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What Does NIH Look For?

NIH funds grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts that support the advancement of fundamental knowledge about the nature and behavior of living systems to meet the NIH mission of extending healthy life and reducing the burdens of illness and disability. While NIH awards many grants specifically for research, we also provide grant opportunities that support research-related activities, including: construction, training, career development, conferences, resource grants and more.

We encourage:

1. Projects of High Scientific Caliber

NIH looks for grant proposals of high scientific caliber that are relevant to public health needs and are within NIH Institute and Center (IC) priorities. ICs highlight their research priorities on their Web sites. Applicants may want to contact the appropriate Institute or Center to discuss the relevancy and/or focus of the proposed research before submitting an application. NIH also has a number of broad NIH-wide initiatives that may be of interest.

2. Investigator-Initiated Research

NIH strongly encourages investigator-initiated research across the spectrum of our mission. We issue hundreds of funding opportunity announcements (FOAs) in the form of Program Announcements (PAs) and requests for applications (RFAs) to stimulate research in particular areas of science. Some PAs, called "Parent Announcements," span the breadth of the NIH mission in order to ensure we have a way to capture "unsolicited" applications that do not fall within the scope of targeted announcements. The majority of NIH applications are submitted in response to parent announcements.

3. Unique Research Projects

Projects must be unique. By law, NIH cannot support a project already funded or pay for research that has already been done. Although you may not send the same application to more than one Public Health Service (PHS) agency at the same time, you can apply to an organization outside the PHS with the same application. If the project gets funded by another organization, however, it cannot be funded by NIH as well.

Who Is Eligible for an NIH Grant?

Each type of NIH grant program has its own set of eligibility requirements. Applicants can find eligibility information in section III of each funding opportunity announcement (FOA). While the principal investigator (PI) conceives and writes the application, NIH recognizes the applicant institution as the grantee for most grant types.

Individual Eligibility

NIH supports scientists at various stages in their careers, from pre-doctoral students on research training grants to investigators with extensive experience who run large research centers. NIH is committed to supporting new and early stage investigators.
(ESI). Reviewers give new and early stage investigators special consideration, and NIH has programs targeted specifically for these populations.

Generally, PIs and other personnel supported by NIH research grants are not required to be U.S. citizens; however, some NIH programs/mechanisms have a citizenship requirement. Any citizenship requirement will be stated in the program announcement (PA) or request for applications (RFA).

**Institutional Eligibility**

In general, domestic or foreign, public or private, non-profit or for-profit organizations are eligible to receive NIH grants. NIH may limit eligibility for certain types of programs, such as limitations on the participation of foreign entities or programs for which only small businesses are eligible applicants.

**Foreign Eligibility**

In general, foreign institutions and international organizations, including public or private non-profit or for-profit organizations, are eligible to apply for research project grants. Foreign institutions and international organizations are not eligible to apply for Kirschstein-NRSA institutional research training grants, program project grants, center grants, resource grants, SBIR/STTR grants, or construction grants. However, some activity codes, such as program project grants (P01), may support projects awarded to a domestic institution with a foreign component. For purposes of this policy, a "foreign component" is defined as performance of any significant element or segment of the project outside the United States (U.S.) either by the grantee or by a researcher employed by a foreign institution, whether or not grant funds are expended. Proposed research should provide special opportunities for furthering research programs through the use of unusual talent, resources, populations, or environmental conditions in other countries that are not readily available in the U.S. or that augment existing U.S. resources.

Foreign applicants are strongly encouraged to review the Eligibility section of the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) to determine whether their non-domestic (non-U.S.) entity (foreign organization) is eligible to respond to that particular FOA. Additional information on grants to foreign institutions, international organizations and domestic grants with foreign components is found in the NIH Grants Policy Statement.

**Finding a Funding Opportunity**

NIH announces availability of funds for grant programs by issuing funding opportunity announcements (FOAs) in the NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts and on Grants.gov. Parent announcements, program announcements (PAs), and requests for applications (RFAs) are all types of FOA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Receipt Date</th>
<th>Money Set Aside</th>
<th>Peer Review</th>
<th>Specificity of Topic</th>
<th>Advantage to Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Announcement</td>
<td>Standard receipt dates, usually open for three years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>In Center for Scientific Review (CSR) or in an IC, by one of many review committees</td>
<td>Non-specific, investigator-initiated. Not all ICs participate in all parent FOAs.</td>
<td>May submit any topic within the breadth of the NIH mission. Competition tied mainly to an IC's overall payline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC- specific Program Announcements (PA)</td>
<td>Standard receipt dates, usually open for three years</td>
<td>No set aside (unless PAS); high-priority applications may be funded beyond the payline</td>
<td>In CSR or in an IC, by one of many review committees (unless PAR)</td>
<td>Often broadly defined or a reminder of a scientific need; investigator-initiated</td>
<td>Competition tied mainly to the IC's overall payline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Specifies</td>
<td>Usually in</td>
<td>Well-defined</td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications (RFA)</td>
<td>funds and targets number of awards</td>
<td>and IC, but sometimes in CSR. Same review committee for all applications. Usually reviewed by a Scientific Review Group, called a Special Emphasis Panel, that is convened on a one-time basis</td>
<td>scientific area</td>
<td>depends on number of applicants and dollars set aside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Grants Process At-A-Glance

The following NIH "Grants Process At-A-Glance" chart is provided as a sample of the general time element necessary for a competing application to proceed from Receipt and Referral through the Peer Review process to negotiation and award.

Planning, Writing, Submitting

Planning: Applicant should start early, collect preliminary data, and establish internal deadlines.

Writing: Applicant often begins writing application several months prior to application due date.

