genomic Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member
Griffith, Malachi	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Associate Professor of Medicine and Genetics, Washington University	Peer Review Consultant Member
Haendel, Melissa	11/14/2022	06/30/2026	Professor, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus.	Peer Review Consultant Member
KIBBE, WARREN	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor, Duke University School of Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member
Leslie, Christina	07/01/2023	06/30/2026	Associate Professor of Medicine and Genetics, Washington University	Peer Review Consultant Member
Miga, Karen	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Assistant Research Scientist, University of California, Santa Cruz	Peer Review Consultant Member
Palacios, Julia	10/26/2022	06/30/2026	Assistant Professor, Stanford University.	Peer Review Consultant Member
Satija, Rahul	07/01/2021	06/30/2025	Assistant Professor, New York University	Peer Review Consultant Member
WENG, CHUNHUA	07/01/2021	06/30/2025	Professor, Columbia University	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 9

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 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

N/A

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
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?

690

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 41

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 41

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$74,993,325

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

Access Comments

IC Committee Management Officer 240-669-5201