

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases Extramural Research Program Office

Promoting the Importance of Infant and Childhood Vaccination Among Pregnant Women by Prenatal Care Providers

RFA-IP-21-001

Application Due Date: 02/02/2021

Promoting the Importance of Infant and Childhood Vaccination Among Pregnant Women by Prenatal Care Providers

RFA-IP-21-001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part 1. Overview Information
- Key Dates
- Required Application Instructions
- Executive Summary

Part 2. Full Text
- Section I. Funding Opportunity Description
- Section II. Award Information
- Section III. Eligibility Information
- Section IV. Application and Submission Information
- Section V. Application Review Information
- Section VI. Award Administration Information
- Section VII. Agency Contacts
- Section VIII. Other Information

Part 1. Overview Information

Participating Organization(s)

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Components of Participating Organizations

National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases

Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Title

Promoting the Importance of Infant and Childhood Vaccination Among Pregnant Women by Prenatal Care Providers

Activity Code

U01 – Research Project - Cooperative Agreement

Please see Section VI.4. "Cooperative Agreement Terms and Conditions" for more information regarding substantial Federal scientific or programmatic involvement.

Notice of Funding Opportunity Type

New

Agency Notice of Funding Opportunity Number

RFA-IP-21-001

Assistance Listings (CFDA) Number(s)

93.185
93.083

Category of Funding Activity:

Health

NOFO Purpose

The purpose of this notice of funding opportunity is to investigate the acceptability, feasibility, and effectiveness of promoting infant immunization during prenatal care visits, leading parents to vaccinate their children confidently. Prenatal care providers, including obstetricians and midwives, are trusted sources of information for pregnant women, yet many feel uncomfortable providing information or discussing concerns about infant vaccination, likely because they consider this to be outside their area of expertise. This represents a significant missed opportunity to provide important information to pregnant women from a trusted source, at a critical time, when research suggests maternal opinions about childhood vaccination are forming.

Key Dates

Publication Date:	**To receive notification of any changes to RFA-IP-21-001, return to the synopsis page of this announcement at www.grants.gov and click on the "Send Me Change Notification Emails" link. An email address is needed for this service.**
Letter of Intent Due Date:	**01/05/2021**

Application Due Date:	**02/02/2021**

On-time submission requires that electronic applications be error-free and made available to CDC for processing from the NIH eRA system on or before the deadline date. Applications must be submitted to and validated successfully by Grants.gov no later than 5:00 PM U.S. Eastern Time. Applications must be submitted using the Application Submission System & Interface for Submission Tracking (ASSIST) module which is a web-based service used for the preparation and submission of grant applications to CDC through Grants.gov. ASSIST provides the ability for applicants to prepare their applications online, and offers the applicant additional capabilities including the ability to preview the application image, validate the application against required business rules, and prepopulate data from an applicant organization's records, therefore identifying issues earlier in the application submission process.

Note: HHS/CDC grant submission procedures do not provide a grace period beyond the application due date time to correct any error or warning notices of noncompliance with application instructions that are identified by Grants.gov or eRA systems (i.e., error correction window).

Scientific Merit Review:	**04/13/2021**
Secondary Review:	**05/13/2021**
Estimated Start Date:	**09/01/2021**
Expiration Date:	**02/03/2021**
Due Dates for E.O. 12372:	**Due no later than 60 days after the application receipt date.**

Required Application Instructions

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION SUBMISSION VIA ASSIST IS PREFERRED

It is recommended that applicants use ASSIST for the electronic preparation and submission of applications through Grants.gov to CDC. ASSIST is an alternative method to prepare and submit applications, and provides many features to facilitate the application submission process which improves data quality (e.g., pre-population of organization data, pre-submission validation of business rules, and preview of the application image used for review). Use of the Grants.gov downloadable Adobe application packages and submission process will still be supported.

It is critical that applicants follow the instructions in the SF 424 (R&R) Application Guide except where instructed to do otherwise in this NOFO. Conformance to all requirements (both in the Application Guide and the NOFO) is required and strictly enforced. Applicants must read and follow all application instructions in the Application Guide as well as any program-specific instructions noted in Section IV. When the program-specific instructions deviate from those in the Application Guide, follow the program-specific instructions.

Note: The Research Strategy component of the Research Plan is limited to 20 pages.

Applications that do not comply with these instructions may be delayed or not accepted for review.

Pages that exceed page limits described in this NOFO will be removed and not forwarded for peer review, potentially affecting an application's score.

Telecommunications for the Hearing Impaired: TTY 1-888-232-6348

Executive Summary

- **Purpose:** The purpose of this notice of funding opportunity is to investigate the acceptability, feasibility, and effectiveness of promoting infant immunization during prenatal care visits, leading parents to vaccinate their children confidently. Prenatal care providers, including obstetricians and midwives, are trusted sources of information for pregnant women, yet many feel uncomfortable providing information or discussing concerns about infant vaccination, likely because they consider this to be outside their area of expertise. This represents a significant missed opportunity to provide important information to pregnant women from a trusted source, at a critical time, when research suggests maternal opinions about childhood vaccination are forming.
- **Mechanism of Support:** U01 – Research Project – Cooperative Agreement.
- **Funds Available and Anticipated Number of Awards:** The estimated total funding available, including direct and indirect costs, for the entire three (3)-year project period is $1,500,000. The anticipated number of awards is one (1). Awards issued under this NOFO are contingent upon availability of funds and a sufficient number of meritorious applications. Because the nature and scope of the proposed research will vary from application to application, it is also anticipated that the size and duration of each award may also vary. The total amount awarded and the number of awards will depend upon the number, quality, duration and cost of the applications received.
- **Budget and Project Period:** The estimated total funding (direct and indirect) for the first year (12-month budget period) is $500,000, with individual awards ranging from $300,000 to $500,000 for the first year. The estimated total funding (direct and indirect) for the entire project period is $1,500,000. The project period is anticipated to run from 9/01/2021 to 8/31/2024.
- **Application Research Strategy Length:** Page limits for the Research Strategy are clearly specified in Section IV. “Application and Submission Information” of this announcement.
- **Eligible Institutions/Organizations.** Institutions/organizations listed in Section III. of this announcement are eligible to apply.
- **Eligible Project Directors/Principal Investigators (PDs/PIs).** Individuals with the skills, knowledge, and resources necessary to carry out the proposed research are invited to work with their institution/organization to develop an application for support. **NOTE:** CDC does not make awards to individuals directly. Individuals from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups as well as individuals with disabilities are always encouraged to apply.
- **Number of PDs/PIs.** There will only be one PD/PI for each application.
- **Number of Applications.** Only one application per institution (normally identified by

having a unique DUNS number) is allowed.
- **Application Type.** New.
- **Application Materials.** See **Section IV.1** for application materials. Please note that Form F is to be used when completing the application package.

Part 2. Full Text

Section I. Funding Opportunity Description

Statutory Authority

Public Health Service Act, Section 317(k)(1) [42 USC 247b(k)(1)], as amended.

1. Background and Purpose

Although overall childhood vaccination coverage is high in the United States, vaccine hesitancy leading to the delay or refusal of vaccination is a growing concern. Health care providers are consistently rated as the parent's most trusted source of vaccine information, and discussions and recommendations from a health care provider are the leading reasons that parents who initially planned to delay, or refuse, vaccines change their mind to acceptance. Thus, development of effective, evidence-based strategies to improve parent-provider vaccine conversations is critical for strengthening vaccine confidence among parents.

Evidence suggests that the prenatal period is a critical time for vaccine discussions, as most mothers make vaccine decisions for their child before or during pregnancy. Despite the desire for more information on pediatric vaccines from a healthcare provider, expectant mothers may have limited opportunities to have these discussions and, frequently, turn to the internet, media, or word of mouth for more information. In the process, they may encounter information on infant/child vaccination which may be unreliable and not evidence-based. This may lead women and expectant parents to question the safety or necessity of following Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) recommendations for their child. In the worst-case scenario, exposure to such information may lead to children missing recommended vaccines, leaving them susceptible to serious, and sometimes deadly, vaccine-preventable diseases.

Prenatal care providers, including obstetricians and midwives, are trusted sources of information for pregnant women. Prenatal providers may receive requests for information about newborn vaccination from expectant parents but may not feel comfortable providing information, or discussing concerns about infant vaccination, likely because they consider this to be outside their area of expertise. This represents a significant missed opportunity to provide important information to pregnant women from a trusted source, at a critical time, when maternal opinions about childhood vaccination are likely forming.

This funding opportunity seeks to investigate the acceptability, feasibility, and effectiveness of promoting infant immunization during prenatal care visits, leading parents to vaccinate their children confidently.

Healthy People 2030 and other National Strategic Priorities

This NOFO relates to the following Healthy People 2030 objectives:

- IID-01: Maintain the elimination of measles, rubella, congenital rubella syndrome (CRS), and acute paralytic poliomyelitis
- IID-02: Reduce the proportion of children who receive 0 doses of recommended vaccines by age 2 years
- IID-03: Maintain the vaccination coverage level of 1 dose of the measles-mumps-rubella (MMR) vaccine among children by age 2 years
- IID-04: Maintain the vaccination coverage level of 2 doses of the measles-mumps-rubella (MMR) vaccine for children in kindergarten
- IID-05: Reduce cases of pertussis among infants
- IID-06: Increase the vaccination coverage level of 4 doses of the diphtheria-tetanus-acellular pertussis (DTaP) vaccine among children by age 2 years
- IID-07: Reduce infections due to human papillomavirus (HPV) types prevented by the 9-valent vaccine in young adults
- IID-08: Increase the proportion of adolescents who receive recommended doses of the human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine
- IID-09: Increase the proportion of people who get the flu vaccine every year
- IID-10: Reduce the rate of hepatitis A
- IID-11: Reduce the rate of acute hepatitis B

This NOFO also relates to CDC's *Vaccinate with Confidence* strategic framework to strengthen vaccine confidence and prevent outbreaks of vaccine-preventable diseases in the United States. Specifically, this work will help achieve the priority of empowering parents to make vaccine decisions by starting vaccine conversations early and strengthening provider-parent vaccine discussions.

Public Health Impact

Under-vaccination can lead to a resurgence of vaccine-preventable diseases. For example, in 2019, under-vaccination contributed to a 30-year high in reported measles cases in the United States. The primary driver of these outbreaks was hesitancy by parents to vaccinate their children on time and according to the schedule recommended by the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices. In turn, vaccine hesitancy is informed by misinformation.

This NOFO seeks to provide factual immunization information and correct any immunization-related misinformation consumed by expectant parents, before a child is born, in the hope that parents will be empowered with evidence-based information, as opposed to myths and misinformation, and will be confident about their decision to vaccinate their child according to the recommended schedule.

