



CANCER PREVENTION & RESEARCH
INSTITUTE OF TEXAS

§ 701.3 Definitions

The following words and terms, when used in this chapter, shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

- (1) **Advisory Committee**--a committee of experts, including practitioners and patient advocates, created by the Oversight Committee to advise the Oversight Committee on issues related to cancer.
- (2) **Allowable Cost**--a cost that is reasonable, necessary for the proper and efficient performance and administration of the project, and allocable to the project.
- (3) **Annual Public Report**--the report issued by the Institute pursuant to Texas Health and Safety Code §102.052 outlining Institute activities, including Grant Awards, research accomplishments, future Program directions, compliance, and Conflicts of Interest actions.
- (4) **Authorized Expense**--cost items including honoraria, salaries and benefits, consumable supplies, other operating expenses, contracted research and development, capital equipment, construction or renovation of state or private facilities, travel, and conference fees and expenses.
- (5) **Approved Budget**--the financial expenditure plan for the Grant Award, including revisions approved by the Institute and permissible revisions made by the Grant Recipient. The Approved Budget may be shown by Project Year and detailed budget categories.
- (6) **Authorized Signing Official (ASO)**--the individual, including designated alternates, named by the Grant Applicant, who is authorized to act for the Grant Applicant or Grant Recipient in submitting the Grant Application and executing the Grant Contract and associated documents or requests.
- (7) **Bylaws**--the rules established by the Oversight Committee to provide a framework for its operation, management, and governance.
- (8) **Cancer Prevention**--a reduction in the risk of developing cancer, including early detection, control and/or mitigation of the incidence, disability, mortality, or post-diagnosis effects of cancer.
- (9) **Cancer Prevention and Control Program**--effective strategies and interventions for preventing and controlling cancer designed to reduce the incidence and mortality of cancer and to enhance the quality of life of those affected by cancer.

(10) Cancer Prevention and Research Fund--the dedicated account in the general revenue fund consisting of legislative appropriations, gifts, grants, other donations, and earned interest.

(11) Cancer Research--research into the prevention, causes, detection, treatments, and cures for all types of cancer in humans, including basic mechanistic studies, pre-clinical studies, animal model studies, translational research, and clinical research to develop preventative measures, therapies, protocols, medical pharmaceuticals, medical devices or procedures for the detection, treatment, cure or substantial mitigation of all types of cancer and its effects in humans.

(12) Chief Compliance Officer--the individual employed by the Institute to monitor and report to the Oversight Committee regarding compliance with the Institute's statute and administrative rules. The term may also apply to an individual designated by the Chief Compliance Officer to fulfill the duty or duties described herein, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

(13) Chief Executive Officer--the individual hired by the Oversight Committee to perform duties required by the Institute's Statute or designated by the Oversight Committee. The term may apply to an individual designated by the Chief Executive Officer to fulfill the duty or duties described herein, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

(14) Chief Prevention Officer--the individual hired by the Chief Executive Officer to oversee the Institute's Cancer Prevention program, including the Grant Review Process, and to assist the Chief Executive Officer in collaborative outreach to further Cancer Research and Cancer Prevention. The term may also apply to an individual designated by the Chief Prevention Officer to fulfill the duty or duties described herein, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

(15) Chief Product Development Officer--the individual hired by Chief Executive Officer to oversee the Institute's Product Development program for drugs, biologicals, diagnostics, or devices arising from Cancer Research, including the Grant Review Process, and to assist the Chief Executive Officer in collaborative outreach to further Cancer Research and Cancer Prevention. The term may apply to an individual designated by the Chief Product Development Officer to fulfill the duty or duties described herein, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

(16) Chief Scientific Officer--the individual hired by the Chief Executive Officer to oversee the Institute's Cancer Research program, including the Grant Review Process, and to assist the Chief Executive Officer in collaborative outreach to further Cancer Research and Cancer Prevention. The term may apply to an individual designated by the

Chief Scientific Officer to fulfill the duty or duties described herein, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

(17) Code of Conduct and Ethics--the code adopted by the Oversight Committee pursuant to Texas Health and Safety Code §102.109 to provide guidance related to the ethical conduct expected of Oversight Committee Members, Program Integration Committee Members, and Institute Employees.

(18) Compliance Program--a process to assess and ensure compliance by the Oversight Committee Members and Institute Employees with applicable laws, rules, and policies, including matters of ethics and standards of conduct, financial reporting, internal accounting controls, and auditing.

(19) Conflict(s) of Interest--a financial, professional, or personal interest held by the individual or the individual's Relative that is contrary to the individual's obligation and duty to act for the benefit of the Institute.

(20) Encumbered Funds--funds that are designated by a Grant Recipient for a specific purpose.

(21) Financial Status Report--form used to report all Grant Award related financial expenditures incurred in implementation of the Grant Award. This form may also be referred to as "FSR" or "Form 269-A."

(22) Grant Applicant--the public or private institution of higher education, as defined by §61.003, Texas Education Code, research institution, government organization, non-governmental organization, non-profit organization, other public entity, private company, individual, or consortia, including any combination of the aforementioned, that submits a Grant Application to the Institute. Unless otherwise indicated, this term includes the Principal Investigator or Program Director.

(23) Grant Application--the written proposal submitted by a Grant Applicant to the Institute in the form required by the Institute that, if successful, will result in a Grant Award.

(24) Grant Award--funding, including a direct company investment, awarded by the Institute pursuant to a Grant Contract providing money to the Grant Recipient to carry out the Cancer Research or Cancer Prevention project in accordance with rules, regulations, and guidance provided by the Institute.

(25) Grant Contract--the legal agreement executed by the Grant Recipient and the Institute setting forth the terms and conditions for the Cancer Research or Cancer Prevention Grant Award approved by the Oversight Committee.

(26) Grant Management System--the electronic interactive system used by the Institute to exchange, record, and store Grant Application and Grant Award information.

(27) Grant Mechanism--the specific Grant Award type.

(28) Grant Program--the functional area in which the Institute makes Grant Awards, including research, prevention and product development.

(29) Grant Progress Report--the required report submitted by the Grant Recipient at least annually and at the close of the grant award describing the activities undertaken to achieve the Scope of Work [~~goals and objectives~~] of the funded project and including information, data and program metrics. Unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, the Grant Progress Report also includes other required reports such as a Historically Underutilized Business and Texas Supplier form, a single audit determination form, an inventory report, a single audit determination form, a revenue sharing form, and any other reports or forms designated by the Institute.

(30) Grant Recipient--the entire legal entity responsible for the performance or administration of the Grant Award pursuant to the Grant Contract. Unless otherwise indicated, this term includes the Principal Investigator, Program Director, or Company Representative.

(31) Grant Review Cycle--the period that begins on the day that the Request for Applications is released for a particular Grant Mechanism and ends on the day that the Oversight Committee takes action on the Grant Award recommendations.

(32) Grant Review Process--the Institute's processes for Peer Review, Program Review and Oversight Committee approval of Grant Applications.