Submitting: Applicant organization submits application to NIH/Division of Receipt and Referral (DRR), Center for Scientific Review (CSR) (using Grants.gov and eRA Commons for electronic submissions).

Receipt and Referral

Application arrives at CSR. (Applications compliant with NIH policies are assigned for review and funding consideration.)

CSR assigns application to an NIH Institute/Center (IC) and a Scientific Review Group (SRG).

Scientific Review Officer (SRO) assigns applications to reviewers and readers.

Peer Review

Initial Level of Review: SRG members review and evaluate

Priority Scores: Available to PD/PIs on eRA

Summary Statement: Available to PD/PIs on eRA

Second Level of Review: Advisory council/board
### Award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Award Process: IC grants management staff conducts final administrative review and negotiates award.*</th>
<th>Notification of Award: IC issues and sends Notice of Award (NoA) to applicant institution/organization.</th>
<th>Congratulations! Project period officially begins!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Requests additional information needed just-in-time for award.

**Post-Award Management**

Administrative and fiscal monitoring, reporting, and compliance.

**NOTE:** Timeline is based on the standard grants process. It does not reflect a shorter timeframe for grants undergoing expedited review (e.g., AIDS) and NIH Pilot Study to Shorten the Review Cycle for New Investigator.

* Requests additional information needed just-in-time for award.
Types of Grant Programs

NIH uses activity codes (e.g. R01, R43, etc.) to differentiate the wide variety of research-related programs we support. NIH Institutes and Centers (ICs) may vary in the way they use activity codes; not all ICs accept applications for all types of grant programs or they apply specialized eligibility criteria. Look closely at Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOAs) to determine which ICs participate and the specifics of eligibility.

A comprehensive list of all activity codes is available, or you can search for specific codes below:

- Search Activity Codes: (e.g. R01, P01, T, K, F, etc.)
- Search All Text: (e.g. Mentored, Training, etc.)
- Select from List:

The following groupings represent the main types of grant funding we provide:

- **Research Grants** (R series)
- **Career Development Awards** (K series)
- **Research Training and Fellowships** (T & F series)
- **Program Project/Center Grants** (P series)

- **Resource Grants** (various series)
- **Trans-NIH Programs**
- **Inactive Programs** (Archive)

Research Grants

The following represent frequently used research grant programs. A comprehensive list of all activity codes is also available.

Important note: NIH Institutes and Centers (ICs) may vary in the way they use activity codes; not all ICs accept applications for all types of grant programs or they apply specialized eligibility criteria. Look closely at funding opportunity announcements (FOAs) to determine which ICs participate and the specifics of eligibility.

**R01** NIH Research Project Grant Program (R01)
- Used to support a discrete, specified,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>circumscribed research project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o NIH’s most commonly used grant program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o No specific dollar limit unless specified in FOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Advance permission required for $500K or more (direct costs) in any year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Generally awarded for 3 -5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o All ICs utilize</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R03 NIH Small Grant Program (R03):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Provides limited funding for a short period of time to support a variety of types of projects, including: pilot or feasibility studies, collection of preliminary data, secondary analysis of existing data, small, self-contained research projects, development of new research technology, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Limited to two years of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Direct costs generally up to $50,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Not renewable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Utilized by more than half of the NIH ICs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R13 NIH Support for Conferences and Scientific Meetings (R13 and U13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Support for high quality conferences/scientific meetings that are relevant to NIH's scientific mission and to the public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Requires advance permission from the funding IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Foreign institutions are not eligible to apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Award amounts vary and limits are set by individual ICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Support for up to 5 years may be possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R15 NIH Academic Research Enhancement Award (AREA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Support small research projects in the biomedical and behavioral sciences conducted by students and faculty in health professional schools and other academic components that have not been major recipients of NIH research grant funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Eligibility limited (see <a href="http://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/area.htm">http://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/area.htm</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Direct cost limited to $150,000 over entire project period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Project period limited to up to 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o All NIH ICs utilize except FIC an NCMHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R34</th>
<th>NIH Clinical Trial Planning Grant (R34) Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Designed to permit early peer review of the rationale for the proposed clinical trial and support development of essential elements of a clinical trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Usually project period of one year, sometimes up to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Usually, a budget of up to $100,000 direct costs, sometimes up to $450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Used only by select ICs; no parent FOA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R41/R42</th>
<th>Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Intended to stimulate scientific and technological innovation through cooperative research/research and development (R/R&amp;D) carried out between small business concerns (SBCs) and research institutions (RIs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Fosters technology transfer between SBCs and RIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Assists the small business and research communities in commercializing innovative technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Three-phase structure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ I - Feasibility study to establish scientific/technical merit of the proposed R/R&amp;D efforts (generally, 1 year; $100,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ II - Full R/R&amp;D efforts initiated in Phase I (generally 2 years; $750,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ III - Commercialization stage (cannot use STTR funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Eligibility limited to U.S. small business concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Project Director/Principal investigator (PD/PI) may be employed with the SBC or the participating non-profit research institution as long as he/she has a formal appointment with or commitment to the applicant SBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Multiple PD/PIs allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o All ICs utilize except FIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R43/R44</strong></td>
<td>Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Intended to stimulate technological innovation in the private sector by supporting research or research and development (R/R&amp;D) for profit institutions for ideas that have potential for commercialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Assists the small business research community in commercializing innovative technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Three-phase structure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ I - Feasibility study to establish scientific/technical merit of the proposed R/R&amp;D efforts (generally, 1 year; $100,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ II - Full research or R&amp;D efforts initiated in Phase I (generally 2 years; $750,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ III- Commercialization stage (cannot use SBIR funds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Eligibility limited to U.S. small business concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The primary employment of the Project Director/Principal investigator (PD/PI) must be with the small business concern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Multiple PD/PIs allowed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o All ICs utilize except FIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>R56</strong></th>
<th>NIH High Priority, Short-Term Project Award (R56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Will fund, for one or two years, high-priority new or competing renewal R01 applications with priority scores or percentiles that fall just outside the funding limits of participating NIH Institutes and Centers (IC). Investigators may not apply for R56 grants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>U01</strong></th>
<th>Research Project Cooperative Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Supports discrete, specified, circumscribed projects to be performed by investigator(s) in an area representing their specific interests and competencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Used when substantial programmatic involvement is anticipated between the awarding Institute and Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o One of many types of cooperative agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o No specific dollar limit unless specified in FOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>K99/R00</strong></th>
<th>NIH Pathway to Independence (PI) Award (K99/R00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Also see, New Investigators Program web page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provides up to five years of support consisting of two phases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Project/Center Grants (P series)