Relevant Work

CDC recommends that pregnant women receive influenza vaccine and tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and acellular pertussis vaccine (Tdap) during pregnancy, as this can reduce influenza and pertussis risk for themselves and their infants. Therefore, prenatal care providers are likely familiar with the importance of vaccination and have engaged in discussions with patients. However, discussions around vaccinating infants may be less familiar to this group.

Recent CDC-related work relevant to this NOFO includes the following:

1. RFA-IP-19-002 is a CDC-sponsored funding opportunity that is currently conducting research focused on increasing influenza and Tdap vaccination of pregnant women in OB/GYN practices in large health systems through Quality Improvement interventions. Participating practices will be implementing evidence-based quality improvement strategies that have previously been shown to increase vaccination rates, thus improving vaccination coverage among pregnant women. Comparisons will be made of baseline and follow-up data in the same practice, as well as comparisons between intervention and control groups, to determine the most effective strategy, or combination of strategies, to increase vaccination coverage among pregnant women. Baseline and follow-up data will also be obtained to determine: 1) whether quality improvement interventions impacted providers' knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to the National Vaccine Advisory Committee's Standards for Adult Immunization Practice; 2) whether the providers think they are making strong vaccine recommendations to their patients; 3) the value they place on adult immunizations; and 4) any perceived or real barriers they have to implementing the Standards for Adult Immunization Practice and/or to vaccinating their patients.
2. CDC has conducted formative communications research with pregnant women and certified nurse midwives (CNMs) in recent years. A study of first-time expectant mothers found that the majority of participants made decisions about their babies' vaccines while still pregnant, and these decisions remained stable over time. Most appeared to be receptive to immunization information, but relatively few were receiving it from obstetricians, midwives, or physicians. Topline findings from recent research with CNMs showed that CNMs discuss childhood vaccines with their pregnant patients less often than maternal vaccines and that CNMs were less confident in their ability to answer questions about childhood vaccines as compared to questions about maternal vaccines.

Other relevant work:

1. Mbaeyi S, Cohn A, Messonnier N. *Pediatrics* June 2020, 145 (6) e20200390. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2020-0390
2. Paterson P, Meurice F, Stanberry L, *et al.* Vaccine hesitancy and healthcare providers. Vaccine (2016) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.Vaccine.2016.10.042
3. Wroe AL, Turner N, Salkovskis PM. Understanding and predicting parental decisions about early childhood immunizations. *Health Psychol.* 2004; Jab 23(1):33-41.
4. Danchin M, Costa-Pinto J, Attwell K, *et al.* Vaccine decision-making begins in pregnancy: Correlation between vaccine concerns, intentions and maternal vaccination with subsequent childhood vaccine uptake. *Vaccine* (2018). 36 (44), 6473-6479. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.Vaccine.2016.10.042
5. Vaccinating with Confidence. Protect communities. Empower families. Stop myths. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/partners/vaccinate-with-confidence.html
6. Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices Child schedule. Recommended Child and Adolescent Immunization Schedule for ages 18 years or younger, United States, 2020. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/schedules/hcp/imz/child-adolescent.html

7. Patel M, Lee AD, Clemmons NS, *et al.* National Update on Measles Cases and Outbreaks — United States, January 1–October 1, 2019. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2019;68:893–896. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6840e2
8. Guidelines for vaccinating pregnant women. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/pregnancy/hcp-toolkit/guidelines.html

2. Approach

The application should propose recruiting multiple prenatal care practices (obstetrical and, optionally, midwifery), in one or more geographic areas, that do not currently include in their prenatal care protocols a planned discussion about infant or childhood vaccination. Populations under study should include both rural and urban populations, and racially/ethnically diverse populations. Participating practices should agree to be randomized to one of the following study groups:

1. **Control group:** All providers in practices follow existing standards of care.
2. **Intervention group:** All providers in the practice implement the intervention for pregnant patients expecting their first child.

Intervention: The application should propose a protocol that includes a formal discussion with pregnant patients expecting their first child about infant and child vaccination to be delivered at specific prenatal encounters, and with the provision of specific educational materials that promote the importance of infant/childhood vaccination, outline what to expect (e.g., the ACIP schedule), and dispel myths/misinformation about infant/child vaccination. The application should describe how the award recipient will collaborate with prenatal care providers, or organizations, to ensure the protocol is practical and acceptable to implement.

The application should describe how the award recipient will ensure appropriate training and education of staff at participating practices randomized to the intervention group. This training and education should include an overview of childhood vaccination in general (e.g., ACIP-recommended schedule) as well as how to implement the study protocol in a consistent manner.

The application should describe what materials will be provided to patients and can either be newly developed by the award recipient, adapted from existing materials, or pre-existing. Message testing for comprehensibility and acceptability of all newly developed, adapted, and existing materials should be conducted and/or documented. This step may be waived if there is written documentation and evidence that the materials have already been appropriately tested in a patient population similar to that of the study population. If materials will be newly developed, conducting formative research should be included. All formative research and testing of new materials should be done among a population of pregnant women who are similar to, but not the same as, those receiving care from practices participating in the study. Results of the formative research and testing must be complete prior to implementing the intervention phase of the study.

Assessment of study outcomes: Intervention success should be assessed by comparing study groups on the following outcomes:

1. Short term: As assessed via surveys and possibly other means, changes in patient attitudes and intentions related to infant and childhood vaccination prior to and after the

point in pregnancy when the intervention versus standard of practice has been delivered.
2. Intermediate term: As assessed via surveys and possibly other means, attitudes and intentions about the child related to infant and child vaccination assessed after delivery of their first child, at one or more specific points, based on the age of the child.
3. Long term: Among infants at 6 to 18 months of age, age-appropriate infant vaccination status according to the ACIP-recommended schedule. Vaccination records can be assessed using immunization information system searches and/or pediatric practice medical record review (parent self-report is not considered acceptable).

In addition, an assessment of the acceptability, feasibility, and cost of the intervention should be conducted from the practice, provider, and patient perspective. This assessment could include surveys, interviews, and/or focus groups of providers and patients in practices randomized to the intervention group.

Objectives/Outcomes

Whenever possible, applications should include objectives written in the SMART format (e.g., Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound).

At the end of the project period, the award recipient should be able to:

- Describe changes in vaccine attitudes and intentions among pregnant women between the baseline and subsequent assessments within the intervention arm.
- Describe whether the intervention, in comparison to standard of care, led to positive attitudes and intentions by pregnant women expecting their first child in terms of vaccinating their child according to the ACIP-recommended schedule.
- Describe whether the intervention was successful in leading to greater infant vaccination that is in accordance with ACIP recommendations.
- Describe whether the intervention was feasible and acceptable for prenatal providers and patients, and cost-effective to implement.
- Make a statement about whether such an intervention is recommended, in a modified or unmodified form, to be used widely by similar prenatal care practices.
- As appropriate, develop an implementation plan that can be used by appropriate stakeholders (e.g., health systems, immunization programs, professional associations) for scaling up the activity to be used by additional practices.

Target Population

The target population for this research activity should be women who are pregnant with their first child who are receiving prenatal care at an obstetrical or midwifery practice. Populations under study should include both rural and urban populations, and racially/ethnically diverse populations. Practices that are geographically, socio-economically, and racially and ethnically diverse are encouraged.

Collaboration/Partnerships

Collaborating with the state or local immunization program as well as relevant local professional organizations (e.g., American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, American

Association of Pediatrics) is recommended. If the applicant is unable to demonstrate strong subject matter expertise in both obstetrical care and immunization services, establishing such collaborations and partnerships is critical.

The application should also describe how expertise from partners will be incorporated into the study team, to ensure appropriate guidance as the study is developed and implemented. Applicants are encouraged to include letters of support from proposed collaborators (e.g., healthcare professional organizations, state/local immunization programs) indicating support and intent to participate in the project.

Evaluation/Performance Measurement

The application should include measurable goals and aims based on a three (3)-year research project period. The application should describe specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-phased (SMART) project objectives for each activity described in the application's project plan and describe the development and implementation of project performance measures based on specific programmatic objectives.

The application should describe milestones and a timeline to achieve those milestones. In addition, the application should describe detailed plans to track progress toward the outcomes of the project.

PI's of funded applications must submit an annual progress report showing project activities and outcomes based on the overall research goals and timeline. For more information on required Reporting, please see Section VI. of this NOFO.

Translation Plan

The application should describe plans for how research findings will be reported and disseminated (e.g., peer-reviewed journals, scientific presentations) and specify how these activities are integrated into the three (3)-year project plan. Dissemination plans could include drafting of manuscripts for peer-reviewed publication, submission of abstracts to scientific conferences, and/or presentation of findings before national advisory committees or organizations to which research results are relevant.

Section II. Award Information

Funding Instrument Type:	Cooperative Agreement A support mechanism used when there will be substantial Federal scientific or programmatic involvement. Substantial involvement means that, after award, scientific or program staff will assist, guide, coordinate, or participate in project activities.

Application Types Allowed:

New - An application that is submitted for funding for the first time. Includes multiple submission attempts within the same round.

Estimated Total Funding: $1,500,000

Estimated Total Funding for the entire three(3)-year project period, including direct and indirect costs: $1,500,000.

Estimated Total Funding for the first year (12-month budget period), including direct and indirect costs: $500,000.

Anticipated Number of Awards: 1

Awards issued under this NOFO are contingent on the availability of funds and submission of a sufficient number of meritorious applications.

Award ceiling and floor are for the first 12-month budget period only.

Award Ceiling: $500,000 Per Budget Period
Award Floor: $300,000 Per Budget Period
Total Period of Performance Length: 3 year(s)

Throughout the Period of Performance, CDC's commitment to continuation of awards will depend on the availability of funds, evidence of satisfactory progress by the recipient (as documented in required reports), and CDC's determination that continued funding is in the best interest of the Federal government.

HHS/CDC grants policies as described in the HHS Grants Policy Statement (http://www.hhs.gov/ sites/default/files/grants/grants/policies-regulations/hhsgps107.pdf) will apply to the applications submitted and awards made in response to this NOFO.

Section III. Eligibility Information

1. Eligible Applicants

Eligibility Category:

State governments
County governments
City or township governments
Special district governments
Independent school districts
Public and State controlled institutions of higher education
Native American tribal governments (Federally recognized)
Public housing authorities/Indian housing authorities
Native American tribal organizations (other than Federally recognized tribal governments)
Nonprofits having a 501(c)(3) status with the IRS, other than institutions of

higher education
Nonprofits without 501(c)(3) status with the IRS, other than institutions of higher education
Others (see text field entitled "Additional Information on Eligibility" for clarification)

Additional Eligibility Category:

Nonprofits (Other than Institutions of Higher Education):

Nonprofits (Other than Institutions of Higher Education)

Governments:

Eligible Agencies of the Federal Government
U.S. Territory or Possession

Other:

Faith-based or Community-based Organizations
Regional Organizations
Bona Fide Agents: A Bona Fide Agent is an agency/organization identified by the state as eligible to submit an application under the state eligibility in lieu of a state application. If applying as a bona fide agent of a state or local government, a legal, binding agreement from the state or local government as documentation of the status is required. Attach with "Other Attachment Forms."