(33) Indirect Costs--the expenses of doing business that are not readily identified with a particular Grant Award, Grant Contract, project, function, or activity, but are necessary for the general operation of the Grant Recipient or the performance of the Grant Recipient's activities.

(34) Institute--the Cancer Prevention and Research Institute of Texas or CPRIT.

(35) Institute Employee--any individual employed by the Institute, including any individual performing duties for the Institute pursuant to a contract of employment.

Unless otherwise indicated, the term does not include an individual providing services to the Institute pursuant to a services contract.

(36) Intellectual Property Rights--any and all of the following and all rights in, arising out of, or associated therewith, but only to the extent resulting from the Grant Award:

(A) The United States and foreign patents and utility models and applications therefore and all reissues, divisions, re-examinations, renewals, extensions, provisionals, continuations and such claims of continuations-in-part as are entitled to claim priority to the aforesaid patents or patent applications, and equivalent or similar rights anywhere in the world in Inventions and discoveries;

(B) All trade secrets and rights in know-how and proprietary information;

(C) All copyrights, whether registered or unregistered, and applications therefore, and all other rights corresponding thereto throughout the world excluding scholarly and academic works such as professional articles and presentations, lab notebooks, and original medical records; and

(D) All mask works, mask work registrations and applications therefore, and any equivalent or similar rights in semiconductor masks, layouts, architectures or topography.

(37) Invention--any method, device, process or discovery that is conceived and/or reduced to practice, whether patentable or not, by the Grant Recipient in the performance of work funded by the Grant Award.

(38) License Agreement--an understanding by which an owner of Technology and associated Intellectual Property Rights grants any right to make, use, develop, sell, offer to sell, import, or otherwise exploit the Technology or Intellectual Property Rights in exchange for consideration.

(39) Matching Funds--the Grant Recipient's Encumbered Funds equal to one-half of the Grant Award available and not yet expended that are dedicated to the research that is the subject of the Grant Award. For public and private institutions of higher education, this includes the dollar amount equivalent to the difference between the indirect cost rate authorized by the federal government for research grants awarded to the Grant Recipient and the five percent (5%) Indirect Cost limit imposed by §102.203(c), Texas Health and Safety Code.

(40) Numerical Ranking Score--the score given to a Grant Application by the Review Council that is substantially based on the final Overall Evaluation Score submitted by the

Peer Review Panel, but also signifies the Review Council's view related to how well the Grant Application achieves program priorities set by the Oversight Committee, the overall Program portfolio balance, and any other criteria described in the Request for Applications.

(41) Overall Evaluation Score--the score given to a Grant Application during the Peer Review Panel review that signifies the reviewers' overall impression of the Grant Application. Typically it is the average of the scores assigned by two or more Peer Review Panel members.

(42) Oversight Committee--the Institute's governing body, composed of the nine individuals appointed by the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(43) Oversight Committee Member--any person appointed to and serving on the Oversight Committee.

(44) Patient Advocate--a trained individual who meets the qualifications set by the Institute and is appointed to a Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee to specifically represent the interests of cancer patients as part of the Peer Review of Grant Applications assigned to the individual's committee.

(45) Peer Review--the review process performed by Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee members and used by the Institute to provide guidance and recommendations to the Program Integration Committee and the Oversight Committee in making decisions for Grant Awards. The process involves the consistent application of standards and procedures to produce a fair, equitable, and objective evaluation of scientific and technical merit, as well as other relevant aspects of the Grant Application. When used herein, the term applies individually or collectively, as the context may indicate, to the following review process(es): Preliminary Evaluation, Individual Evaluation by Primary Reviewers, Peer Review Panel discussion and Review Council prioritization.

(46) Peer Review Panel--a group of Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee members conducting Peer Review of assigned Grant Applications.

(47) Prevention Review Council--the group of Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee members designated as the chairpersons of the Peer Review Panels that review Cancer Prevention program Grant Applications. This group includes the Review Council chairperson.

(48) Primary Reviewer--a Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee member responsible for individually evaluating all components of the Grant Application, critiquing the merits according to explicit criteria published in the Request for Applications, and providing an individual Overall Evaluation Score that conveys the general impression of the Grant Application's merit.

(49) Principal Investigator, Program Director, or Company Representative--the single individual designated by the Grant Applicant or Grant Recipient to have the appropriate level of authority and responsibility to direct the project to be supported by the Grant Award.

(50) Product Development Review Council--the group of Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee Members designated as the chairpersons of the Peer Review Panels that review Grant Applications for the development of drugs, biologics, diagnostics, or devices arising from earlier-stage Cancer Research. This group includes the Review Council chairperson.

(51) Product Development Prospects--the potential for development of products, services, or infrastructure to support Cancer Research efforts, including but not limited to pre-clinical, clinical, manufacturing, and scale up activities.

(52) Program Income--income from fees for services performed, from the use or rental of real or personal property acquired with Grant Award funds, and from the sale of commodities or items fabricated under the Grant Contract. Except as otherwise provided, Program Income does not include rebates, credits, discounts, refunds, etc. or the interest earned on any of these items. Interest otherwise earned in excess of \$250 on Grant Award funds is considered Program Income.

(53) Program Integration Committee--the group composed of the Chief Executive Officer, the Chief Scientific Officer, the Chief Product Development Officer, the Commissioner of State Health Services, and the Chief Prevention Officer that is responsible for submitting to the Oversight Committee the list of Grant Applications the Program Integration Committee recommends for Grant Awards.

(54) Project Results--all outcomes of a Grant Award, including publications, knowledge gained, additional funding generated, and any and all Technology and associated Intellectual Property Rights.

(55) Project Year--the intervals of time (usually 12 months each) into which a Grant Award is divided for budgetary, funding, and reporting purposes. The effective date of the Grant Contract is the first day of the first Project Year.

(56) Real Property--land, including land improvements, structures and appurtenances thereto, excluding movable machinery and equipment.

(57) Relative--a person related within the second degree by consanguinity or affinity determined in accordance with §§573.021 - 573.025, Texas Government Code. For purposes of this definition:

(A) examples of an individual within the second degree by consanguinity are a child, grandchild, parent, grandparent, brother, sister;

(B) a husband and wife are related to each other in the first degree of affinity. For other relationship by affinity, the degree of relationship is the same as the degree of the underlying relationship by consanguinity;

(C) an individual adopted into a family is considered a Relative on the same basis as a natural born family member; and

(D) an individual is considered a spouse even if the marriage has been dissolved by death or divorce if there are surviving children of that marriage.

(58) Request for Applications--the invitation released by the Institute seeking the submission of Grant Applications for a particular Grant Mechanism. It provides information relevant to the Grant Award to be funded, including funding amount, Grant Review Process information, evaluation criteria, and required Grant Application components. The Request for Applications includes any associated written instructions provided by the Institute and available to all Grant Applicants.

(59) Review Council--the term used to generally refer to one or more of the Prevention Review Council, the Product Development Review Council, or Scientific Review Council.

(60) Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee--a group of experts in the field of Cancer Research, Cancer Prevention or Product Development, including trained Patient Advocates, appointed by the Chief Executive Officer and approved by the Oversight Committee for the purpose of conducting Peer Review of Grants Applications and recommending Grant Awards. A Peer Review Panel is a Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee, as is a Review Council.