The following represents the most frequently used programs. A comprehensive list of all activity codes is also available. Program project/center grants are large, multi-project efforts that generally include a diverse array of research activities. NIH Institutes and Centers issue funding opportunity announcements to indicate their interest in funding this type of program. Centers (ICs) may vary in the way they use activity codes. Look closely at funding opportunity announcements (FOAs) to determine which ICs participate and the specifics of eligibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P01</th>
<th>Research Program Project Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Support for integrated, multi-project research projects involving a number of independent investigators who share knowledge and common resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Each project contributes or is directly related to the common theme of the total research effort, thus forming a system of research activities and projects directed toward a well-defined research program goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Specific dollar limit unless specified in FOA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P20</th>
<th>Exploratory Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Often used to support planning activities associated with large multi-project program project grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P30</th>
<th>Center Core Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o To support shared resources and facilities for categorical research by a number of investigators from different disciplines who provide a multidisciplinary approach to a joint research effort or from the same discipline who focus on a common research problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The core grant is integrated with the center's component projects or program projects,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I - will provide 1-2 years of mentored support for highly promising, postdoctoral research scientists
- II - up to 3 years of independent support contingent on securing an independent research position
  o Award recipients will be expected to compete successfully for independent R01 support from the NIH during the career transition award period
  o Eligible Principal Investigators include outstanding postdoctoral candidates who have terminal clinical or research doctorates who have no more than 5 years of postdoctoral research training
  o Foreign institutions are not eligible to apply
  o PI does not have to be a U.S. citizen
The following represent some of the more frequently used types of grant programs that provide research-related support or access to resources. This list is by no means exhaustive. A comprehensive list of all activity codes is also available.

Important note: NIH Institutes and Centers (ICs) may vary in the way they use activity codes; not all ICs accept applications for all types of grant programs or they apply specialized eligibility criteria. Look closely at funding opportunity announcements (FOAs) to determine which ICs participate and the specifics of eligibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P50</strong></td>
<td>Specialized Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To support any part of the full range of research and development from very basic to clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May involve ancillary supportive activities such as protracted patient care necessary to the primary research or R&amp;D effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The spectrum of activities comprises a multidisciplinary attack on a specific disease entity or biomedical problem area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive continuous attention from staff funding IC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centers may serve as regional or national resources for special research purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **R24** | Resource-Related Research Projects |
|  | Used in a wide variety of ways to provide resources for problems where multiple expertise is needed to focus on a single complex problem in biomedical research or to enhance research infrastructure |

| **R25** | Education Projects |
|  | Used in a wide variety of ways to promote an appreciation for and interest in biomedical research, provide additional training in specific areas, and/or to develop ways to disseminate scientific discovery into public health and community applications |

NIH supports a variety of broad-reaching programs that are trans-NIH in nature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BECON</strong></td>
<td>NIH Bioengineering Consortium (BECON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BISTI</strong></td>
<td>Biomedical Information Science and Technology Initiative (BISTI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inactive Programs (Archive)

The following grant programs are inactive and are shown for informational and historical purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blueprint</th>
<th>NIH Blueprint for Neuroscience Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Supplements</td>
<td>Research Supplements to Promote Diversity in Health-Related Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWAS</td>
<td>Genome-Wide Association Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECASE</td>
<td>Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers (PECASE) Program with listing of NIH Recipients since 1996. NIH nominates investigator for this award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadmap</td>
<td>NIH Roadmap Initiatives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP1</td>
<td>NIH Director's Pioneer Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP2</td>
<td>NIH Director's New Innovator Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Roadmap page for more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S07** | Human Subjects Research Enhancement Awards (HSREA) |
**Ethical Issues in Human Studies** | Research on Ethical Issues in Human Studies |
**R29** | First Independent Research and Transition (FIRST) |
How to Apply

As you plan to write and submit an NIH application, it is important to know some important submission basics, such as what type of application will be needed (paper or electronic) and which forms are necessary, as well as links to contacts, important deadlines, a general timeline, and guidelines for tracking your application through the process. The following resources provide details on each of these elements:

- **Submitting Your Application**
  
  What's the process for submitting an application and should it be submitted in an electronic or paper format? This Web page provides tips and links for submitting competing applications and non-competing renewals that should answer these and other important submission questions.

- **NIH Forms and Applications**
  
  What application should be used and where can all the forms be found? This Web page provides MS Word and PDF versions of all NIH Forms and Applications necessary for submitting research grant proposals to the NIH. **Note:** See individual funding announcements for specific application instructions and contacts.

- **Receipt Dates and Deadlines**
  
  When are applications due? This Web page provides standard due dates for competing applications, special guidelines for SBIR/STTR applications, and non-competing renewal applications. Please note the special instructions regarding receipt versus postmark dates for submission of paper applications.