2. Foreign Organizations

Foreign Organizations are not eligible to apply.

Foreign components of U.S. Organizations are not eligible to apply.

For this announcement, applicants may not include collaborators or consultants from foreign institutions. All applicable federal laws and policies apply.

3. Additional Information on Eligibility

- Public and private non-profit institutions of higher education
- The following types of Higher Education Institutions are always encouraged to apply for CDC support as Public or Private Nonprofit Institutions of Higher Education:
    - Hispanic-serving Institutions
    - Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)
    - Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities (TCCUs)
    - Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions

4. Justification for Less than Maximum Competition

N/A

5. Responsiveness

If an applicant requests a funding amount greater than the ceiling of $500,000, including direct and indirect costs, for the first 12-month budget period as indicated in Section II. of this NOFO, HHS/CDC will consider the application non-responsive and it will not enter into the review process. HHS/CDC will notify the applicant that the application did not meet the submission requirements.

6. Required Registrations

Applicant organizations must complete the following registrations as described in the SF 424 (R&R) Application Guide to be eligible to apply for or receive an award. Applicants must have a valid Dun and Bradstreet Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number in order to begin each of the following registrations.

- (Foreign entities only): Special Instructions for acquiring a Commercial and Governmental Entity (NCAGE) Code: https://cage.dla.mil/
- System for Award Management (SAM) – must maintain current registration in SAM (the replacement system for the Central Contractor Registration) to be renewed annually, https://www.sam.gov/index.html .
- Grants.gov
- eRA Commons

All applicant organizations must register with Grants.gov. Please visit www.Grants.gov at least 30 days prior to submitting your application to familiarize yourself with the registration and submission processes. The “one-time” registration process will take three to five days to complete. However, it is best to start the registration process at least two weeks prior to application submission.

All Program Directors/Principal Investigators (PD/PIs) must also work with their institutional officials to register with the eRA Commons or ensure their existing Principle Investigator (PD/PI) eRA Commons account is affiliated with the eRA commons account of the applicant

organization. All registrations must be successfully completed and active before the application due date. Applicant organizations are strongly encouraged to start the eRA Commons registration process at least four (4) weeks prior to the application due date. ASSIST requires that applicant users have active eRA Commons account in order to prepare an application. It also requires that the applicant organization's Signing Official have an active eRA Commons Signing Official account in order to initiate the submission process. During the submission process, ASSIST will prompt the Signing Official to enter their Grants.gov Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) credentials in order to complete the submission, therefore the applicant organization must ensure that their Grants.gov AOR credentials are active.

7. Universal Identifier Requirements and System for Award Management (SAM)

All applicant organizations **must obtain** a DUN and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number as the Universal Identifier when applying for Federal grants or cooperative agreements. The DUNS number is a nine-digit number assigned by Dun and Bradstreet Information Services. An AOR should be consulted to determine the appropriate number. If the organization does not have a DUNS number, an AOR should complete the US D&B D-U-N-S Number Request Web Form or contact Dun and Bradstreet by telephone directly at 1-866-705-5711 (toll-free) to obtain one. A DUNS number will be provided immediately by telephone at no charge. Note this is an organizational number. Individual Program Directors/Principal Investigators do not need to register for a DUNS number. Additionally, all applicant organizations must register in the **System for Award Management (SAM)**. Organizations must maintain the registration with current information at all times during which it has an application under consideration for funding by CDC and, if an award is made, until a final financial report is submitted or the final payment is received, whichever is later. SAM is the primary registrant database for the Federal government and is the repository into which an entity must provide information required for the conduct of business as a recipient. Additional information about registration procedures may be found at the SAM internet site at https://www.sam.gov/index.html.
If an award is granted, the recipient organization **must** notify potential sub-recipients that no organization may receive a subaward under the grant unless the organization has provided its DUNS number to the recipient organization.

8. Eligible Individuals (Project Director/Principal Investigator) in Organizations/Institutions

Any individual(s) with the skills, knowledge, and resources necessary to carry out the proposed research as the Project Director/Principal Investigator (PD/PI) is invited to work with his/her organization to develop an application for support. Individuals from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups as well as individuals with disabilities are always encouraged to apply for HHS/CDC support.

9. Cost Sharing

This FOA does not require cost sharing as defined in the HHS Grants Policy Statement (http://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/grants/grants/policies-regulations/hhsgps107.pdf).

10. Number of Applications

As defined in the HHS Grants Policy Statement, (https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/grants/grants/policies-regulations/hhsgps107.pdf), applications received in response to the same Notice of Funding Opportunity generally are scored individually and then ranked with other applications under peer review in their order of relative programmatic, technical, or scientific merit. HHS/CDC will not accept any application in response to this NOFO that is essentially the same as one currently pending initial peer review unless the applicant withdraws the pending application.

Only one application per institution (normally identified by having a unique DUNS number) is allowed.

Section IV. Application and Submission Information

1. Address to Request Application Package

In order to use ASSIST, applicants must visit https://public.era.nih.gov/assist where you can login using your eRA Commons credentials, and enter the Notice of Funding Opportunity Number to initiate the application, and begin the application preparation process.
If you experience problems accessing or using ASSIST, you can refer to the ASSIST Online Help Site at: https://era.nih.gov/erahelp/assist. Additional support is available from the NIH eRA Service desk via:

- E-mail: http://grants.nih.gov/support/index.html
- Phone: 301-402-7469 or (toll-free) 1-866-504-9552. The NIH eRA Service desk is available Monday - Friday, 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. Eastern Time, excluding federal holidays.

2. Content and Form of Application Submission

It is critical that applicants follow the instructions in the SF-424 (R&R) Application Guide http://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide.htm and here: https://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide/forms-f/general-forms-f.pdf, except where instructed in this Notice of Funding Opportunity to do otherwise. Conformance to the requirements in the Application Guide is required and strictly enforced. Applications that are out of compliance with these instructions may be delayed or not accepted for review. The package associated with this NOFO includes all applicable mandatory and optional forms. Please note that some forms marked optional in the application package are required for submission of applications for this NOFO. Follow the instructions in the SF-424 (R&R) Application Guide to ensure you complete all appropriate “optional” components.
When using ASSIST, all mandatory forms will appear as separate tabs at the top of the Application Information screen; applicants may add optional forms available for the NOFO by selecting the Add Optional Form button in the left navigation panel.

Letters of Support from partners or other organizations should be placed in the PHS 398 Research Plan "Other Research Plan Section" of the application under "9. Letters of Support".

Please include all of the eight (8) mandatory forms listed below in the application package:

Mandatory

1. SF424(R&R)[V2.0];
2. PHS 398 Cover Page Supplement [V4.0];
3. Research and Related Other Project Information [V1.4];
4. Project/Performance Site Location(s) [V2.0];
5. Research and Related Senior/Key Person Profile (Expanded) [V2.0];
6. Research and Related Budget [V1.4];
7. PHS 398 Research Plan [V4.0];
8. PHS Human Subjects and Clinical Trials Information [V1.0].

If multiple collaborating institutions will be involved, please include in this section of the application your single IRB (sIRB) Plan:

- Describe how you will comply with the single IRB review requirement under the Revised Common Rule at 45 CFR 46.114 (b) (cooperative research). If available, provide the name of the IRB that you anticipate will serve as the sIRB of record.
- Indicate that all identified engaged institutions or participating sites will agree to rely on the proposed sIRB and that any institutions or sites added after award will rely on the sIRB.
- Briefly describe how communication between institutions and the sIRB will be handled.
- Indicate that all engaged institutions or participating sites will, prior to initiating the study, sign an authorization/reliance agreement that will clarify the roles and responsibilities of the sIRB and participating sites.
- Indicate which institution or entity will maintain records of the authorization/reliance agreements and of the communication plan.
- Note: Do not include the authorization/reliance agreement(s) or the communication plan(s) documents in your application.
- Note: If you anticipate research involving human subjects but cannot describe the study at the time of application, include information regarding how the study will comply with the single Institutional Review Board (sIRB) requirement prior to initiating any multi-site study in the delayed onset study justification.

Please include the one (1) optional form listed below, if applicable, in the application package:

Optional

1. R&R Subaward Budget Attachment(s) Form 5 YR 30 ATT.

3. Letter of Intent

Due Date for Letter of Intent: **01/05/2021**

Although a letter of intent is not required, is not binding, and does not enter into the review of a subsequent application, the information that it contains allows CIO staff to estimate the potential review workload and plan the review.

By the date listed in Part 1. “Overview Information”, prospective applicants are asked to submit

a letter of intent that includes the following information:

Name of the applicant institution

Descriptive title of proposed research

Name, address, and telephone number of the PD(s)/PI(s)

Names of other key personnel

Participating institutions

Number and title of this notice of funding opportunity

The letter of intent should be sent to:

Gregory Anderson, MPH, MS

Extramural Research Program Office

Office of the Associate Director of Science

National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD and TB Prevention

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

1600 Clifton Road, MS US8-1

Atlanta, GA 30333

Telephone: 404-718-8833

Email: GAnderson@cdc.gov

4. Required and Optional Components

A complete application has many components, both required and optional. The forms package associated with this NOFO in Grants.gov includes all applicable components for this NOFO, required and optional. In ASSIST, all required and optional forms will appear as separate tabs at the top of the Application Information screen.