(61) Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee Member--an individual appointed by the Chief Executive Officer and approved by the Oversight Committee to serve on a Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee. Peer Review Panel

Members are Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee Members, as are Review Council Members.

(62) Scientific Review Council--the group of Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee Members designated as the chairpersons of the Peer Review Panels that review Cancer Research Grant Applications. This group includes the Review Council chairperson.

(63) Scope of Work--the goals and objectives or specific aims and subaims, if appropriate, of the Cancer Research or Cancer Prevention project, including the timeline and milestones to be achieved.

(64) Senior Member or Key Personnel--the Principal Investigator, Project Director or Company Representative and other individuals who contribute to the scientific development or execution of a project in a substantive, measurable way, whether or not the individuals receive salary or compensation under the Grant Award.

(65) Technology--any and all of the following resulting or arising from work funded by the Grant Award:

(A) Inventions;

(B) Third-Party Information, including but not limited to data, trade secrets and know-how;

(C) databases, compilations and collections of data;

(D) tools, methods and processes; and

(E) works of authorship, excluding all scholarly works, but including, without limitation, computer programs, source code and executable code, whether embodied in software, firmware or otherwise, documentation, files, records, data and mask works; and all instantiations of the foregoing in any form and embodied in any form, including but not limited to therapeutics, drugs, drug delivery systems, drug formulations, devices, diagnostics, biomarkers, reagents and research tools.

(66) Texas Cancer Plan--a coordinated, prioritized, and actionable framework that helps to guide statewide efforts to fight the human and economic burden of cancer in Texas.

(67) Third-Party Information--generally, all trade secrets, proprietary information, know-how and non-public business information disclosed to the Institute by Grant Applicant, Grant Recipient, or other individual external to the Institute.

§ 703.6 Grant Review Process

(a) For all Grant Applications that are not administratively withdrawn by the Institute for noncompliance or otherwise withdrawn by the Grant Applicant, the Institute shall use a two-stage Peer Review process.

(1) The Peer Review process, as described herein, is used to identify and recommend meritorious Cancer Research projects, including those projects with Cancer Research Product Development prospects, and evidence-based Cancer Prevention and Control projects for Grant Award consideration by the Program Integration Committee and the Oversight Committee.

(2) Peer Review will be conducted pursuant to the requirements set forth in Chapter 702 of this title (relating to Institute Standards on Ethics and Conflicts, Including the Acceptance of Gifts and Donations to the Institute) and Chapter 102, Texas Health and Safety Code.

(b) The two stages of the Peer Review Process used by the Institute are:

(1) Evaluation of Grant Applications by Peer Review Panels; and

(2) Prioritization of Grant Applications by the Prevention Review Council, the Product Development Review Council, or the Scientific Review Council, as may be appropriate for the Grant Program.

(c) Except as described in subsection (e) of this section, the Peer Review Panel evaluation process encompasses the following actions, which will be consistently applied:

(1) The Institute distributes all Grant Applications submitted for a particular Grant Mechanism to one or more Peer Review Panels.

(2) The Peer Review Panel chairperson assigns each Grant Application to no less than two panel members that serve as the Primary Reviewers for the Grant Application. Assignments are made based upon the expertise and background of the Primary Reviewer in relation to the Grant Application.

(3) The Primary Reviewer is responsible for individually evaluating all components of the Grant Application, critiquing the merits according to explicit criteria published in the

Request for Applications, and providing an individual Overall Evaluation Score that conveys the Primary Reviewer's general impression of the Grant Application's merit. The Primary Reviewers' individual Overall Evaluation Scores are averaged together to produce a single initial Overall Evaluation Score for the Grant Application.

(4) The Peer Review Panel meets to discuss the Grant Applications assigned to the Peer Review Panel. If there is insufficient time to discuss all Grant Applications, the Peer Review Panel chairperson determines the Grant Applications to be discussed by the panel. The chairperson's decision is based largely on the Grant Application's initial Overall Evaluation Score; however, a Peer Review Panel member may request that a Grant Application be discussed by the Peer Review Panel.

(A) If a Grant Application is not discussed by the Peer Review Panel, then the initial Overall Evaluation Score serves as the final Overall Evaluation Score for the Grant Application. The Grant Application is not considered further during the Grant Review Cycle.

(B) If a Grant Application is discussed by the Peer Review Panel, each Peer Review Panel member submits a score for the Grant Application based on the panel member's general impression of the Grant Application's merit and accounting for the explicit criteria published in the Request for Applications. The submitted scores are averaged together to produce the final Overall Evaluation Score for the Grant Application.

(i) The panel chairperson participates in the discussion but does not score Grant Applications.

(ii) A Primary Reviewer has the option to revise his or her score for the Grant Application after panel discussion or to keep the same score submitted during the initial review.

(C) If the Peer Review Panel recommends changes to the Grant Award funds amount requested by the Grant Applicant or to the Scope of Work [goals and objectives or timeline] for the proposed project, then the recommended changes and explanation shall be recorded at the time the final Overall Evaluation Score is set.

(5) At the conclusion of the Peer Review Panel evaluation, the Peer Review Panel chairperson submits to the appropriate Review Council a list of Grant Applications discussed by the panel ranked in order by the final Overall Evaluation Score. Any changes to the Grant Award funding amount or to the Scope of Work [project goals and

~~objectives or timeline~~] recommended by the Peer Review Panel shall be provided to the Review Council at that time.

(d) The Review Council's prioritization process for Grant Award recommendations encompasses the following actions, which will be consistently applied:

(1) The Review Council prioritizes the Grant Application recommendations across all the Peer Review Panels by assigning a Numerical Ranking Score to each Grant Application that was discussed by a Peer Review Panel. The Numerical Ranking Score is substantially based on the final Overall Evaluation Score submitted by the Peer Review Panel, but also takes into consideration how well the Grant Application achieves program priorities set by the Oversight Committee, the overall Program portfolio balance, and any other criteria described in the Request for Applications.

(2) The Review Council's recommendations are submitted simultaneously to the presiding officers of the Program Integration Committee and Oversight Committee. The recommendations, listed in order by Numerical Ranking Score, shall include:

(A) An explanation describing how the Grant Application meets the Review Council's standards for Grant Award funding;

(B) The final Overall Evaluation Score assigned to the Grant Application by the Peer Review Panel, including an explanation for ranking one or more Grant Applications ahead of another Grant Application with a more favorable final Overall Evaluation Score; and

(C) The specified amount of the Grant Award funding for each Grant Application, including an explanation for recommended changes to the Grant Award funding amount or to the Scope of Work [~~goals and objectives or timeline~~].

(3) A Grant Award recommendation is not final until the Review Council formally submits the recommendation to the presiding officers of the Program Integration Committee and the Oversight Committee. The Program Integration Committee, and, if appropriate, the Oversight Committee must make a final decision on the Grant Award recommendation in the same state fiscal year that the Review Council submits its final recommendation.

