

University Alliance Group
Idea for “greening grants”

Brenda Petrella, PhD
Biosafety Officer, Lab Sustainability Manager
Dartmouth College

One approach to incentivize principal investigators (PIs) in greening their labs may be to incorporate “points” or some sort of recognition in the grant review process for being a green lab or practicing sustainable behaviors/methods in the lab. A statement could be provided that described what the lab was doing in terms of being a green lab (certified green lab, or some sort of metric that may be institutionally specific) that would be considered along with the rest of the grant proposal. A similar statement is already requested by DHHS/PHS for proposals involving biohazards under *Additional Review Criteria* (see below). A biohazards statement is required to demonstrate to the reviewers that the institutional policies are in place and the facilities are appropriate working with the proposed biohazards.

A second approach that would address the UAG discussed equipment sharing or shared resources idea is to incorporate these ideas into the current *Additional Review Considerations* section of grants on “Resource Sharing Plans” (see below).

The current criteria and considerations for review of DHHS/PHS SF424 (R&R) Applications (PHS Research Grants – R awards; Career Development – K awards; Institutional Training Grants – T awards¹) are below. I included the descriptions for the sections that seemed most relevant.

1. 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 five scored review criteria, and additional review criteria (as applicable for the project proposed).

2. Scored Review Criteria: Reviewers will consider each of the five review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and give a separate score for each.

a. Significance

b. Investigator(s)

¹ http://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/424/sf424_rr_guide_general_verc.pdf

c. Innovation

d. Approach

e. 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?

3. Additional Review Criteria: As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will consider the following additional items in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and in providing an overall impact/priority score, but will not give separate scores for these items.

a. Protection for Human Subjects

b. Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Children

c. Vertebrate Animals

d. 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.

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

a. Applications from Foreign Organizations

b. Select Agents Research

c. Resource Sharing Plans

d. Budget and Period of Support: Reviewers will comment on whether the following Resource Sharing Plans, or the rationale for not sharing the following types of resources, are reasonable:

- 1) Data Sharing Plan (http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/data_sharing/data_sharing_guidance.htm);
- 2) Sharing Model Organisms (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-04-042.html>); and
- 3) Genomic Data Sharing (GDS) Plan (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-14-124.html>)