5. PHS 398 Research Plan Component

The SF424 (R&R) Application Guide includes instructions for applicants to complete a PHS 398 Research Plan that consists of components. Not all components of the Research Plan apply to all Notices of Funding Opportunities (NOFOs). Specifically, some of the following components are for Resubmissions or Revisions only. See the SF 424 (R&R) Application Guide https://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide/forms-f/general-forms-f.pdf and http://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide.htm for additional information. Please attach applicable sections of the following Research Plan components as directed in Part 2, Section 1 (Notice of Funding Opportunity Description).
Follow the page limits stated in the SF 424 unless otherwise specified in the NOFO. As applicable to and specified in the NOFO, the application should include the bolded headers in this section and should address activities to be conducted over the course of the entire project,

including but not limited to:

1. **Introduction to Application** (for Resubmission and Revision ONLY) - provide a clear description about the purpose of the proposed research and how it addresses the specific requirements of the NOFO.
2. **Specific Aims** – state the problem the proposed research addresses and how it will result in public health impact and improvements in population health.
3. **Research Strategy** – the research strategy should be organized under 3 headings: Significance, Innovation and Approach. Describe the proposed research plan, including staffing and time line.
4. **Progress Report Publication List** (for Continuation ONLY)

Other Research Plan Sections

5. **Vertebrate Animals**
6. **Select Agent Research**
7. **Multiple PD/PI Leadership Plan.**
8. **Consortium/Contractual Arrangements**
9. **Letters of Support**
10. **Resource Sharing Plan(s)**
11. **Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources**
12. **Appendix**

All instructions in the SF424 (R&R) Application Guide https://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide/forms-f/general-forms-f.pdf and here: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide.htm must be followed along with any additional instructions provided in the NOFO.
Applicants that plan to collect public health data must submit a Data Management Plan (DMP) in the Resource Sharing Plan section of the PHS 398 Research Plan Component of the application. A DMP is required for each collection of public health data proposed. Applicants who contend that the public health data they collect or create are not appropriate for release must justify that contention in the DMP submitted with their application for CDC funds.
The DMP may be outlined in a narrative format or as a checklist but, at a minimum, should include:
• A description of the data to be collected or generated in the proposed project;
• Standards to be used for the collected or generated data;
• Mechanisms for, or limitations to, providing access to and sharing of the data (include a description of
provisions for the protection of privacy, confidentiality, security, intellectual property, or other rights -
this section should address access to identifiable and de-identified data);
• Statement of the use of data standards that ensure all released data have appropriate documentation that
describes the method of collection, what the data represent, and potential limitations for use;

and
• Plans for archiving and long-term preservation of the data, or explaining why long-term preservation
and access are not justified (this section should address archiving and preservation of identifiable and deidentified
data).
Examples of DMPs may be found here: USGS, http://www.usgs.gov/products/data-and-tools/data-management/data-management-plans

or University of California https://dmp.cdlib.org/

Letters of Support from partners or other organizations should be placed in the PHS 398 Research Plan "Other Research Plan Section" of the application under "9. Letters of Support".

6. Appendix

Do not use the appendix to circumvent page limits. A maximum of 10 PDF documents are allowed in the appendix. Additionally, up to 3 publications may be included that are not publically available. Follow all instructions for the Appendix as described in the SF424 (R&R) Application Guide.

PLEASE NOTE all page limitations in this NOFO. Pages over the limit may be removed and not peer reviewed, possibly negatively affecting the overall impact score and funding.

7. Page Limitations

All page limitations described in this individual NOFO must be followed. For this specific NOFO, the Research Strategy component of the Research Plan narrative is limited to 20 pages. Supporting materials for the Research Plan narrative included as appendices may not exceed 10 PDF files with a maximum of 25 pages for all appendices. Pages that exceed page limits described in this NOFO will be removed and not forwarded for peer review, potentially affecting an application's score.

8. Format for Attachments

Designed to maximize system-conducted validations, multiple separate attachments are required for a complete application. When the application is received by the agency, all submitted forms and all separate attachments are combined into a single document that is used by peer reviewers and agency staff. Applicants should ensure that all attachments are uploaded to the system.
CDC requires all text attachments to the Adobe application forms be submitted as PDFs and that all text attachments conform to the agency-specific formatting requirements noted in the SF424 (R&R) Application Guide https://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide/forms-f/general-forms-f.pdf.

9. Submission Dates & Times

Part I. Overview Information contains information about Key Dates. Applicants are strongly encouraged to allocate additional time and submit in advance of the deadline to ensure they

have time to make any corrections that might be necessary for successful submission. This includes the time necessary to complete the application resubmission process that may be necessary, if errors are identified during validation by Grants.gov and the NIH eRA systems. The application package is not complete until it has passed the Grants.gov and NIH eRA Commons submission and validation processes.
Organizations must submit applications using the ASSIST web-based application preparation and submission process.
ASSIST will validate applications before submission. If the system detects errors, then the applicant must correct errors before their application can be submitted.
Applicants are responsible for viewing their application in ASSIST after submission to ensure accurate and successful submission through Grants.gov. If the submission is not successful and post-submission errors are found, then those errors must be corrected and the application resubmitted in ASSIST.
Applicants are able to access, view, and track the status of their applications in the eRA Commons.
Information on the submission process is provided in the SF-424 (R&R) Application Guidance and ASSIST User Guide at https://era.nih.gov/files/ASSIST_user_guide.pdf.
Note: HHS/CDC grant submission procedures do not provide a grace period beyond the grant application due date time to correct any error or warning notices of noncompliance with application instructions that are identified by Grants.gov or eRA systems (i.e. error correction window).
Applicants who encounter problems when submitting their applications must attempt to resolve them by contacting the NIH eRA Service desk at:
Toll-free: 1-866-504-9552; Phone: 301-402-7469
http://grants.nih.gov/support/index.html
Hours: Mon-Fri, 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. Eastern Time (closed on federal holidays)

Problems with Grants.gov can be resolved by contacting the Grants.gov Contact Center at:
Toll-free: 1-800-518-4726
https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html
support@grants.gov
Hours: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; closed on Federal holidays

It is important that applicants complete the application submission process well in advance of the due date time.
After submission of your application package, applicants will receive a "submission receipt" email generated by Grants.gov. Grants.gov will then generate a second e-mail message to applicants which will either validate or reject their submitted application package. A third and final e-mail message is generated once the applicant's application package has passed validation and the grantor agency has confirmed receipt of the application.

Unsuccessful Submissions: If an application submission was unsuccessful, the **applicant** must:

1. Track submission and verify the submission status (tracking should be done initially regardless of rejection or success).

a. If the status states "rejected," be sure to save time stamped, documented rejection notices, and do #2a or #2b

2. Check emails from both Grants.gov and NIH eRA Commons for rejection notices.

a. If the deadline has passed, he/she should email the Grants Management contact listed in the Agency Contacts section of this announcement explaining why the submission failed.
b. If there is time before the deadline, correct the problem(s) and resubmit as soon as possible.

Due Date for Applications: **02/02/2021**

Electronically submitted applications must be submitted no later than 5:00 p.m., ET, on the listed application due date.

10. Intergovernmental Review (E.O. 12372)

Your application is subject to Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs, as governed by Executive Order 12372 (https://www.archives.gov/federal-register/codification/executive-order/12372.html). This order sets up a system for state and local review of proposed federal assistance applications. You should contact your state single point of contact (SPOC) as early as possible to alert the SPOC to prospective applications, and to receive instructions on your state's process. Click on the following link to get the current SPOC list: https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/SPOC-4-13-20.pdf.

11. Funding Restrictions

Expanded Authority:
For more information on expanded authority and pre-award costs, go to https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/grants/grants/policies-regulations/hhsgps107.pdf and speak to your GMS.
All HHS/CDC awards are subject to the federal regulations, 45 CFR 75, terms and conditions, and other requirements described in the HHS Grants Policy Statement. Pre-award costs may be allowable as an expanded authority, but only if authorized by CDC.

Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance:
In accordance with the United States Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance policy, all non-governmental organization (NGO) applicants acknowledge that foreign NGOs that receive funds provided through this award, either as a prime recipient or subrecipient, are strictly prohibited, regardless of the source of funds, from performing abortions as a method of family planning or engaging in any activity that promotes abortion as a method of family planning, or to provide financial support to any other foreign non-governmental organization that conducts such activities. See Additional Requirement (AR) 35 for applicability (https://www.cdc.gov/grants/additional-requirements/ar-35.html).

Public Health Data:
CDC requires that mechanisms for, and cost of, public health data sharing be included in grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts. The cost of sharing or archiving public health data may

also be included as part of the total budget requested for first-time or continuation awards.

Data Management Plan:
Fulfilling the data-sharing requirement must be documented in a Data Management Plan (DMP) that is developed during the project planning phase prior to the initiation of generating or collecting public health data and must be included in the Resource Sharing Plan(s) section of the PHS398 Research Plan Component of the application.
Applicants who contend that the public health data they collect or create are not appropriate for release must justify that contention in the DMP submitted with their application for CDC funds (for example, privacy and confidentiality considerations, embargo issues).

Recipients who fail to release public health data in a timely fashion will be subject to procedures normally used to address lack of compliance (for example, reduction in funding, restriction of funds, or award termination) consistent with 45 CFR 74.62 or other authorities as appropriate. For further information, please see: https://www.cdc.gov/grants/additional-requirements/ar-25.html for revised AR-25.

Human Subjects:
Funds relating to the conduct of research involving human subjects will be restricted until the appropriate assurances and Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals are in place. Copies of all current local IRB approval letters and local IRB approved protocols (and CDC IRB approval letters, if applicable) will be required to lift restrictions.
If the proposed research project involves more than one institution and will be conducted in the United States, awardees are expected to use a single Institutional Review Board (sIRB) to conduct the ethical review required by HHS regulations for the Protections of Human Subjects Research, and include a single IRB plan in the application, unless review by a sIRB would be prohibited by a federal, tribal, or state law, regulation, or policy or a compelling justification based on ethical or human subjects protection issues or other well-justified reasons is provided. Exceptions will be reviewed and approved by CDC in accordance with Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Regulations (Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46), or a restriction may be placed on the award. For more information, please contact the scientific/research contact included on this NOFO.
Note: The sIRB requirement applies to participating sites in the United States. Foreign sites participating in CDC-funded, cooperative research studies are not expected to follow the requirement for sIRB.

Additional Funding Restrictions:

1) Awards made under this NOFO should have no scientific or budgetary overlap with other funded awards.

2) Funds relating to the conduct of research involving human subjects will be restricted until the appropriate assurances and Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals are in place. Copies of all current local IRB approval letters and local IRB approved protocols (and CDC IRB approval

letters, if applicable) will be required to lift restrictions.

If the proposed research project involves more than one institution and will be conducted in the United States, awardees are expected to use a single Institutional Review Board (sIRB) to conduct the ethical review required by HHS regulations for the Protections of Human Subjects Research, and include a single IRB plan in the application, unless review by a sIRB would be prohibited by a federal, tribal, or state law, regulation, or policy or a compelling justification based on ethical or human subjects protection issues or other well-justified reasons is provided. Exceptions will be reviewed and approved by CDC in accordance with Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Regulations (Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46), or a restriction may be placed on the award. For more information, please contact the scientific/research contact included in this NOFO. Please see Section IV.2 of this NOFO, "Content and Form of Application Submission" for guidance on sIRB Plan content.

Note: The sIRB requirement applies to participating sites in the United States. Foreign sites participating in CDC-funded, cooperative research studies are not expected to follow the requirement for sIRB.

3) Funds relating to the conduct of research involving vertebrate animals will be restricted until the appropriate assurances and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approvals are in place. Copies of all current local IACUC approval letters and local IACUC approved protocols will be required to lift restrictions.