(e) Circumstances relevant to a particular Grant Mechanism or to a Grant Review Cycle may justify changes to the dual-stage Peer Review process described in subsections (c) and (d) of this section. Peer Review process changes the Institute may implement are described in this subsection. The list is not intended to be exhaustive. Any material changes to the Peer Review

process, including those listed in this subsection, shall be described in the Request for Applications or communicated to all Grant Applicants.

(1) The Institute may use a preliminary evaluation process if the volume of Grant Applications submitted pursuant to a specific Request for Applications is such that timely review may be impeded. The preliminary evaluation will be conducted after Grant Applications are assigned to Peer Review Panels but prior to the initial review described in subsection (c) of this section. The preliminary evaluation encompasses the following actions:

(A) The criteria and the specific Grant Application components used for the preliminary evaluation shall be stated in the Request for Applications;

(B) No less than two Peer Review Panel members are assigned to conduct the preliminary evaluation for a Grant Application and provide a preliminary score that conveys the general impression of the Grant Application's merit pursuant to the specified criteria; and

(C) The Peer Review Panel chairperson is responsible for determining the Grant Applications that move forward to initial review as described in subsection (c) of this section. The decision will be based upon preliminary evaluation scores. A Grant Application that does not move forward to initial review will not be considered further, and the average of the preliminary evaluation scores received becomes the final Overall Evaluation Score for the Grant Application.

(2) The Institute shall assign all Grant Applications submitted for recruitment of researchers and clinicians to the Scientific Review Council.

(A) The Scientific Review Council members review all components of the Grant Application, evaluate the merits according to explicit criteria published in the Request for Applications, and, after discussion by the Review Council members, provide an individual Overall Evaluation Score that conveys the Review Council member's recommendation related to the proposed recruitment.

(B) The individual Overall Evaluation Scores are averaged together for a final Overall Evaluation Score for the Application.

(C) If more than one recruitment Grant Application is reviewed by the Scientific Review Council during the Grant Review Cycle, then the Scientific Review Council shall assign a Numerical Ranking Score to each Grant Application to convey its prioritization ranking.

(D) If the Scientific Review Council recommends a change to the Grant Award funds requested by the Grant Application, then the recommended change and explanation shall be recorded at the time the final Overall Evaluation Score is set.

(E) The Scientific Review Council's recommendations shall be provided to the presiding officer of the Program Integration Committee and to the Oversight Committee pursuant to the process described in subsection (d) of this section.

(3) The Institute may assign continuation Grant Applications to the appropriate Review Council.

(A) The Review Council members review all components of the Grant Application, evaluate the merits according to explicit criteria published in the Request for Applications, and, after discussion by the Review Council members, provide an individual Overall Evaluation Score that conveys the Review Council member's recommendation related to the progress and continued funding.

(B) The individual Overall Evaluation Scores are averaged together for a final Overall Evaluation Score for the Application.

(C) If more than one continuation Grant Application is reviewed by the Review Council during the Grant Review Cycle, then the Review Council shall assign a Numerical Ranking Score to each continuation Grant Application to convey its prioritization ranking.

(D) If the Review Council recommends a change to the Grant Award funds or to the Scope of Work [~~scope of work or timeline~~] requested by the continuation Grant Application, then the recommended change and explanation shall be recorded at the time the final Overall Evaluation Score is set.

(E) The Review Council's recommendations shall be provided to the presiding officer of the Program Integration Committee and to the Oversight Committee pursuant to the process described in subsection (d) of this section.

(4) The Institute's Peer Review process described in subsections (c) and (d) of this section may include the following additional process steps for Product Development of Cancer Research Grant Applications:

(A) A Grant Applicant may be invited to deliver an in-person presentation to the Peer Review Panel. The Product Development Review Council chairperson is responsible for deciding which Grant Applicants will make in-person presentations. The decision is based upon the initial Overall Evaluation Scores of

the primary reviewers following a discussion with Peer Review Panel members, as well as explicit criteria published in the Request for Applications.

(i) Peer Review Panel members may submit questions to be addressed by the Grant Applicant at the in-person presentation.

(ii) A Grant Application that is not presented in-person will not be considered further. The average of the primary reviewers' initial Overall Evaluation Scores will be the final Overall Evaluation Score for the Grant Application.

(iii) Following the in-person presentation, each Peer Review Panel member submits a score for the Grant Application based on the panel member's general impression of the Grant Application's merit and accounting for the explicit criteria published in the Request for Applications. The submitted scores are averaged together to produce the final Overall Evaluation Score for the Grant Application.

(B) A Grant Application may undergo business operations and management due diligence review and an intellectual property review. The Peer Review Panel submits a list of applications recommended for due diligence review to the Product Development Review Council. The Product Development Review Council decides which Grant Applications submitted by the Peer Review Panel will undergo business operations and management due diligence and intellectual property review. The decision is based upon the Grant Application's final Overall Evaluation Score, but also takes into consideration how well the Grant Application achieves program priorities set by the Oversight Committee, the overall Program portfolio balance, and any other criteria described in the Request for Applications. A Grant Application that is not recommended for due diligence and intellectual property review will not be considered further.

(i) Business operations and management due diligence may be conducted by an outside vendor, contracted by the Institute or by members of the Product Development Review Council.

(ii) It will be at the Institute's discretion as to who to use to perform business operations and management due diligence; factors may include volume of work and expertise required.

(C) After receipt of the business operations and management due diligence and intellectual property reviews for a Grant Application, the Product Development Review Council and the Primary Reviewers meet to determine whether to

recommend the Grant Application for a Grant Award based upon the information set forth in the due diligence and intellectual property reviews. The Product Development Review Council may recommend changes to the Grant Award budget and Scope of Work. [~~goals and objectives or timeline~~]

(D) The Product Development Review Council assigns a Numerical Ranking Score to each Grant Application recommended for a Grant Award.

(f) Institute Employees and Oversight Committee members may attend Peer Review Panel and Review Council meetings. If an Institute Employee or an Oversight Committee member attends a Peer Review Panel meeting or a Review Council meeting, the attendance shall be recorded and the Institute Employee or Oversight Committee member shall certify in writing compliance with the Institute's Conflict of Interest rules. The Institute Employee's and Oversight Committee member's attendance at the Peer Review Panel meeting or Review Council meeting is subject to the following restrictions:

(1) Unless waived pursuant to the process described in Chapter 702, §702.17 of this title (relating to Exceptional Circumstances Requiring Participation), Institute Employees and Oversight Committee members shall not be present for any discussion, vote, or other action taken related to a Grant Applicant if the Institute Employee or Oversight Committee member has a Conflict of Interest with that Grant Applicant; and

(2) The Institute Employee or Oversight Committee member shall not participate in a discussion of the merits, vote, or other action taken related to a Grant Application, except to answer technical or administrative questions unrelated to the merits of the Grant Application and to provide input on the Institute's Grant Review Process.

(g) The Institute's Chief Compliance Officer shall observe meetings of the Peer Review Panel and Review Council where Grant Applications are discussed.