- **Grants Process Overview**
  
  How long until an award is made? The NIH Grants process can take approximately 10 months from application receipt and the peer review process through negotiation and award. The [Grants Process At-A-Glance Chart](#) on this Web page is a resource for understanding the steps your application goes through in that timeframe.

- **Tracking Your Application**
  
  What is the status of an application? This web page provides guidance on following your application's progress through the NIH Grants Process, including paper and electronic submission.
Peer Review Process

On This Page:
- Peer Review News
- Overview
- Initial Peer Review
- Second Level Of Review - Advisory Council/Board
- Post-Review

Peer Review News

Enhancing Peer Review at NIH: On February 28, 2008, the Final Draft of the NIH 2007-2008 Peer Review Self-Study was submitted to Dr. Elias Zerhouni, Director of NIH, marking the end of the diagnostic phase of the peer review enhancement effort.

Side-by-Side Comparison of Enhanced and Former Review Criteria (03/17/2009) - (PDF - 61 KB)


Registration Instructions to Receive Reimbursement and Honoraria for Participation in NIH Peer Review - (12/23/2008) - (MS Word - 1.8 mb)

Overview

NIH policy is intended to ensure that grant applications submitted to the NIH are evaluated on the basis of a process that is fair, equitable, timely, and conducted in a manner free of bias. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act and federal regulations governing "Scientific Peer Review of Research Grant Applications and Research and Development Contract Proposals" (42 CFR Part 52h-).
The first level of review is carried out by a Scientific Review Group (SRG) composed primarily of non-federal scientists who have expertise in relevant scientific disciplines and current research areas. The second level of review is performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Councils are composed of both scientific and lay members chosen for their expertise, interest, or activity in matters related to health and disease. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the SRG and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.
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Initial Peer Review

Depending on the grant assignment, initial peer review meetings are administered by either the Center for Scientific Review (CSR) or an individual NIH IC. Peer review meetings are announced in the Federal Register. The meetings are closed to the public, although some meetings may have an open session; the Federal Register provides the details of each meeting.

A. Peer Review Roles

Scientific Review Officer:

Each SRG is led by a Scientific Review Officer [(SRO), formerly Scientific Review Administrator (SRA)]. The SRO is an extramural staff scientist and the Designated Federal Official responsible for ensuring that each application receives an objective and fair initial peer review, and that all applicable laws, regulations, and policies are followed.

SROs:

- Analyze the content of each application, and check for completeness.
- Document and manage conflicts of interest.
- Recruit qualified reviewers based on scientific and technical qualifications specifically related to each grant application, including:
  - Authority in their scientific field (42 CFR 52h.4)
  - Dedication to high quality, fair, and objective reviews
  - Ability to work collegially in a group setting
  - Experience in research grant review
- Assign applications to reviewers for critique preparation.
- Attend and oversee administrative and regulatory aspects of peer review meetings.
- Prepare summary statements for all applications reviewed.

SRG Members

NOTE: SRG rosters are posted on the NIH website thirty days in advance of each meeting.

Chair:

- Serves as moderator of the discussion of scientific and technical merit of the applications under review.
- Is also a peer reviewer for the meeting.
Reviewers:

- Receive copies of the grant applications approximately six weeks prior to the peer review meeting.
- Prepare a written critique for each application assigned per the SRO, based on review criteria and judgment of merit.
- Make recommendations concerning the scientific and technical merit of applications under review, in the form of final written comments and numerical scores.
- Make recommendations concerning appropriateness of budget requests.
- Make recommendations concerning protections for human subjects; inclusion of women, minorities, and children in clinical research; welfare of vertebrate animals; and other areas as applicable for the application.

Other NIH Staff

- Federal officials who have need-to-know or pertinent related responsibilities are permitted to attend closed review meetings.
- NIH IC or other federal staff members wishing to attend an SRG meeting must have advance approval from the responsible SRO. These individuals may provide programmatic or grants management input at the SRO’s discretion.

B. Initial Peer Review Meeting

Overall

- Most SRGs convene for one-two days.
- Applications are reviewed based on established review criteria (see below).
- Assigned reviewers present their prepared critiques to the group.
- An open discussion follows.
- Final scoring is conducted by private ballot.

Streamlining

The initial scientific peer review of most research applications also will include a process in which only those applications deemed by the reviewers to have the highest scientific merit, generally the top half of the applications under review, will be discussed at the SRG meeting, assigned an overall impact score, and receive a second level review. Applications in the lower half are not discussed or scored at the SRG meeting. This process allows the reviewers to focus their discussion on the most meritorious applications.

Summary statements for streamlined applications contain the written critiques submitted by the assigned reviewers but do not contain a resume and summary of discussion. Streamlined applications are not barred from potential funding and may be revised and re-submitted.

Review Criteria

NOTE: December 2, 2008 - See Notice (NOT-OD-09-
Enhanced review criteria (below) have been issued for the evaluation of research applications received for potential FY2010 funding and thereafter. Research applications received for potential FY2009 funding will be evaluated according to criteria adopted on October 12, 2004 (http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-05-002.html) and modified May 11, 2006 (see http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-06-069.html).

Side-by-Side Comparison of Enhanced and Former Review Criteria (12/01/2008) - (MS Word - 49 KB)

Current Review Criteria (research applications received for potential FY2009 funding)

NIH applications are evaluated using established criteria (42 CFR 52h). Specific initiatives or programs may indicate review criteria in addition to the following required criteria:

**Significance:** Does this study address an important problem? If the aims of the application are achieved, how will this advance scientific knowledge? What will be the effect of this study on the concepts or methods that drive this field?