4) On September 24, 2014, the Federal government issued a policy for the oversight of life sciences “Dual Use Research of Concern” (DURC) and required this policy to be implemented by September 24, 2015. This policy applies to all New and Renewal awards issued on applications submitted on or after September 24, 2015, and to all non-competing continuation awards issued on or after that date. CDC grantee institutions and their investigators conducting life sciences research subject to the Policy have a number of responsibilities that they must fulfill. Institutions should reference the policy, available at http://www.phe.gov/s3/dualuse, for a comprehensive listing of those requirements.

Non-compliance with this Policy may result in suspension, limitation, or termination of US Government (USG) funding, or loss of future USG funding opportunities for the non-compliant USG-funded research project and of USG funds for other life sciences research at the institution, consistent with existing regulations and policies governing USG funded research, and may subject the institution to other potential penalties under applicable laws and regulations.

5) Please note the requirement for inclusion of a Data Management Plan (DMP) in applications described above under "Funding Restrictions" and also in AR-25 in the Additional Requirements section of this NOFO (https://www.cdc.gov/grants/additionalrequirements/ar-25.html). Funding restrictions may be imposed, pending submission and evaluation of a Data Management Plan.

12. Other Submission Requirements and Information

Risk Assessment Questionnaire Requirement

CDC is required to conduct pre-award risk assessments to determine the risk an applicant poses to meeting federal programmatic and administrative requirements by taking into account issues such as financial instability, insufficient management systems, non-compliance with award

conditions, the charging of unallowable costs, and inexperience. The risk assessment will include an evaluation of the applicant's CDC Risk Questionnaire, located at https://www.cdc.gov/grants/documents/PPMR-G-CDC-Risk-Questionnaire.pdf, as well as a review of the applicant's history in all available systems; including OMB-designated repositories of government-wide eligibility and financial integrity systems (see 45 CFR 75.205(a)), and other sources of historical information. These systems include, but are not limited to: FAPIIS (https://www.fapiis.gov/), including past performance on federal contracts as per Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act of 2009; Do Not Pay list; and System for Award Management (SAM) exclusions.
CDC requires all applicants to complete the Risk Questionnaire, OMB Control Number 0920-1132 annually. This questionnaire, which is located at https://www.cdc.gov/grants/documents/PPMR-G-CDC-Risk-Questionnaire.pdf, along with supporting documentation must be submitted with your application by the closing date of the Notice of Funding Opportunity Announcement. Upload the questionnaire and supporting documents as an attachment in the "12. Other Attachments" section of the "RESEARCH & RELATED Other Project Information" section of the application. If your organization has completed CDC's Risk Questionnaire within the past 12 months of the closing date of this NOFO, then you must submit a copy of that questionnaire, or submit a letter signed by the authorized organization representative to include the original submission date, organization's EIN and DUNS.

When uploading supporting documentation for the Risk Questionnaire into this application package, clearly label the documents for easy identification of the type of documentation. For example, a copy of Procurement policy submitted in response to the questionnaire may be labeled using the following format: Risk Questionnaire Supporting Documents _ Procurement Policy.

Duplication of Efforts

Applicants are responsible for reporting if this application will result in programmatic, budgetary, or commitment overlap with another application or award (i.e. grant, cooperative agreement, or contract) submitted to another funding source in the same fiscal year. Programmatic overlap occurs when (1) substantially the same project is proposed in more than one application or is submitted to two or more funding sources for review and funding consideration or (2) a specific objective and the project design for accomplishing the objective are the same or closely related in two or more applications or awards, regardless of the funding source. Budgetary overlap occurs when duplicate or equivalent budgetary items (e.g., equipment, salaries) are requested in an application but already are provided by another source. Commitment overlap occurs when an individual's time commitment exceeds 100 percent, whether or not salary support is requested in the application. Overlap, whether programmatic, budgetary, or commitment of an individual's effort greater than 100 percent, is not permitted. Any overlap will be resolved by the CDC with the applicant and the PD/PI prior to award.
Report Submission: The applicant must upload the report under "Other Attachment Forms." The document should be labeled: "Report on Programmatic, Budgetary, and Commitment Overlap."

Please note the new requirement for a **Risk Assessment Questionnaire** (described above) that should be uploaded as an attachment in the "12. Other Attachments" section of the "RESEARCH & RELATED Other Project Information" section of the application.

Application Submission
Applications must be submitted electronically following the instructions described in the SF 424 (R&R) Application Guide. **PAPER APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.**

Applicants must complete all required registrations before the application due date. Section III.6 "Required Registrations" contains information about registration.

For assistance with your electronic application or for more information on the electronic submission process, visit Applying Electronically (https://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide.html).

Important reminders:
All PD/PIs must include their eRA Commons ID in the Credential field of the Senior/Key Person Profile Component of the SF 424(R&R) Application Package. Failure to register in the Commons and to include a valid PD/PI Commons ID in the credential field will prevent the successful submission of an electronic application to CDC.
The applicant organization must ensure that the DUNS number it provides on the application is the same number used in the organization's profile in the eRA Commons and for the System for Award Management (SAM). Additional information may be found in the SF424 (R&R) Application Guide.
If the applicant has an FWA number, enter the 8-digit number. Do not enter the letters "FWA" before the number. If a Project/Performance Site is engaged in research involving human subjects, the applicant organization is responsible for ensuring that the Project/Performance Site operates under and appropriate Federal Wide Assurance for the protection of human subjects and complies with 45 CFR Part 46 and other CDC human subject related policies described in Part II of the SF 424 (R&R) Application Guide and in the HHS Grants Policy Statement.

See more resources to avoid common errors and submitting, tracking, and viewing applications:

- http://grants.nih.gov/grants/ElectronicReceipt/avoiding_errors.htm
- http://grants.nih.gov/grants/ElectronicReceipt/submit_app.htm
- https://era.nih.gov/files/ASSIST_user_guide.pdf
- http://era.nih.gov/erahelp/ASSIST/

Upon receipt, applications will be evaluated for completeness by the CDC Office of Grants Services (OGS) and responsiveness by OGS and the Center, Institute or Office of the CDC.

Applications that are incomplete and/or nonresponsive will not be reviewed.

Section V. Application Review Information

1. Criteria

Only the review criteria described below will be considered in the review process. As part of the CDC mission (https://www.cdc.gov/about/organization/mission.htm), all applications submitted to the CDC in support of public health research are evaluated for scientific and technical merit through the CDC peer review system.

Overall Impact

Reviewers will provide an overall impact/priority 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 review criteria and additional review criteria (as applicable for the project proposed).

Scored Review Criteria

Reviewers will consider each of the review criteria below in the determination of scientific 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?

- Will the proposed project strengthen vaccine confidence and reduce vaccine hesitancy among new parents?
- If successful, do the research results have the potential to be scalable and reach a large portion of obstetrical and midwifery practices in the United States?

Investigator(s)

Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? 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?

- Does the Principal Investigator and/or co-investigator(s) possess strong subject matter expertise in immunization services and/or obstetrical care?
- Does the Principal Investigator and/or co-investigator(s) have subject matter expertise

in working in a clinical setting and with prenatal care providers (e.g., obstetrical and midwifery practices)?
- Does the Principal Investigator and/or co-investigator(s) have familiarity with immunization services-related research?
- Does the Principal Investigator and/or co-investigator(s) have experience conducting health services research specifically related to the provision of prenatal care?
- Does the Principal Investigator and/or co-investigator(s) have experience conducting health services research specifically related to infant and childhood immunization?
- Does the Principal Investigator and/or co-investigator(s) have a record of publishing such research in peer-reviewed journals?
- Does the Principal Investigator and/or co-investigator(s) show success, or potential for success, in similar research using a similar study population and similar study design?
- Does the Principal Investigator and/or co-investigator(s) have experience assessing vaccination status, for example, by using immunization information systems and electronic medical records?

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?

- Does the proposed research offer reasonable potential for concrete applications of interest and value to public health?
- Does the proposed research have reasonable potential to be scalable and sustainable across obstetrical and midwifery practices in a variety of public health jurisdictions?

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 there 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?

- Do the populations under study include both rural and urban populations and racially/ethnically diverse populations?
- Does the application fully address all of the research objectives of the NOFO?
- Does the application include sample size calculations demonstrating that the study design and sample sizes proposed will allow for differences between intervention and

control group performance measures to be realistically detected with statistical power?
- Does the application describe an ability to reach a geographically (including by urban vs. rural location) and socio-demographically diverse populations of pregnant women through an appropriate sample of prenatal care providers?

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?

- If the Principal Investigator and/or co-investigator(s) did not demonstrate strong subject matter expertise in both obstetrical care and immunization services, are collaborations and partnerships with state or local immunization programs, as well as relevant local professional organizations (e.g., American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, American Association of Pediatrics), described?
- Are letters of support from proposed collaborators (e.g., healthcare professional organizations, state/local immunization programs) indicating support and intent to participate in the project included in the application?
- Does the application describe how expertise from partners will be incorporated into the study team to ensure appropriate guidance as the study is developed and implemented?

2. Additional Review Criteria

As applicable for the project proposed, *reviewers will evaluate* the following additional items while determining scientific and technical merit, and in providing an overall impact/priority score, but *will not give separate scores* for these items.

Protections for Human Subjects

If the research involves human subjects but does not involve one of the six categories of research that are exempt under 45 CFR Part 46, the committee will evaluate the justification for involvement of human subjects and the proposed protections from research risk relating to their participation according to the following five review criteria: 1) risk to subjects, 2) adequacy of protection against risks, 3) potential benefits to the subjects and others, 4) importance of the knowledge to be gained, and 5) data and safety monitoring for clinical trials.

For research that involves human subjects and meets the criteria for one or more of the six categories of research that are exempt under 45 CFR Part 46, the committee will evaluate: 1) the justification for the exemption, 2) human subjects involvement and characteristics, and 3) sources of materials. For additional information on review of the Human Subjects section, please refer to the HHS/CDC Requirements under AR-1 Human Subjects Requirements (https://www.cdc.gov/grants/additionalrequirements/ar-1.html).

If your proposed research involves the use of human data and/or biological specimens, you must provide a justification for your claim that no human subjects are involved in the Protection of

Human Subjects section of the Research Plan.

Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Children
When the proposed project involves clinical research, the committee will evaluate the proposed plans for inclusion of minorities and members of both genders, as well as the inclusion of children. For additional information on review of the Inclusion section, please refer to the policy on the Inclusion of Women and Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Research (https://www.cdc.gov/maso/Policy/Policy_women.pdf and the policy on the Inclusion of Persons Under 21 in Research (https://www.cdc.gov/maso/Policy/policy496.pdf).

