

DOM DRA: ITEMS NOT REVIEWED

Revised December 1, 2022

Below are items that DOM DRA does **NOT** review when reviewing a grant proposal.

Reminder: It is the PI's responsibility to review the entire proposal for accuracy.

Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) Information

- Correct FOA: Reviews will be based on the FOA selected by the FM in Cayuse/S2S.
- PI Eligibility: DOM DRA does NOT review for:
 - Eligibility as per the FOA requirements.
 - Eligibility for NIH Continuous Submission privileges.
 - PI ORCID IDs linked to NIH Commons account (currently required for NIH Ks).

SF424 RR

- Item 4.a. Federal Identifier: For resubmission/renewals/revisions, DOM DRA does not review for accuracy of the federal identifier number. The FM needs to confirm with PI that the federal identifier is correct.
- Item 8 Type of Application: It is the responsibility of the PI and FM to determine the appropriate [proposal application type](#).
 - PIs can submit one Resubmission application using the same FOA.
 - If the PI is submitting an additional application, or changing FOAs, then the application must be submitted as a New application.

Performance Sites

- FM needs to assure the lab address is current and accurate.

Key Persons Section

- Position/Title: We do not review to assure the accuracy of the faculty member's Position/Title. The FM should verify current title in [UCPath](#) or with the MSO.
- Credential, e.g., agency login: PI and FM need to assure the information is correct in order to avoid receiving an error during Sponsor validation.
 - NIH eRA Commons ID:
 - FM needs to assure Commons ID for PI is *associated with UCLA* (especially for new UCLA faculty who have transferred from another university).
 - FM needs to assure the *role of PI is assigned* to PI's Commons ID (especially for young faculty who may have previously been post-docs and/or trainees).

Scientific Sections (Abstract, Project Narrative, Research Plan, Human Subjects, etc.)

- Assuring no prior grant information is included anywhere within a 'New' proposal
 - Example: this application was submitted as New, but Project Summary states, "The proposal is a continuation of a project within a Program Project Grant (HLXXXXX, J. Bruin, PI). The NHLBI recently ruled that such PPGs cannot extend beyond 2 cycles and, therefore, we seek R01 funds to continue our work."
- Scientific material or its contents.
- Letters of Support (LOS): DRA does not review LOS to assure compliance with NIH policy.

- PI and FM must determine the appropriate Human Subjects usage (e.g. human subject data only vs. Exemption #4 vs. full IRB required)

Budget & Justification

- On or Off Campus: DRA checks current On or Off campus rate is correctly listed (26% or 56%), but does not check if the performance site is accurately categorized as On or Off Campus.
- Salary Verification: FM must assure accurate [salary information](#).
- Benefit Calculation: FM must assure the [composite benefit rate \(CBR\)](#) used is accurate based on the category for each individual.
- Justification: DRA will provide a cursory review of the breakdown of expenses to assure the expenses add up to the totals and match the budget amount. If there are extended tables containing a very detailed itemized breakdown of expenses, DRA does not review to assure accuracy.

Overall

- Hyperlinks/Hypertexts: [Hypertexts is restricted by the NIH](#); only allowing them in very specific documents, such as publication list in section C of the bioskech. DRA will provide a general review of various documents but it is the responsibility of the PI and FM to ensure compliance.

Internal Documents

- EPASS: DRA does not review if the [COI date](#) is accurate.
- PI Exception status check: DRA will check PI Exception Letter is attached if EPASS states it is required, but DRA does not check if PI category is a [Policy 900 eligible PI](#).

Please contact Raellen Man (rman@mednet.ucla.edu) if you have any questions regarding this policy.