**Approach:** Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics? For applications designating multiple Project Directors/Principal Investigators (PDs/PIs), is the leadership approach, including the designated roles and responsibilities, governance and organizational structure consistent with and justified by the aims of the project and the expertise of each of the PDs/PIs?

**Innovation:** Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?

**Investigators:** Are the PD/PI(s) and other key personnel appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the PD/PI(s) and other researchers? Do the PD/PI(s) and investigative team bring complementary and integrated expertise to the project (if applicable)?

**Environment:** Do(es) the scientific environment (s) in which the work will be conducted contribute to the probability of success? Does the proposed study benefit from unique features of the scientific environment or subject populations, of employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support?

**Additional criteria.** In addition to the above criteria, the following items will be considered in the determination of scientific merit and the priority score:

- Recombinant DNA research
- Protection of human subjects from research risks
- Inclusion of women, minorities, and children
- Vertebrate animal research
Select agents

**Additional considerations.** The following considerations do not contribute to the priority score:

- **Budget**
- **Resource sharing** *(May be included as a review criterion that may affect the score for certain programs and initiatives.)*

**Enhanced Review Criteria** (research applications received for potential FY2010 funding)

The mission of the NIH is to support science in pursuit of knowledge about the biology and behavior of living systems and to apply that knowledge to extend healthy life and reduce the burdens of illness and disability. As part of this mission, applications submitted to the NIH for grants or cooperative agreements to support biomedical and behavioral research are evaluated for scientific and technical merit through the NIH peer review system.

**Overall Impact.** Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the following five core review criteria, and additional review criteria (as applicable for the project proposed).

**Core Review Criteria.** Reviewers will consider each of the five review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and give a separate score for each. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

**Significance.** Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

**Investigator(s).** Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Early Stage Investigators or New Investigators, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? If the project is collaborative or multi-PD/PI, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project?

**Innovation.** Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches...
or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?

**Approach.** Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed? If the project involves clinical research, are the plans for 1) protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) inclusion of minorities and members of both sexes/genders, as well as the inclusion of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?

**Environment.** Will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed? Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?

**Additional Review Criteria.** As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will consider the following additional items in the determination of scientific and technical merit, but will not give separate scores for these items.

- Protections for Human Subjects
- Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Children
- Vertebrate Animals
- Resubmission Applications
- Renewal Applications
- Revision Applications
- Biohazards

**Additional Review Considerations.** As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will address each of the following items, but will not give scores for these items and should not consider them in providing an overall impact score.

- Budget and Period Support
- Select Agent Research
- Applications from Foreign Organizations
- Resource Sharing Plans

**C. Scoring**

**NOTE:** The NIH will implement the new scoring system described below, effective for all applications for research grants and cooperative agreements submitted for funding consideration for FY2010 and thereafter. See NOT-OD--09-024 (http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-09-024.html)
New Scoring System (for applications submitted for potential FY2010 funding)

Before the SRG meeting, each reviewer and discussant assigned to an application will give a separate score for each of five core review criteria (Significance, Investigator(s), Innovation, Approach, and Environment; see above). For all applications, even those not discussed by the full committee, the scores of the assigned reviewers and discussant(s) for these criteria will be reported individually on the summary statement.

Before the review meeting, each reviewer and discussant assigned to an application will give a preliminary impact score for that application. The preliminary impact scores will be used to determine which applications will be discussed. For each application that is discussed, a final impact score will be given by each eligible committee member (without conflicts of interest). Each member's impact score will reflect his/her evaluation of the overall impact that the project is likely to have on the research field(s) involved, rather than a weighted average applied to the reviewer's scores given to each criterion.

The new scoring system will utilize a 9-point rating scale (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor). The overall impact score for each discussed application will be determined by calculating the mean score from all the eligible members' impact scores, and multiplying the average by 10; the overall impact score will be reported on the summary statement. Thus, the overall impact scores will range from 10 (high impact) to 90 (low impact). (Overall impact scores will not be reported for applications that are not discussed.)

Current Scoring System (for applications submitted for FY2009 funding)

Priority scores reflect the relative strengths and weaknesses of an application, with the lowest scores indicating the highest level of merit:

- 100-150: Outstanding
- 151-200: Excellent
- 210-250: Very Good
- 251-350: Good
- 351-500: Acceptable

Applicants should contact the program official for the application to seek additional feedback on the score and summary statement.

Rarely, an application will receive an 'NR' score, indicating that it is not recommended for further consideration because it lacks significant scientific merit, or because it presents serious research risks and protections against risks are inadequate. An application with an 'NR' cannot be moved to the second level of review and should not be resubmitted until the problems are resolved.

D. Summary Statement

Within one or two months of the SRG meeting, a summary statement will be available to the Principal Investigator via his/her NIH Commons account. The summary statement contains information about the application's review including:
Contact information for the Program Officer handling the application
Overall impact score or priority score (depending on the fiscal year)
Percentile (if applicable)
Resume and summary of the discussion (only for applications that are discussed)
Reviewer critiques and individual criterion scores (if under the new scoring system)
Committee recommendations concerning the budget
Human subject and vertebrate animal concerns (if applicable)
Additional administrative comments (if applicable)
Official meeting roster

Understanding the Percentile
The overall impact score or priority score is used to determine an application’s rank relative to other applications reviewed by the same SRG. This is referred to as the percentile ranking of an application. Some application types are not given percentile rankings.

Second Level Of Review - Advisory Council or Board

Who Reviews the Application?
The Advisory Council/Board of the potential awarding IC performs the second level of review. Advisory Councils/Boards are composed of scientists from the extramural research community and public representatives (NIH Federal Advisory Committee Information). Members are chosen by the respective IC and are approved by the Department of Health and Human Services.

