

# 2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 04/20/2024 04:07:53 PM

<b>1. Department or Agency</b>	<b>2. Fiscal Year</b>
Department of Health and Human Services	2024
<b>3. Committee or Subcommittee</b>	<b>3b. GSA Committee No.</b>

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

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

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

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

**11. Establishment Authority** Authorized by Law

<b>12. Specific Establishment Authority</b>	<b>13. Effective Date</b>	<b>14. Committee Type</b>	<b>14c. Presidential?</b>
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
<b>18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants</b>	\$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?**

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 243 grant and cooperative agreement applications requesting \$399,400,423 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. Members: Dr. Jeffery Fowlkes served as chairman for 2 different meetings which is why there are only 15 chairmen listed for 16 meetings. 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**

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 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



Trust in government



Major policy changes



- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 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?

5,032

### 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 243

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 243

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$399,400,423

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



**Access Comments**

N/A