(1) The Chief Compliance Officer shall document that the Institute's Grant Review Process is consistently followed, including observance of the Institute's established Conflict of Interest rules, and that participation by Institute employees, if any, is limited to providing input on the Institute's Grant Review Process and responding to committee questions unrelated to the merits of the Grant Application. Institute Program staff shall not participate in a discussion of the merits, vote, or any other action taken related to a Grant Application.

(2) The Chief Compliance Officer shall report to the Oversight Committee prior to a vote on the award recommendations specifying issues, if any, that are inconsistent with the Institute's established Grant Review Process.

(3) Nothing herein shall prevent the Institute from contracting with an independent third party to serve as a neutral observer of meetings of the Peer Review Panel and/or the Review Council where Grant Applications are discussed and to assume the reporting responsibilities of the Chief Compliance Officer described in this subsection. In the event that the independent third party observes the meeting of the Peer Review Panel and/or the Review Council, then the independent third party reviewer shall issue a report to the Chief Compliance Officer specifying issues, if any, that are inconsistent with the Institute's established Grant Review Process.

(h) Excepting a finding of an undisclosed Conflict of Interest as set forth in §703.9 of this chapter (relating to Limitation on Review of Grant Process), the Review Council's decision to not include a Grant Application on the prioritized list of Grant Applications submitted to the Program Integration Committee and the Oversight Committee is final. A Grant Application not included on the prioritized list created by the Review Council shall not be considered further during the Grant Review Cycle.

(i) At the time that the Peer Review Panel or the Review Council concludes its tasks for the Grant Review Cycle, each member shall certify in writing that the member complied with the Institute's Conflict of Interest rules. An Institute Employee or an Oversight Committee member attending one or more Peer Review Panel meetings during the Grant Review Cycle shall certify compliance with the Institute's Conflict of Interest rules.

(j) The Institute shall retain a review record for a Grant Application submitted to the Institute, even if the Grant Application did not receive a Grant Award. Such records will be retained by the Institute's electronic Grant Management System. The records retained by the Institute must include the following information:

(1) The final Overall Evaluation Score and Numerical Ranking Score, if applicable, assigned to the Grant Application;

(2) The specified amount of the Grant Award funding for the Grant Application, including an explanation for recommended changes to the Grant Award funding amount or to the Scope of Work [~~goals and objectives or timeline~~];

(3) The Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee that reviewed the Grant Application;

(4) Conflicts of Interest, if any, with the Grant Application identified by a member of the Scientific Research and Prevention Programs Committee, the Review Council, the Program Integration Committee, or the Oversight Committee; and

(5) Documentation of steps taken to recuse any member or members from the Grant Review Process because of disclosed Conflicts of Interest.

(k) For purposes of this rule, a Peer Review Panel chairperson or a Review Council chairperson that is unable to carry out his or her assigned duties due to a Conflict of Interest with regard to one or more Grant Applications or for any other reason may designate a co-chairperson from among the appointed Scientific Research and Prevention Programs committee members to fulfill the chairperson role. Such designation shall be recorded in writing and include the specific time and extent of the designation.

§ 703.7. Program Integration Committee Funding Recommendation

(a) The Institute uses a Program Review process undertaken by the Institute's Program Integration Committee to identify and recommend for funding a final list of meritorious Cancer Research projects, including those projects with Cancer Research Product Development prospects, and evidence-based Cancer Prevention and Control Program projects that are in the best overall interest of the State.

(b) Program Review shall be conducted pursuant to the requirements set forth in Chapter 702 of this title (relating to Institute Standards on Ethics and Conflicts, Including the Acceptance of Gifts and Donations to the Institute) and Chapter 102, Texas Health and Safety Code.

(c) The Program Integration Committee shall meet pursuant to a schedule established by the Chief Executive Officer, who serves as the Committee's presiding officer, to consider the prioritized list of Grant Applications submitted by the Prevention Review Council, the Product Development Review Council, or the Scientific Review Council.

(d) The Program Integration Committee shall approve by a majority vote a final list of Grant Applications recommended for Grant Awards to be provided to the Oversight Committee, including a list of Grant Applications, if any, that have been deferred until a future meeting of the Program Integration Committee. In composing the final list of Grant Applications recommended for Grant Award funding, the Program Integration Committee shall:

(1) Substantially base the list upon the Grant Award recommendations submitted by the Review Council.

(2) To the extent possible, give priority for funding to Grant Applications that:

(A) Could lead to immediate or long-term medical and scientific breakthroughs in the area of Cancer Prevention or cures for cancer;

(B) Strengthen and enhance fundamental science in Cancer Research;

- (C) Ensure a comprehensive coordinated approach to Cancer Research and Cancer Prevention;
 - (D) Are interdisciplinary or interinstitutional;
 - (E) Address federal or other major research sponsors' priorities in emerging scientific or Technology fields in the area of Cancer Prevention, or cures for cancer;
 - (F) Are matched with funds available by a private or nonprofit entity and institution or institutions of higher education;
 - (G) Are collaborative between any combination of private and nonprofit entities, public or private agencies or institutions in this state, and public or private institutions outside this state;
 - (H) Have a demonstrable economic development benefit to this state;
 - (I) Enhance research superiority at institutions of higher education in this state by creating new research superiority, attracting existing research superiority from institutions not located in this state and other research entities, or enhancing existing research superiority by attracting from outside this state additional researchers and resources;
 - (J) Expedite innovation and commercialization, attract, create, or expand private sector entities that will drive a substantial increase in high-quality jobs, and increase higher education applied science or Technology research capabilities; and
 - (K) Address the goals of the Texas Cancer Plan.
- (3) Document the factors considered in making the Grant Award recommendations, including any factors not listed in paragraph (2) of this subsection;
 - (4) Explain in writing the reasons for not recommending a Grant Application that was recommended for a Grant Award by the Review Council or for deferring a Grant Application recommendation until a future meeting date;
 - (5) Specify the amount of Grant Award funding for each Grant Application.

(A) Unless otherwise specifically stated, the Program Integration Committee adopts the changes to the Grant Award amount recommended by the Review Council.

(B) If the Program Integration Committee approves a change in the Grant Award amount that was not recommended by the Review Council, then the Grant Award amount and a written explanation for the change shall be provided.

(6) Specify changes, if any, to the Grant Application's Scope of Work [~~goals and objectives or timeline~~] recommended for a Grant Award and provide an explanation for the changes made;

(7) Address how the funding recommendations meet the annual priorities for Cancer Prevention, Cancer Research and Product Development programs and affect the Institute's overall Grant Award portfolio established by the Oversight Committee; and

(8) Provide a list of deferred Grant Applications, if any.

(e) In the event that the Program Integration Committee's vote on the final list of Grant Award recommendations or deferrals is not unanimous, then the Program Integration Committee Member or Members not voting with the majority may submit a written explanation to the Oversight Committee for the vote against the final list of Grant Award recommendations or deferrals. The explanation may include the Program Integration Committee Member or Members' recommended prioritized list of Grant Award recommendations or deferrals.