Recommendation Process
- NIH program staff members examine applications, their overall impact scores or priority scores, percentile rankings and their summary statements and consider these against the IC’s needs.
- Program staff provide a grant-funding plan to the Advisory Board/Council.
- The Advisory Board/Council also considers the IC’s goals and needs and advises the IC director.
- The IC director makes final funding decisions based on staff and Advisory Council/Board advice.

Post-Review
- Not Funded – What Next?
The NIH receives thousands of applications for each application receipt round. Funding on the first attempt is difficult, but not impossible. If an application does not result in funding, NIH has resources available to help applicants prepare a possible application revision and resubmission. Applications in response to a specific initiative with set aside money typically cannot be resubmitted, but you the program officer should be
consulted about next steps.

- **Fundable Score – What Next?**

  If an application results in an award, the applicant will be working closely with the IC program officer on scientific and programmatic matters and a grants management officer on budgetary or administrative issues.
Award Management

On This Page:
- Overview
- Pre-Award Process - Competing Applications
- Pre-Award Process - Non-Competing Awards
- Award Process
- Post-Award Process

Overview

When an agency awards a grant, it is formalizing its partnership with the recipient (grantee) to ensure compliance with federal laws, regulations and policies. This protects the integrity of the overall scientific endeavor. Timely and effective communication between a grantee and the NIH is critical throughout the pre-award process, award process and post-award process.

At this stage in the grants process, the roles and responsibilities of NIH participants are summarized as follows:

- Grants Management Officer (GMO): The GMO signs the Notice of Award (NoA) and is the NIH official who is responsible for the business management and other non-programmatic aspects of the award. GMOs ensure that the NIH and grantee staffs fulfill requirements of laws, regulations, and administrative policies.

- Grants Management Specialist (GMS): The GMS works with the GMO on the day-to-day management of the grant. The name and contact information of the GMS assigned to a particular grant appears on the NoA.

- Program Official (PO): The PO is responsible for the programmatic, scientific, and/or technical aspects of assigned applications and grants. The PO’s responsibilities include, but are not limited to, developing research initiatives and research training programs to meet the Institute/Center’s (IC) mission; coordinating with Center for Scientific Review and IC Scientific Review Officers and working in partnership with grants management on post-award administration, including review of progress reports, participation in site visits, and other activities.

A summary of Grantee participants’ roles and responsibilities appears below:

- Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR): The AOR, also known as Signing Official (SO) in the eRA Commons, is the designated representative of the grantee organization in matters related to the award and administration of its NIH grants, including those that require NIH approval. In signing a grant application, this individual certifies that the applicant organization will comply with all applicable assurances and certifications referenced in the application. This individual’s signature further certifies that the applicant organization will be accountable both for the appropriate use of funds awarded and for the performance of the grant-supported project or activities resulting from the application.

- Project Director(s)/Principal Investigator(s) (PD/PI): The PD/PIs are the individual(s) designated by the applicant organization to have the appropriate level of authority and responsibility to direct the project or program supported by the award. The applicant organization may designate multiple individuals as PIs who share the authority and responsibility for leading and directing the project, intellectually and logistically. Each PI is responsible and accountable to the grantee organization, or as appropriate, to a collaborating organization, for the proper conduct of the project or program, including the submission of all required reports.
The PD/PIS are core members of the grantee team responsible for ensuring compliance with the financial and administrative aspects of the award. These individuals work closely within the grantee organization to create and maintain necessary documentation, such as technical and administrative reports, preparing justifications, appropriately acknowledging federal support of research findings in publications, announcements, news programs, and other media, and ensuring compliance with other federal and organizational requirements.

NIH encourages the PD/PIS to maintain contact with the NIH program officer with respect to the scientific aspects of the project and the grants management officer concerning the business and administrative aspects of the award.

Pre-Award Process - Competing Applications

IC Preliminary Review

Following the peer review process, applications that an IC may fund are reviewed 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.

In anticipation of an award being made, the applicant may be asked to submit additional information, such as

- other support,
- verification of Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) review.

**Note:** Such requests by NIH do not guarantee that an award will be made.

Collection of Just in Time (JIT) Information

After the priority scores are released, NIH sends an e-mail requesting Just-in-Time (JIT) information for grants within the competitive range for possible funding. **This notification, sent to the PD/PI, is NOT a Notice of Award, nor should it be construed as an indicator of possible award.** JIT information requested includes other support, certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, certification of IACUC approval, and human subjects training certification for all key personnel. JIT information must be submitted for review and evaluation PRIOR to making an award. This information may be submitted via the Just-In-Time function within the eRA Commons.

If you have questions about the JIT process, contact your assigned grants management specialist.

Negotiation of Competing Award

Following the IC’s review and evaluation of the application, peer review results, and all applicable material, the IC will determine whether an award can be made, if special conditions are required, and what level of funding is appropriate.

The pre-award process involves communication between the NIH and the applicant organization, and includes negotiation if significant adjustments are required prior to award.

- **Initial peer review recommendations:** Peer reviewers may recommend changes to the specific aims and/or modifications to the requested budget. These recommendations are provided in the summary statement. Under these circumstances, NIH staff will include these recommendations in consideration of a potential award.
- **Overlap:** Program and grants management staff will review the other support information before an award to ensure the following:
Sufficient levels of effort are committed to support the approved project.

- There is no scientific, budgetary, or commitment overlap.

- **Budget/programmatic modification**: NIH may reduce the project’s budget if sufficient funds are not available to support the application at 100 percent of the recommended level.