Vertebrate Animals
The committee will evaluate the involvement of live vertebrate animals as part of the scientific assessment according to the following four points: 1) proposed use of the animals, and species, strains, ages, sex, and numbers to be used; 2) justifications for the use of animals and for the appropriateness of the species and numbers proposed; 3) procedures for limiting discomfort, distress, pain and injury to that which is unavoidable in the conduct of scientifically sound research including the use of analgesic, anesthetic, and tranquilizing drugs and/or comfortable restraining devices; and 4) methods of euthanasia and reason for selection if not consistent with the AVMA Guidelines on Euthanasia. For additional information on review of the Vertebrate Animals section, please refer to the Worksheet for Review of the Vertebrate Animal Section (https://olaw.nih.gov/guidance/vertebrate-animal-section.htm).

Biohazards
Reviewers will assess whether materials or procedures proposed are potentially hazardous to research personnel and/or the environment, and if needed, determine whether adequate protection is proposed.

Dual Use Research of Concern
Reviewers will identify whether the project involves one of the agents or toxins described in the US Government Policy for the Institutional Oversight of Life Sciences Dual Use Research of Concern, and, if so, whether the applicant has identified an IRE to assess the project for DURC potential and develop mitigation strategies if needed.

For more information about this Policy and other policies regarding dual use research of concern, visit the U.S. Government Science, Safety, Security (S3) website at: http://www.phe.gov/s3/dualuse. Tools and guidance for assessing DURC potential may be found at: http://www.phe.gov/s3/dualuse/Pages/companion-guide.aspx.

3. Additional Review Considerations

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

If requesting indirect costs in the budget based on a federally negotiated rate, a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement is required. Include a copy of the current negotiated federal indirect

cost rate agreement or cost allocation plan approval letter.

Resource Sharing Plan(s)
HHS/CDC policy requires that recipients of grant awards make research resources and data readily available for research purposes to qualified individuals within the scientific community after publication. Please see: https://www.cdc.gov/grants/additionalrequirements/ar-25.html

New additional requirement: CDC requires recipients for projects and programs that involve data collection or generation of data with federal funds to develop and submit a Data Management Plan (DMP) for each collection of public health data.

Investigators responding to this Notice of Funding Opportunity should include a detailed DMP in the Resource Sharing Plan(s) section of the PHS 398 Research Plan Component of the application. The AR-25 outlines the components of a DMP and provides additional information for investigators regarding the requirements for data accessibility, storage, and preservation.

The DMP should be developed during the project planning phase prior to the initiation of collecting or generating public health data and will be submitted with the application. The submitted DMP will be evaluated for completeness and quality at the time of submission.

The DMP should include, at a minimum, a description of the following:

- A description of the data to be collected or generated in the proposed project;
- Standards to be used for the collected or generated data;
- Mechanisms for, or limitations to, providing access to and sharing of the data (include a description of provisions for the protection of privacy, confidentiality, security, intellectual property, or other rights - this section should address access to identifiable and de-identified data);
- Statement of the use of data standards that ensure all released data have appropriate documentation that describes the method of collection, what the data represent, and potential limitations for use; and
- Plans for archiving and long-term preservation of the data, or explaining why long-term preservation and access are not justified (this section should address archiving and preservation of identifiable and de-identified data).

Applications submitted without the required DMP may be deemed ineligible for award unless submission of DMP is deferred to a later period depending on the type of award, in which case, funding restrictions may be imposed pending submission and evaluation.

Budget and Period of Support
Reviewers will consider whether the budget and the requested period of support are fully justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research. The applicant can obtain guidance for completing a detailed justified budget on the CDC website, at the following Internet address: http://www.cdc.gov/grants/interestedinapplying/applicationresources.html

The budget can include both direct costs and indirect costs as allowed.
Indirect costs could include the cost of collecting, managing, sharing and preserving data.
Indirect costs on grants awarded to foreign organizations and foreign public entities and performed fully outside of the territorial limits of the U.S. may be paid to support the costs of compliance with federal requirements at a fixed rate of eight percent of modified total direct costs exclusive of tuition and related fees, direct expenditures for equipment, and subawards in excess of $25,000. Negotiated indirect costs may be paid to the American University, Beirut, and the World Health Organization.
Indirect costs on training grants are limited to a fixed rate of eight percent of MTDC exclusive of tuition and related fees, direct expenditures for equipment, and sub-awards in excess of $25,000.
If requesting indirect costs in the budget based on a federally negotiated rate, a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement is required. Include a copy of the current negotiated federal indirect cost rate agreement or cost allocation plan approval letter.

4. Review and Selection Process

Applications will be evaluated for scientific and technical merit by an appropriate peer review group, in accordance with CDC peer review policy and procedures, using the stated review criteria.
As part of the scientific peer review, all applications:

- Will undergo a selection process in which only those applications deemed to have the highest scientific and technical merit (generally the top half of applications under review), will be discussed and assigned an overall impact/priority score.

- Will receive a written critique.

Applications will be assigned to the appropriate HHS/CDC Center, Institute, or Office.
Applications will compete for available funds with all other recommended applications submitted in response to this NOFO. Following initial peer review, recommended applications will receive a second level of review. The following will be considered in making funding recommendations:

- Scientific and technical merit of the proposed project as determined by scientific peer review.
- Availability of funds.
- Relevance of the proposed project to program priorities.

Review of risk posed by applicants.
Prior to making a Federal award, CDC is required by 31 U.S.C. 3321 and 41 U.S.C. 2313 to

review information available through any OMB-designated repositories of government-wide eligibility qualification or financial integrity information as appropriate. See also suspension and debarment requirements at 2 CFR parts 180 and 376.

In accordance 41 U.S.C. 2313, CDC is required to review the non-public segment of the OMB-designated integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently the Federal Recipient Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS)) prior to making a Federal award where the Federal share is expected to exceed the simplified acquisition threshold, defined in 41 U.S.C. 134, over the period of performance. At a minimum, the information in the system for a prior Federal award recipient must demonstrate a satisfactory record of executing programs or activities under Federal grants, cooperative agreements, or procurement awards; and integrity and business ethics. CDC may make a Federal award to a recipient who does not fully meet these standards, if it is determined that the information is not relevant to the current Federal award under consideration or there are specific conditions that can appropriately mitigate the effects of the non-Federal entity's risk in accordance with 45 CFR §75.207.

CDC’s framework for evaluating the risks posed by an applicant may incorporate results of the evaluation of the applicant's eligibility or the quality of its application. If it is determined that a Federal award will be made, special conditions that correspond to the degree of risk assessed may be applied to the Federal award. The evaluation criteria is described in this Notice of Funding Opportunity.

In evaluating risks posed by applicants, CDC will use a risk-based approach and may consider any items such as the following:

(1) Financial stability;
(2) Quality of management systems and ability to meet the management standards prescribed in this part;
(3) History of performance. The applicant's record in managing Federal awards, if it is a prior recipient of Federal awards, including timeliness of compliance with applicable reporting requirements, conformance to the terms and conditions of previous Federal awards, and if applicable, the extent to which any previously awarded amounts will be expended prior to future awards;
(4) Reports and findings from audits performed under subpart F 45 CFR 75 or the reports and findings of any other available audits; and
(5) The applicant's ability to effectively implement statutory, regulatory, or other requirements imposed on non-Federal entities.

CDC must comply with the guidelines on government-wide suspension and debarment in 2 CFR part 180, and require non-Federal entities to comply with these provisions. These provisions restrict Federal awards, subawards and contracts with certain parties that are debarred, suspended or otherwise excluded from or ineligible for participation in Federal programs or activities.

5. Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates

After the peer review of the application is completed, the PD/PI will be able to access his or her Summary Statement (written critique) and other pertinent information via the eRA Commons.

Section VI. Award Administration Information

1. Award Notices

Any applications awarded in response to this NOFO will be subject to the DUNS, SAM Registration, and Transparency Act requirements. If the application is under consideration for funding, HHS/CDC will request "just-in-time" information from the applicant as described in the HHS Grants Policy Statement (https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/grants/grants/policies-regulations/hhsgps107.pdf).

A formal notification in the form of a Notice of Award (NoA) will be provided to the applicant organization for successful applications. The NoA signed by the Grants Management Officer is the authorizing document and will be sent via email to the grantee's business official.

Recipient must comply with any funding restrictions as described in Section IV.11. Funding Restrictions. Selection of an application for award is not an authorization to begin performance. Any costs incurred before receipt of the NoA are at the recipient's risk. These costs may be allowable as an expanded authority, but only if authorized by CDC.

2. CDC Administrative Requirements

Overview of Terms and Conditions of Award and Requirements for Specific Types of Grants

Administrative and National Policy Requirements, Additional Requirements (ARs) outline the administrative requirements found in 45 CFR Part 75 and the HHS Grants Policy Statement and other requirements as mandated by statute or CDC policy. Recipients must comply with administrative and national policy requirements as appropriate. For more information on the Code of Federal Regulations, visit the National Archives and Records Administration: https://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr.

Specific requirements that apply to this NOFO are the following:

CDC Administrative Requirements:

AR-1: Human Subjects Requirements

AR-2: Inclusion of Women and Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Research

AR-3: Animal Subjects Requirements

AR-7: Executive Order 12372 Review

AR-8: Public Health System Reporting Requirements

AR-10: Smoke-Free Workplace Requirements

AR-11: Healthy People 2020

AR-12: Lobbying Restrictions

AR-13: Prohibition on Use of CDC Funds for Certain Gun Control Activities

AR-14: Accounting System Requirements

AR-15: Proof of Non-profit Status

AR-16: Security Clearance Requirement

AR-21: Small, Minority, And Women-owned Business

AR-22: Research Integrity

AR-23: Compliance with 45 C.F.R. Part 87

AR-25: Policy on Public Health Research and Non-research Data Management and Access

AR-26: National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

AR-28: Inclusion of Persons Under the Age of 21 in Research

AR-29: Compliance with EO13513, “Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging while Driving”, October 1, 2009

AR-30: Information Letter 10-006, - Compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

AR 31 - Distinguishing Public Health Research and Public Health Nonresearch

AR 32 – FY 2012 Enacted General Provisions

AR-33: United States Government Policy for Institutional Oversight of Life Sciences Dual Use Research of Concern

AR-34: Language Access for Persons with Limited English Proficiency

AR-35: Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance

AR-36: Certificates of Confidentiality

For more information on the Code of Federal Regulations, visit the National Archives and Records Administration at: http://www.archives.gov/.

To view brief descriptions of relevant CDC requirements visit: http:// www.cdc.gov/ od/OGS /funding/ grants/additional_ req.shtm.