(f) The Program Integration Committee's decision to not include a Grant Application on the prioritized list of Grant Applications submitted to the Oversight Committee is final. A Grant Application not included on the prioritized list created by the Program Integration Committee shall not be considered further during the Grant Review Cycle, except for the following:

(1) In the event that the Program Integration Committee's vote on the final list of Grant Award recommendations is not unanimous, then, upon a motion of an Oversight Committee Member, the Oversight Committee may also consider the Grant Award recommendations submitted by the non-majority Program Integration Committee Member or Members;

(2) A finding of an undisclosed Conflict of Interest as set forth in §703.9 of this chapter (relating to Limitation on Review of Grant Process); or

(3) A decision by the Program Integration Committee to defer a decision to include a Grant Application on the prioritized list of Grant Applications submitted to the Oversight

Committee until a future meeting of the Program Integration Committee, subject to subsection (k).

(g) The Chief Compliance Officer shall attend and observe Program Integration Committee meetings to document compliance with Chapter 102, Texas Health and Safety Code and the Institute's administrative rules.

(h) At the time that the Program Integration Committee's final Grant Award recommendations are formally submitted to the Oversight Committee, the Chief Executive Officer shall prepare a written affidavit for each Grant Application recommended by the Program Integration Committee containing relevant information related to the Grant Application recommendation.

(1) Information to be provided in the Chief Executive Officer's affidavit may include:

(A) The Peer Review process for the recommended Grant Application, including:

- (i) The Request for Applications applicable to the Grant Application;
- (ii) The number of Grant Applications submitted in response to the Request for Applications;
- (iii) The name of the Peer Review Panel reviewing the Grant Application;
- (iv) Whether a preliminary review process was used by the Peer Review Panel for the Grant Mechanism in the Grant Review Cycle;
- (v) An overview of the Conflict of Interest process applicable to the Grant Review Cycle noting any waivers granted; and
- (vi) A list of all final Overall Evaluation Scores for all Grant Applications submitted pursuant to the same Grant Mechanism, de-identified by Grant Applicant;

(B) The final Overall Evaluation Score and Numerical Ranking Score assigned for the Grant Applications recommended during the Peer Review process; and

(C) A high-level summary of the business operations and management due diligence and intellectual property reviews, if applicable, conducted for a Cancer Research Product Development Grant Application.

(2) In the event that the Program Integration Committee's final Grant Award recommendations are not unanimous and the Program Integration Committee Member or

Members in the non-majority recommend Grant Applications not included on the final list of Grant Award recommendations, then the Chief Executive Officer shall also prepare a written affidavit for each Grant Application recommended by the non-majority Program Integration Committee Member or Members.

(i) To the extent that the information or documentation for one Grant Application is the same for all Grant Applications recommended for Grant Award funding pursuant to the same Grant Mechanism, it shall be sufficient for the Chief Executive Officer to provide the information or documentation once and incorporate by reference in each subsequent affidavit.

(j) At least three business days prior to the Oversight Committee meeting held to consider the Grant Applications for Grant Award funding, the Chief Executive Officer shall provide a list of Grant Applications, if any, recommended for an advance of Grant Award funds upon execution of the Grant Contract. The list shall include the reasons supporting the recommendation to advance funds.

(k) The Program Integration Committee's decision to defer the final Grant Award recommendation for a Grant Application is only effective for the state fiscal year in which the Program Integration Committee's deferral decision is made.

(1) A Grant Application that is deferred by the Program Integration Committee and is pending a final Grant Award recommendation at the end of the state fiscal year shall be considered not recommended for a Grant Award without further action from the Program Integration Committee.

(2) A Grant Application that is deferred and pending a final Grant Award recommendation at the end of the state fiscal year may be resubmitted by the Grant Applicant in a subsequent review cycle. Such resubmission will not count against the resubmission limit, if any, stated in the Request for Applications.

§ 703.10 Awarding Grants by Contract

(a) The Oversight Committee shall negotiate on behalf of the state regarding the awarding of grant funds and enter into a written contract with the Grant Recipient.

(b) The Oversight Committee may delegate Grant Contract negotiation duties to the Chief Executive Officer and the General Counsel for the Institute. The Chief Executive Officer may enter into a written contract with the Grant Recipient on behalf of the Oversight Committee.

(c) The Grant Contract shall include the following provisions:

- (1) If any portion of the Grant Contract has been approved by the Oversight Committee to be used to build a capital improvement, the Grant Contract shall specify that:
 - (A) The state retains a lien or other interest in the capital improvement in proportion to the percentage of the Grant Award amount used to pay for the capital improvement; and
 - (B) If the capital improvement is sold, then the Grant Recipient agrees to repay to the state the Grant Award used to pay for the capital improvement, with interest, and share with the state a proportionate amount of any profit realized from the sale;
- (2) Terms relating to Intellectual Property Rights and the sharing with the Institute of revenues generated by the sale, license, or other conveyance of such Project Results consistent with the standards established by this chapter;
- (3) Terms relating to publication of materials created with Grant Award funds or related to the Cancer Research or Cancer Prevention project that is the subject of the Grant Award, including an acknowledgement of Institute funding and copyright ownership, if applicable:
 - (A) Acknowledgment of Institute funding must include the grant number of every Institute-funded grant contributing to the work memorialized in the publication; and
 - (B) Subparagraph (A) of this paragraph is effective beginning September 1, 2021;
- (4) Repayment terms, including interest rates, to be enforced if the Grant Recipient has not used Grant Award funds for the purposes for which the Grant Award was intended;
- (5) A statement that the Institute does not assume responsibility for the conduct of the Cancer Research or Cancer Prevention project, and that the conduct of the project and activities of all investigators are under the scope and direction of the Grant Recipient;
- (6) A statement that the Cancer Research or Cancer Prevention project is conducted with full consideration for the ethical and medical implications of the project and that the project will comply with all federal and state laws regarding the conduct of the Cancer Research or Prevention project;
- (7) Terms related to the Standards established by the Oversight Committee in Chapter 701 of this title (relating to Policies and Procedures) to ensure that Grant Recipients, to the extent reasonably possible, demonstrate good faith effort to purchase goods and

services for the Grant Award project from suppliers in this state and from historically underutilized businesses as defined by Chapter 2161, Texas Government Code, and any other state law;

(8) An agreement by the Grant Recipient to submit to regular inspection reviews of the Grant Award project by Institute staff during normal business hours and upon reasonable notice to ensure compliance with the terms of the Grant Contract and continued merit of the project;

(9) An agreement by the Grant Recipient to submit Grant Progress Reports to the Institute on a schedule specified by the Grant Contract that includes information on a grant-by-grant basis quantifying the amount of additional research funding, if any, secured as a result of Institute funding;

(10) An agreement that, to the extent possible, the Grant Recipient will evaluate whether any new or expanded preclinical testing, clinical trials, Product Development, or manufacturing of any real or intellectual property resulting from the award can be conducted in this state, including the establishment of facilities to meet this purpose;

(11) An agreement that the Grant Recipient will abide by the Texas Grant Management Standards (TxGMS) published by the Comptroller of Public Accounts Statewide Procurement Division, if applicable, unless one or more standards conflicts with a provision of the Grant Contract, Chapter 102, Texas Health and Safety Code, or the Institute's administrative rules. Such interpretation of the Institute rules and TxGMS shall be made by the Institute;