- **Determination of Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Costs**: Grants Management staff will utilize the negotiated F&A costs (also known as indirect costs) for each grant. More information on the reimbursement of F&A costs can be found in the [NIH Grants Policy Statement](#).

---

**Pre-Award Process - Non-Competing Awards**

The pre-award process for non-competing continuation awards is a streamlined version of this process, including an assessment of progress (see "Administrative Requirements—Monitoring—Reporting—Non-Competing Grant Progress Reports").

---

**Award Process**

Following review of all applicable information, the IC will determine whether an award will be made, if special conditions are required, and what level of funding is appropriate.

**Notice of Award (NoA)**

The NoA is the legal document issued to notify the grantee that an award has been made and that funds may be requested from the designated HHS payment system or office. An NoA is issued for the initial budget period. If subsequent budget periods are also approved, the NoA will include a reference to those budgetary commitments. Funding for subsequent budget periods are generally provided in annual increments following the annual assessment of progress. This funding is also contingent on the availability of funds. The NoA includes all applicable terms of award either by reference or specific statements. It provides contact information for the assigned program officer and grants management specialist.

**Accepting the Award**

The grantee accepts an NIH award and its associated terms and conditions by drawing or requesting funds from the Payment Management System, or upon the endorsement of a check from the US Treasury for foreign awardees.

**Compliance with Terms and Conditions of Award**

An NoA includes two sections (Sections III & IV) where terms of award are described.

Section III of awards lists standard terms such as:

- Grant program legislation and program regulation cited in this NoA.
- Restrictions on the expenditure of federal funds in [appropriation acts](#), to the extent those restrictions are pertinent to the award.
- The [National Institutes of Health Grants Policy Statement](#) (NIHGPS) in effect at the beginning date of the budget period.
- The award notice including any special terms and conditions....
- A reference to carryover authority when applicable
- A reference to inclusion or exclusion to SNAP as applicable
- A reference on the treatment of Program Income
- A reference to participation in the Federal Demonstration Partnership as applicable.
The NIH Grants Policy Statement, NIHGPS, as a term and condition for all awards contains the legally binding requirements for all grant recipients (See Part II Terms of Award).

Section IV of awards contains Special Terms and Conditions specific to the particular NIH Institute/Center and/or specific to the particular grant. It is important that you pay careful attention to the terms and conditions of an award, particularly any specific to the grant. Unless these terms are carefully reviewed and addressed, grantees may unknowingly violate the terms and conditions of the award. In those cases, NIH may place a restriction on the award, institute special monitoring procedures, or potentially terminate an award.

Post-Award Process

If you are the recipient of a grant from the NIH, there is a great deal of information that your organization will need in order to be successful steward of federal funds. The NIH Welcome Wagon Letter provides information and resources for new grantee organizations on how to manage the award.

NIH publishes policy updates in the NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts. Individuals may subscribe for weekly e-mail updates.

The information provided below is just a brief overview of selected post-award processes and requirements. For full details on any of these topics, see the NIH Grants Policy Statement. In addition, for specific questions, consult first with the administrative officials within your organization. The assigned NIH program officials and grants management specialists are also available to answer any remaining questions.

Monitoring Your Award

Grantees are responsible for managing the day-to-day operations of their grant. To fulfill their role in regard to the stewardship of federal funds, NIH awarding offices monitor grants to identify potential problems and areas where technical assistance might be necessary. This active monitoring is accomplished through review of reports and correspondence from the grantee, audit reports, site visits, and other information available to NIH.

Payment

HHS grant payments may be made by one of several advance payment methods, including SMARTLINK II/ACH, CASHLINE/ACH, or cash request, or by cash request on a reimbursement basis. The Office of Financial Management (OFM) makes payments under grants to foreign or international organizations, awards to individuals, and awards to agencies of the federal government. Additional information on payment is in the NIH Grants Policy Statement.

Monitoring Expenditures

Applicant organizations are required to have financial systems in place to monitor their grant expenditures. NIH monitors grantee expenditures under individual grants within each budget period and within the overall project period. The funding that NIH provides for each budget period is based on an assessment of the effort to be performed during that period and the grantee’s associated budget, including the availability of "un-obligated" balances. Although NIH allows its grantees flexibilities with respect to re-budgeting (see ”Administrative Requirements—Changes in Project and Budget” in the NIH Grants Policy Statement), NIH expects the rate and types of expenditures to be consistent with the approved project and budget and may question or restrict expenditures that appear inconsistent with these expectations.

The Grants Management Specialist (GMS) reviews grantee cash expenditure reports to determine whether they indicate a pattern of accelerated or delayed expenditures. Expenditure patterns are of particular concern because they may indicate a deficiency in the grantee’s financial management system or internal controls. Accelerated or delayed expenditures may result in a grantee’s inability to complete the approved project within the approved budget and period of performance. In these situations, the GMS may seek additional information from the grantee and may make any necessary and appropriate actions.
Prior Approval Requests

All requests that require prior NIH approval must be made in writing (e-mail is acceptable) to the Grants Management Officer at least 30 days before the proposed change. The request must be endorsed by the Authorized Organization Representative. Failure to obtain required prior approval from the appropriate NIH awarding office may result in the disallowance of costs, termination of the award, or other enforcement action within the NIH's authority.

See the NIH Grants Policy Statement on Prior Approval Requirements.

If you have questions, contact the grants management specialist or the program official named in your NoA.

Reporting Requirements

NIH requires that grantees periodically submit reports. For all of the reports discussed in this section, grantees are reminded that they are due at specific times during the life cycle of a grant award. It is important that all reports are accurate, complete, and submitted on time.

