

GCSG Meeting:

1. **Mike Q** - Revised Copy Proposal instructions for PS.
2. **NIH VideoCast** - Training session
 - a. Geared toward the applicant community
 - b. Provide an overview of NIH's transition plans, the submission process and the new form set.
 - c. A question and answer session will follow the formal presentations.

January 11 - Can view this from your own desk OR we are planning to have a Group Viewing here in the Monsanto Auditorium for next month's GCSG meeting on Jan. 11:
WATCH for information from Paula regarding the time/details.
Plan for somewhere around 11:30 or 12:00 and it will last approx. 3 ½ hours.
2. When **submitting a Proposal to NIH thru grants.gov** –
 - a. It is “**Rec'd**” when it **hits grants.gov** **HOWEVER**, NIH will “**validate**” the proposal when it hits the NIH eCommons. IF the proposal **does NOT pass** the “Check for Accuracy” & receive validation – an **e-mail will be sent back to UMC** and we will have the opportunity to make the necessary corrections & **resubmit through grants.gov**.
 - i. **Errors & Warnings** – explain the difference:
 1. **Error** Message: **MUST** be **FIXED** to complete the submission process
 2. **Warning**: Do not stop the application from being accepted by eCommons, **HOWEVER**, each warning should be carefully looked at to avoid delays or issues later on in the peer review process.
 - a. **GO OVER DEMO & show errors/warnings**
 - i. **Errors** rec'd (NOT obvious in e-mail rec'd from NIH – explain)
 1. **MUST** be registered in eCommons & the eCommons log in **MUST** be entered or the Proposal will **NOT pass validation** at NIH when they receive it via grants.gov. (we have already had this happen) – **SEE Demo link** as to where **the LOGIN should be entered. (Senior/Key Person Profile)**
 2. **Legal Name of UMC** – 40 characters limit
 - ii. **Warnings** Rec'd
 1. **PI DIVISION**
 2. **PD/PI Degree**
 3. **PI name** – Needs to **MATCH** how they are registered in eCommons – if Middle Name on eCommons registration was their middle “Initial” and they enter their **FULL** Middle Name on the 424
 - ii. **Describe process of our one & only Proposal Submission so far**
 1. Proposal was Submitted three (3) times before it finally passed validation
 - a. Appears as though if there are going to be Errors/Warnings – it can take maybe 16 hours to receive this e-mail. The final Validation e-mail was rec'd within 30 minutes of submitting the proposal. (after all corrections were made).
 2. If the PI waits until the last day/last minute to have his/her proposal submitted and it does not pass the “check for accuracy”, there will **NOT** be time to make corrections. They will be out of luck. This is an **EXTREMELY** good reason as to why a PI should **get their proposals complete AHEAD of time (1 – 2 weeks is recommended)** to allow for the possibility of inaccuracies, correction & resubmission.

- b. If the **Proposal PASSES the NIH validation** – an e-mail is sent from NIH – within this e-mail it will state something about a “**TWO DAY WINDOW**”– (two business days) to **VERIFY** the submitted proposal **in eCommons**. The PI & SO (Dona McKinney) **MUST BOTH verify** the submitted proposal in eCommons. (The e-mail is sent to grantsdc & to the PI) The GCA will be **FOLLOWING UP** with the PI & admin to assure that the PI verifies the submitted proposal within eCommons). When the SO submits **AFTER verification** – the eCommons saves the data & grant image, and **NIH begins processing the application**.
3. **NIH eCommons:** Remind to use “**route button**” to route to the **Grants & Contracts Administrator** (from the dropdown) when submitting **progress reports through e-commons**. The **PI** has to do the **ROUTING**. (for those familiar with NSF – think of it like NSF – only the PI can give SRO access to Submit the proposal) The system will not let someone who has “rec’d” the Progress Report, route it to someone else. **The only person who can “ROUTE” is the PI**. (If they do not “Route”, then Dona will not be able to submit it – earlier we told them they did not have to use the “route” feature, but we have learned this is not the case).....when Routing – an e-mail will be sent to the GCA –
- a. Keep in mind what “can” happen – on Monday, I was informed that a Prog Report had been routed to me – the e-mail from eCommons took 50 minutes to hit my e-mail box. Had I not been informed by Julia R., that it had been routed, I would not have been looking for it. I went into eCommons after Julia told me it had been routed and sure enough, I could see it and review it but I didn’t feel right routing it on to DRM for submission since I hadn’t rec’d the e-mail. When I rec’d the e-mail, I routed the e-mail to DRM for submission. **If a PI WAITS until the LAST MINUTE to “ROUTE” the Progress Report and IF there is a delay in the e-mail process and if the admin doesn’t inform the GCA, we could miss submitting it.**

4. **NSF Advisories:**

12/09/05 - Adobe 6.0 and Adobe 7.0 files can now be uploaded without having to save them as Adobe 5.0 files.

11/21/05 - NSF FY 2006 Grants.gov Implementation Strategy:

In Fiscal Year 2006, NSF has identified **specific programs** that will either authorize, or require, use of Grants.gov to prepare & submit proposals to NSF.

NSF is revising Funding Opportunities to incorporate grants.gov submission requirements. Until the funding opportunity has been revised, the NSF Fastlane System must be used to prepare & submit applications to NSF.

A list of the NSF Programs that will either authorize, or require, use of grants.gov is posted within this announcement.

***** Proposals that are **collaborative** and/or **contain a subcontract CANNOT** be processed through grants.gov. They must go through fastlane."

5. **ACS Petroleum Research Fund** – Announces *Electronic Proposal Submission and Review* = New electronic Submission process – Paula is reviewing the process & will send out instructions to everyone.
6. **Brandi Rifner** – Grants Pending/Current/Completed. Brandi demonstrated on the Web how to use the report, which can be accessed if you have contacted Dr. Michael Warnock for logins. Beth Minor was

present, since she programmed the report to meet requested changes and additions. The report is similar to the Web Grants Report #5, except closed projects have a field showing the closed status.

7. Questions answered by Brandi:

- a.) If CO-PI is not in resources and he/she is put in effort, will his/her information be on the reports? If any information is added to the effort panel, it will show up on the current and pending report.
- b.) How is percent effort changed, once a proposal is submitted, but not yet awarded? GCA can un-submit it and fix % effort.
- c.) Can zero effort be shown? The only person ever listed in report 5 is the PI. But, even if you have zero effort listed for a person it will at least show up on the current and pending report as a project they are on at zero percent.