3. Additional Policy Requirements

The following are additional policy requirements relevant to this NOFO:

HHS Policy on Promoting Efficient Spending: Use of Appropriated Funds for Conferences and Meetings, Food, Promotional Items and Printing Publications This policy supports the Executive Order on Promoting Efficient Spending (EO 13589), the Executive Order on Delivering and Efficient, Effective, and Accountable Government (EO 13576) and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Eliminating Excess Conference Spending and Promoting Efficiency in Government (M-35-11). This policy apply to all new obligations and all funds appropriated by Congress. For more information, visit the HHS website at: https://www.hhs.gov/grants/contracts/contract-policies-regulations/efficient-

spending/index.html.

Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA), P.L. 109–282, as amended by section 6202 of P.L. 110–252, requires full disclosure of all entities and organizations receiving Federal funds including grants, contracts, loans and other assistance and payments through a single, publicly accessible website, www.usaspending.gov. For the full text of the requirements, please review the following website: https://www.fsrs.gov/.

Plain Writing Act The Plain Writing Act of 2010, Public Law 111-274 was signed into law on October 13, 2010. The law requires that federal agencies use "clear Government communication that the public can understand and use" and requires the federal government to write all new publications, forms, and publicly distributed documents in a "clear, concise, well-organized" manner. For more information on this law, go to: http://www.plainlanguage.gov/plLaw/index.cfm.

Pilot Program for Enhancement of Employee Whistleblower Protections All applicants will be subject to a term and condition that applies the terms of 48 CFR section 3.908 to the award and requires that grantees inform their employees in writing (in the predominant native language of the workforce) of employee whistleblower rights and protections under 41 U.S.C. 4712.

Copyright Interests Provision This provision is intended to ensure that the public has access to the results and accomplishments of public health activities funded by CDC. Pursuant to applicable grant regulations and CDC's Public Access Policy, Recipient agrees to submit into the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Manuscript Submission (NIHMS) system an electronic version of the final, peer-reviewed manuscript of any such work developed under this award upon acceptance for publication, to be made publicly available no later than 12 months after the official date of publication. Also at the time of submission, Recipient and/or the Recipient's submitting author must specify the date the final manuscript will be publicly accessible through PubMed Central (PMC). Recipient and/or Recipient's submitting author must also post the manuscript through PMC within twelve (12) months of the publisher's official date of final publication; however the author is strongly encouraged to make the subject manuscript available as soon as possible. The recipient must obtain prior approval from the CDC for any exception to this provision.
The author's final, peer-reviewed manuscript is defined as the final version accepted for journal publication, and includes all modifications from the publishing peer review process, and all graphics and supplemental material associated with the article. Recipient and its submitting authors working under this award are responsible for ensuring that any publishing or copyright agreements concerning submitted articles reserve adequate right to fully comply with this provision and the license reserved by CDC. The manuscript will be hosted in both PMC and the CDC Stacks institutional repository system. In progress reports for this award, recipient must identify publications subject to the CDC Public Access Policy by using the applicable NIHMS identification number for up to three (3) months after the publication date and the PubMed Central identification number (PMCID) thereafter.

Language Access for Persons with Limited English Proficiency Recipients of federal financial assistance from HHS must administer their programs in compliance with federal civil rights law. This means that recipients of HHS funds must ensure equal access to their programs without regard to a person's race, color, national origin, disability, age and, in some circumstances, sex and religion. This includes ensuring your programs are accessible to persons with limited English proficiency. Recipients of federal financial assistance must take the reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to their programs by persons with limited English proficiency.

Dual Use Research of Concern On September 24, 2014, the US Government Policy for the Institutional Oversight of Life Sciences Dual Use Research of Concern was released. Grantees (foreign and domestic) receiving CDC funding on or after September 24, 2015 are subject to this policy. Research funded by CDC involving the agents or toxins named in the policy, must be reviewed to determine if it involves one or more of the listed experimental effects and if so, whether it meets the definition of DURC. This review must be completed by an Institutional Review Entity (IRE) identified by the funded institution.

Recipients also must establish an Institutional Contact for Dual Use Research (ICDUR). The award recipient must maintain records of institutional DURC reviews and completed risk mitigation plans for the term of the research grant, cooperative agreement or contract plus three years after its completion, but no less than eight years, unless a shorter period is required by law or regulation.

If a project is determined to be DURC, a risk/benefit analysis must be completed. CDC will work collaboratively with the award recipient to develop a risk mitigation plan that the CDC must approve. The USG policy can be found at http://www.phe.gov/s3/dualuse.

Non-compliance with this Policy may result in suspension, limitation, restriction or termination of USG funding, or loss of future USG funding opportunities for the non-compliant USG-funded research project and of USG funds for other life sciences research at the institution, consistent with existing regulations and policies governing USG funded research, and may subject the institution to other potential penalties under applicable laws and regulations.

Data Management Plan(s)
CDC requires that all new collections of public health data include a Data Management Plan (DMP). For purposes of this announcement, "public health data" means digitally recorded factual material commonly accepted in the scientific community as a basis for public health findings, conclusions, and implementation.

This new requirement ensures that CDC is in compliance with the following; Office of Management and Budget (OMB) memorandum titled "Open Data Policy–Managing Information as an Asset" (OMB M-13-13); Executive Order 13642 titled "Making Open and Machine Readable the New Default for Government Information"; and the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) memorandum titled "Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research" (OSTP Memo).

The AR-25 https://www.cdc.gov/grants/additional-requirements/ar-25.html outlines the components of a DMP and provides additional information for investigators regarding the requirements for data accessibility, storage, and preservation.
Certificates of Confidentiality: Institutions and investigators are responsible for determining whether research they conduct is subject to Section 301(d) of the Public Health Service (PHS) Act. Section 301(d), as amended by Section 2012 of the 21st Century Cures Act, P.L. 114-255 (42 U.S.C. 241(d)), states that the Secretary shall issue Certificates of Confidentiality (Certificates) to persons engaged in biomedical, behavioral, clinical, or other research activities in which identifiable, sensitive information is collected. In furtherance of this provision, CDC supported research commenced or ongoing after December 13, 2016 in which identifiable, sensitive information is collected, as defined by Section 301(d), is deemed issued a Certificate and therefore required to protect the privacy of individuals who are subjects of such research. Certificates issued in this manner will not be issued as a separate document, but are issued by application of this term and condition to this award. See Additional Requirement 36 to ensure compliance with this term and condition. The link to the full text is at: https://www.cdc.gov/grants/additional-requirements/ar-36.html.

4. Cooperative Agreement Terms and Conditions

The following special terms of award are in addition to, and not in lieu of, otherwise applicable U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) administrative guidelines, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) grant administration regulations at 45 CFR Part 75, and other HHS, PHS, and CDC grant administration policies. The administrative and funding instrument used for this program will be the cooperative agreement, an "assistance" mechanism (rather than an "acquisition" mechanism), in which substantial CDC programmatic involvement with the awardees is anticipated during the performance of the activities. Under the cooperative agreement, the HHS/CDC purpose is to support and stimulate the recipients' activities by involvement in and otherwise working jointly with the award recipients in a partnership role; CDC Project Officers are not to assume direction, prime responsibility, or a dominant role in the activities. Consistent with this concept, the dominant role and prime responsibility resides with the awardees for the project as a whole, although specific tasks and activities may be shared among the awardees and HHS/CDC as defined below.

The PD(s)/PI(s) will have the primary responsibility for:

- Complying with the responsibilities for the Extramural Investigators as described in the Policy on Public Health Research and Non-research Data Management and Access.
- Ensuring the protection of human subjects through ethical review of all protocols involving human subjects at the local institution and at CDC and obtaining the appropriate Institutional Review Board approvals for all institutions or individuals engaged in the conduct of the research project.
- Working with CDC scientists to obtain OMB-PRA approvals, as needed.
- PUBLICATIONS/PRESENTATIONS: Publications, journal articles, presentations, etc. produced under a CDC grant support project must bear an acknowledgment and disclaimer, as appropriate, for example: “This publication (journal article, etc.) was supported by the Cooperative Agreement Number above from the Centers for Disease

Control and Prevention. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention". In addition, the PI/PD must provide to CDC Program abstracts or manuscripts prior to any publication related to this funding. The grantee will not seek to publish or present results or findings from this project without prior clearance and approval from CDC.

- Complying with the responsibilities for the PI as described in the United States Government Policy for Institutional Oversight of Life Science Dual Use Research of Concern (DURC) http://www.phe.gov/s3/dualuse/Documents/durc-policy.pdf.
- Awardees will retain custody of and have primary rights to the data and software developed under these awards, subject to Government rights of access consistent with current DHHS, PHS, and CDC policies.

CDC staff have substantial programmatic involvement that is above and beyond the normal stewardship role in awards, as described below:

- Assisting the PI, as needed, in complying with the Investigator responsibilities described in the Policy on Public Health Research and Non-research Data Management and Access.
- Preparing the paperwork necessary for submission of research protocols to the CDC Institutional Review Board for review, as needed.
- Obtaining Office of Management and Budget approval per the Paperwork Reduction Act, if necessary.
- Assisting the PI, as needed, in complying with the PI responsibilities described in the United States Government Policy for Institutional Oversight of Life Science Dual Use Research of Concern (DURC) http://www.phe.gov/s3/dualuse/Documents/durc-policy.pdf
- Providing technical assistance and subject matter expertise, as needed.
- Providing technical assistance on data collection instrument development and data analysis plans.
- Assisting the awardee to obtain CDC clearance of manuscripts, presentations, and abstracts developed by the awardee.
- Providing technical assistance on manuscripts and reporting and dissemination of findings, as warranted.

Additionally, a Scientific Program Officer in the NCHHSTP Extramural Research Program Office (ERPO) will be responsible for the normal scientific and programmatic stewardship of the award as described below:

- Named in the Notice of Award as the Program Official to provide overall scientific and programmatic stewardship of the award;
- Serve as the primary point of contact on official award-related activities including an annual review of the grantee's performance as part of the request for continuation application;
- Make recommendations on requests for changes in scope, objectives, and or budgets that deviate from the approved peer-reviewed application;

- Carry out continuous review of all activities to ensure objectives are being met;
- Attend committee meetings and participate in conference calls for the purposes of assessing overall progress, and for program evaluation purposes; and
- Monitor performance against approved project objectives.

5. Reporting

Recipients will be required to complete Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) in eRA Commons at least annually (see https://grants.nih.gov/grants/rppr/index.htm; https://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms/report_on_grant.htm) and financial statements as required in the HHS Grants Policy Statement.

A final progress report, invention statement, equipment inventory list and the expenditure data portion of the Federal Financial Report are required for closeout of an award, as described in the HHS Grants Policy Statement.

Although the financial plans of the HHS/CDC CIO(s) provide support for this program, awards pursuant to this funding opportunity depend upon the availability of funds, evidence of satisfactory progress by the recipient (as documented in required reports) and the determination that continued funding is in the best interest of the Federal government.