Progress Reports

Progress reports are usually required annually as part of the non-competing continuation award process. The “Grant Progress Report” (PHS 2590) or equivalent documentation must be submitted to (and approved by) the NIH to non-competitively fund each additional budget period within a previously approved project period (competitive segment).

The information to be included in the progress report is specified in the PHS 2590 instructions, which also include alternate instructions for awards under Streamlined Non-competing Award Process (SNAP). Non-competing progress reports are submitted directly to NIH. Forms for non-competing grant progress reports are available at http://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/2590/2590.htm.

If your award is eligible for the eSNAP, you may file an electronic progress report 45 days before the grant anniversary date. Non-SNAP awards should be submitted 60 days before the grant anniversary date.

Other factors related to your project might add additional requirements. For example, if you are working with human subjects, you need to get your certification of IRB approval re-approved every year of your award. Likewise, if you're working with research animals, you need to get your certification of IACUC approval re-approved every three years.

Invention Reports

Regulations require that grantee organizations report all inventions to the awarding agency (see NIH Grants Policy Statement), as well as include an acknowledgement of federal support in any patents. Grantee organizations are expected to use the Web-based Interagency Edison system (iEdison). NIH funding recipients are expected to use this system to comply with the Bayh-Dole Act (P.L. 96-517) and related intellectual property reporting requirements.

For more information on the policies that govern Invention Reporting, see the iEdison Web site.

Final Invention Statement

When a grant is completed and no more funding is provided, or when a grant is transferred from one institution to another, then a Final Invention Statement and Certification (HHS 568) is one of the required forms submitted to the NIH. For grants that are closing out, the Final Invention Statement and Certification can be submitted along with the other required closeout documents through the eRA Commons. For transfers, this document should be submitted directly to the NIH awarding Institute or Center. A
Financial Reporting (Institutional Requirement)

Quarterly Cash Transaction Reports (PSC 272)

Quarterly Federal Cash Transaction Report, PSC 272 covers the financial information related to your project. For more information on 272 reports, see the Division of Payment Management’s Web site.

Financial Status Reports (SF269)

A Financial Status Report (FSR) is required as documentation of the financial status of grants according to the official accounting records of the grantee organization. Financial reporting is accomplished using the FSR (SF-269 or SF-269 A); the grantee must use the long form (SF 269) to report program income earned and used.

Except for awards under SNAP and awards that require more frequent reporting, the FSR is required on an annual basis. An annual FSR is required for awards to foreign organizations and federal institutions, whether or not they are under SNAP. When required on an annual basis, the report must be submitted for each budget period no later than 90 days after the close of the budget period. The report also must cover any authorized extension in time of the budget period. If more frequent reporting is required, the NoA will specify both the frequency and due date.

Beginning October 1, 2007 all FSRs must be submitted electronically through the eRA Commons. (NIH Guide Notice)

Audit Requirements

For fiscal years ending after 12/31/2003, NIH grantees or sub-recipients that expend $500,000 or more in federal awards during the fiscal year are subject to an audit requirement. Organizations expending less than $500,000 during the fiscal year are not required to have an annual audit for that year, but must make their grant-related records available to NIH or other designated officials for review or audit.

- Educational institutions and nonprofit organizations, including hospitals, are subject to the requirements of OMB Circular A-133.
- For-profit organizations, including for-profit hospitals, and foreign organizations can satisfy audit requirements with either of two audit types, according to 45 CFR 74.26(d):
  - A financial-related audit as defined in, and in accordance with, the Government Auditing Standards (the "Yellow Book").
  - An audit that meets the requirements of OMB Circular A-133.

These audits are required annually. Audits shall be completed and submitted to the designated offices shown below within a period that is either the earlier of (1) 30 days after receipt of the auditor’s report(s), or (2) nine months after the end of the audit period (i.e., the organization's fiscal year).

Educational institutions and non-profit institutions should submit their audit report directly to:

Federal Audit Clearinghouse
Bureau of the Census
1201 East 10th Street
Jeffersonville, IN 47132
For-profit organizations, including for-profit hospitals, and foreign organizations should submit their audit report directly to:

National External Audit Review Center  
HHS Office of Audit Services  
1100 Walnut Street, Suite 850  
Kansas City, MO 64106-2197  
800.732.0679/816.426.7725

If your organization has expended less than $500,000 in federal funds in a year, it is exempt from the audit requirements, but must keep grant-related records available to NIH or other designated officials for review or audit.

Closeout

NIH closes out a grant as soon as possible after expiration if the grant will not be extended or if continued funding is not provided. Closeout includes ensuring timely submission of all required reports and adjustments for amounts due the grantee or NIH. Closeout of a grant does not automatically cancel any requirements for property accountability, record retention, or financial accountability. Following closeout, the grantee remains obligated to return funds due as a result of later refunds, corrections, or other transactions, and the federal government may recover amounts based on the results of an audit covering any part of the period of grant support.

Required closeout reports include:
- Final FSR
- Final progress report
- Final Invention Statement and Certification
- Final population tracking data when applicable

These reports are due within 90 days of the end of grant support. Failure to submit timely and accurate final reports may affect future funding to the organization or awards with the same PD/PI.

Record Retention

Grantees generally must retain financial and programmatic records, supporting documents, statistical records, and all other records that are required by the terms of a grant, or may reasonably be considered pertinent to a grant, for a period of 3 years from the date the annual FSR is submitted. For awards issued under the SNAP authorities, the three-year retention period is calculated from the date the FSR is submitted for the entire competitive segment.

Closeout may also affect the time period for retention of records by the grantee, because the three-year record retention period begins with the submission of the final FSR. See 45 CFR Part 74.53 and 45 CFR Part 92.42, Retention and access requirements for records.