(12) An agreement that the Grant Recipient is under a continuing obligation to notify the Institute of any adverse conditions that materially impact the Scope of Work [milestones and objectives included] in the Grant Contract;

(13) An agreement that the design, conduct, and reporting of the Cancer Research or Prevention project will not be biased by conflicting financial interest of the Grant Recipient or any individuals associated with the Grant Award. This duty is fulfilled by certifying that an appropriate written, enforced Conflict of Interest policy governs the Grant Recipient;

(14) An agreement regarding the amount, schedule, and requirements for payment of Grant Award funds, if such advance payments are approved by the Oversight Committee in accordance with this chapter. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Institute may require that up to ten percent of the final tranche of funds approved for the Grant Award must be expended on a reimbursement basis. Such reimbursement payment shall not be made

until close out documents described in this section and required by the Grant Contract have been submitted and approved by the Institute;

(15) An agreement to provide quarterly Financial Status Reports and supporting documentation for expenses submitted for reimbursement or, if appropriate, to demonstrate how advanced funds were expended;

(16) A statement certifying that, as of June 14, 2013, the Grant Recipient has not made and will not make a contribution, during the term of the Grant Contract, to the Institute or to any foundation established specifically to support the Institute;

(17) A statement specifying the agreed effective date of the Grant Contract and the period in which the Grant Award funds must be spent. If the effective date specified in the Grant Contract is different from the date the Grant Contract is signed by both parties, then the effective date shall control;

(18) A statement providing for reimbursement with Grant Award funds of expenses made prior to the effective date of the Grant Contract at the discretion of the Institute. Pre-contract reimbursement shall be made only in the event that:

(A) The expenses are allowable pursuant to the terms of the Grant Contract;

(B) The request is made in writing by the Grant Recipient and approved by the Chief Executive Officer; and

(C) The expenses to be reimbursed were incurred on or after the date the Grant Award recommendation was approved by the Oversight Committee;

(19) Requirements for closing out the Grant Contract at the termination date, including the submission of a Financial Status Report, a final Grant Progress Report, an equipment inventory, a HUB and Texas Business report, a revenue sharing form, a single audit determination report form and a list of contractual terms that extend beyond the termination date;

(20) A certification of dedicated Matching Funds equal to one-half of the amount of the Research Grant Award that includes the name of the Research Grant Award to which the matching funds are to be dedicated, as specified in Section §703.11 of this chapter (relating to Requirement to Demonstrate Available Funds for Cancer Research Grants);

(21) The project deliverables as described by the Grant Application and stated in the Scope of Work for the Grant Contract reflecting modifications, if any, approved during the Peer Review process or during Grant Contract negotiation;

(22) An agreement that the Grant Recipient shall notify the Institute and seek approval for a change in effort for any of the Senior Members or Key Personnel of the research or prevention team listed on the Grant Application, including any proposed temporary leave of absence of a Principal Investigator, Program Director, or Company Representative;

(23) An agreement that the Grant Recipient is legally responsible for the integrity of the fiscal and programmatic management of the organization; and

(24) An agreement that the Grant Recipient is responsible for the actions of its employees and other research collaborators, including third parties, involved in the project. The Grant Recipient is responsible for enforcing its standards of conduct, taking appropriate action on individual infractions, and, in the case of financial conflict of interest, informing the Institute if the infraction is related to a Grant Award.

(d) The Grant Recipient's failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the Grant Contract may result in termination of the Grant Contract, pursuant to the process prescribed in the Grant Contract, and trigger repayment of the Grant Award funds.

§ 703.21 Monitoring Grant Award Performance and Expenditures

(a) The Institute, under the direction of the Chief Compliance Officer, shall monitor Grant Awards to ensure that Grant Recipients comply with applicable financial, administrative, and programmatic terms and conditions and exercise proper stewardship over Grant Award funds. Such terms and conditions include requirements set forth in statute, administrative rules, and the Grant Contract.

(b) Methods used by the Institute to monitor a Grant Recipient's performance and expenditures may include:

(1) Financial Status Reports Review--The Institute shall review Grant Award expenditures reported by Grant Recipients on the quarterly Financial Status Reports and supporting documents to determine whether expenses charged to the Grant Award are:

(A) Allowable, allocable, reasonable, necessary, and consistently applied regardless of the source of funds; and

(B) Adequately supported with documentation such as cost reports, receipts, third party invoices for expenses, or payroll information.

(2) Timely submission of Grant Award Reports--The Institute shall monitor the submission of all required reports and implement a process to ensure that Grant Award funds are not disbursed to a Grant Recipient with one or more delinquent reports.

(3) Grant Progress Reports--The Institute shall review Grant Progress Reports to determine whether sufficient progress is made consistent with the Scope of Work [~~scope of work and timeline~~] set forth in the Grant Contract.

(A) The Grant Progress Reports shall be submitted at least annually, but may be required more frequently pursuant to Grant Contract terms or upon request and reasonable notice of the Institute.

(B) Unless specifically stated otherwise herein, the annual Grant Progress Report shall be submitted within sixty (60) days after the anniversary of the effective date of the Grant Contract. The annual Grant Progress Report shall include at least the following information:

(i) An affirmative verification by the Grant Recipient of compliance with the terms and conditions of the Grant Contract;

(ii) A description of the Grant Recipient's progress made toward completing the Scope of Work [~~scope of work~~] specified by the Grant Contract, including information, data, and program metrics regarding the achievement of the Scope of Work [~~project goals and timelines~~];

(iii) The number of new jobs created and the number of jobs maintained for the preceding twelve month period as a result of Grant Award funds awarded to the Grant Recipient for the project;

(iv) An inventory of the equipment purchased for the project in the preceding twelve month period using Grant Award funds;

(v) A verification of the Grant Recipient's efforts to purchase from suppliers in this state more than 50 percent goods and services purchased for the project with grant funds;

(vi) A Historically Underutilized Businesses report;

(vii) Scholarly articles, presentations, and educational materials produced for the public addressing the project funded by the Institute;

(viii) The number of patents applied for or issued addressing discoveries resulting from the research project funded by the Institute;

(ix) A statement of the identities of the funding sources, including amounts and dates for all funding sources supporting the project;

(x) A verification of the amounts of Matching Funds dedicated to the research that is the subject of the Grant Award for the period covered by the annual report, which shall be submitted pursuant to the timeline in §703.11 of this title (relating to Requirement to Demonstrate Available Funds for Cancer Research Grants). In order to receive disbursement of grant funds, the most recently due verification of the amount of Matching Funds must be approved by CPRIT;

(xi) All financial information necessary to support the calculation of the Institute's share of revenues, if any, received by the Grant Recipient resulting from the project; and

(xii) A single audit determination form, which shall be submitted pursuant to the timeline in §703.13 of this title (relating to Audits and Investigations).

(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, in the event that the Grant Recipient and Institute execute the Grant Contract after the effective date of the Grant Contract, the Chief Program Officer may approve additional time for the Grant Recipient to prepare and submit the outstanding reports. The approval shall be in writing and maintained in the Institute's electronic Grants Management System. The Chief Program Officer's approval may cover more than one report and more than one fiscal quarter.