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Transparency Act), includes a requirement for recipients of Federal grants to report information about first-tier subawards and executive compensation under Federal assistance awards issued in FY2011 or later.
Compliance with this law is primarily the responsibility of the Federal agency. However, two elements of the law require information to be collected and reported by recipients:
1) Information on executive compensation when not already reported through the SAM Registration; and
2) Similar information on all sub-awards/ subcontracts/ consortiums over $25,000. It is a requirement for recipients of Federal grants to report information about first-tier subawards and executive compensation under Federal assistance awards issued in FY2011 or later.
All recipients of applicable CDC grants and cooperative agreements are required to report to the Federal Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) available at www.fsrs.gov on all subawards over $25,000. See the HHS Grants Policy Statement (https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/grants/grants/policies-regulations/hhsgps107.pdf).

Please note: FFR reporting is now via the Payment Management System (PMS): https://pms.psc.gov/

A. Submission of Reports
The Recipient Organization must provide HHS/CDC with an original, plus one hard copy of the following reports:

1. **Yearly Non-Competing Grant Progress Report**, is due 90 to 120 days before the end

of the current budget period. The RPPR form (https://grants.nih.gov/grants/rppr/index.htm; https://grants.nih.gov/grants/rppr/rppr_instruction_guide.pdf) is to be completed on the eRA Commons website. The progress report will serve as the non-competing continuation application. Although the financial plans of the HHS/CDC CIO(s) provide support for this program, awards pursuant to this funding opportunity are contingent upon the availability of funds, evidence of satisfactory progress by the recipient (as documented in required reports) and the determination that continued funding is in the best interest of the Federal government.

2. **Annual Federal Financial Report (FFR) SF 425** (https://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms/report_on_grant/federal_financial_report_ffr.htm) is required and must be submitted through the Payment Management System (PMS) **within 90 days after the end of the calendar quarter in which the budget period ends**.

3. **A final progress report**, invention statement, equipment/inventory report, and the final FFR are required **90 days after the end of the period of performance**.

B. Content of Reports

1. Yearly Non-Competing Grant Progress Report: The grantee's continuation application/progress should include:

- Description of Progress during Annual Budget Period: Current Budget Period Progress reported on the RPPR form in eRA Commons (https://grants.nih.gov/grants/rppr/index.htm). Detailed narrative report for the current budget period that directly addresses progress towards the Measures of Effectiveness included in the current budget period proposal.
- Research Aims: list each research aim/project

a) Research Aim/Project: purpose, status (met, ongoing, and unmet), challenges, successes, and lessons learned
b) Leadership/Partnership: list project collaborations and describe the role of external partners.

- Translation of Research (1 page maximum). When relevant to the goals of the research project, the PI should describe how the significant findings may be used to promote, enhance, or advance translation of the research into practice or may be used to inform public health policy. This section should be understandable to a variety of audiences, including policy makers, practitioners, public health programs, healthcare institutions, professional organizations, community groups, researchers, and other potential users. The PI should identify the research findings that were translated into public health policy or practice and how the findings have been or may be adopted in public health settings. Or, if they cannot be applied yet, this section should address which research

findings may be translated, how these findings can guide future research or related activities, and recommendations for translation. If relevant, describe how the results of this project could be generalized to populations and communities outside of the study. Questions to consider in preparing this section include:

- How will the scientific findings be translated into public health practice or inform public health policy?
- How will the project improve or effect the translation of research findings into public health practice or inform policy?
- How will the research findings help promote or accelerate the dissemination, implementation, or diffusion of improvements in public health programs or practices?
- How will the findings advance or guide future research efforts or related activities?

- Public Health Relevance and Impact (1 page maximum). This section should address improvements in public health as measured by documented or anticipated outcomes from the project. The PI should consider how the findings of the project relate beyond the immediate study to improved practices, prevention or intervention techniques, inform policy, or use of technology in public health. Questions to consider in preparing this section include:
- How will this project lead to improvements in public health?
- How will the findings, results, or recommendations been used to influence practices, procedures, methodologies, etc.?
- How will the findings, results, or recommendations contributed to documented or projected reductions in morbidity, mortality, injury, disability, or disease?

- Current Budget Period Financial Progress: Status of obligation of current budget period funds and an estimate of unobligated funds projected provided on an estimated FFR.

- New Budget Period Proposal:
- Detailed operational plan for continuing activities in the upcoming budget period, including updated Measures of Effectiveness for evaluating progress during the upcoming budget period. Report listed by Research Aim/Project.
- Project Timeline: Include planned milestones for the upcoming year (be specific and provide deadlines).

- New Budget Period Budget: Detailed line-item budget and budget justification for the new budget period. Use the CDC budget guideline format.

- Publications/Presentations: Include publications/presentations resulting from this CDC grant only during this budget period. If no publication or presentations have been made at this stage in the project, simply indicate “Not applicable: No publications or presentations have been made."

- IRB Approval Certification: Include all current IRB approvals to avoid a funding restriction on your award. If the research does not involve human subjects, then please

state so. Please provide a copy of the most recent local IRB and CDC IRB, if applicable. If any approval is still pending at time of APR due date, indicate the status in your narrative.

- Update of Data Management Plan: The DMP is considered a living document that will require updates throughout the lifecycle of the project. Investigators should include any updates to the project's data collection such as changes to initial data collection plan, challenges with data collection, and recent data collected. Applicants should update their DMP to reflect progress or issues with planned data collection and submit as required for each reporting period.

- Additional Reporting Requirements:

N/A

2. Annual Federal Financial Reporting The Annual Federal Financial Report (FFR) SF 425 is required and must be submitted through the Payment Management System (PMS) within 90 days after the end of the calendar quarter in which the budget period ends. The FFR should only include those funds authorized and disbursed during the timeframe covered by the report. The final FFR must indicate the exact balance of unobligated funds and may not reflect any unliquidated obligations. There must be no discrepancies between the final FFR expenditure data and the Payment Management System's (PMS) cash transaction data.
Failure to submit the required information in a timely manner may adversely affect the future funding of this project. If the information cannot be provided by the due date, you are required to submit a letter explaining the reason and date by which the Grants Officer will receive the information.
The due date for final FFRs is 120 days after the Period of Performance end date.
Recipients must submit closeout reports in a timely manner. Unless the Grants Management Officer (GMO) of the awarding Institute or Center approves an extension, recipients must submit a final FFR, final progress report, and Final Invention Statement and Certification within 90 days of the end of grant period. Failure to submit timely and accurate final reports may affect future funding to the organization or awards under the direction of the same Project Director/Principal Investigator (PD/PI).
FFR (SF 425) instructions for CDC recipients are now available at https://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms/report_on_grant/federal_financial_report_ffr.htm. For further information, contact GrantsInfo@nih.gov. Additional resources on the Payment Management System (PMS) can be found at https://pms.psc.gov.
Organizations may verify their current registration status by running the "List of Commons Registered Organizations" query found at: https://era.nih.gov/registration_accounts.cfm. Organizations not yet registered can go to https://era.nih.gov/ for instructions. It generally takes several days to complete this registration process. This registration is independent of Grants.gov and may be done at any time.
The individual designated as the PI on the application must also be registered in the Commons. The PI must hold a PI account and be affiliated with the applicant organization. This registration must be done by an organizational official or their delegate who is already registered in the

Commons. To register PIs in the Commons, refer to the eRA Commons User Guide found at: https://era.nih.gov/docs/Commons_UserGuide.pdf.
3. Final Reports: Final reports should provide sufficient detail for CDC to determine if the stated outcomes for the funded research have been achieved and if the research findings resulted in public health impact based on the investment. The grantee's final report should include:

- Research Aim/Project Overview: The PI should describe the purpose and approach to the project, including the outcomes, methodology and related analyses. Include a discussion of the challenges, successes and lessons learned. Describe the collaborations/partnerships and the role of each external partner.

- Translation of Research Findings: The PI should describe how the findings will be translated and how they will be used to inform policy or promote, enhance or advance the impact on public health practice. This section should be understandable to a variety of audiences, including policy makers, practitioners, public health programs, health care institutions, professional organizations, community groups, researchers and other potential end users. The PI should also provide a discussion of any research findings that informed policy or practice during the course of the period of performance. If applicable, describe how the findings could be generalized and scaled to populations and communities outside of the funded project.

- Public Health Relevance and Impact: This section should address improvements in public health as measured by documented or anticipated outcomes from the project. The PI should consider how the findings of the project related beyond the immediate study to improved practices, prevention or intervention techniques, or informed policy, technology or systems improvements in public health.

- Publications; Presentations; Media Coverage: Include information regarding all publications, presentations or media coverage resulting from this CDC funded activity. Please include any additional dissemination efforts that did or will result from the project.

- Final Data Management Plan: Applicants must include an updated final Data Management Plan that describes the data collected, the location of where the data is stored (example: a repository), accessibility restrictions (if applicable), and the plans for long term preservation of the data.

Section VII. Agency Contacts

We encourage inquiries concerning this funding opportunity and welcome the opportunity to answer questions from potential applicants.

Application Submission Contacts
Grants.gov Customer Support (Questions regarding Grants.gov registration and submission, downloading or navigating forms)

Contact Center Phone: 800-518-4726
Email: support@grants.gov
Hours: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; closed on Federal holidays

eRA Commons Help Desk (Questions regarding eRA Commons registration, tracking application status, post submission issues, FFR submission)
Phone: 301-402-7469 or 866-504-9552 (Toll Free)
TTY: 301-451-5939
Email: commons@od.nih.gov
Hours: Monday - Friday, 7am - 8pm U.S. Eastern Time

Agency Contacts:

Scientific/Research Contact

Deborah Loveys Ph.D.

Extramural Research Program Office

Office of the Associate Director of Science

National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD and TB Prevention

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

1600 Clifton Road, Mailstop US8-1

Atlanta, GA 30333

Telephone: 404-718-8834

Email: hft6@cdc.gov

Peer Review Contact

Gregory Anderson, MPH, MS

Extramural Research Program Office

Office of the Associate Director of Science

National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD and TB Prevention

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

1600 Clifton Road, Mailstop US8-1

Atlanta, GA 30333

Telephone: 404-718-8833

Email: GAnderson@cdc.gov

Financial/Grants Management Contact

Sharon Cassell

Office of Financial Resources

Office of Grant Services

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

2939 Brandywine Road, MS TV-2

Atlanta, GA 30341

Telephone: 770-488-2703

Email: zpr0@cdc.gov

Section VIII. Other Information

Other CDC Notices of Funding Opportunities can be found at www.grants.gov.
All awards are subject to the terms and conditions, cost principles, and other considerations described in the HHS Grants Policy Statement.

Authority and Regulations
Awards are made under the authorization of Sections of the Public Health Service Act as amended and under the Code Federal Regulations.

Public Health Service Act, Section 317(k)(1) [42 USC 247b(k)(1)], as amended.