(D) In addition to annual Grant Progress Reports, a final Grant Progress Report shall be filed no more than ninety (90) days after the termination date of the Grant Contract. The final Grant Progress Report shall include a comprehensive description of the Grant Recipient's progress made toward completing the Scope of Work [~~scope of work~~] specified by the Grant Contract, as well as other information specified by the Institute.

(E) The Grant Progress Report will be evaluated pursuant to criteria established by the Institute. The evaluation shall be conducted under the direction of the Chief Prevention Officer, the Chief Product Development Officer, or the Chief Scientific Officer, as may be appropriate. Required financial reports associated with the Grant Progress Report will be reviewed by the Institute's financial staff. In order to receive disbursement of grant funds, the final progress report must be approved by CPRIT.

(F) If the Grant Progress Report evaluation indicates that the Grant Recipient has not demonstrated progress in accordance with the Grant Contract, then the Chief

Program Officer shall notify the Chief Executive Officer and the General Counsel for further action.

(i) The Chief Program Officer shall submit written recommendations to the Chief Executive Officer and General Counsel for actions to be taken, if any, to address the issue.

(ii) The recommended action may include termination of the Grant Award pursuant to the process described in §703.14 of this chapter (relating to Termination, Extension, and Close Out of Grant Contracts, and De-Obligation of Grant Award Funds).

(G) If the Grant Recipient fails to submit required financial reports associated with the Grant Progress Report, then the Institute financial staff shall notify the Chief Executive Officer and the General Counsel for further action.

(H) In order to receive disbursement of grant funds, the most recently due progress report must be approved by CPRIT.

(I) If a Grant Recipient fails to submit the Grant Progress Report within 60 days of the anniversary of the effective date of the Grant Contract, then the Institute shall not disburse any Grant Award funds as reimbursement or advancement of Grant Award funds until such time that the delinquent Grant Progress Report is approved.

(J) In addition to annual Grant Progress Reports, Product Development Grant Recipients shall submit a Grant Progress Report at the completion of specific tranches of funding specified in the Award Contract. For the purpose of this subsection, a Grant Progress Report submitted at the completion of a tranche of funding shall be known as "Tranche Grant Progress Report."

(i) The Institute may specify other required reports, if any, that are required to be submitted at the time of the Tranche Grant Progress Report.

(ii) Grant Funds for the next tranche of funding specified in the Grant Contract shall not be disbursed until the Tranche Grant Progress Report has been reviewed and approved pursuant to the process described in this section.

(K) A Grant Award in the prevention program with a Grant Contract effective date within the last quarter of a state fiscal year (June 1-August 31) will have an initial reporting period beginning September 1 of the following state fiscal year.

(4) Desk Reviews--The Institute may conduct a desk review for a Grant Award to review and compare individual source documentation and materials to summary data provided during the Financial Status Report review for compliance with financial requirements set forth in the statute, administrative rules, and the Grant Contract.

(5) Site Visits and Inspection Reviews--The Institute may conduct a scheduled site visit to a Grant Recipient's place of business to review Grant Contract compliance and Grant Award performance issues. Such site visits may be comprehensive or limited in scope.

(6) Audit Reports--The Institute shall review audit reports submitted pursuant to §703.13 of this chapter (relating to Audits and Investigations).

(A) If the audit report findings indicate action to be taken related to the Grant Award funds expended by the Grant Recipient or for the Grant Recipient's fiscal processes that may impact Grant Award expenditures, the Institute and the Grant Recipient shall develop a written plan and timeline to address identified deficiencies, including any necessary Grant Contract amendments.

(B) The written plan shall be retained by the Institute as part of the Grant Contract record.

(c) All required Grant Recipient reports and submissions described in this section shall be made via an electronic grant portal designated by the Institute, unless specifically directed to the contrary in writing by the Institute.

(d) The Institute shall document the actions taken to monitor Grant Award performance and expenditures, including the review, approvals, and necessary remedial steps, if any.

(1) To the extent that the methods described in subsection (b) of this section are applied to a sample of the Grant Recipients or Grant Awards, then the Institute shall document the Grant Contracts reviewed and the selection criteria for the sample reviewed.

(2) Records will be maintained in the electronic Grant Management System as described in §703.4 of this chapter (relating to Grants Management System).

(e) The Chief Compliance Officer shall be engaged in the Institute's Grant Award monitoring activities and shall notify the General Counsel and Oversight Committee if a Grant Recipient fails to meaningfully comply with the Grant Contract reporting requirements and deadlines, including Matching Funds requirements.

(f) The Chief Executive Officer shall report to the Oversight Committee at least annually on the progress and continued merit of each Grant Program funded by the Institute. The written report

shall also be included in the Annual Public Report. The report should be presented to the Oversight Committee at the first meeting following the publication of the Annual Public Report.

(g) The Institute may rely upon third parties to conduct Grant Award monitoring services independently or in conjunction with Institute staff.

(h) If a deadline set by this rule falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday as designated by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, the required filing may be submitted on the next business day. The Institute will not consider a required filing delinquent if the Grant Recipient complies with this subsection.

§ 703.25 Grant Award Budget

(a) The Grant Contract shall include an Approved Budget that reflects the amount of the Grant Award funds to be spent for each Project Year.

(b) All expenses charged to a Grant Award must be budgeted and reported in the appropriate budget category.

(c) Actual expenditures under each category should not exceed budgeted amounts authorized by the Grant Contract as reflected on the Approved Budget for each Grant Award.

(d) Recipients may make transfers between or among lines within budget categories listed on the Approved Budget so long as the transfer fits within the Scope of Work [scope of the Grant Contract] and the total Approved Budget; is beneficial to the achievement of the Scope of Work [project objectives-]; and is an efficient, effective use of Grant Award funds.

(e) Except as provided herein, all budget changes or transfers require Institute approval.

(1) The Grant Recipient may make budget changes or transfers without prior approval from the Institute for expenses not specified in the equipment category if:

(A) The total dollar amount of all changes of any single line item (individually and in the aggregate) within budget categories other than equipment is 10% or less of the total budget for the applicant grant year;

(B) The transfer will not increase or decrease the total grant budget; and

(C) The transfer will not materially change the nature, performance level, or Scope of Work [scope of the project].

(2) The Institute may reverse one or more budget changes or transfers under paragraph (1) of this subsection [~~subsection (1)~~] if the Institute determines that the Grant Recipient made multiple individual budget changes or transfers within the same category that, if considered together, would require Institute approval.

(f) A Grant Recipient awarded a Grant Award for a multiyear project that fails to expend the total Project Year budget may carry forward the unexpended budget balance to the next Project Year.

(1) If the amount of the unexpended balance for a budget line item in a Project Year exceeds twenty-five percent (25%) or more of the total budget line item amount for that year, Institute approval is required before the Grant Recipient may carry forward the unexpended balance to the next Project Year.

(2) For a budget carry forward requiring Institute approval, the Grant Recipient must provide justification for why the total Grant Award amount should not be reduced by the unexpended balance.